

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

**Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)**

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1972

Afternoon Sitting

[[Page 93](#)]

THURSDAY, JANUARY 27, 1972

Prayers.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Premier.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I'm sure all Members of the House feel for His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor who last night at the State Dinner didn't feel very well, and was advised to go to the hospital.

The report that I received this morning is that he had a good night, and is coming along as well as can be expected. I'm sure that all the prayers and all the thoughts of all Hon. Members of the House will be with his Honour.

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

MR. D. BARRETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I too would like to pass along our deep concern, and thankfulness that he had a good night last night, and hopefully his illness is only temporary.

I'd also like to ask the House to welcome a group of some 40 students from Centennial High School in the great district of Coquitlam who are visiting here.

Introduction of Bills.

Orders of the day.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

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

HON. R.J. CAMPBELL (Minister of Municipal Affairs): Mr. Speaker, once again it's my privilege to join this debate in thanking His Honour for his speech on this opening of the third session of this parliament.

I'm not going to take any advice from the Hon. Member from North Vancouver (Mr. Clark) as to my remark. We won the bet. We got them out of their seats within 32 seconds this year.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that disturbs me quite a bit is the way in which some public issues that affect people, or the hardships of people are used in the political arena.

I've commented many times in this House on the way in which political people in opposition in this province have ridden on the backs of the poor to make a point. They've taken issues like glue sniffing to make a point. They've taken issues like the Willingdon School for Girls to make a point many years ago. They've taken the whole drug scene to make a point as the Leader of Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition did the other day.

AN HON. MEMBER: A very good point too.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: And off the top of his head he indicated that the only solution for young people of 16 years of age was to tell a mother that the answer to her problem was that youngster lay in the proposition of the free drug culture, the state drug culture, of England.

Mr. Speaker, that kind of statement is typical of the suggestions that are made from time to time about the hardships of people in the name of politics — the preoccupation with some situations like the glue sniffing situation — without listening to what we have been attempting to do and what what we've been attempting to say.

Long before this became a political issue in terms of glue sniffing the government and the Attorney General's Department, and my Department have been examining the proposition of where the municipalities might fit into this particular situation and remove any technical and legal difficulties that are involved.

But when I hear remarks like the Hon. Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barrett) gave out with respect to the drug culture to try and make a point — that nobody on this side of the House cares, or nobody on this side of the House is doing anything about this in terms of our public posture — I'll accept his challenge as to what I would have told that mother or that person 16 years of age. Because I have already done that in my own constituency.

Many people are concerned about the drug culture in British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, and they have asked questions to me as their Member. I'll read the letter that I sent to at least 100 people in my own constituency who wrote me as to where I stood.

This is to acknowledge your letter of January 11, 1972 regarding the drug problem in British Columbia.

In my opinion there is far too much public waffling about the drug situation.

For example, federal and provincial agencies are saying they don't know enough about it to take a stand. Many medical doctors are reluctant to take a stand. A great number of studies and Royal commissions have not been taking a helpful position. In my view there is only one posture to assume with respect to this problem and that is to clearly say as I do now, that drugs are a bad scene. Period.

As Minister of Social Welfare, when there was a Minister of Social Welfare, I had some background on the impact of the drug culture on young people. In particular. And without reservation it was not difficult to come to the conclusion that whatever the merits of a particular drug might be the problem lies in the creation of the culture and the moral climate that surrounds the use of the drugs, and the impact of that culture on the individual. I have no hesitation then in saying publicly and to you that my position is simply that the whole drug culture is a bad scene, period, and should not receive any encouragement from any public people.

Now, Mr. Speaker I open my remarks in that context because I think there is far too much use of what are real serious public and personal problems in the whole range of the social services simply for the opportunistic gains of a particular party, at a particular political time.

Mr. Speaker, I think that's bad politics, I think that's bad government, I think that's bad debate. And the Hon. Leader of the Opposition ever since he came into this House has been a past master at that kind of an approach to politics in British Columbia, to alternatives, to the Brannan Lake School for boys — all of these situations.

MR. BARRETT: Say something.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: He doesn't like what I'm saying. The Opposition never likes what the Hon. Member for Comox says. But I'm going to say it anyway.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

[[Page 94](#)]

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, in dealing with the Speech from the Throne, I was naturally delighted as the Member for Comox to have such prominent mention of the new highway system that's moving up-island, from Kelsey Bay to Beaver Cove without federal help. I'm very pleased to be able to say that following my suggestions of a couple of years ago, that the ferry system from Kelsey Bay to Beaver Cove needed expansion, it went on to show last year a record increase of 80 per cent. The whole north end of Vancouver Island is a complete new empire today, a tremendous area which when we brought that area to the attention...

Interjections by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I'm coming to my friend again. Simmer down, simmer down.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: When we brought that area to the attention of the federal minister Mr. Marchand, my colleague the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests (Hon. Mr. Williston) and my colleague the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Skillings) went to the north end of Vancouver Island with Mr. Marchand with the support of every single municipal council in the north island area to make one point and one point alone. That in a developing area like that, when you're building instant towns, when you have to do today what some communities have had 10 and 15 and 20 years to accomplish, when you have to build the hospitals immediately, the schools immediately, the water system immediately, the road system immediately, everything is telescoped into a very short period of time.

We said to Mr. Marchand and his officials: "This is the kind of area where a sensible government would place capital in terms of making it possible for that area to help the rest of Canada and the rest of British Columbia in terms of employment."

We at no time, when those officials were there, described this area as a depressed area. We at no time suggested that it needed some kind of special attention in the name of it being a poor area. We did it to suggest that it makes a lot of sense if you're going to put federal money anywhere, instead of putting it into some kitten club in Prince Edward Island — where the Canadian taxpayer is paying \$1,400,000 in the Liberal Government's money which is the Canadian taxpayer's money — so that a bunch of Liberals down in Prince Edward Island can run around and have parties. We suggested that it made a lot of sense to put some of that kind of money if it was available in a productive area of British Columbia.

And we made very clear that this was not just in the name of the British Columbia situation or the people of the north end of Vancouver Island. We simply said it made good economic sense to at least put some of your money where your strength is. What happened? The Hon. Member for Comox-Alberni, the great federal NDP Member for Comox-Alberni, who I refer to as silent Tom, did he get up in the House of Commons and try to support the position of the government of this province? No way, no way! What did he do?

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: He stood up in the House of Commons and ridiculed the suggestion that the north end of Vancouver Island needed any special attention, ridiculed it.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: And what did the Liberal Members for British Columbia do? Would you believe

they did...

AN HON. MEMBER: Nothing?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: With the number of members, would you believe that they helped British Columbia by making 20 speeches in the House of Commons? Fourteen?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: No, no!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Two? You know how many speeches they made in the House of Commons on behalf of British Columbia when that position was being expressed, which makes some sense? Ziltch! Ziltch! Zero! But I must say, having said those nasty things about the federal Liberals — and they need help, they need help. They need a sense of direction...

AN HON. MEMBER: Help!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: They need to be given some good ideas. Even if they don't take them. But I want to be fair because I'm always fair. There's another matter affecting my constituency, and I know the Hon. Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) will be very pleased to hear this. The Minister, Mr. Jean Chretien — that's pretty good French — took a look at the Cape Mudge situation and other communities in British Columbia, because we had never established from the Minister that he was willing to extend the proposition that we had offered to Cape Mudge to other communities in British Columbia. We simply had established that it was to be a model and you all know the results and I must express my public disappointment again at those results.

But the business is not over yet, I'm pleased to say.

HON. MR. BENNETT: Those are pretty good percentages, though.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Very good percentages, Mr. Premier. But Mr. Chretien this morning sent this wire and I've been in touch with him and he suggested I read it to you in the Legislature this afternoon and I'm very pleased to do that:

RE: YOUR TELEGRAM OF JANUARY 18, I HAVE NOTED THAT YOUR MUNICIPAL ACT CONTAINS DIFFERENT PERCENTAGE VOTING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE ESTABLISHMENT OF NON-INDIAN MUNICIPALITIES TO THE PER CENTAGE REQUIRED FOR INDIAN MUNICIPALITIES. I SHARE YOUR VIEWPOINT THAT THE VOTING REQUIREMENTS SHOULD BE THE SAME. HOWEVER YOU MAY WISH TO OBTAIN THE GENERAL OPINION OF THE INDIAN PEOPLE. PERHAPS THROUGH THE UNION OF B.C. CHIEFS. LIKE YOU, I AM ALSO WILLING TO USE THE BASIC MODEL WHICH HAS ALREADY BEEN AGREED TO FOR ANY OTHER INDIAN COMMUNITY IN YOUR PROVINCE. SIGNED, JEAN CHRETIEN, MINISTER OF THE DEPARTMENT OF INDIAN AFFAIRS AND NORTHERN DEVELOPMENT.

[[Page 95](#)]

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this, when this whole process of negotiations was going on, I have nothing but the highest regard for the cooperation received from Mr. Chretien.

I know this House would be disappointed if I didn't make a report to them about the state of municipal governments in the province. Because I know from time to time although you haven't seen fit to mention municipalities in this debate yet they are an important part of the government process in the Province of British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: You weren't listening.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I was listening, I was...

AN HON. MEMBER: I reported on the...

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I was listening. I'm going to report on what they said this afternoon. I'm glad you mentioned it.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, I can report and I want Hon. Members to have this information so that their debate in the future course of this debate and in the budget debate can be based on an intelligent understanding of the facts.

Never before, Mr. Speaker, in the history of this province have the relations between the Department of Municipal Affairs and the Union of B.C. Municipalities been on a higher plane. The Hon. Member for New Westminster (Mr. Cocke) suggested that that was not the case. Now, I wouldn't like to suggest that he is not telling this House the truth, but I do not want to be so immodest.

I could use my own description of those relationships. That would be unfair. So I will use the U.B.C.M. Newsletter to describe the relations between the government of this province and the Union of B.C. Municipalities.

... and of course, Municipal Affairs Minister, Mr. Dan Campbell. (In my remarks at the convention I pointed out the close relationship which now exists between the U.B.C.M. and the Municipal Affairs Department.) It was not always this way and much of the credit for this improved relationship must go to Mr. Campbell.

Now, I am almost blushing, I'm almost blushing to read this, it's so good. I could have written it myself. Mr. Speaker, they go on to say in another addition after expressing the general appreciation of local government in B.C.,

the Municipal Affairs Minister, Dan Campbell, his door's open to us at all reasonable times and we get a lot of help from him and members of his department.

I certainly appreciate, Mr. Speaker, these kind remarks which I am forced to read into the records. (Laughter). They go on to say, he goes on to say — this is the president talking...

AN HON. MEMBER: President?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: The president of the U.B.C.M. (Laughter).

We have been getting fantastic cooperation (laughter) from the Minister, Dan Campbell and his officials of the Department of Municipal Affairs.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you can't really knock it when you are three for three. (Laughter). But, Mr. Speaker, that's not the whole story, of course. Chapter two is even better. (Laughter).

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: This year once again Members of this Legislature will be discussing municipal affairs and the problems, and obviously problems do arise from time to time. But once again I don't know of any area in the free world that would be able to make some of the statements I'm going to make this afternoon. Because in financial terms, this is a record of management which was established by my friend, the then Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs, the Member for Nelson-Creston (Hon. Mr. Black), when the objective was to start to put municipalities on a forwardplanning basis in terms of finance. They were to as large an extent possible to finance their water utilities and their sewer utilities on the basis of self-liquidation. They were encouraged by my friends to start a programme of forwardlooking capital management in terms of capital budgeting. They were encouraged to take as much as they do today and it was small in those days, relatively in 1956.

The amount that they do take from revenue surpluses, from surplus accounts, from cash reserves, for capital projects again this year is unexcelled anywhere in Canada or the world as far as I can discover. But I will stand on Canada and once again I'll make my annual offer to resign.

I know Hon. Members opposite have been working diligently, Mr. Speaker, as they do every year. They work diligently from one session to the next to try and discover where the Minister of Municipal Affairs is giving false information to the House about the financial position of the municipalities in British Columbia. And they haven't

found it yet.

Why, Mr. Speaker? Because I don't use the figures that are produced by the Department of Municipal Affairs. I don't use the figures that are produced by the Minister of Finance.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's enough of that ...

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I use the figures that are produced by the municipalities themselves, and there they are, Mr. Speaker, there they are.

AN HON. MEMBER: How can you tell they are right?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: By all the yardsticks.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose yardsticks?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: This year, by all the yardsticks of anyone who knows how to read municipal financial statistics — and the Hon. Member obviously doesn't — current tax collection, 1970, is 96 per cent for districts, 95 per cent for villages, 94 per cent for towns. Not excelled anywhere in Canada. Period.

With school taxation, \$152 million represents that portion of the municipalities' total tax picture. \$52 million of that comes from the home-owner grant. And, Mr. Speaker of the remainder of that \$100 million, 94 per cent, or very close, comes from the assessment on commercial and industrial property in British Columbia. Depending on the year you are looking at, between 6 and 8 per cent only comes from the residential property owner. No other province in Canada can even come close to making a statement like that.

Point number two. This year, I have taken only the totally liquid reserves. The statutory reserves, the operating reserves, the surpluses, totalled last year \$104,954,000 —

[[Page 96](#)]

\$105 million. Up \$10 million in that year alone.

Mr. Speaker, the incredible thing about this is that that represents 27 per cent of the general revenues of the municipalities. Now, I'm not going to suggest that the municipalities are in such good shape that 27 per cent is too low or too high. I'm not going to suggest that the municipalities are over-taxing the people. I'm not going to suggest that they in certain problem areas do not require money for certain types of priority projects. But I am going to say this.

When any group of municipalities together can have a revenue surplus position of 27 per cent, and those Hon. Members a little later on talk about a budget of the Province of British Columbia and bounce up and down around the Province of British Columbia and talk about the overburdened surpluses of the province that should be going here, there and everywhere and suggest that that's a bad thing, are they suggesting that it's a bad thing that municipalities are in such financial position that they can have that kind of reserve?

I don't think so. I don't think so. I find it incredible that some people in the municipal world keep knocking on a purely political basis the financial picture.

Why do they do it? It interferes with their credit position. They are knocking their own products. If they go to the bond market why don't they paint the big picture? Well, Mr. Speaker, last year they did. They did go to the bond market and in New York, for the first time, on a first-time issue, got a double A rating, pooling the credits of all the municipalities in British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Whose rating?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Standard and Poor. I'm glad you asked that question. You should never ask a

question to which you don't know the answer.

Mr. Speaker, first-time issue, a coupon was issued at 8 3/8 per cent at par in the U.S. dollars. The following day there was a provincial issue of \$75 million which was issued with a coupon rate sold in the same market 8 1/2 per cent, a provincial issue with a full provincial guarantee. It happened to be the Quebec issue and obviously, putting the two together, one right after the other, the municipal finance authority proved what the Liberal leader said it could not prove, what the Hon. Leader of the Opposition said it could not prove.

As a matter of fact, they voted against the establishment of the idea of pooling all the credits of the municipalities of the Province of British Columbia and I warned them then, and this House will remember. I warned them then: "You are making a mistake." They were not taking a correct reading of what should be done for municipal financing in British Columbia and they ignored that advice and they will pay for that within a very short period of time.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: When, when?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Next year or the year after.

But, Mr. Speaker, that same financing authority went to the Canadian market for the first time and no Canadian issue has been better — \$1,250,000 Canadian 25-year issue was issued at 7.8 per cent. Which was a prediction I made as well when this was announced — that in the 70's there would be 7 per cent interest for the municipal financing authorities. Seven per cent in the '70's, and it's going to go lower than that if they follow some more advice.

Point number three. The municipal financing in British Columbia last year took \$44 million of their capital requirement without going to the marketplace for long-term debt at all.

Out of surplus accounts, out of cash in the bank \$44 million. Nowhere in Canada, Mr. Speaker, was that picture painted as it was in the Province of British Columbia. Nowhere. And I'll offer to resign on that one too, as I'm doing on all of these. Do those Hon. Members want to take me up on it?

Mr. Speaker, what is past is prologue. Because just assuming the present situation in the Province of British Columbia, and the present resources of the municipality, we've projected this through to 1975. By 1975 the municipalities in British Columbia will require on an annual basis approximately \$597 million, for various capital programmes.

Mr. Speaker, they will finance approximately 50 per cent of that \$597 million requirement from general revenue, from reserved funds, or from surplus. In no other place in Canada can anyone say that municipalities will finance approximately 50 per cent of their capital requirements without going into long-term debt. No way.

Mr. Speaker, point number six. What is the current debt position of the municipalities in British Columbia? Mr. Speaker, I'm reporting about the finances of the Department of Municipal Affairs. I know, Mr. Speaker, that the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mr. Macdonald) doesn't like this story, but that doesn't worry me at all.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Go and buy yourself another island so we can make this municipal picture even better, increase the assessments — or another apartment.

Mr. Speaker, the average debt of the municipalities is: cities, 6.4 per cent; Vancouver, 9.1 per cent; districts, 6.4 per cent; towns, 7.4 per cent (this is a percentage of their current revenue); villages, 5.6 per cent.

What's the picture in the province that's in the heart of Canada? Almost all of the municipalities in that great Province of Ontario are in excess of 9 per cent, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt in any one's mind that the municipalities of British Columbia have once

again shown sound financial management. Because I am taking their own figures, I am using their own position as reported to the department, and I say without fear of contradiction that these municipalities with that kind of a record should consider taking step number two.

Why go to the external market of other provinces or the rest of the world at all? Why not offer the people of the Province of British Columbia an opportunity to buy bonds with backup such as that? Why don't they this year, 1972, offer to the people of the Province of British Columbia the opportunity to invest in the growth of that kind of a corporation, or group of corporations?

AN HON. MEMBER: Will the government accept those bonds as deposit?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Order!

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, there can be no doubt that in the future, and I'll predict this, the

[[Page 97](#)]

municipalities with that record as it is will not only one day be able to produce bonds which they can sell across the counter, but if they could resolve their position in terms of pooling their credit — why don't they pool their reserves? — will approach the time when they may even be able to duplicate the amazing feats of the Minister of Finance of the Province of British Columbia.

I wish to move to the situation which I think is quite serious in the Province of British Columbia, and I indicate this in terms of policy comment. As the world has become more complicated, so the concern for environment has become so pronounced. If there's a threat running through the Speech from the Throne it has to be that there is a tremendous posture on the part of this government to answer the problems of growth with controlled growth.

The issue in British Columbia is not as some would have it — "stop the world, I want to get off." The issue in British Columbia is not that we're not going to face growth in the future as we have in the past. The issue in British Columbia in terms of the problems of municipalities and how we regulate and so on is on whose terms and under what condition we are going to accept growth.

Now, when you put that proposition there you're starting to talk in a positive way.

Unfortunately Mr. Speaker, it's my opinion, and I say it now, that many municipalities in seeking to cope with that problem in a very complex world have ringed themselves around with a whole series of negative regulations — bylaws, professional planners, bureaucrats in regional districts, in municipalities — with completely unnecessary rules and regulations. These, Mr. Speaker, do not meet the test of common sense.

I had occasion to write to municipalities this year about this particular problem. Because, Mr. Speaker, it is the job of political people and not the job of bureaucrats to chart the direction in which the community is going to grow — just as it is the job of a provincial parliament to chart the course the way a province is going to go.

But when you ring development proposals around with a whole series of negatives instead of talking about positive proposals for development and how to do things best, instead of not doing it all, then you come up with this kind of thing. And this was a quote from a letter I sent.

The drafting of some regulatory bylaws leaves the implication that the Municipal Act without qualification is the basis for the bylaw. I think the public are entitled to know that most municipal bylaws today are permissive. And perhaps a specific example here would illustrate the nature of the public concern, and I get it every day from developers — from individuals who are not able to meet some very foolish regulations, some very foolish planning ideas, some very foolish zoning bylaws.

I serve notice that where those regional areas have not met the test of public acceptance for their bylaw (and

the Hon. Member for Cowichan-Malahat (Mr. Strachan) knows very well what I'm talking about) I will not sign the bylaw, because it was not borne along in the spirit of participation of the public which has to live with it. They were not brought along in the spirit that a zoning bylaw or a building regulation or any other kind of bureaucratic regulation is no good unless the public are part and parcel of the process which brought it into existence in the first place.

I'm going to give Hon. Members some pretty specific examples here this afternoon. But here's one. The wording of this bylaw had to do with the regulating of animals I guess.

The bylaw said this: "Animals must make no offensive odour or noise or any other nuisance."

Mr. Speaker, the point that I want to attach this to is the whole question which happens to be one of the very large areas of concern in the Department of Municipal Affairs. And that is in the provision of housing for people. Because there are examples after examples of good and proper housing proposals which bureaucratic planners, uninformed building inspectors, and very foolish municipal councils have turned down sometimes simply because the regulation was there. Sometimes, I suspect, because of an element of snobbery.

Everybody can't live in Shaughnessy, everybody is not going to live on the West shore, everybody's not going to live in the University Endowment Land, everybody's not going to live in the Uplands in Victoria.

But I'll tell Hon. Members this, Mr. Speaker. It is foolish in the extreme to think that all those young people who are coming along today are not going to want exactly the same thing which the people before them had an opportunity to have. And that is the ownership of their home.

If there is anything that this government has said loud and clear throughout the years, it is that the most fundamental way to hang a community or a province together is to make it possible for a family to live in their own home.

The home acquisition grant, with the home-owner grant, the proposals for senior citizens housing — all these have been directed to that very fundamental principle. And as Minister of this department I served notice with the U.B.C.M. at the last convention, and with the municipalities in regional districts that I don't intend to permit stupidity and the lack of common sense to interfere with that. No way.

Here's a classic example in the constituency of my friend the Hon. Member for Coquitlam (Mr. Barrett). Because any time anybody talks about good developments and bad developments they keep throwing this horrible word "speculator" around — especially the Hon. Member for Vancouver East (Mr. Macdonald) who doesn't normally know what he's talking about — or developers, and rip-off artists and all that sort of thing.

I'm talking about 250 individual people in the Municipality of Coquitlam. Who formed a cooperative, who had an idea. It was innovative, it was a good thing for them at their point in time that they happened to live in a run-down rental trailer park. They want to do something about it, and they think this is step number one.

They perhaps don't intend to live in this particular unit all their lives. But they do want an opportunity to do it. This is the kind of thing that should be accommodated.

What do they want to do? I'll pass this around. And there's 200 of them. They want to lay out a specific section of the municipality. They want to landscape it, they want to properly terrace the road system, they want to put in sidewalks, street lights, they want to put in their own sewer system, they want to put in their own water system, they want to put in their own ornamental lighting, they want to lay out a recreational area, they want to have a joint ownership of certain facilities for day care within this proposal.

I'll tell you Mr. Speaker there is a land use contract proposal in the Municipal Act which applies to regional districts where the Minister may determine that this kind of thing is in the public interest, in the unorganised areas of British Columbia, if it is felt proper to do so, if municipalities are not willing to examine this kind of thing.

I do not want in British Columbia a system like they have

[[Page 98](#)]

anywhere in Canada with all these municipal boards, and appeal procedures that take years and years to move something from A to B, like they have in Ontario, Alberta, Manitoba, Saskatchewan and in Quebec.

But Mr. Speaker, I'm asking now, in the name of housing and in the name of common sense that municipalities look at the section of the Municipal Act that was provided for them last year under "land use contract," and give this kind of project a chance.

I purposely used this one because I didn't want that friend of mine over there from Vancouver East to get up and talk about rip-off artists, developers, and speculators, who are behind all these schemes. This is 200 people who wish to do something sensible. And planners get in the way. They think that they're planning for Forest Lawn Cemetery instead of for living people. That's their problem.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I will have more to say about housing in the budget debate. But, I wanted to bring that specific situation to the attention of the House because it's typical of what's going on all over the province.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: I know the kind of attitude my friend. I never expected the Hon. Member for New Westminster, my home city, to have such a snobbish attitude about housing. When I grew up as a boy in New Westminster we helped to look after one another. We helped look after one another. Where did that feeling in New Westminster go? How did you destroy that feeling? How did you destroy that feeling in New Westminster?

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to go back to my own home town of New Westminster and tell them that the Hon. Member for New Westminster doesn't care about people; he doesn't care about housing people anymore.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, the other kind of situation that affects the whole planning procedure: I think it is the responsibility of government to lay out what public policy happens to be.

Over the course of the last couple of years, it has been pretty clear that this government has been on a course of co-ordinating activity — the introduction of the environmental land use committee, the proposition of emphasising the control of environment. Planners all over the province have started a process which is not bringing the people into any kind of a process of understanding of what planning should be. It is bringing them into a process where they are ridiculing what should be sound and sensible planning. I will give you a good example. It has been pretty clearly stated that the suggestion that we start on the Gulf Islands and bridge all those little islands out there is not part of public policy. It's like this old business that my friend from North Vancouver was playing around with yesterday. A Liberal plot. I'll answer it.

AN HON. MEMBER: A liberal plot?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: You know, they have been bouncing all over British Columbia, building up straw men so that they can knock them down. That's the only exercise they've been engaged in. And if they want to know the answer to Moran dam, read the tape. They're experts on the tape machine — read it. But here we have a document that's going out to residents of the Gulf Islands by the Capital Regional Planning Board. It's got a bridge across Active Pass, if you please. It's got a bridge and a freeway running through Portland Island. Apart from anything else, my colleague the Hon. Minister of Recreation and Conservation (Hon. Mr. Kiernan) might get a little upset if they were to build a freeway through Princess Margaret's Park.

When the government of this province enunciates public policy with respect to the multiple use of forest lands, when the government enunciates policy with respect to the Gulf Islands, do you think, Mr. Speaker, that the

Minister of Municipal Affairs put a 10-acre freeze — which was a difficult thing to do — on the Gulf Islands to try and bring some sensible planning to that area? Do you think he put a 10-acre freeze on the Gulf Islands in expectation that we were going to have about 15 bridges over there. One across Active Pass?

No way, Mr. Speaker. But when these airy-fairy, dreamy-planners get up in the air with these schemes, and then present them to the public, they destroy, in British Columbia, what they're trying to prove is a necessity. I agree it's a necessity. But these way-out super-planners, like the Hon. Member for Vancouver-East — he doesn't nod his head in agreement, he's not part of the solution, he's part of the problem.

AN HON. MEMBER: What about all the parks he's planned for the island? Think of those. He's responsible.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, the point I am making is this, that if we're going to have sensible control of the environment in British Columbia, if we are going to meet the challenges of growth in a very complex and not a simple-answer world, we are only going to get it in terms of establishing a public posture — in meeting with the people it affects.

Whether you are talking about a municipality or a regional district or whatever, I just would suggest to the planning fraternity of British Columbia: "Get down out of the clouds, plan for people and not for Forest Lawn Cemetery. Don't sit in your smokey rooms and come up with the plan and then like chickens just having hatched an egg, cackle about it, when the people never even knew you were sitting on the nest." (Laughter).

Now, Mr. Speaker, for the last point I want to make with respect to urban affairs. I want to talk for a moment about the new development in Canada having to do with the establishment of an urban affairs department for Canada at the federal level.

Mr. Speaker, I happen to believe in the Jeffersonian theory of democracy — that a federal system happens to be an excellent system for the collection of taxes but it's an extremely poor system for the distribution of services directly to communities.

The best money that is spent, is spent as close to the project where you are managing the project as is possible. The Government of Canada has indicated that it wishes to establish an urban affairs department. It is theoretically supposed to deliver nothing except this key word today — "co-ordination."

They will produce nothing. Nothing. Zero.

We have had a number of conferences with respect to this question and the suggestion has been made that the government of the Province of British Columbia is opposed to the idea of tri-level consultations. That is simply not true.

[[Page 99](#)]

Secondly, the suggestion has been made that British Columbia has scuttled the activities of that particular department. Mr. Speaker, that is simply not true. What British Columbia's position was can be spelled out in two points.

One, we asked the Department of Urban Affairs for Canada for a simple definition of what they were going to do. Mr. Speaker, I tell you now, that we haven't got that definition yet. It's a department, Mr. Speaker, that's running around looking for a role. Mr. Speaker is there anything wrong...

AN HON. MEMBER: Have they got an office?

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: They not only have an office, my friend, they're already put 300 super-planners in there.

AN HON. MEMBER: Sounds like they have some businessmen.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, is there anything wrong with asking a government department that is charting a new course, the simple question, "what are you going to do?" and getting a relatively simple answer? I don't think so.

Secondly, we suggested that there are a number of government departments in Ottawa — something like 150 that have programmes of one kind or another that financially have some bearing on activities at the municipal level. The Department of Transport, Public Works, all of these departments are delivering money, in a variety of kinds, to the municipalities through the provincial government for sewer projects, and so on. Somebody asked another simple question. We suggested we wanted to know in what way would the new department co-ordinate the capital expenditures that were perhaps in a variety of other departments. Now that's a simple question.

Mr. Speaker, we do not have the answer yet. Now I want to make it perfectly clear that the government of this province is not opposed to meeting with the municipalities, the federal government and the other provinces, to talk about the answers to those questions and the very real responsibilities which I have spelled out to that Minister in no uncertain terms.

There are three major urban problems in Canada — one I've mentioned already, housing. Two, is the cost for the capital construction of pollution abatement procedures of one kind or another. And the third, is the question of providing urban transit in the metropolis areas of Canada.

Those are the three number one problems. And they are being tackled, Mr. Speaker, in every other part of the world, including the country to the south of us, with direct federal moneys going to urban transit, pollution abatement and housing.

Now, I'm not going to question the involvement of the federal government in terms of the credit position they hold. Who can dispute that it is the parliament of Canada that controls credit? We don't dispute that.

Through the Bank of Canada, it is the government of Canada that should be answering these questions. How do you provide the mass of sums of capital to solve modern problems? It's no good standing around at cocktail parties and cocktail lounges and coffee klatches and talking about the problem and defining the problems — that we need urban transit, and we need housing and we need pollution abatement — when the key to the bank, through the Bank of Canada, happens to rest with the parliament of Canada.

It should be, that's where it should be. We have no quarrel with that. But, Mr. Speaker, you can't talk about the federal government's involvement in urban affairs and make any sense out of it, if you've just got a bunch of super-planners fiddling around in the country, trying to put together a nothing, and wrapping it around with words and then doing nothing about these urgent problems that everybody recognises. That's the issue.

I said that I was not prepared to go to a conference if all we were going to be doing at the conference was throwing a bunch of confetti up in the air and putting some streamers out so that the public would think that provincially, municipally and federally, we were really seriously doing something about housing, urban transit and pollution abatement, on a proper basis.

Mr. Speaker, is there any one in this House, who would quarrel with the position taken here this afternoon on that question? Why do they keep talking about these problems in Canada, about pollution abatement? It's a good thing, let's have some. Urban transit is a good thing, let's have some.

The government that controls all the credit in Canada sits on its duff, Mr. Speaker, and does nothing at a time when they could be getting on with these problems, deliberately put this country into an unemployment tail-spin. That's what they did.

If a little bit of unemployment was a good thing, a little bit more was better ...

AN HON. MEMBER: You helped, you helped.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: During the budget debate, I'll have quite a bit to say about unemployment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Hand in hand you did it.

HON. MR. CAMPBELL: Now, Mr. Speaker, I have enjoyed this afternoon. I want my good friend, the Hon. Member for Atlin, (Mr. Calder) to have some time in the debate and I know my friend from Atlin is a lot smarter than all the other members on the N.D.P. benches. I'll tell you why, Mr. Speaker. He agrees all the time with the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Atlin.

MR. F.A. CALDER (Atlin): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It is an honour, once again, to take my place in this debate, on behalf of the Atlin constituency.

Before going into my contribution this afternoon, I would just like to make two remarks before the previous speaker leaves the chamber, because I know he is a busy man, and he may just be going back to his office. But before he does that I would like to make a comment on his remarks about the drugs.

Now we all know in this House that this is a very serious situation that it is much involved in this province and elsewhere in the world. We had our first lobby just prior to the opening of the Legislature when the narcotic-addiction foundation representatives came to present its brief to our N.D.P. caucus — a very interesting one.

This isn't the first time I have listened to this organisation and the presentation that they made certainly reached me and from that I know that there is a serious problem.

The government knows this is a serious problem and I am

[[Page 100](#)]

just wondering what they are trying to do about it. The previous speaker said that he's against it. We all know that we are all against it and we are trying to do something about it. What is the government plan on this, Mr. Speaker, what is the government policy? What is the treatment plan of the government?

This is such a serious situation that this is one problem that should have been stressed in the throne speech. We certainly hope that before the prorogation of the House, that the government will come out with something that we can work on in helping to solve this serious problem.

Secondly, the Honourable Minister of Municipal Affairs (Hon. Mr. Campbell) made remarks about Cape Mudge and I would just like to make my remarks about this most interesting development.

This is not the first time that I have come up with this municipal status. As you know Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Members that have been here for quite a number of years, as long as I have, know that I have advocated municipal status. Perhaps what Hon. Members don't know is that I and the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs have had correspondence over this Cape Mudge situation — not so much on Cape Mudge but on the municipal status itself.

In 1967, we thought it was quite an appropriate time to come forward with some form of a resolution and this we did in the centennial celebration of Canada.

We thought this was a very appropriate time, that in its 100th birthday we should come out with something that would help solve the reservation problems. I would like to read the resolution to Hon. Members. This actually in my estimation was one of the first times that I corresponded with the Hon. Minister and he agreed with perhaps most of what we had placed before him. This was not done on the floor of the House, it was done by correspondence as I have mentioned. I will read you the resolution. By the way, this came out of an Indian convention which is my own convention in the Nass River. This is a Niska resolution.

Whereas the Niska people advocate self-government on Indian reserves and whereas the Niska people advocate provincial

jurisdiction of Indian affairs and whereas the Niska Tribal Council on behalf of its members believe that the application of certain aspects and principles of the municipal affairs would assist greatly self-government on reserves, and whereas the Minister of Municipal Affairs of the Province of British Columbia and the Minister of Indian Affairs of the Government of Canada have indicated by public announcements their support of municipal status for reserves in British Columbia, be it resolved that the Government of the Province of British Columbia consider the advisability of introducing at its 1968 spring session of the Legislature an enabling bill to establish municipal status on reserves, with the following stipulations:

(A) Optional plebiscite on reserves with respect to municipal status. (B) 75 per cent basic acceptance vote. (C) No sale of properties from Indian municipalities to non-Indians. (D) Complete detailed government policies and regulations with respect to municipal status. (E) A government guidance towards complete self-government on reserves that accept municipal status.

Indian village councils and others concerned present their briefs relative to their proposed amendments, additions or deletions to the bill to a select standing committee on municipal status and self-government for Indian bands in the Province of British Columbia.

We thought this was a very good resolution. It was passed unanimously in the convention in the north, following which we presented the motion to the Hon. Minister and we had a very good correspondence over this and I think it was in the 1968 session that the Hon. Minister amended the Municipal Act.

We're most thankful for this. I think this was a victory in itself when it was introduced into the statute books of the province of B.C.

Again to enlighten the members about this resolution, we, the Indian people, are very much concerned about this self-government. They certainly would like to administer their own affairs and they would like to have their own money.

I still couldn't see why, if we're going to talk about self-government, the Indians still have to go to Ottawa and perhaps to B.C. and beg for money. So we thought that it was best to provide another definition than the word "reserves" and this is where the municipal status definition came in to the picture. The Act itself will have provided an avenue for the return of the Indian's tax dollar so that he could use his own funds to administer and provide selfgovernment on the reserves. This is the whole key behind our fight to establish municipal status in this province.

Certainly we didn't have to fight on the floor of the House because the government did accept it without any debate and this is very good. We thought of the 5 per cent sales tax, of which a percentage which goes to every municipality in the province but not to the reserves. I think if the vote at Cape Mudge had been favourable the 5 per cent sales tax would have gone back into this by this avenue provided.

Now the reason why we suggested the 75 per cent was because we wanted a real majority. We had quite a debate before we accepted this motion in our convention, as a matter of fact we had considered 60 even 50 per cent then with this absolutely new development concerning reserves anywhere in this country we thought that a big majority would be wise and therefore we arrived at this 75 per cent.

I think in this respect — and I think the Hon. Minister will agree with me that I feel partly responsible for this as well — we were all disappointed. I must say that there was great attention focused on this vote from right across the country. I know this. When I was in Ottawa before Christmas I met with many Indian leaders and they were much concerned over this and I know they had their eyes focused on this. I know that there was a big disappointment. I was very disappointed in this.

But it has been proven to us that that 75 per cent is a bit too high and I would support the Hon. Minister if he goes along with what's in the municipal plebiscites. If they go for 60, we'll go for 60, with no differences when it comes to Indians voting for municipal status. Let it be the same and whatever you decide on — and I believe it is going to be 60 per cent — I and the members of my group will support this if the amendment comes in. I hope the amendment comes in this session so that Cape Mudge may be given another chance.

I would like to take this opportunity of congratulating the chief counsellor Lawrence Lewis, a school chum of mine, and congratulate the people of Cape Mudge because actually it was a victory. It was a large vote.

I'm also thankful that my friend Lawrence did not resign because he has put a lot of effort into this and I'm quite sure that any other village will be putting a lot of effort into it.

We set this motion in the beginning in the hope that one

[[Page 101](#)]

of my villages in the Nass would have started, but of course Lawrence and Cape Mudge beat us to the punch. So, we stepped aside to see what happened.

Even Nass River, we believe we are ready for municipal status and a great many other villages are ready for it.

Like I say, it was a victory in itself when this was introduced and it was a victory for Cape Mudge and the people when they decided to step into this field. I'm sure that it will be favourable in the next vote and no doubt it won't be too long before other villages will take part in this.

While I'm on the Indian affairs, Mr. Speaker, I would just like to make a few remarks about the Quilt case in Williams Lake. I just pose this as a question to the people of the province.

It's a simple question. Does the mafia justice towards Indians actually exist in this province and throughout Canada? Many terms have been applied and I think it's high time that we have found out just what exists with respect to justice to the Indian people.

Many Indian leaders, Mr. Speaker, believe that there is much injustice towards Indians. The now and then publicity of brutality and injustices in other parts of the province and throughout Canada, I believe, leads the public to believe so. I know that the Indian organisations are presently moving.

May I direct my remarks to the Hon. Attorney General? I heard not too long ago that the Indian organisations throughout Canada are going to press that something be done about this Quilt case and many other cases which I understand exist but have never been brought before the attention of the authorities or especially the public. I think that this leads to sort of a bad court image in our land. The Indian people are now being provided with equal laws all over the country, in Alaska and the United States, Mexico. There are other instances such as this. This certainly doesn't provide an image along the way to a equality and to progress for the Indian people.

Just the other day I received a letter from the Department of Justice requesting that I be one on those that become a member of a committee on Indians and the law. From what I have heard prior to this about injustice I think I'm going to accept to be a member on this committee because I am most interested.

I think this is going to be heard in the near future, that the Indian organisations throughout Canada now are going to really approach the federal and the province for a full inquiry into this case because I noticed there was a case just recently that involved an R.C.M.P. in a car crash which caused the death of several occupants of a car in which because there was further evidence to be heard that the Attorney General's department actually reopened the case.

From what I have read — and I too have not read the transcript — if there are further witnesses to be heard I think in the same token that this Quilt case be reopened. As a matter of fact, if we're going to assist in the development of our people and especially with the matter of justice I think a whole public inquiry should be established in this Quilt case.

Certainly it would ease the tension because there is a tension over this and I'd even heard yesterday that there were many cases involved right in this same area in which the Quilt case hit the papers. And this is all I have to remark about on the Indian case. I do hope that the Honourable Attorney General will do something forthwith.

During the past year, Mr. Speaker, I spent two months touring my 62,000 square miles constituency of Atlin,

visiting and interviewing officials of industries, officials of the local communities, and of course the same with the transient and local residents. It was a real fact-finding mission, I'm quite sure that this is what all of the M.L.A.'s do. I certainly did that in this past year. It is a duty of an M.L.A. to do this.

On immediate problems naturally there is correspondence and during the session we present some of the issues either on the floor of the House or by interview with the Ministers and their deputies.

I make these introductory remarks because I read with interest prior to the opening or just after the opening about the wasteful two weeks. The writer, I believe, should direct his attention — and of course this is what he did — to the Cabinet when he wrote this.

I quite agree with him, after all it's a destitute piece of document and if the writer agreed that this is so then at least as a member of one constituency I can say that these two weeks are not wasteful as far as I'm concerned because I have done quite a bit this past year and I know the other M.L.A.'s have done the same.

I'm just so far behind now in my interviews, it just isn't funny. I require these two weeks, although I will be bringing up a lot of these constituency problems during the course of this session. I'm nevertheless privileged to say other things other than what's involved with my riding, one or two of which I will be speaking about this afternoon.

I'd like to give Hon. Members my views on Brinco. There was a development in my riding. By the way, Mr. Speaker, we read so much about the isolation of my constituency and yet I must tell the Legislature here that I have got a very active riding. I was most thankful about this because I think very few people know about the mineral exploration in the area, about the road construction which has provided work for people in my riding. After I got through travelling throughout this territory I actually believe that if a person was not working it was because of a complete isolation and there was no employment because of a lack of development — that's one. Two, is because maybe he doesn't want to work. But other than that there was a lot of activity and employment in my riding and this has been very good for the local people this year.

During the course of my trip up there — and prior to going up there I read about the income of the British Newfoundland Corporation Ltd. which would explore the power potential on the Stikine — after this hit the papers I was just wondering what part the government was playing in this matter.

I more or less pose this as a question on whether these people were working on any guide lines at all. This is the criticism that I have with respect to the government.

Naturally, I'm not against development. I have been advocating development in this riding for many years. Nevertheless, being in the House here I also believe that the government must provide guidelines and should not allow any company, no matter how large, to roam freely in an area and perhaps destroy it during its period of exploration.

I'm not saying that this company actually did destroy forests by creating roads and everywhere else digging holes, drilling and then, finding that there is poor power potential, deciding to move on to another and do likewise. I note by a recent publicity that they have examined seven areas and if they go into an area where there is no guidelines I would suggest that the government consider having someone representing the government and actually observe what has been done.

If it wasn't for publicity this summer, nobody would have

[[Page 102](#)]

known about what Brinco was doing in the north. Actually, it smartened the company up, according to the local people, when this publicity came out, that reporter Larson of the Vancouver *Sun* had written.

I am also wondering why B.C. Hydro has not provided information. For years we have had reports on the power potential of practically every river and stream in the area but these are, I would say, very poor estimates

because I don't think they have actually done any real work to find out the potential of these waters in North-West B.C. B.C. Hydro does not want to participate in the development. I think B.C. Hydro should be providing information, provide a bible of power potential for every stream or river in British Columbia so that if any company was to become interested and engage themselves in development then they've at least got a guideline and know much more about power before proceeding with their activities.

Such is not the case up there. It almost indicates to me that the government may not be interested in assisting development in the north and this I'm very highly critical of. I think they should take a full part in the development of the north.

Brinco was also a mineral explorer and if the company finds that there is little to work on, and knowing that maybe adjacent companies got nothing to work on, you're certainly not going to end up with any development of power in the area.

There has been much talk, Mr. Speaker, about the Moran dam and because I spend most of my life in the fishing industry, I too am going to say a few words about the Moran dam.

I've been one of the fortunate ones to be appointed by the federal government to be an official delegate for Canada in all the discussions of the salmon industry. In the last three years, we have met two major nations. A year-and-a-half ago, we met Russia for the first time in the history of Canada and last June we spent quite a bit of a time in Seattle, meeting the United States.

You will note that I was absent the first two days. That's because I was attending the second phase of our Canada-United States deliberations on the protection of salmon in this province. We met in camera and therefore I'm not going to discuss any of the points.

The conference I think was concluded yesterday but I will speak on some of the issues that concerns the conference. It has concerned the two nations — United States and Canada — and certainly will concern them until we are assured that nothing will be done about this particular river system.

The commercial fishing industry is so concerned about this dam, Mr. Speaker, that it has actually done a lot of investigating. I might as well give you the people who went to investigate this whole issue. I'm speaking of this report issued last August, August 1971, on the fishery problems related to the Moran dam on the Fraser river. It is prepared by the technical fisheries service and the International Pacific Salmon Fisheries Commission.

It is quite a volume, I don't know if any of you have completed reading it. Maybe on account of the thickness of the book and the so many words issued, the committee decided to condense it into a smaller book and then it is even condensed a little more by the industry.

I'm going to read the very important points which the industry, not only the commercial industries but people engaged in it like the fishermen, pin-point — the very things that are very much concerned about this.

Up to now, the speakers have just said: "Well, don't build the Moran dam." But nobody has actually said: "Well, what do the fishermen, and people engaged in the industry actually think about this whole proposal?" So if you will bear with me, I will remark about several excerpts from this book, and because it is about three pages, I will get right into it.

A dam at Moran Canyon would wipe out salmon stocks that spawn above the site and cut commercial and Indian food fishery catches below the dam by 50 per cent.

I'd just like to say there, Mr. Speaker, that the reservoir that's going to be created, especially from a very high dam — over 700 feet we were told in the report — a reservoir from this would stretch for almost 170 miles, almost right to Quesnel. This certainly is a reservoir that really worries the industry.

Salmon species include sockeye, the major run, pinks, coho, chum and chinook.

And these are the very species that provide one of the greatest names in the name for British Columbia in the whole fishing world.

This loss would cost \$24 million annually, based on present wholesale values. Recreational fishery losses are estimated at \$22 million annually — a two year study of this aspect is not yet completed.

There are the highlights of the federal fisheries service and International Pacific Fisheries Commission report on problems related to the Moran dam released to date. Prepared by technical staff the 200 page report covers flood control, salmon production, environmental changes, migration and upstream passage, cost of fish facilities and comparison of hydro-electric and thermo-nuclear power costs.

Moran dam is not necessary for flood control of Fraser Valley. Dykes can provide this protection as they have in the densely populated area below in New Westminster. This was recommended by the Federal-Provincial Fraser River Board in 1963.

Now don't forget, this is the actual, the province did agree on that.

The two senior governments agreed on a 10-year programme of dykes and drainage improvements in 1969. It would cost \$40 million. Annual loss of salmon stocks above and below Moran would be 24 million, 10 million for total loss above and 13 million for 50 per cent loss below the reservoirs. Annual loss of potential salmon production would be 71 million.

My own remarks, Mr. Speaker, I think I mentioned last year. I will repeat again, this whole development of Moran dam — and no doubt, I believe they are going to try to develop it — this is the reason why I think the pressure is on by politicians. Soon you'll be hearing from all over the country that this may just actually lead to the destruction of the salmon industry in this province.

At any rate this is going, including the permission of the federal government to allow passage of oil tankers in our inland waters, the immediate coast, and with the sewage, the pulp, and the damming of such great places as the Skeena — tributaries to the Skeena which we just read the other day — and also this, I would say give it 50 years and this province will have destroyed another industry.

I am just wondering whether if fisheries came under the jurisdiction of the province all this discussion would have been taking place. But because it is a federal — and in my term of office here, I know that there has been a lot of infighting between this government and the federal government, sometimes almost to the extent that I just couldn't

[[Page 103](#)]

describe how when the two governments do not cooperate — then we're victimised. For instance, the fishing industry would be victimised in this respect, if there is no cooperation between both government. To continue with the quote:

Fraser River sockeye provided 46 per cent of total B.C. sockeye packed during the period of 1952-1969. About 44 per cent of Fraser River sockeye catch originated from races that spawned above Moran. About 15 per cent of total B.C. Chinook salmon catch are produced in the Fraser River system with 1/3 of this total originating above Moran.

Hatcheries and artificial spawning channels could not compensate for salmon losses. Sockeye spend one year in a lake adjacent to spawning areas before returning to sea. Nursery lakes in the water-shed below Moran are needed to handle the present stock. About 66 per cent of sockeye reared in capacity of Fraser's system is in the large lakes on tributaries up stream from Moran Canyon. Most of these lakes are only partly utilised. Thus potential for increase of sockeye stock is all above Moran. Anticipated loss of up to 85 per cent of downstream migrants.

and this is an important quote...

anticipated loss of up to 85 per cent of downstream migrants in the reservoir could only be overcome by capturing the fish before they enter the dam and transporting them by trucks or pipelines to the river below. The costly operation would not be feasible. There is precedent where salmon have been successfully passed over a dam as high as Moran.

The Fraser dumps over 10 million tons of sediment into the Strait of Georgia every year. The bulk of this deposits at the

delta. Removal of this changes the delta eco system. Not only the salt marshes and mud flats where water fowl live cease to be maintained but the delta will undergo erosion.

Preliminary analysis shows cost of Moran power at distribution centre would be 12.2 to 13.6 mils per kilowatt hour. This cost includes expected loss of stocks above Moran, 50 per cent of stock originating below potential production, and recreational fisheries loss and fish facilities. This last cost is estimated at 214 million for fish passage and temperature control installations. Thermo-nuclear power studies in Pacific-North-West estimate cost at 3 mils per kilowatt hour. Thermal power plants need not have adverse effect on Fraser River salmon fisheries if properly designed and located. There would be little effect on environment and full development of fisheries resource of the Fraser System would be possible.

Just a last few paragraphs, and this is more of a history ...

First proposal for the dam came from a private company in 1955. Plans to build a 700-foot, concrete gravity dam with auxiliary power storage and diversion dams on the Fraser River and its tributaries and on the Babine and Peace Rivers.

Fisheries problems were studied for two years and the conclusion was it would destroy a large segment of the Fraser River salmon fishery.

The policy of the provincial government at that time was that no dams would be permitted on major salmon streams unless fish could be protected and the proposals were turned down. The Federal-Provincial Fraser River Board has made studies of flood control of the river system and possible hydro-electric development. The board considered both a high and low dam at the site in the final report released in 1963. This report recommended reconstruction of dykes as a primary requirement from floods. With a series of flood storage hydro-electric projects at locations that would avoid major interference with salmon.

This proposal would provide complete flood protection without requiring any dams on the main stem of the Fraser River downstream from the Grand Canyon above Prince George. In 1969 the federal and provincial governments agreed on a 10-year \$40 million programme of dyke and drainage improvements. Dykes are being built two feet high and so on.

Any of you that have the time to read this report, I would advise that you do so. These and many others are concern of the industry and as I have stated, I think this construction at the Moran dam if it comes about will certainly destroy the industry. It will have taken the real heart of of the industry in this province and lead to the industry being not an industry any more.

I would suggest, for what it is worth, that in this province I think this government should take the lead in setting up a committee or commission — some form of a tribunal. It will be comprised of the federal and provincial governments, municipalities, the ecology groups and all concerned, so that before major constructions ever take place — such as the proposed construction, if it comes about, of the Moran dam — all phases of our whole economic structure should be considered before they allow any construction which of course in this case would include the construction of the Moran dam.

This is all I have to say about this particular subject, Mr. Speaker.

Lastly, another issue I had hoped to see included in the throne debate, but which did not happen and that has to do with the automobile insurance. In my travels throughout my riding I have had many talks on this although I did not bring the subject up. There were people in my riding that were very much concerned about the provision at cost to them of this important insurance.

One interesting aspect too is that some of my own people are much concerned about this because they have difficulty in securing insurance in this respect, so I would prefer that Hon. Members consider this very important issue and having said that I would like to move a motion.

As I said, Mr. Speaker, I had interviews with quite a number of interested parties and individuals about this insurance. I happen to come from an isolated area, the districts that I represent are mostly unorganised territories and we have much automobile and vehicle problems in my riding.

I am going to mention some of these later on during the course of this session, but because I would like to hear the views of Hon. Members in the House I am going to move that the motion in reply to the opening speech of

His Honour be amended by adding the words: "But this House regrets that the speech fails to disclose any proposals for implementing a universal government automobile insurance plan whereby automobile insurance would be provided at cost to the public."

This Motion is seconded by the Hon. Member for Yale-Lillooet (Mr. Hartley). And I so present it to the Speaker.

MR. W.L. HARTLEY (Yale-Lillooet): Mr. Speaker, I would like to rise and second the motion made by the Hon.

[[Page 104](#)]

Member for Atlin, the amendment to the throne speech.

I'd like to use the first part of my time to take up some local matters. And I prefer to conclude my remarks on the matter of automobile insurance.

I would like to first offer best wishes for a speedy and full recovery of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. And I am pleased to note that all Hon. Members from the 55 seats throughout the province have returned in good health, including the Hon. Member for Skeena (Mr. Little).

Hon. Members over in this corner of the House have had a very good year, under the energetic leadership of the Hon. Member for Coquitlam (Mr. Barrett). He's not only given good ideas, but good leadership, and through that we've had some good positive experiences.

While down in Olympia I had the privilege of meeting with some of the representatives and senators for the border communities. I had lunch with Senator Wilson and he requested to have lunch, because he said that as a member for the Okanagan in Washington he was very, very much concerned what we were doing with the Okanagan Lakes and the Okanagan watershed by way of pollution, and I assured him that this party felt very much the same way.

I said I only regretted that the Premier, and the Hon. Member from North Okanagan (Hon. Mrs. Jordan) had said there is no pollution in the North Okanagan Lakes.

Fortunately, I had received a copy of the W.C. Bennett report — not the W.A.C. Bennett report, but the W.C. Bennett report — on the pollution of the Okanagan waters and Okanagan lakes and they mention that there are some two billions of gallons of effluent being dumped into the Okanagan lakes yearly. Two billion gallons!

So this not only affects our water ways, but it certainly affects theirs, and I believe these are some of the problems that we must work out together.

It's really a shocking situation when we have to be pushed into giving a little more support for our municipalities, a little more financial help for our municipalities, a little more direct leadership in the unorganised area by this government, and a little more action in cleaning up pollution.

I would like to commend the members of the staff of B.C. Hydro, particularly our outside crews. For the past several days they have been working night and day in both hazardous and miserable conditions in trying to provide power throughout this province.

I believe this is a good time to take the management of B.C. Hydro to task for wasting so much electricity, and encouraging the misuse of electricity: you have but to fly into Vancouver, or drive into Vancouver and you see that great B.C. Hydro tower lit up like long great neon tubes.

I say that if that's all you're going to do with the power when you flood some of our finest valleys we're better not to put on that type of display. We have much more worthwhile purposes, Mr. Speaker, for hydroelectricity than that sort of cheap advertising, that this government under their agency the B.C. Hydro is doing.

Here's an advertisement from the *Victoria Times* of a few weeks ago, urging the people of this city to use electricity for heat. They urge the businessman to put up more and more neon signs.

If nothing else this goes to add to the cost of consumer products, to say nothing of forcing the B.C. Hydro and this government to build more dams and flood more valleys without any particular worthwhile effects.

But I do commend the Hydro employees particularly the linemen. They're up those poles in high winds and sub-zero weather.

I would also like to commend the outside crews of the Department of Highways. In the Yale-Lillooet district we have a major portion of trans-provincial Highway 3 between Hope and Princeton, and a major portion of the trans-Canada highway between Rosedale and Cache Creek.

Now both of these highways are the most difficult to keep ploughed clear of snow, and to keep in operation at this time of year, and I believe a great deal of credit goes to our employees on the Department of Highways and B.C. Hydro.

It is very well for the Hon. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. Chabot) to sit back and smirk, but when the Hydro boys come up asking for a raise in pay I hope that we will remember that when the chips are down they work all hours, under all conditions and do a yeoman's job.

With regard to Hydro, Mr. Speaker, this is a suggestion that I have made in other years. And it's with regard to completing the great system between the interior and the lower mainland. We've had several power failures in the last few days and weeks, in the canyon area — you read in the papers where the dairy farmers are milking their cows by hand.

One of the reasons is that B.C. Hydro has no way to back feed electricity into the Fraser Valley. But by building as little as 15 miles of power line completing the gap between Lillooet and Lytton, and the gap between Lytton and Boston Bar — we have lines most of the way but there is about a seven-mile break in both these areas that would have to be completed — by building 15 miles of hydro power transmission lines we could at least have a 60,000 volt circuit supplying Hope and a part of the Chilliwack area now. I say now because one of the phenomena of these ice storms is that they affect the Fraser Valley much more than they do the interior. The interior is dry and you just don't get enough ice to effect an icing condition on the hydro lines.

So I submit Mr. Speaker — and I'm pleased to see that the two Hydro directors are in their place — that this is a project that we should consider. One for the further development of the interior, but two and possibly more important, to guarantee a higher quality of hydro-electric service to the consumers in the Fraser Valley.

On the trans-Canada highway, we have many car accidents. And this is not necessarily the fault of the drivers but it is because of the icy and snowy slippery conditions on the trans-Canada highway. And if you or I happen to slide over the bank and we survive, who will take us to the nearest hospital at Lytton, Hope or Chilliwack?

There is a very gallant little group of men and women that staff the Boston Bar and North Bend search and rescue group. The police will call them out. They'll come out any hour or day, and this is a voluntary group. While you may say yes, the provincial government pays \$1 per capita for ambulance services, you don't pay one penny to the Boston Bar and North Bend group. Because they reside in an unorganised territory. Only the organised communities receive this support.

So I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that a special grant be given to the North Bend and Boston Bar search and rescue and ambulance crew because of the great public service that they are paying to anyone that should meet up with an accident on the trans-Canada highway.

I would like to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that starting this year we have a fall session of the Legislature. Each year the budget grows, the work load of bills grows and instead of trying to have all-night sessions and ram this through in a

great hurry like ramming meat into a sausage machine, we should give the bills first reading, put some of them into committee and that would allow us to go out and discuss the bills related to hospitals with hospital boards, discuss the bills related to municipal affairs with the municipal government. Then we could come back to the fall session, and where necessary amend this legislation and get it a final reading and have it proclaimed. I think that this would be a much better way of doing business than what we have done in the past.

I would like to once again remind the government of the millions of dollars of copper that is being mined in British Columbia. British Columbia is one of the leading copper mining areas of America and the world, yet not one ounce is being smeltered and refined in this province. When I was first elected in 1963 I said I would work for a clean copper smelter in the western interior. Many mines have been proven up since then. The need is far greater, and until we have this we're going to have ever-increasing numbers of unemployed, ever-increasing numbers of able people on welfare. Now, part of the New Democratic Party programmes for work and wages will be to build a clean copper smelter in the western interior.

I would like to say this through you Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Minister of Mines (Hon. Mr. Richter) who doesn't happen to be here. But when a contract is signed by a mining corporation to export copper, to export minerals outside Canada, there should be a mandatory clause that a goodly percentage of that raw mineral must be processed in B.C., in Canada, if and when our smelter and refinery is available.

If we don't start writing that clause in now, all our copper reserves will be committed and we won't be able to operate a smelter because of our previous commitments to the mining corporations.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to raise a matter with regard to the difference in the rates that the Department of Lands charges for Crown land. It seems that if you happen to be a mining corporation you can get Crown land for a townsite for a song. But if you are a legitimate community, like the town of Merritt it's a different story. A few years ago Merritt was bankrupt and it picked itself up by its boot-straps and because of the far-sightedness of the city fathers — they had bought up Crown land to any resident at a very nominal rate. The lots that we bought to build our homes were bought at \$10 a frontage foot for a fully-serviced lot, \$750 for a 75-foot lot. Now, all of these lots have been taken up.

AN HON. MEMBER: How long ago was this?

MR. HARTLEY: During the Craigmont Boom, in the '60's, the early '60's. Eight, 10 years ago, since 1960. Now all these lots had been used up, Mr. Speaker, the town requested the reserve on land north of Merritt in the hill running over into the Highland Valley. They received a letter back when they asked if they could buy it. They received a letter back saying yes, they could buy it — but the price that was asked by the Department of Lands was better than eight times as much as the Department of Lands by an order-in-council issued on August 19, 1971, last summer to Lornex Mining and Smelting. They allowed the mining corporation Crown land and in the exact same locality for one-eighth of the price that we're now going to charge Merritt. And I think this is very unfair because in the same locality...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. HARTLEY: Do I get this correct? I appreciate the Minister's comment. If the Town of Merritt will agree to the same commitment in this order-in-council then they could buy it at \$10 an acre as did Lornex Mining and Smelting?

Well, Merritt did subsidise their original land and with the Hon. Minister's permission, I would be pleased to carry that message back to the town council of Merritt. Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to deal briefly with the death of Fred Quilt, up in the Williams Lake Area.

I see by the paper that there is a headline "Inquest Absolution of Police Angers Indians in the Cariboo." Now

I think they should be rightfully indignant. I'm not saying who is right and who is wrong but from what has been released in the papers, from the Press stories, there appears to have been either a gross miscarriage of justice or a gross misinterpretation by the Press of what has gone on.

I'm not just raising this from an individual point of view. Various native organisations have contacted me and I notice that the United Church's committee on Indian affairs is very much concerned about this. I believe they have contacted the Hon. Mr. Attorney General.

Now in the first couple of hundred years of the history of this province and the earlier history of Canada, we have given the native Indians a great deal to question our values of justice and our standards. We've given them that. But I think it is time that we turned a new page in the book of justice to all people and make it abundantly clear that all Canadians will stand equal before the law.

Because of the economic position of many of our native people they just do not have the price to hire a lawyer. So one of the recommendations I would like to suggest is that the Department of the Attorney General provide full time Indian court workers.

AN HON. MEMBER: Legal aids, province-wide legal aids. Go the whole way, go the whole way.

MR. HARTLEY: Yes, I have nothing against legal aid, but this is something that we've been asking for a long time, this is an immediate step that with the snap of his fingers, the Hon. Attorney General could rise as did the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests and say: "Yes, I am prepared to do something about the situation among our native people, to give the R.C.M.P. a better chance to keep their good name." Read the record.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Premier): I am advised that the air strike is over.

MR. HARTLEY: The Premier says the air strike is over.

HON. MR. BENNETT: I am advised...

MR. HARTLEY: Oh, the Premier is advised.

AN HON. MEMBER: Don't tell Gaglardi, don't tell Gaglardi.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HARTLEY: I guess we should have known the air strike was over when we saw that the Hon. Member from Kamloops (Hon. Mr. Gaglardi) was absent. We should have known before he came in.

[[Page 106](#)]

Now with regard to the matter of Indian justice, one of the first stories that I read of the Nicola Valley was the story of the hanging of the two George brothers. This came about because of the fact a policeman went in looking for a suspect. He went into this home and took the sheets and blankets off a bed where a woman was sleeping. At least she was in bed. This raised the wrath of the Indians and they reacted and I think they reacted as any man worth his salt would react. I met the Anglican priest who represented that area at the time of this happening. It was his first church after he left college.

He said to me that what happened to those George brothers was the greatest miscarriage of justice that he had seen at any time. Now these are blots that are on our history, and we cannot do anything to remove those blots but I say, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Attorney General, and I plead with him to appoint some court workers now and let it be known to all our native people that whenever an Indian gets into trouble that he doesn't appear in court without the assistance of a court worker paid by this province.

AN HON. MEMBER: Answer, answer!

MR. HARTLEY: I would like to ask the Hon. Attorney General if he is considering ordering an investigation into the circumstances surrounding Fred Quilt's death on November 30, 1971.

Mr. Speaker, I will repeat that. Is the Hon. Attorney General considering ordering an investigation into the circumstances surrounding the death of Fred Quilt on November 30, 1971? Will he order the chief coroner to review this and hold a further investigation? I think this is a fair question and it's something the Attorney General could stand up and be prepared to deal with now — not six months from now when all the damage of innuendo and rumour has gone on through the media for weeks and weeks.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: You made a speech yesterday why didn't you say something yesterday?

MR. HARTLEY: If the Hon. Minister would like to answer the question this is his opportunity.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HARTLEY: The Premier stood up ...

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member please proceed with his speech and please address the Chair?

MR. R.A. WILLIAMS (Vancouver East): The Premier stood up and was able to continue, you can do the same.

MR. SPEAKER: I want order, please. I don't think the Chair is going to accept that type of remark. The Hon. the Premier is entitled to speak in this debate, the same as any other member of this Legislature and hasn't exercised that opportunity as yet. He asked leave to make a statement — the House apparently consented — to say he had been advised that the airline strike was over. Now these sort of remarks from Hon. Members sitting in their places are not appreciated by the Chair at all and I think are really very unfair. Would the Member please proceed.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I noticed...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please. If the Hon. Member is going to continue these remarks he is going to force the Chair into a very undesirable position. I don't want to exercise the authorities that are invested in these orders, but at the same time I don't have to sit here and take those type of remarks, whether they are from your place or standing on your feet. Would the Hon. Member continue.

MR. HARTLEY: Just for the record, Mr. Speaker, I didn't take your remarks to be directed to me.

MR. SPEAKER: No, they weren't directed to you at all.

MR. HARTLEY: The way it would sound in the tape, it might look otherwise.

Now, on this matter of morality that the Attorney General seems to have made a great deal to do with, I thought I'd better just take and look it up in the book.

What does Webster's Dictionary say? "Pertaining to or concerned with right conduct." I think we can probably accept that with a fair enough meaning. But if that is the meaning we accept, do we not accept it to our whole life? Do we not accept it to the business world? Does it not apply to the rape of a beautiful trout stream by pollution and the flooding of those clear waters — say such as up in the Skagit Valley? Isn't this just as wrong morally as if the Attorney General thinks for a beautiful young lady to go about with a bare bosom? And many...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. HARTLEY: Yes, you can look up here at the sculpturing above us. This was considered as a work of art. It's the old saying: "Beauty is in the eye of the beholder." But, if the Hon. Attorney General would apply his thinking right across the board, okay. But just to be so parsimonious and sactimonious and figure that you can get all the nice old ladies to vote for you, you're not going to do it. If Hon. Members saw a little C.B.C. news item two weeks ago you saw where some of our senior citizens had gone on a bus trip down to California and they went to one of these topless shows. They were interviewed and this dear old lady said: "Oh, that was wonderful, I enjoyed it. It was pretty." An old gentlemen, he blushed a little, but he enjoyed it too. Now, beauty is in the eye of the beholder

Mr. Speaker, I say that it is morally wrong to allow the rape of our beautiful trout streams. To allow the forests, the hills, to be denuded of their forests with a clear-cut pattern that washes the silt down and kills the steel-head and the salmon in the streams.

AN HON. MEMBER: What's that got to do with logging?

MR. HARTLEY: Well, that's the bottom of the river. Take the rape of Powder Mountain, after the Hon. Minister of Lands and Forests said it wouldn't happen again. After it happened, there was Cypress Bowl and when this matter was raised through the media to him, he said. "That's a lot of snot." Now if that's all the concern and intelligence

[[Page 107](#)]

we can have displayed on these matters then this tired old government had better roll over and let a new government with ideas and character and morality for all things take over.

It was very interesting to meet Governor Dan Evans because Governor Dan Evans backed the director of the Department of Ecology, John Biggs, right down the line.

John Biggs was very critical of Seattle Power for wanting to flood the Skagit Valley.

What's our Hon. Minister of Water Rights say? He says "get on with it," as late as December. Why can't we get on with the job? Now, I've got the clipping right here — it was in an issue of the *Vancouver Sun* of December. Now what Dan Evans said was this, and I'll send the clipping over to the Hon. Minister if he would like it.

Governor Evans said that Seattle Power was an opportunistic company with no environmental programme. Mr. Speaker, I submit that this applies to this government. This is a fast-buck, opportunistic government with no environmental department or programme.

I wrote to Mr. John Biggs after our visit, after having attended the hearing on our environment and I commended Mr. Biggs and the Department of Ecology of the State of Washington for the very reasonable and forthright position that they had taken in opposition to the raising of the Ross Dam and the flooding of Skagit Valley.

Now, I would like to say a few words on the Skagit Valley and I should state right at the outset that of the many, many letters I have received from my constituents and people throughout different parts of the province I have received only one letter supporting the flooding. All other letters have opposed the flooding, but the whole board of trade have written to me and stated that they support the flooding of the Skagit Valley.

I felt it only right that I bring their message to you, Mr. Speaker.

Now, of all the hearings I have attended in Seattle, in the past three years, and of all the people that have written to me the one letter that came up supporting the flooding really gave no basic reasons, brought forward no new evidence.

If there is new evidence in favour of flooding, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have it. Maybe the government benchers can provide it.

But I believe that one of our greatest recreational assets in the lower mainland is the unflooded Skagit Valley. The Skagit River is one of the finest fly-fishing streams in all of British Columbia and we are very fortunate to have it located so close by in the lower mainland, so that a fisherman, a camper, a picnicker can drive up there in a few hours from Vancouver and have a very enjoyable day or weekend. So we in this group are opposed to the flooding and we ask the Hon. Minister of Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williston) to re-negotiate this treaty.

We have other assets. Washington is interested in our natural gas. We could develop thermal power in the Upper Hat creek. Without any open pit mining, we could drill down into those great coal fields, set them afire and develop thermal power and sell electricity to Washington and to the world.

This to me would be much more progressive, it would be much better for both United States and Canada. Because once the Skagit Valley is flooded, we're not only robbing ourselves, but we are removing the spawning beds that keep Ross Lake supplied with a fresh supply of fish each year.

The trout go out of Ross Lake and up into the meandering waters on the Skagit River. In those fine gravel beds, they lay their eggs, the eggs hatch and then the fingerling go back down and Ross Lake is one of the few lakes that quite ably, naturally stocks itself by natural means. So we are not only doing ourselves great harm, we are doing harm to their beautiful lake.

The U.S. government, through their department of ecology in Washington, are aware of this and other mistakes that Seattle City Light would be making if that dam was built another 123 feet and the lake flooded.

I have noticed also in this newspaper quote, that the Minister said that we have a great debt to Seattle City Light, because they have put in great footings. Those footings, if they are there, have not been put in since January 10, 1967. That's when this amendment was endorsed. If they were put in, they were put in many, many years ago. If they were put in many, many years ago, they knew that they would have to appeal and re-negotiate this treaty and they weren't sure they would get it.

So this was a business gambling chance they took. We're not responsible for it and I don't think you are doing the right thing for the citizens of British Columbia, Mr. Minister of Lands, to try and hold that over our heads.

I read a very interesting article with regard to the summit committee on poverty and it was entitled, "Poverty in Canada." This is a quote from the story of the minority report by the four authors of "The Real Poverty Report" — Ian Adams, Bill Cameron, Brian Hill and Peter Pins. They resigned from the senate committee in April, 1971, because they felt Senator Crow was politically motivated in not attacking the real cause of poverty — our economic system.

The two reports are very similar. However, they agree that poverty is extensive in Canada, that it is the result of the economic system and that welfare and social welfare systems are a failure. They also agree on the need for a guaranteed annual income — that's one.

Two, universal health care, without premiums that supplies medical, dental, and drug requirements.

Three, full employment, with a minimum wage of \$2.50 and \$3.00 an hour, Mr. Minister of Labour.

Four, a new public, organisational approach to supply social services.

Five, more and better low-income housing. I might add, humane housing.

The most damaging myth, the comment says, the most damaging myth to the poor is the one that says they are poor through their own fault. The Crow report shows that 60 per cent of the poor are working full time. They found only 2% of the people on welfare who preferred being on welfare to working. They also found that thousands of working poor would be better off financially on welfare.

It is interesting to note that the working poor get no help from the annual expenditure of \$6 billion on social

security. If Canadian poor people are lazy, unmotivated and no good, then Canadian women must be exceptionally lazy, no good and unmotivated, because in 1967, 38 per cent of all Canadian women raising children on their own were poor. This fact dispels the assumption that society only punishes shiftless burns, with low welfare rates, while helpless widows and children are properly cared for.

Why is there so much ignorance, apathy, callousness, even cruelty, in treatment of most Canadians, given to their fellow Canadians in need? For over 200 years there has been a cultural acceptance, part of the puritan ethic of the idea that people who succeed do so because they work hard, and are morally strong, while people who need government help do

[[Page 108](#)]

not work hard and are morally weak.

This work ethic has been accompanied by the Christian good samaritan approach to poverty — fine for personal character, but useless for obtaining social justice for the poor.

What possible answers are there to problems of poverty? Political action is required to change Canada's economic system so that the people who want to work will have jobs that are satisfying and pay good wages.

The social service system must supply a high standard of living in the areas of basic needs.

To bring about political changes required, the poor and the near-poor must organise and train themselves so that they can bargain with government from a position of power. The power will probably have to come from the use of civil disobedience and violence against things. The Crow report offers moral justification for this action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when senators and other top men in the Canadian government make statements like that I think we can indeed recognise that our economy, our social structure, our way of life, is in very serious trouble. I didn't say that; men with far greater depth of understanding the problem and possibly any of us in here have said that.

But what is going on nationally is going on in British Columbia. What did the Hon. Member for Richmond (Mr. LeCours) say when he moved the adoption of the throne speech? He said the people of British Columbia are without hope. This was one of the government's own members, Mr. Speaker. A B.C. lottery was urged to give people hope. The throne speech, Mr. Speaker, was so empty that the member for Richmond said, B.C. needs a provincial lottery to give the average citizen reason for hope.

Now isn't that a condemnation of the way we live, the way the vast majority of working people live? Isn't that a shocking indictment of our economy? This is after 20 years of the so-called Social Credit good life.

Now before I sit down, Mr. Speaker, I should say a few words about car insurance and to do that I would like to reflect back to March, 1969. We had a special committee on automobile insurance and I have a clipping that the Hon. Attorney General can have if he wishes. It's a clipping of the Vancouver *Sun*, March 29 — and remember that was before the 1969 election: "L.R. Peterson said Friday that a reduction in automobile premiums will be coming and they will range from 15-35 per cent, he said. Opposition M.L.A.'s charged that this statement was made by Peterson to gain votes in the coming election."

Now about that time, Mr. Burns came all the way out from Eastern Canada representing the insurance industry and said that the laws that Mr. Peterson and his government just passed were the best insurance laws in the world.

The Opposition said yes — the best insurance laws in the world for the automobile insurance companies. Of course that was back in March, 1969, before the election.

We had an election, this little government was returned with the greatest majority it has ever received. And I

think it is only right that it should, because no doubt it received the greatest amount of campaign funds from the car insurance industry that it has ever received before. Believe me, if they don't do something about these good laws for the car insurance corporations, but poor laws for the people, they're going to need a lot more campaign funds from those same vested car insurance industries next time.

I know Hon. Members can't do anything about it. I know they'd like to. I've seen some of the Hon. Members speak out about it, but they're in the bag of the car insurance industry.

The government accepted their bribe, they accepted their campaign funds and the Hon. Members can do nothing. They've got to sit back and be quiet.

And furthermore the Hon. Attorney General can do very little. He would like to give that B.C. auto-insurance board a free hand so that they could do what would be the right thing, but he knows that the man who pays the piper calls the tune. He knows the man that put up the campaign funds, says: "Oh no, take it easy on that B.C. Insurance commission."

So, Mr. Speaker, on January 1, 1970, no-fault accident benefits took place in B.C. And we'll remember that when these accident benefits first took effect, the industry provided that coverage the first year.

If your insurance came due on February 1, you got one month of accident benefits without charge; March 1, two months. In my case my insurance comes due on November 24, so I got almost 11 months of no-fault benefit, without any charge the first year. So that I think it's fair to agree that in the first year, 1970, the car insurance industry collected something considerably less than a full year's premium income.

Now, these were the figures, the 1960 figures, that the insurance board studied. These were the ones they set up for comparison and yet even though the B.C. car insurance industry had considerably less than a full year's premium income, they only used 41 per cent of that to pay claims. Almost 60 per cent — 59 per cent — was in gravy and administration to the insurance industry.

So I would like to submit, Mr. Speaker, that while the Hon. Attorney-General said rates would come down, and while the industry, which for a change during the first year took in a considerable less portion of a full year's premium, they only used 40 cents of the premium dollar that they did collect.

Now, I don't know how many Hon. Members have seen a copy of the letter that Dr. English sent out to the car insurance industry, wherein he suggested the board is of the opinion that the maximum annual premium should not exceed \$13.79.

He winds up: "If you are prepared to reduce the premiums, please let us know the date on which you will implement the change. We believe that it would not be later than January, 1972."

Now, the chairman's a dear old gentleman, but he's either misguided or instructed because — believe me, Mr. Speaker — any time that you're dealing with the fat cats of the insurance industry, you don't say "please would you." You say: "The Legislature of British Columbia passed a law empowering us to do this. You've had two years to do the right thing. You failed — we're ordering you to roll back the premiums."

This insurance board that's supposed to represent the people of British Columbia, Mr. Speaker, invited the insurance industry to give reasons why they didn't have to reduce their rates. But did they invite the public to come out and give reasons why the rate should be reduced? Did they invite representatives of the public to come out and say why they would like to see the rates reduced?

No. That's why I say that board is being instructed, Mr. Speaker. That board is being instructed by representatives of the government that was elected by campaign funds of the insurance industry and that's why they are so instructed to take it easy on the car insurance industry in this province.

Now there are two or three points that commission

should have considered. I placed a series of questions...

HON. MR. BENNETT: This government has never received...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order!

MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Speaker, will the Premier categorically stand and deny that his Social Credit party in this province have ever received campaign funds from anyone in the car insurance industry? Will you stand and categorically deny that Mr. Premier? You'll stand up and make your statement.

Mr. Speaker, I want the Press and all to recognise that the Premier declines to categorically deny that they received campaign funds from the insurance industry. I have the floor and if he wishes to make a statement, he can make a statement.

Now, that's quite an admission, gentlemen.

Now, there was no allowance for the fact that the money that had been paid in advance — you pay your car insurance in advance. If you pay an annual premium you pay 12 months and in the bookkeeping of insurance they withdraw a month's premium so that when you renew your premium there's eleven months unearned premium. This money is invested, it's invested at high rates of interest.

The industry was never asked about crediting this to the car driver — the person that buys car insurance. What the insurance industry argued is simply this. They said: "Well look, by having no-fault benefits and also limited liability we have to have a separate column of figures. We have to have a separate column of figures now in our ledgers and this has made it more expensive for us. The fact that we've got to figure liability and no-fault and then unlimited liability makes it much more expensive for us to operate." This was the song that they played.

In my opinion they didn't have a good argument at all. They were arguing that we had helped make their operation more efficient. But, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask you just how much more inefficient can we make it?

According to the Superintendent of Insurance report that was filed here earlier in the week there are 185 companies doing business in this province and they choose not to flat rate the province. They break the province down into various districts — Victoria one district, Vancouver another — in all about eight districts throughout the province. Then they have different categories of vehicles and different qualifications of drivers, so you work this all out and multiply it by 185 times.

How much more inefficient, how much more complicated can they make it? But this is their way of doing business and this is the government's way of doing business — 185 companies. That's right, 185 companies and they all have to have a president, they all have to have a well-paid board of directors, they all have to have a fancy head office building. Inefficient.

They concluded, Mr. Speaker, that they were losing money. My heart really bled for them and I told them. I said: "You know, in reading history I find government went into the railway business because railroads were losing money and when they were losing money they went to the government and the government took them over. We went into the ferry business. We went into the airplane business and the radio and T.V. business. But this is the first time that I've seen an industry come cap-in-hand to the government and say: "We're losing money, but we like it that way and we laugh all the way to the bank."

Now, Mr. Speaker I'd just like to give you a few figures of how this government has allowed the people of this province to be bilked by the car insurance industry. Bilked... milked... The first year, the car insurance industry had a limited amount of premium income. Of that limited amount only 40 per cent was used for claims, and with that

there was a surplus of close to \$4 million. Now in 1971, the year we just completed, they had a full year's premium income under the surplus of close to \$7 million. Now this year with the roll-back in premiums, there'll possibly be between \$3 and \$4 million surplus.

Now that's a total of \$14 million that the people of this province have doled out in \$22 a year for the first two years, \$15 a year for the third year. That works out, at \$14 million for something less than 700,000 motor vehicles, at a \$20 bill from each car owner in the province.

Now what is the Hon. Attorney General going to do about it? Saying nothing about the money that the people are being milked or bilked for the collision insurance for their full legal liability.

There was a clipping in the paper that said that insurance rates throughout B.C. were going to go up 5.9 per cent — 5.9 per cent boost due in car insurance rates in eight of 10 provinces across Canada.

What two aren't going to have higher rates? The two provinces, Manitoba and Saskatchewan, where the members of that government and the parties of that government didn't accept the moneys from the insurance industry. The people of this province...

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please. I thought I missed a word earlier during the Honourable Member's speech where I wasn't sure whether or not he said that the government was accepting bribes. He's now imputing an improper motive by saying that it's accepting money. First of all, did the Hon. Member make the statement that the government was accepting bribes?

MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Speaker, I earlier said that the Social Credit party of this province has accepted the bribe of the car insurance industry.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member is using a very highly improper remark. Would he withdraw that statement please?

MR. HARTLEY: Well, Mr. Speaker, I feel very strongly on this.

MR. SPEAKER: I feel rather strongly about the use of language in this Legislature and suggest you withdraw it.

MR. HARTLEY: Would you allow me to use the term "slush funds"? I'll leave it at "campaigning."

MR. SPEAKER: I'm asking the Honourable Member to withdraw the expression.

MR. HARTLEY: I'll withdraw the word, "bribe."

MR. SPEAKER: Carry on if you wish.

MR. HARTLEY: Now following this announcement that

[[Page 110](#)]

there would be a 5.9 per cent boost due in car insurance in B.C., and that this increase was going to go across Canada with the exception of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, you know one reason why the rates have to go up here. Because the people of this province are being taxed by the insurance industry so that the insurance industry can lower their rates in Saskatchewan and Manitoba to compete with government insurance.

Now the Hon. Attorney General said that he was going to empower the board to see that when they roll back the \$22 to \$15 they wouldn't increase the rate on collision and public liability. Now I have a photo copy here of a car insurance premium where for 1972 the driver has a class A rating. His car is in group five and the company that is selling that insurance has increased their group five rate by 65 per cent on their collision. I photostatted this. I'll be happy to turn the papers over to the Hon. Attorney General. I would like to see him order that company — don't call

them in and have a little tea party — to turn this over to the insurance board. Certainly when they say in the Press we're going to have 5.9 per cent increase and they start handing out 65 per cent rate increases, that's a little bit much. I have this documented. The Hon. Minister can have the car insurance policy and the number of the policy and so on.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. HARTLEY: Yes, there's a morality in the business world. There's a morality in dealing with people. It's all very well, you can cast askance about the topless dancers. That was just a smoke screen, that was just a sham to try and get the people away from thinking or knowing how they really were bilked.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. HARTLEY: There's a letter that I received very recently, Mr. Speaker and it shows that no-fault and pink-slip insurance is not working in British Columbia, it's not working to the advantage of a great many people.

This was written to me by a lady whose brother was killed in a car accident and he didn't have insurance, and in the car with him was another woman and another man so they weren't covered. He was involved in an accident with a car owned by a Mr. Weir from Sardis. So, until we supply car insurance with licence plates and drivers' licences, a great many people are going to be killed and a great many families are going to be maimed and will suffer because of the failure of the car insurance laws of this province.

Now there is a better way. There's very definitely a better way to do this. I'll send one up to the Press too so they have one — I'll give the Hon. Minister the figures on that photostat Mr. Minister. The rate for collision a year ago was \$23, the rate this year is \$38 — an increase of \$15, \$15 over \$23 is 65 per cent. Now there is a better way.

In 1946 the people in the province of Saskatchewan had come through a very tough, hard time, through a tough Depression. Their Treasury Board put up \$12,000 and they set up Saskatchewan Government Insurance Offices and they started supplying car insurance with every licence plate. At the end of the first year they had set up enough reserve so they could return this \$12,000 and pay the Treasury Board full interest.

Today, the assets controlled by Saskatchewan Government Insurance are something in the neighbourhood of \$60 million.

That \$60 million isn't invested in other parts of the world. Every penny is invested in the pipelines, in the railways, in the power dams, in industry, in the hospitals, in the schools, in the public buildings in the province of Saskatchewan.

So this is a two-fold benefit. Not only will the people get better insurance coverage, they have the use of using those reserve dollars for the people in their native province.

Now the original car insurance legislation licence plate insurance legislation is such that they cannot make a profit. If there is a surplus at the end of the year, then the compulsory insurance benefits have either to be increased or their premiums reduced.

On the casualty and fire government insurance office they can make a profit. But by the virtue of the fact that the government is in business in the insurance business in Saskatchewan fire and casualty rates on farm buildings that were heretofore prohibited have been reduced anywhere from 50 per cent to a tenth of their former rate before the government was in business.

So there were also dividends paid to the home-owners, even though they didn't drive cars, by having lower rates. And today the farm rates there are the lowest anywhere in Canada.

And what is the difference, Mr. Speaker? The Social Democrats believe in service to people. This is our philosophy. When we develop an industry, when we go into an enterprise we do it with no malicious intent to anyone. We do it to better serve the public.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask through you the Press and the galleries and the members of government if they know what S.C. stand for? Yes, Social Credit. And what does Social Credit do? When they change the insurance laws they say: "Yes, S.C. means service to corporations." And this is the situation with this government. There is the mine corporation, the lumber baron, the beer baron, or the car insurance industry. The Social Credit stands for service to corporations, the Social Democrats for service to and for people.

So, with that Mr. Speaker, we put B.C. first, we think that this government should have a first-class programme of government insurance for all people and that they would invest those reserves here where it would be putting the people of B.C. before Bay Street and Wall Street.

The first step, possibly the most simple and easiest step for you to take, would merely to be expand your present programme of government car insurance — the programme that you have for the 6,500 government vehicles, the vehicles that are out bucking the snow drifts, driving under the most hazardous conditions night and day at this time of the year.

You know that the highways report that was filed on January 20 on page 14B gives a report on the government's own car insurance and you know what it costs for the average vehicle this year — \$23.85.

We insure all our publicly-owned vehicles that are operated by the government in various government departments for approximately from an eighth to a tenth of what it would have cost if you had insured them through private industry.

The total cost for the 6,000 vehicles is \$125,000. If we had insured these through the private car insurance corporations it would have cost \$1 million more than that. Through this good business insuring your cars the government saved the taxpayer \$1 million.

[[Page 111](#)]

Now if they can save \$1 million on 6,500 vehicles what could they do with 650,000 vehicles?

Certainly they could do 1,000 times as much, and we're challenging them to do that. This is the challenge that we are holding out today.

Surely, Mr. Speaker, this has gone on long enough? If this little government doesn't accept the challenge that we're offering, then the people will recognise that it is no longer a government of little people, they'll recognise it is a government of big business — a government of a great car insurance. They will believe me that when I go up to Yale-Lillooet and follow the Premier. They'll say: "Little people, this is no longer the leader, little people. Social Credit stands for service to corporations."

MR. SPEAKER: Honourable Members, the House is now discussing an amendment to the opening speech which states that "this House regrets the speech fails to disclose any proposal for implementing a universal government automobile insurance plan, whereby automobile insurance would be provided at cost to the public." Honourable Members would confine their remarks therefore to the contents of that particular amendment.

The Honourable the second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): It's awfully pleasant to be vertical for the first time this year. (Laughter). And I would like to address myself to the motion of the N.D.P. The motion, Mr. Speaker, is essentially on the premise, "the cheapest is best and the best is cheapest," and that is never really necessarily correct. Quite frankly Mr. Speaker, I have a great deal of hesitation in accepting, and very, very seriously question, the fact that their proposal would even be cheaper, either philosophically or economically.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. GARDOM: I'd rather not have too much support, from that side of the House, it troubles me.

(Laughter). I'd like to cover six points in my remarks, Mr. Speaker. First of all I think that we have to look, at the legislative assembly, for the hidden charges that one would find in the proposals such as have been raised by our socialistic friends to our right today.

What about the overlapping of agencies? The overlapping of personnel, of supplies, of desks, of typewriters, of buildings and all of the other governmental fixed assets? Secondly, their suggestion would produce a gross saving — I don't think there's any question of a doubt. But I very, very much doubt that it would produce any kind of a net saving. In fact, I think there would be a net increase, because we would find that these hidden charges would have to be paid by taxes, and quite frankly why should the non motorist pay the burden of those increased taxes?

The only element, the only single solitary element of savings in the proposal of the N.D.P. would be the interest charges on prepaid premiums. And that is a considerable amount of money and I'd like to say a little bit more about that at the end of my remarks dealing with this motion.

If the government took over automobile insurance would it not be just the first step for a government taking over every other kind of insurance? Quite frankly, say, the fire insurance business is a much easier business to administer and on the whole it's more profitable. Is the government then going to go into every facet of insurance? Does that mean that insurance is going to be denied to people to have as their jobs, outside of the government in this province?

I think that would be a very, very retrogressive step, because what the N.D.P. has suggested is just an increase of bureaucracy. We'd have more buildings and we'd have more red tape and certainly a great deal of increased rigidity.

Quite frankly, look at the government that those people are asking to do this. They are asking the Social Credit government, which is the government of the province today, to bring in government insurance and have them run it. The government which will not render itself to true accounts, which will not permit itself to be sued, which is devoid of programmes for reform, and which looks upon advertising for public purposes as a means of self-perpetuation.

These are the people that they are asking to take over insurance in the Province of British Columbia. Boy, are those N.D.P. fellows short sighted. Why, that proposal in itself would be just one more open sesame to the abuse that we've heard a great deal about the Opposition side of the House so far in the throne debate, and a great deal also from the back bench of this government. Just one more open sesame of Cabinet abuse in B.C.

This is what the N.D.P. want them to do. I think that's absolute nonsense. Quite frankly, also look at the other side of the corner of their proposal. They have come up today with a suggestion which would denude about 15,000 people in the province of jobs. Isn't that a great proposal?

They would put the secretaries out of work. They would put the agents out of work. They would put the salesman out of work, and the people they support all down the lines.

You'd have another insurance czar. Which Cabinet Minister over there do you want to have become the insurance czar? Which one? "Isabel the insurance czar," if that's your suggestion well it's certainly not mine. With every respect to Isabel who's a very, very pleasant lady.

Mr. Speaker, where there is abuse one has to advocate change. But in advocating change, Mr. Speaker, one has to very carefully consider the consequences of such change and I submit that the people who are responsible for moving this motion have ill-considered the consequences.

One cannot for one second fault them for seeing a problem. And I think that's obvious, it's very obvious.

It's been obvious I think, to everyone in the province. It's been obvious to the public, and it's been obvious even to the odd individual in the government side.

Also, to an extent, it's been obvious to two areas of the industry. And the two areas of the insurance industry who carry the complaint of the industry on their back are the people that do the most work — and that's the insurance agents. Don't forget for one minute that they perform a great service. They inform people of the content of their policy. If you want to just go ahead and put 25 cents into a machine and yank out a policy you think you're going to be properly insured. I think that's nonsense.

AN HON. MEMBER: Westco doesn't have any.

MR. GARDOM: Who are Westco? (Laughter). Secondly, they have carried the abuse of the industry on their back insofar as the slowness of payments are concerned, insofar as in many cases the miserable payments that have been made. Quite frankly, they are the very first people who receive the complaints from the general public that the insurance

[[Page 112](#)]

industry is not doing anything within its own four walls to try to cure things.

And that's true. The industry per se is not, but these people who are performing the service are.

I don't think that we can buy in British Columbia any kind of argument for industry miscalculation of the rate, which we're talking about to a great extent. That did not just happen. And I'm talking about the rate for no-fault insurance.

The industry had every economic and statistical expert at their beck and call, and I find it very, very difficult to accept the premise that this automobile insurance board reached a decision upon was not known to the industry, and could have well been contemplated by them at the outset.

So I think they knew. But I also think that this government knew. Or if it did not know it at least should have known, with the terrific resources and the knowledge they have at their beck and call any point of the time.

The insurance no-fault rate, I think, was high-graded from the start. I said so at the time this was discussed in the House, and I remember saying very clearly that no-fault insurance would increase the overall rate by about 25' per cent. I also recall the Honourable the Attorney General pooh-poohing it. He said: "Oh no, no, no. It's all going to go down." But it proved in the matter of fact and in the statistics that I was correct, and he was wrong.

So now we find, Mr. Speaker, after two years, an overcharge on the no-fault side still after allowing for a profit about \$7.50 per premium per year. Well, assuming we've got two million people, and assuming we've got roughly one million cars that's \$7,500,000 overcharged per year, or \$15 million over the two years.

But also there is a little more than that. Because again you can take into account the interest of those prepaid premiums. So I suppose one could say that it's close to \$17 million, or roughly \$16.9 million that has been overcharged to the motoring public.

This \$16.9 million is a bonanza that has been placed directly into the coffers of the insurance companies, and very, very little of that to the agents or to the salesmen.

I would like to ask the industry to say: "Alright, we've made \$17 million more approximately over the past two years than we should as a result (charitably) of a miscalculation, and we're going to plough that back to you," and say for 1972 the no-fault is going to cost not \$15 but it's going to cost \$7.50. And the same thing for 1973.

I think government should give the industry seven days from today to think that over, and if there's no offer forthcoming from the industry I recommend that the insurance board reconvene at the Legislature's request and order the companies to do just that.

There was an interesting editorial which I'm sure many Hon. Members read in the Vancouver *Sun* yesterday, Wednesday January 26. And the last three paragraphs say this:

Strangely, the insurance board seems to have no intention of ordering the companies to make rebates for these two years of excessively high premiums. It doesn't think such repayment would be practical.

This is funny, because in a similar situation the State of Massachusetts thinks it's practical indeed. It has found motorists have been paying too much under the state's no-fault insurance system. Therefore the State of Massachusetts has ordered a 55.2 per cent cut in 1972 premiums for bodily injury insurance and welcomes the challenge in the courts.

I'm quoting still from the *Sun*:

"We are going to try to get those excess charges back for the motorists in the form of premium credits," says Francis Sargent, the state's governor.

If the interests of B.C. motorists were looked after as considerably, perhaps the future of the new insurance board — and indeed the government's vulnerable Car Insurance Act would be a little more assured.

Well, I'm going to put a simple question to the government, Mr. Speaker. Does it have the gumption of the Massachusetts government or does it not? Does it or does it not? Because the industry, and, I submit the government well knew that this thing would never, ever come into the cost of \$22 to \$24. Yet our Attorney General knew this from the very beginning, and he in my view permitted this two years of overcharge. And I call upon him to order this board to tell the insurance companies to see that this is reconstituted back to the public of B.C.

Quite frankly, Mr. Speaker, I think that we have had dark deeds here. I think it is something that can well be solved. The money has not disappeared into the night and I think that we should do in British Columbia as they have done in Massachusetts.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. GARDOM: My friends ask me, am I supporting the motion, or am I not? I am obviously not supporting the motion and if this comes as a surprise to them, sir, I am very, very amazed indeed.

I favour; Mr. Speaker, very much private carriers over the public because I believe in free competitive enterprise. But it's got to be free and it's got to be competing and it's got to be enterprising.

The situation that we have here, the situation that has shown itself just like a sore in the business world in so far as the insurance industry is concerned, is that it is not doing that.

What we definitely need, Mr. Speaker, is less government, not more government, and this proposal is just more and more government. They are indicating to us that by bringing this in they will find savings for the Province of British Columbia and the motorist public. And that with every respect is absolute tommy-rot.

What we should do is bring the insurance companies to task. The Hon. Attorney General has the power to do it. This legislative assembly has the power to do it. It's been obvious that they have overcharged. For two years — 1972 and 1973 — make the charge from a no-fault premium \$7.50. And that can be ordered by the insurance board as it was ordered in Massachusetts as it should be ordered in British Columbia.

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

MR. R.M. STRACHAN (Cowichan-Malahat): Thank you very much Mr. Speaker. I want to state very clearly, very decisively, and very forcefully that I am supporting the amendment. Just in case there was any doubt. I listened to the last Hon. Member. He cast aspersions on us because we were asking this government — indicating a trust in this government- to administer an automobile insurance plan.

He indicated he had no trust in the government. Then he turns around and wants us to repeat a mistake that has already been clearly demonstrated by asking the government

to bring the insurance companies in, let them have their say, and then for the government to take action. I've a distinct recollection we did exactly that in the matter of the price of gasoline. And we got some magnificent reports.

Then there were committees that brought in reports as to what should not be done. And of course they were heard. It was recorded. Recommendations came in. Nothing happened, and nothing is going to happen.

I'm supporting this resolution, Mr. Speaker, because I'm expressing a matter of principle, and that principle is that monopoly doesn't belong in private hands. Despite the fact that there happens to be 195 or 185 or 183 insurance companies operating in this province, they all operate out of the same rate book handed to them, sent to them by centralised bureaucracy that's operating the insurance business of Canada.

I'm expressing the principle here, not only in this House, because I carry it all over the province — it must be obvious that we can no longer leave this monopoly in private hands. And if any one votes against this amendment this afternoon, they are saying: "We like monopoly, we like it in private hands, we like them to be able to gouge and rob the public and set their own rate." Because that's what this is all about.

AN HON. MEMBER: You better watch your blood pressure.

MR. STRACHAN: You bet I'm watching my blood pressure. Nothing makes my blood pressure rise than to see this sort of thing coming out from the insurance company. The Hon. Attorney General of this province passes laws to try and make a valid legal system operate — a fairly reasonable system, he called it the point system — to avoid getting people into court and getting fined because they have committed some misdemeanor.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. STRACHAN: Fair enough. A point system. So some driver is driving along and he happens not to notice that the speedometer is slightly over the legal limit. What happens? He's stopped. It used to be he was hauled into court. But under the system now, we don't. He used to be fined; we don't fine him. But there are a few points recorded against him somewhere over here.

MR. STRACHAN: But time after time after time where there has been no charge laid, no fine imposed by any court, the insurance company turn around and fine that man, by increasing his rates. Here is one case here — a 35 per cent surcharge that is a fine levied against an individual by an insurance monopoly, not by the state. It's a fine. He's been convicted of nothing, there is merely in what was supposed to be a private relationship, a private record between the Attorney General's office and the individual. Somehow or other they get hold of this and that man is fined even though he may not be involved in any accident. There it is — 25 per cent surcharge and unless he pays it, he can't drive.

That's what I'm voting for when I vote for this amendment, that I'm opposing the kind of mishmash that the Hon. Attorney General has been giving the province with regard to his no-fault policy.

It is obvious that it can't, it simply can't carry on the way it is. Now when the member here was speaking and made some reference to the car insurance board being instructed, the Hon. Premier turned to the Hon. Attorney General and asked him had he given them any instructions?

I gather the answer was no. But the fact that the Premier had to ask the question indicates that time after time after time instructions are given to these boards. Because the Premier didn't know whether or not instructions had been given to the board — otherwise he wouldn't have had to ask you the question.

That's the kind of thing we don't like happening. It indicates that it is not an unusual practice for these boards to be given these kind of instructions.

I'm voting for this amendment also because I recollect the time when the Hon. Attorney General introduced this legislation and he held it up here as the answer to all the problems. "We are going to, reduce automobile insurance by \$15" — and a week later they shot him down in flames.

Here it is. In a year when many of the financial reports of the insurance companies all across North America show higher profit than ever before, I was shocked and amazed to find in the report that they were going to increase rates.

I'm expressing my approval of a principle. These people have had their chance. They've had their day. It is obvious that they are certainly not in business to be kind or charitable to the people of this province. I think it is an absolute waste of the public's money to have to pay this tribute and once you pass a law that says everyone in this province must carry insurance then you have absolutely no right to say they must pay tribute of any kind to a private company. No right at all. Not only under the no-fault clause but any other clause.

But even worse, I tell the Hon. Minister, is the fact that because of the ramifications and the bureaucracy and the multiplicity and the fact that they raise this division of responsibility within automobile insurance in the Province of British Columbia, we haven't solved the basic problem.

Insurance companies are still fighting insurance companies as to who pays what when and time after time after time cases drag on month after month — yes and year after year without the just dues the people involved in the accident being met even though they had to pay their dues under the law that you passed.

This will continue until we have a government prepared to support a motion calling for a government-operated automobile insurance. It's a monopoly, it belongs in public hands. I'm expressing that principle and anyone who votes against this motion is saying: "We don't like it the way it is, but we're with the big boys and no matter what it costs the people, no matter how inadequate it is, no matter how long people have to wait, we'd rather continue with the way it is."

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for New Westminster.

MR. D.G. COCKE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I listened with a good deal of interest to the Liberal spokesman on insurance. It was a surprise, Mr. Speaker, in that when the Liberals were in power in Saskatchewan, for some eight years after they took power, they had all the opportunity in the world to reverse what the 20-year-old government of the N.D.P. had done.

We're back now in Saskatchewan, fortunately for the people, but the Liberals did not reverse it, Mr. Speaker, and the reason they didn't reverse it was because of the fact that it was providing a service for the people of Saskatchewan that they wanted, needed and they had had the other system before.

[[Page 114](#)]

Mr. Speaker, the Liberals are talking about increased taxes and they say: "Well, you know, we don't want to increase taxes." It's nothing to do with increased taxes, Mr. Speaker. What were suggesting is government car insurance.

The Hon. Member says there'd be a reduction in jobs. Right now practically every agent on the North American continent wants out of the car insurance business. I'm talking about the salesmen. They want out of it. They're not making a nickel.

The fact of the matter is they're making enough — 5 per cent and 4 per cent and 3 per cent — on renewals and they just want out of it. That's right.

It's the companies that want: in and they're in like Flynn in this province.

Anyway, another thing I'd like to bring to the Liberal Member's attention was he wasn't unique in his feeling that the no-fault rate was too high. Those people who were on the committee remember well that the actuary to the committee said those rates were too high. That was two years ago and now we're doing something about it.

Mr. Speaker, the fact that we went for a 1972 increase again, that increase was announced in Toronto, I

noticed to begin with — that's where everything is announced in this country either in Toronto or New York or someplace else, not here — our rates were going up 5.9 per cent they said, after an increase last year of 12 per cent.

Who is being milked? Who is being milked? In spite of these increases, the companies still claim that they're not making money. If that's the case then my suggestion is what are they trying so hard to stay in for?

Mr. Speaker, they have these hundred millions that they took in the no-fault coverage and I agree with the Member from Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) that the people that pay for those benefits should be paid back.

But I could go a great deal further than he does. I say that we've been playing the wrong game with the wrong people. People are tired of being squeezed by the insurance octopus. Tired of being squeezed by that octopus. Here the octopus doesn't come to us. We're taken to the octopus and placed in its tentacles by this government, Mr. Speaker. That's what happens.

What a nice situation it is in B.C. We're served like an hors d'oeuvres to the insurance industry of this province. Mr. Speaker, we have an insurance Act and an insurance board and a superintendent of insurance all to protect us. And I say to you that they protect the car insurance companies, they don't protect the public of this province. They sure don't. B.C. has given the car owners a burn deal. The private profit motive insurance industry has taken us to the cleaners, and they've done it without mercy, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Attorney General of this province said that he had 42 complaints they were looking into — 48, I'm sorry, 48 that they were looking into. I can tell you I've got complaints from thousands in New Westminster and I'm sure that every other M.L.A. In this whole province has had complaint after complaint about the car insurance industry. What about this discrimination? Well there is discrimination in two ways. The discriminatory rate and the discrimination against people by the insurance industry and by our own rules.

Now in the first place, the discrimination with respect to rate. If you're an old person over 65 you still go on paying your no-fault despite the fact that it is all too well-known that there is no way you are ever going to collect it.

If you are a young person still going to school, or not working steadily, you can't collect it.

Let me give you an indication of what happens. A young man got very badly hurt in the Fraser Valley, extremely badly hurt. That young man is probably impaired for the rest of his life to some degree and certainly very badly disabled at the present time. He had been going to university for half the year and working for half the year.

But not quite, he hadn't been working long enough to put him in a position where he could take advantage of the no-fault insurance. He's out of commission now and he's in a position where he has no chance of collecting the no-fault. So they have to go through the long way, and that's go after the insurance of the other man who was at fault. The other driver was at fault.

They've got to go the long way and so far it's been a year-and-a-half and no closer.

A young man in New Westminster was hit in a crosswalk on Royal Avenue. Now there is a person who doesn't work full time, unfortunately, for one reason or another. That man hasn't worked six months in the last year. He is on social welfare now while he is waiting and I'm sure he will be waiting for some time to come for a claim against that insurance company.

It is patently clear that he is in the right. His lawyer doesn't dare ask for an advance of any sort because he knows it will reduce the chance in the future of getting a just claim. So those are the kinds of things that happen.

A 25-year-old man last night told me: "I'm 25 and I haven't had an accident and I pay \$280 for my insurance on a 1969 Toyota." Mr. Real Estate man probably drives a Continental at less price, at less insurance than what that poor devil is paying. Now what kind of nonsense are we putting up with in this province? That's rank discrimination. All the way down the line.

Mr. Speaker, the insurance company that was suggested by the Hon. Member from Cowichan-Malahat (Mr. Strachan) are the enforcement officers in this province as well, sharing the duties of the police. Now that is not right, it's not right if I have a speeding charge — and don't forget according to our own statistics in this province 1.2 per cent of the accidents were caused by speeding and yet the other 99 per cent of the speeders have to pay an additional insurance rate. Now really, it just doesn't make sense.

Another thing I would like to bring to the attention of the House, Mr. Speaker. From 1964 to 1968 the insurance premiums increased by 84 per cent — 84 per cent, let's not forget that. How much do you think the claims went up in the same time? — 58 per cent during the same period. We don't seem to learn lessons in this province. We don't seem to understand that there is just no way we can deal with those price-fixers who are taking us down the garden path.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tell us about Manitoba.

MR. COCKE: Mr. Speaker, Manitoba will do very nicely now they have their own insurance plan. Very nicely. You know, the rate books look alike. No wonder they look alike. They look alike because they are composed in the same back room. The rating bureaus do the work. The insurance companies make the money. All those people that this government says are going to be put out of work by government car insurance would only be too happy to unload that stupid part of their work because they don't get remunerated for it, and they admit it.

Isn't it fantastic how hard the insurance industries fight to

[[Page 115](#)]

go on losing money? Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I believe that the solution is no-profit insurance. Insurance at cost for the people in B.C., Mr. Speaker. Insurance at cost. Car drivers deserve something better than what they are getting — government car insurance for the future Mr. Speaker, and the sooner the better. No more fooling around with 180 companies that have failed to produce in the past and no doubt will fail to produce in the future.

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

MR. J.D. TISDALE (Saanich and the Islands): Real estate now has become a word that is dirty too. But we won't go into that subject because I'm not a realtor anymore. The Opposition has studiously avoided talking about labour or job opportunities. They have instead moved an amendment to take over auto insurance. How does that make more jobs? That's how important they consider job opportunities. The Hon. Member who seconded the motion made it very clear he was speaking as a Socialist, that this was Socialist policy and that he was not particularly interested in the principle of what might be the result. As long as it's Socialism it must be good and it must be right and it's desirable.

That's his opinion and he's entitled to it. But there's a great body of opinion of people don't agree with him and show it year after year and time after time, and they know and think for themselves too. Don't belittle the voter as to having not used his intelligence when he has supported this kind of government for some 20 years. I understand very well the intention of the Socialists if they said: "Well the Liberals didn't undo or repeal the legislation in Saskatchewan."

I recall when I was in New Zealand that the Prime Minister Hollyoak said of that kind of legislation too, of Socialist legislation: "To repeal it and start over is like reconstituting berries from jam." It's almost impossible without you dislodge a lot of the things that they have made jam out of. Thatcher found it when he started in as the Prime Minister of Saskatchewan. His first speech in the House in the throne debate was the fact that he was amazed at the amount of hidden subsidies that had to go to keep the automobile insurance system going, he was about to repeal as many sections as possible.

We know that on the surface you can make a claim for a surface net gain or a better position in insurance. But you can't disclose all the multiplicity of government aid that must go along the road such as the owning of real estate — and you can claim the great real estate assets of those corporations or the government agencies of Saskatchewan

as assets, but it is people's investments that would have been made through the private channels just the same.

If Socialism is good for insurance then why not good for those things that are vital to health? How about food stores? We have them in the federal area, so we have some people supporting now food which is essential to life so we're...

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Honourable Member come back to the amendment before the House, please?

MR. TISDALE: ...going to enter the Safeway store business to compete on a monopolistic basis too.

Someone said auto insurance rate books were all the same now and it shows the disadvantage of having private enterprise into it. Please tell me whether if it's a government Crown corporation insurance, do you think you'll have different rate books? I doubt it. No, of course not.

The Hon. Member for New Westminster (Mr. Cocke) suggested that the sales agencies would like to get out of the business because it was a losing proposition. This has always been the position of Socialist concepts — take over losing propositions and then subsidise them out of general revenue. I'm opposed to that kind of thinking.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. TISDALE: The Opposition ranks regret that the throne debate did not include the substance of automobile insurance, and therefore it was ignored. Pray tell me if the government is accused of reciting its accomplishments. If it's going to include everything in the blinking throne debate when they have amendments and motions of this sort. It shows that the government is not going to try and take away their prerogative of thinking for themselves, but I don't appreciate their thinking, and I don't think this side of the House does.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable first Member for Vancouver East.

MR. A.B. MACDONALD (Vancouver East): Mr. Speaker, I'm not surprised that the government takes this kind of a position as they have in the past, because if you look at their own reports like the 1971 Superintendent of Insurance report you'll see that the kind of figures that the insurance company are funneling through to this government would justify almost anything in favour of those companies.

You look, for example, and this is a B.C. licenced company and as a result it gives this report to the government. On page E 61 and 62 you've got Westco Insurance Company. This great company that says it's got the lowest premiums and all the rest of it and takes great ads in the newspapers of the province. So it should be a model for the insurance industry. Look at the kind of figures they submit to the government.

They give their premiums written, and so forth, and then among their expenses, do you know they have a net loss of \$38,000? They're bleeding.

Yet you look for their net premiums earned: \$600,000. Among their expenses you see "general expense and taxes incurred \$334,000." Now I suppose they pay a 2 per cent premium tax and that might be in that figure. But imagine any company presenting a statement to its shareholders and saying all in the same breath "general expenses and taxes incurred \$334,000" — That's half their net premium income. They lump them together.

How does a company that is losing money suffering an underwriting loss as they say have taxes incurred except to the 2 per cent premium tax which doesn't begin to come to anything like that? And then they go down in this kind of a statement which has been accepted by this government for a long period of time Mr. Speaker, which justifies a public system right here out of this book. Mexican jumping bean figures that this government has been accepting. (Laughter).

Look at this other one in this Westco statement, this great company. This company, the prince of the creamers. Sure they are. The Hon. Attorney General knows that and yet takes this kind of a statement from them. Other income, they're giving their expenditures here, "other income and expenditures \$176,000." Other income and

expenditures — all in the same item. Now that kind of statement the Hon.

[[Page 116](#)]

Attorney General should have been sent back to this company postage due C.O.D. because — to use a phrase of a person who's joined our little group here — it's rubbish. And the government has accepted that kind of thing. No wonder our premiums are so high, no wonder you can't get together enough information to order a rebate of the \$15 million in overcharges which admittedly have been taken from the public of British Columbia, admitted by this board, over the past two years.

If you turn to another section of the report well, let's take Westco. In spite of those figures they presumably paid out in the last year 69 cents for every dollar they took in — 69 per cent. But what isn't included in that figure and what this government has never demanded from these companies is their other earnings — the earnings on their investment reserves.

Now in the first statement where it said "other income and expenditures," that's a wild kind of a way to present any figures. But they still show earnings of \$176,000 and presumably it would be more if you took these expenses off.

You add that on to their ratio of premiums received and losses paid out and that company — even on those figures and I don't believe them quite frankly — is paying \$0.54 in lawsuits for every dollar they take in in premium income. This is supposed to be one of the best and maybe it is.

My hon. friend from Point Grey, the second Member from Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) talks about bureaucracy and overlapping. If any company were that inefficient, Mr. Speaker, that for every dollar they took in the best they could do would be to pay out \$0.54 in a public utility field of this kind, you'd say take them over right away. That's grossly wasteful, inefficient, bureaucratic, overlapping labour. Directors' fees, hidden expenses, hidden commissions, kickbacks.

You know why these companies will put into a statement like this that they have an operating loss and yet they carry on in business. Of course, the plum is the built-up investment reserves contributed by the motorists of British Columbia through the years. Now that premium income is flowing into the reserves of the auto insurance companies today at about the rate of \$120 million a year. That's a plum, that's the prize.

How much are those reserves now? They've been building up year after year and you can see who they are. All of the bigger ones are American. They're not B.C. companies with any substantial premium income. They're Wawanesa and Allstate — these are the ones — Northwestern, the ones that run into \$5 or \$6 or \$7 million in premium income. They're American companies.

How much are the built-up reserves? How much are the earnings on them? Where are they invested? By whom are they invested? Are they invested — can the Hon. Member honestly say that they're invested in the best interest of the people of British Columbia right now?

Of course he can't... He doesn't know where they're invested, he's not going to find out.

These are the accumulated savings of the people of this province, Mr. Speaker, and they should be used, as my friend says, for the benefit of the people of this province.

Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Campbell files the annual report for the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ending December 31, 1971.

Hon. Mr. Peterson moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:00 p.m.

The House met at 8:00 p.m.

SPEECH FROM THE THRONE

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

MR. D. BARRETT (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, I address myself to this amendment to the main motion: That this House regrets that the speech failed to disclose any proposals for implementing a universal government automobile insurance plan whereby automobile insurance would be provided at cost to the public.

Mr. Speaker, we are at the crossroads tonight as announced by the Hon. Member from Saanich (Mr. Tisdalle) who after making his position clear left the House. The Hon. Member knew this afternoon that we were going to be faced with a vote on this issue — and I must say that he took the position that he would not vote for a Socialist measure such as government-owned automobile insurance. He condemned it as a Socialist move, an attempt to stifle free enterprise and it has to be stopped here in its tracks right here in this Legislature.

Well, I tell the Hon. Member, the chips are down. Because on this issue Mr. Speaker, they have had "underground Socialists" in their own party over the year. I'll go through the list. I've been in this House when the Hon. Member from Omineca (Hon. Mr. Shelford) spoke out in favour of government-owned car insurance.

The Hon. Member from Richmond (Mr. LeCours) can lift his higher because he'll get a chance tonight to stand up and back up what he's said about government-owned car insurance. Now we have the Hon. Member from Vancouver-Burrard (Mr. Merilees). I've been in the House when he's stood up asking for government-owned car insurance, so he'll get up tonight and back it up.

There have been other Hon. Members over there and latterly the last Hon. Member was the second member from Vancouver South (Mrs. Kripps) who said in Vancouver, Mr. Speaker, that "if the people get behind us I guess we'll have to give them car insurance." That's what she said.

Now Mr. Speaker, I'll tell you what's going on right in the Social Credit Party. Is there a move to purge that party of those Socialists who are advocating auto insurance? Is there a big rupture in that party as evidenced by the statement from the Hon. Member from Saanich tonight?

Page 6, 1969 B.C. Social Credit League resolutions to the annual convention. There they are talking about government car insurance. They even passed it at a Social Credit convention and everybody knows that they're a democratic convention. Once it's passed the politicians are bound by that little party's decision.

They are riddled, riddled with the little people of this

[[Page 117](#)]

province who want justice and hope for it within the Social Credit Party. There they are.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. BARRETT: Well, those Members don't even bother with those kind of conventions. They've never messed around with that kind of stuff to get into that kind of trouble.

The Hon. Member from Cariboo (Mr. Fraser). April 18, 1970, and I'll find his quote — that fighting independent Socialist member from the Cariboo. This is what he said April 18, 1970 in the *Colonist* from Quesnel,

safer than here. He said: "The government of British Columbia will take over the provincial automobile insurance industry by 1971. Alex Fraser, M.L.A. for Cariboo, predicted Thursday night."

AN HON. MEMBER: What year was that?

MR. BARRET: That's another vote we've got on this amendment.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is this '71?

MR. BARRETT: This is what he said: "The Social Credit Member told the Chamber of Commerce meeting, the government was on the verge of doing it at the last session." Oh, they were, were they?

"Fraser said the insurance firms had originally felt that they had been given a captive market through the government's introduction of compulsory no-fault insurance. However the reverse has been true. The legislation became effective January and Fraser said that the intent was to lower insurance premiums increases of 5 to 20 per cent announced earlier this week. However the reverse evidently occurred, and the premium increase will be the last straw as far as the government is concerned."

Remember that you're a back bencher. You don't speak for this government and if you keep that up you're going to have the Attorney General stamping his feet at you.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. BARRETT: There's the back-benchers meddling with government policy. The nerve.

AN HON. MEMBER: Not even a bribe, right here.

MR. BARRETT: No siree boy — we can't have that kind of action. Then we never heard him once, never heard him once come out in a fight for the little people of British Columbia against the big insurance companies. Never heard him once.

Socreds squelch Socialist ideas, they managed to hold back the convention one year, 1965, but they beat back the resolution. But the Social Credit conventions, year after year after year are getting infiltrated with "Socialists" who keep on insisting that they have government car insurance. Now I challenge the Premier of this province to get up and say that he's going to lead the purge in his party. He's going to purge these little people out who keep on insisting that they want — you had your chance to speak, don't get jumpy!

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, order.

MR. BARRETT: After that display I suggest the Hon. Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser) is coming. That party that said it was made up of little people fighting for the little people — there you are — don't threaten me like you threaten your Social Credit M.L.A.'s Don't you threaten me. (Laughter). I'm not frightened of you, I'm not a little member of that Social Credit party. I'm free. But there they are — there they are, Mr. Speaker, that little people's party in the grasp of the New York insurance companies. Oh!

Oh the vote is going to be beautiful tonight. What will the Hon. Member from Vancouver South tell the hot-line shows when she had a chance to vote for car insurance. "I'll have to go to Victoria and fight for government car insurance" — now's her chance. What'll we do with the member from Cariboo on the record? Here's his chance tonight too.

Is the Hon. Member from Saanich going to move a resolution within the Social Credit party purging all those little people who want justice?

Oh, free thinkers. My friend the Hon. Member from Yale-Lillooet (Mr. Hartley) has fought this issue throughout the length and breadth of the Province of British Columbia and he is known now as the champion of the

little people of this province in his attempts to bring them government-owned car insurance.

There was a time, Mr. Speaker, when the member from Omineca (Hon. Mr. Shelford) would have been up on his feet saying: "We want government car insurance — we want it now." What will he do tonight?

The Hon. Member from Richmond (Mr. LeCours) has made those kind of speeches.

Now — there it is. The Hon. Premier came into power because the little people of this province had the feeling that somehow his was a grassroots party that was really aware of their day-to-day problems and understood their needs and their hopes and their aspirations. Part of the Social Credit Party was built on a rural base belief that the old line parties like the Liberals — who have made their position abundantly clear today — would never change because they were tied into the system.

And what has happened, Mr. Speaker? This party that started out as a great hope for the small people of British Columbia just rolled over and took up the same strings that they let down when the Liberals were in government.

We saw the evidence today of that Liberal Party that never cut the tap roots of campaign funds from the big established insurance companies. But it's a sad day here in British Columbia when, I predict, on the vote those independent Social Crediters — who promised so much in those rural constituencies for those little people, that they'd come down to the big city of Victoria and fight for them — they'll cave in under big pressure. They'll cave in.

AN HON. MEMBER: They'll vote for the Liberals.

MR. BARRETT: You bet they'll vote for the Liberals. You can go through all the arguments, you can go through all the records, but 85 per cent of the people of this province want government-owned car insurance. And if by saying you want government car insurance you're synonymous with being a Socialist, then I say to those 85 per cent of the people, join the party — the only party that's going to fight for them and bring them government car insurance.

Delta sent in a resolution. Chilliwack sent in a resolution. Don't those members listen to their own party? But really, Mr. Speaker, I want to say this in conclusion. What this vote

[[Page 118](#)]

reduces itself to, more than anything else, is that when we leave this Legislature after this vote and after this session, some of us are going to be able to say that we stood in our places in this House and we voted for the little people of British Columbia against the big insurance interests in New York.

That's the choice. That's what the choice is tonight. Those Members have an opportunity to put themselves on the record clearly for all the people of this province. Who are they here representing? The little guy who slugs it out trying to make a living, trying to survive, or are they going to vote for the New York insurance companies? That's what it boils down to, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Mr. Speaker, that's a rather difficult act to follow, if I could emphasise the word "act." I have discussed this amendment with my whip and my House leader and my caucus chairman. (Laughter). I think as a result of all these discussions...

AN HON. MEMBER: Did you get a consensus? (Laughter).

MR. WALLACE: Yes, that's exactly the point I was trying to make. In fact I got a very good cross section.

AN HON. MEMBER: He achieved unity.

MR. WALLACE: At least I have two saving graces which the previous speaker was hammering away at the Opposition about. First of all, we haven't had a convention where you can quote the resolutions, thank God. (Laughter).

And another little point is that I'm not on record as ever having said anything about it before.

AN HON. MEMBER: Tread lightly!

MR. WALLACE: Ever so careful. (Laughter).

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. WALLACE: That's right Agnes, when did somebody tell you? (Laughter). Tell you later about it, tell you later. She just discovered I'm in a different position.

I would say this, Mr. Speaker, that the present automobile insurance programme certainly isn't working. On that the Conservative Party would agree. The next conclusion is that it should be changed, right. However, to the narrow minded tunnel-vision Socialists we assume that the only alternative is, to quote, a universal government auto insurance plan — to suggest that that is the only alternative — is to me symbolic of the fact that...

MR. SPEAKER: Order!

MR. WALLACE: Oh, there's no hurry.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House come to order please? Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Oh, there's no hurry.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the House please come to order, so the Honourable Member may proceed?

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, I'm simply saying that because the programme is not effective and efficient and fair to the public at the present time, that I do not consider that the only alternative is a plan run by the government and under the total control and auspices of the government.

As a Conservative representing the party I don't and the party does not, accept the implication that a government-run plan would automatically be cheaper and better.

In fact coming from a country where we endured and the word is "endured", Socialism for a period of time, I would say that in many industries all that Socialism proved was that it was even worse and less efficient than private enterprise.

I'm not saying that this would automatically be the case in this province, but I'm saying that any intelligent group of individuals representing the people of British Columbia, should always be willing to look at many and differing alternatives. It is not the policy of the Conservative Party to provide any service where there is every indication that it can be provided efficiently and at a fair price by the private sector of the company.

The problem here, Mr. Speaker, is that the present system seems to be neither efficient nor at a fair price and a note that I would like to strike on behalf of the Conservative Party, is we believe in regulation but we do not believe in government ownership and total government control in this area.

In this case of the regulatory agency, I would submit that the present automobile insurance board is not fulfilling its need and I would suggest in the first place that it is not clearly an independent board and that there should be consideration by the government of a different method whereby the members of this board are chosen, and that there should be a clearer indication of its independency from political bias.

I would like to suggest one or two particular areas in which the board should show a more continuing and

greater in-depth study. It seems that much of what has been discussed today results from a one-day hearing of what is a very complex and complicated matter.

In other words, this programme — which has only been in existence a relatively short period of time, which involves millions of dollars of citizens' money and has many far-reaching ramifications, not the least of which would be the setting of a considerable precedent if government indeed accepted this amendment and moved into a area presently occupied by private enterprise. The question has been asked...

AN HON. MEMBER: Medicare!

MR. WALLACE: Medicare, my friend, is a very different matter. You can't help being ill but you can help driving a Cadillac. To compare the principle of government intervention and medicare with automobile insurance is certainly a very ridiculous comparison in my opinion.

The concept of medicare is sound and since you've raised the issue and although it's probably out of order, I would say that I'm totally in favour of the concept of medicare since one can't choose to be ill or not be ill. But you can certainly choose the price of car you buy.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I feel that the insurance automobile board has not done an adequate job in looking into the

[[Page 119](#)]

experience of the plan for as long as it has been in existence. I would like to suggest that the board should also give the public a clear determination and statement regarding this aspect of the good driver subsidising the bad driver. I would like to support a comment that was made and I had two letters yesterday by citizens complaining about the excessive penalty against a family under the age of 25 for rather minimal offences — an exorbitant increase in the premium.

I don't profess to have deep knowledge of this question of what is done with prepaid premiums but I certainly feel from the newspaper reports I read, that inquiries skimmed over this very lightly.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: How are you going to vote?

MR. WALLACE: I am going to vote against the amendment.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh no!

MR. WALLACE: If those Hon. Members would take the trouble to listen to what I said earlier about our basic principles and concepts, I'm trying to explain to the less attentive members, Mr. Speaker, that there is room for improvement but certainly not the only alternative in the amendment proposal.

I also agree with the earlier speaker from the Liberal Party that the insurance companies should repay the excess premiums which have clearly been paid in the past year of experience. The final recommendation for the board should be that, whether or not there appears to be any discrepancy in premiums, regardless of the amount of money paid out in claims, there should be a complete review by the board in depth, at least annually.

For these various reasons and in light of these suggestions, I will be voting against the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable the Attorney General.

HON. L.R. PETERSON (Attorney General): I suppose I should express some gratitude that the first opportunity that the Honourable Member for Oak Bay has had to vote confidence or non confidence in the government, that he has chosen to vote confidence in the government. However, in the light of his earlier remarks in this debate about this being the place of play acting and that he would present to this House the views of the Conservative Party whether he agreed with them or not I don't know just how much weight to place on this vote this evening.

However, there are a few matters that have been raised in this debate that I would like to deal with.

I did discuss the subject of automobile insurance at some length earlier in the week and I would hope that the remarks that I made at that time might be taken into consideration at this time without the necessity of any repetition on my part.

There has been some discussion of the rates, the premiums, and I have expressed my point of view on this subject on many occasions.

I regret that some of the Honourable Members have chosen to go back to the time when the new compulsory automobile insurance package was introduced into the House and quoted me as saying there would be a decline in premiums without giving the full quote — which as they well know, was the fact that there would be dollars coming from the property damage sector to the personal injury sector with the amendments that were proposed at that time.

These appeared in the legislation but following meetings of the committee of this House were not proceeded with. That was the basis on which the reduction in insurance premiums were forecast and if Hon. Members look back and read the records, they will find that that is true and the Honourable Members have been less than fair in not pointing that out. The Hon. Member for Yale-Lillooet, I suggest, was less than fair when he produced the photostat of his own personal premiums and quote the increase covering two of his cars, two Mercedes cars...

AN HON. MEMBER: Two cars?

HON. MR. PETERSON: The total premium, and this is for 1972 — and this he sent over to me, Mr. Speaker so it's not any secret, it's public knowledge —

AN HON. MEMBER: Two cars?

HON. MR. PETERSON: the total premium for these two cars over one year is \$138, and I suggest that it would be interesting for him to compare what his rates would be under the government-operated plan in Manitoba.

Likewise, I suggest that if he had wanted to be fully fair and frank with this House he would have told us, when he was computing this increase — which in one sector he indicated was 65 per cent — that it was not a one year proposition, it was two years.

MR. HARTLEY: Point of order, Mr. Speaker!

AN HON. MEMBER: No point of order!

MR. SPEAKER: State the point of order.

MR. HARTLEY: That is one year, from 1971 to 1972, and don't you dare deceive the House because the Press has that document ...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! What is the point of order?

HON. MR. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, I'd like to reply to that and I will do so by quoting from a letter, quoting from a letter direct...

MR. SPEAKER: One moment, please. Would the Hon. Member please listen. Just for a moment, then we can take the point of order.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: I'm going to substantiate what I have said, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: It's a matter of interpretation. This is a letter dated December 16, 1971...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: ...directed to Mr. William Hartley, and what does it say? Did he not receive this letter?

[[Page 120](#)]

At a recent meeting the board was advised by a representative of the cooperative Fire and Casualty Company, that is the company that insures the Hon. Member and this is a letter to Mr. Hartley....

the board was advised by a representative of the Cooperative Fire and Casualty Company that the company did not increase automobile insurance rates in 1970. They continued their 1969 premium levels through the last year. When the company established 1971 premiums in April of this year, they were more or less comparable to the current levels of the industry. If this procedure was applied in your case then the reason for the substantial increases is that your premiums were increased from the 1969 level to the 1971 level in one renewal.

Now, is that true or is that not true? This is a letter that the Hon. Member received, Mr. Speaker, and all I ask that in fairness that should have been pointed out to this House.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. HARTLEY: My premium in 1971 was \$23, for 1972 it is \$38, an increase of \$15, a 65 per cent increase, and that lawyer can twist it any way he likes but those are the facts ...

MR. SPEAKER: Will the Hon. Member be seated!

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, I really would have thought that when any Hon. Member of this chamber takes the trouble to write to Dr. English, chairman of the B.C. Automobile Insurance Board, on this matter and gets this reply to this effect then he would have at least the courtesy to inform the House of what the true facts are rather than just slide over it in the way he did today.

There was also, Mr. Speaker...

MR. HARTLEY: Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: What is the Hon. Member's point of order?

MR. HARTLEY: The point of order is this. I did not in any way attempt to mislead the House. The Attorney General is misleading the House. He has the facts there before him and...

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. HARTLEY: One moment further...

MR. SPEAKER: Take your place, please.

MR. HARTLEY: One moment further. The Attorney General stated...

MR. SPEAKER: One moment. Will the Hon. Member not take directions from the Chair just for a moment?

MR. HARTLEY: Certainly!

MR. SPEAKER: If something inaccurate is being said or has been said in the House, the Hon. Member will

have the courtesy to wait until the other Hon. Member has finished speaking. I will recognise him then. He can correct the record.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Mr. Speaker, there has also been some discussion about the alleged discrimination of the no-fault premium in terms that it is now flat rated throughout the province.

This is understandable, Mr. Speaker, because it is a flat-rate premium and of course other premiums do vary according to age, et cetera, and the categories into which the drivers may fit. This is an aspect that is under study by the automobile insurance board at the present time.

Because this was a new venture we were the first to blend the compulsory, no-fault into a total compulsory insurance package, and this is a study that is underway by the automobile insurance board. I think the Hon. Member should acknowledge that since I did make that indication to the House before.

Now mention has been made of Manitoba and what a glorious thing this socialistic government has done in Manitoba by taking over the insurance, automobile insurance industry. Well if you read the Press in Manitoba today, or if you read the accounts that appear in other newspapers across the country, there seems to be some doubt in this respect.

To be fair to the Manitoba government, I think it is too early to really assess the situation because it has only been in effect for relatively a few months. There are certainly those who have seen...

AN HON. MEMBER: Twenty years and look at us!

HON. MR. PETERSON: There are those who claim that their insurance has been reduced. There are many who claim that even though their insurance has been reduced the service is that so much poorer that they wish they could pay the additional premium to get the better service.

Even the minister in charge of the insurance in Manitoba has acknowledged publicly that the service has not improved. The service to the public has not improved with state-owned automobile insurance. For an analogy you only have to look at the number of complaints today that are being registered about unemployment insurance which is operated by a government agency to know that state ownership isn't the panacea for all problems.

I have a letter here from a constituent in Port Coquitlam, British Columbia. It's just dated January 13, 1971, but it was actually and should have been 1972, because it was received on January 17, 1972.

Addressed to myself as Attorney General, it reads:

I am a native of British Columbia, recently returned here in August of 1971 from Manitoba. Had it not been for the N.D.P. government in Manitoba I would still have been residing there. High taxes, poor business conditions and political stupidity drove us out and we'll now remain here.

Incidentally, my B.C. Automobile Insurance, same coverage, is \$41 per year cheaper than Manitoba AutoPac. It is cheaper here in British Columbia while it should have been considerably higher due to higher labour cost and higher density population.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that what you tell your partner?

HON. MR. PETERSON: And so, Mr. Speaker, I think we

[[Page 121](#)]

should place this debate somewhat in perspective. Let's remember too that back in 1970 — and I'll refer to the *Journals* of 1970 — there is this same motion word for word, comma for comma, by the same members. "Moved by Mr. Calder in amendment, seconded by Mr. Hartley" in 1970.

They haven't improved one bit in that period of time. Not a new idea.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Tired Opposition. Old tired Opposition.

HON. MR. PETERSON: The tired Opposition standing in the same place, Mr. Speaker. But that's not the point that I'm trying to make. The point that I'm trying to make is this, that in 1970 when this same motion was debated on the floor of this chamber, there wasn't any regulatory body as far as the premium rates on insurance were concerned. The British Columbia Automobile Insurance Board was only appointed one year ago. One year ago to this month. They have only been in operation for that limited period of time.

Certainly, when you provide compulsory insurance there can be criticism if the rates sky-rocket and you have no agency that has the authority to regulate those insurance premiums.

In that brief period of time they have looked at this very complex area of no-fault premium and they have decreed a reduction in those premiums and they are now going on to look at other aspects of the premiums and any increases in premium come up for adjudication by this body. I suggest that it is only fair and reasonable to allow this regulatory body an opportunity to demonstrate to the public how they can handle this very difficult and complex problem of automobile insurance. I think one thing we should...

AN HON. MEMBER: Cemeteries...

HON. MR. PETERSON: The cemeteries do not come under the British Columbia Automobile Insurance Board.

AN HON. MEMBER: P.U.C.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Well, there's a difference between the P.U.C. and the automobile insurance board. There are different members on the board and that's how close these Hon. Members over there are to knowing what is going on in the province.

But finally, Mr. Speaker let's understand what this debate is all about. This is a motion of non-confidence in the government. If this motion passes it won't bring government automobile insurance to British Columbia. What it will bring is a provincial election. That's what it would bring.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

HON. MR. PETERSON: Let's not attempt to mislead the public in any way in this area. We all have differing views of what insurance rates should be, but the issue now is a motion of non-confidence in this government, and that's all that we're discussing and going to vote on.

MR. HARTLEY: Question on a point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: I recognise the Hon. Member for Yale-Lillooet on a point of order. Now, he should just clarify whatever the statement is. He's made his address to this particular motion.

MR. HARTLEY: The copy that I sent to the Attorney General is a photostat. These are the originals and this is what the original says: the premium for my collision coverage on one car, \$250 deductible — very limited — for the period ending November, 24, 1971 was \$23 for the period of 12 months ending November 24, 1972, one year later...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. HARTLEY: Are you going to speak on this or just yack?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. HARTLEY: I have the floor.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member be prepared to table, with leave, the documents?

MR. HARTLEY: I'm prepared to table them, but I think

MR. SPEAKER: Shall leave be granted?

HON. MEMBERS: Aye.

MR. HARTLEY: I think I should have the courtesy of order of this House.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member please table the documents?

MR. HARTLEY: I have. Will I have the courtesy of the order of the House? Mr. Speaker, you call us to order and you can call all these little yacking ladies to order too. Okay! I'd like to continue, Mr. Speaker, that there is a difference of \$38 in a 12-month period, and that's better than 65 per cent and no flim-flam that this Attorney General can use is going to change it. I'll be pleased to table this.

AN HON. MEMBER: What are you trying to get away with?

MR. SPEAKER: The second Member for Vancouver-Burrard.

MR. B. PRICE (Vancouver-Burrard): I enter this debate and I'm going to vote against the amendment because I object to the Opposition using a back-door method to try and acquire something that they could not possibly do if they brought in a bill that would interfere with government revenue.

This is purely an exercise in publicity. I speak on it because many people in my constituency are very seriously interested. Every automobile owner in the country is interested in this and I'm convinced that the only way you can cut premiums basically is to cut down on the number of accidents. Saskatchewan did this, of course, by a different method in which they used an indemnity form of insurance and not an open award such as the courts have been giving here.

[[Page 122](#)]

I notice in the paper the other day that an award had been made in California in an automobile accident to the extent of \$1.6 million. If courts are going to follow this pattern throughout the country it's quite easy to see that we're going to be faced with much higher premiums than we have had in the past.

The British Columbia government has gone as far as to enforce insurance on all automobiles in this country and a \$250 fine if you don't comply. In addition to that they have back-up insurance with the traffic victims indemnity fund — and I only wish it had a larger limit and not just \$50 thousand.

Now the commission has been in operation for one year. Fortunately for the people of this province, they are empowered to control rates. I think this is the important thing because it is quite similar to our medical plan.

You know, when the B.C. Medical Plan was set up, Mr. Speaker, there was a great fear that the carriers in this province would be forced out of business. But just the opposite is the case. They have flourished, they're carrying more people in their plans than ever and they've had to enlarge their staffs a great deal. But I would point out that even our medical plan — which is today, I think, equal or better to any medical plan in perhaps the world, at least in America — is in some danger because of the accelerating costs and because the federal government may get away from accepting the accelerating expenses. If they do it may put that plan in danger.

This is the sort of thing you are up against with government insurance. There is no reason to say that because the government operates it that it's going to be run at low cost. If you are talking about subsidies you're getting into a different field altogether.

I don't think the public of this province are prepared to have their property tax, their income tax and their sales tax increase to take care of automobile accidents. I can't see that at all. It's not that the people want government insurance. They're looking for cheap insurance and they are inclined to think that today because there are so many companies in competition with each other that they are not getting the cheapest form of insurance.

I think that the commission should be in a position to go into the profit picture, not only on insurance companies but also have some control over body shops because this has been done in other jurisdictions.

I'm of the opinion myself that you never will have a real control factor over insurance premiums until you also have at least some control over the cost of repairing the damage that those premiums must look after. I'm going to vote against this amendment for the simple reason I just don't like the Opposition using this back-door method because that's all it is.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Richmond.

MR. E.A. LeCOURS (Richmond): Mr. Speaker, while I do think there is perhaps room for improvement in the premium rates structure for automobile insurance — especially insofar as it concerns people who stand to derive no benefit from the no-fault portion of it. I mean by that people who are barred by virtue of their age or occupation from deriving benefits, and perhaps also in regard to people who drive very little — just to and from the store perhaps once a week and that type of affair.

We could perhaps give some direction through our board to restructuring of the premiums. I must say that I resent the attempts that have been made this evening by the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barrett) to put words into my mouth with respect to my attitude towards government insurance.

As a member of the special committee on automobile insurance I would agree that I was impressed by the low cost of repairs on government cars. And if this rate could be spread across the province of course things would be great, but that is not the case.

The cost on government cars has been low because government drivers are extra cautious and careful in their driving. And they have by virtue of supervision and so on made attempts to be careful in their driving when they're driving on business and when driving at night they are doubly careful. So they do not incur too many accidents.

As a result of the information I gleaned while on that committee I had leaned quite strongly towards government insurance, I will admit. However, I have been disappointed today to find that, although the Opposition have had three days prior to today to bring this matter to the floor of this House, they have waited until today to express a nonconfidence motion in the speech given here on Thursday last by His Honour.

And I wonder if it has any relationship to the fact that His Honour was taken ill last night, that they should at this time bring this motion.

MR. D. BARRETT (Leader of the Opposition): Point of order.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! One moment please.

MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw that there was any reflection on His Honour's health by us bringing in this amendment today. I ask the Hon. Member to withdraw that remark.

MR. SPEAKER: I'm sure the Hon. Member intended no such inference. He should probably clarify to the House that no offence was intended to the Crown.

MR. LeCOURS: Mr. Speaker, in view of the fact that they have had three days prior to today to bring this matter up, and they haven't done so, I've been disappointed as well as...

MR. SPEAKER: Just a moment. There is a point. The inference was that the Honourable Member made reference to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor. I ask him now to withdraw such an inference and such a

reference.

MR. LeCOURS: I withdraw, Mr. Speaker, I thought perhaps the Hon. Members of the Opposition thought that one shouldn't wonder, and that's why I misunderstood. Because I know they don't wonder very often, they don't think very often

I've been disappointed as well, Mr. Speaker, to find that the Hon. Members of the Opposition who have advocated government insurance have failed to bring forward any comparative figures with either Saskatchewan or Manitoba, to give us something to look at and express an opinion on.

They have failed completely to bring any figures forward. And I wonder why? I'm sorry I used the word "wonder" — they perhaps wouldn't understand that.

I must say, in addition to that, I have taken the trouble to

[[Page 123](#)]

try to find out some of the reactions to the government insurance in the Province of Manitoba. We already have this information in respect to Saskatchewan, and the reports that I have received with respect to Manitoba have been very unfavourable.

People have been disappointed with what has happened. They are disappointed with the classifications, with the entire automobile insurance, and I think it has been the most disappointing aspect of N.D.P. Government in that province.

I have been pleased to thank His Honour for the fine speech which he presented to this House last week, and I am pleased to vote against this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Esquimalt.

MR. H.J. BRUCH (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker the Opposition is again trying to build up a motherhood issue. It's all very nice to talk about one aspect of insurance. According to the report here from Saskatchewan they lost in 1965 \$207,000.

AN HON. MEMBER: What year?

MR. BRUCH: In 1964. It's the 1965 report.

AN HON. MEMBER: Read it over again.

MR. BRUCH: Mr. Speaker, this is typical of what happened in insurance in Saskatchewan. It 'used to go up and down like a yo-yo depending on what year there would be an election Before the election, insurance rates went down. After every election they went up. Another factor under government insurance I found in talking to some of the M.L.A.'s from Saskatchewan including N.D.P. members, when they tried to take care of some of the other factors, and that is the fraud in insurance, those members got more blinking complaints on car insurance than they did on all other matters of government.

Just to say that we are going to take this into government operation, this is not going to solve all things, all you're going to do is make a worse political football out of it than you are making out of it right now.

Very basically, Mr. Speaker, there are three factors in car insurance. The one is the cost in the administration, the second is the cost of repairs, and the third is the built-in obsolescence in cars. Really before we can talk about reducing the cost of car insurance you have to look around, you've got to get rid of the fraud in insurance.

I had a chap tell me that he was involved in an accident and went to three garages. He told them that he had insurance, it was under insurance coverage. The quotations he got ranged between \$175 and \$194. Then, Mr.

Speaker, he went to three other garages and said that he didn't have insurance coverage.

And to and behold the quotations ran between \$84 and \$96. Really the biggest problem we have in car insurance today is the fraud in insurance, and just for the government to take it over is not going to solve that problem.

The second is obsolescence. When you drive at five miles an hour and hit a solid object and have over \$300 damage, this is where our problem lies. These are the problems that we've got to solve before we can get reduced car insurance and therefore this is just a phoney issue.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Kootenay.

MR. L.T. NIMSICK (Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I have to smile at the way they all thrash about in the pit to try and get out of a corner in regards to automobile insurance. The Honourable the Attorney General read a letter from somebody about Manitoba and just before he read it he said: "Manitoba hasn't had insurance long enough to be able to figure out whether it's worth while or not."

HON. MR. PETERSON: I wanted to be fair.

MR. NIMSICK: Sure but then he went and read the letter as if it was a fact. "Let us wait and see what happens there." That's what he said. And then he read a letter to try and discredit it, right away. So I mean how fair is fair? He never mentioned Saskatchewan, where they've had 36 years' experience and never change their policies. No, I question the Honourable Member for Esquimalt as to whether he knows anything about the insurance business in Saskatchewan. And when he makes a statement like that. He picked one year, one year they were \$265,000 behind — the only year he could find — and this could happen where you have a cost car insurance for one year.

He didn't bring out any other years, he didn't bring out any other figures, and the Liberal Party that ran Saskatchewan during those times, they didn't make any changes in the automobile insurance.

The Honourable Attorney General said that he "provided compulsory automobile insurance for the people of British Columbia." Those are the words he used. He didn't provide it, he compelled the people to take out insurance and he placed them at the mercy of the private companies.

And when the Honourable Member for Esquimalt talked about repairs in Saskatchewan they had just their repairs according to their satellite shops, where they have their own repairs. They adjust the others and they've got to fit into that picture. They've got to find out what it really does cost. So that's another point.

But I'd like to say this. There's all the talk that the backbenchers are trying to squirm out of that. They have admittedly been in favour of government operated insurance before, and are now trying to squirm out of it. They have used every tactic. And if the Premier brought in a government-operated plan next week every one on that side of the House would vote for it, and he knows it. The Liberals would vote for it and so would the Conservatives. Because they know that 85 per cent of the people want governmentoperated automobile insurance and I wouldn't be a bit surprised that before the end of this session he's liable to bring a government-operated plan in and then they'll have to eat these words.

MR. SPEAKER: Are you ready for the question? The Honourable Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, I would like to have the opportunity of participating in this debate. It has been an interesting one. I'm sorry that the Attorney General has seen fit to chastise his Hon. Members by pointing out that it is a motion of confidence, because I was going to vote against the motion until I heard that, and I wondered how I could vote against this motion without trapping myself into some position that I was expressing confidence in this government.

There isn't an Hon. Member in this House that hasn't received from his constituents from time to time

about the functioning of automobile insurance of this province. And they will continue, until such time as this government discharges its responsibilities in the regulation of the insurance business within the responsibilities which have been placed upon the superintendent of insurance.

When the government discharges that responsibility and forces the insurance companies to do what the law in this province requires them to do, then I'm sure that we will find from our constituents complete satisfaction with insurance in this province, as it is presently established under the legislation which was considered by this House in previous years.

There is a suggestion that insurance costs too much. The insurance board is in a position to regulate this, and has regulated it. I only find some dismay that the government has not seen fit at this time to come forward and oblige the insurance companies to redress. To redress the obvious overcharge that the insurance board has found that has been made this past two years.

While I'm speaking about the insurance board Mr. Speaker, may I take exception to the remarks of the Honourable Member from Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace). The insurance board is a responsible body composed of responsible men, appointed to discharge a responsible function. And if the terms of reference of this government to the board have been inadequate, you can't blame the members of the board. I think it is improper when we ask people to come forward in this province to take their position on boards, and positions of responsibility that Hon. Members of this House stand up and criticise them for discharging that responsibility.

I am sure that the Honourable Member and his party would never, never appoint a person to a position and then criticise him for carrying out those responsibilities.

Now, it seems to me that the question that the official Opposition raises in this House is an interesting one. They talk about the high cost of insurance. And yet from one of their own Hon. Members, the seconder of the amendment, we have documentary proof of what he pays for his insurance that he buys in this province. It shows what can be done within the limits of the insurance which is available here.

I have two cars and so has he. He has two Mercedes. I have other rich friends who have Mercedes cars too. I find that for one car with third party coverage, no-fault accident benefits and collision he paid I think, \$69 in 1971. I ask the Hon. Member if that's too much for the insurance service that he received. For his other car in that year without any collision he paid \$46 dollars — that's pretty cheap — and I would ask the official opposition if they, under governmentcontrolled plans, would offer that kind of coverage for any less money.

AN HON. MEMBER: 50 per cent less.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: I ask Hon. Members to note that 50 per cent less.

Then in 1971-72 for those same two vehicles one for third-party liability, no fault accident benefits, and collision he paid \$90. And for the other \$48. And again I ask the Hon. Member if he would offer the same coverage for 50 per cent less.

Because Mr. Speaker, he buys his insurance through the cooperative Fire and Casualty Company, and when I look at the record of this company's business in the Province of British Columbia I find that for losses in 1970 the ratio of their net losses incurred to the net premiums earned 78.9 per cent. Eighty cents out of every \$1 of net premium received by his company — and I must assume that the Hon. Member has been very careful in selecting his company — 80 cents out of every \$1 that that company received was paid out in losses, leaving them with 20 cents out of every \$1 to cover, you know, postage and all the administration that's involved.

Now if that Hon. Member is suggesting that he's going to cut those premiums by half and still pay 80 cents

out of every \$1, that company is going to be in a terrible loss position. And that is the kind of insurance intelligence that these Hon. Members would offer to the people of British Columbia.

Now one other matter that I noticed when the Hon. Member provided me with this information about his particular insurance. He was complaining that he suffered a 65 per cent increase in his collision premium.

AN HON. MEMBER: Is that correct or not correct?

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: That is correct. If my mathematics are correct. Well I also noticed, and it's very interesting, that in the 1970-71 renewal certificate which is marked "paid" it shows the date November 12, 1970, Co-op Fire and Casualty Company, Regina, Saskatchewan.

Now there's a company with its head office in Regina, Saskatchewan, carrying on business in that province offering as it turns out the precise minimum package which is offered in the province of Saskatchewan. This Hon. Member has bought it, and is complaining because that company has increased its collision coverage premium 65 per cent in one year.

I might suggest, Mr. Speaker, that there might be good reason for the Saskatchewan government to think about borrowing from the Province of British Columbia our insurance board. Perhaps they could go there and look at the rate structures that are offered in the province of Saskatchewan.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not the public plan in Saskatchewan.

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: It is the public plan in Saskatchewan, it is the precise minimum rates which are offered in the public plan in Saskatchewan. As a matter of fact, Mr. Speaker, if you want to talk about the public plan in Saskatchewan the fact of the matter is that 65 per cent of the motorists in the province of Saskatchewan take the excess coverage which they buy from private insurers.

The fact of the matter is, Mr. Speaker, that in the Province of Saskatchewan at the time this kind of policy came into effect under the C.C.F. government of Tommy Douglas, only 10 per cent of the people were insured and in fact by bringing in compulsory insurance of this kind they increased the business for the private company. And that stands today.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. L.A. WILLIAMS: The issue before us tonight, Mr. Speaker, is not whether Saskatchewan's plan is good or whether Manitoba's plan could possibly turn out to be good but whether or not in this province we are prepared to say

[[Page 125](#)]

that profit is a dirty word.

Mr. Speaker, I suggest that no real Socialist can suggest that profit is a dirty word, because any real Socialist knows that any enterprise which a Socialist undertakes must make some profit. It must pay its cost and it must make some return to take into account growth and all of the other factors that are required in order to make such a scheme function.

As a matter of fact in discussing this very matter the Hon. Members of the N.D.P. talked about the investment of the reserves in the Province of Saskatchewan and there can't be reserves unless they made profits in the first place.

I was going to say Mr. Speaker that it is a garden variety of Socialist we have here, but that's not true. It is this up-the-garden-path variety Socialist that we have in this province who has been leading the people in this province astray time and time again on this particular issue. They do not state the facts clearly and they talk about

"these poor little people," you know those poor little people, those I.W.A. men who are asking for \$2 an hour increase, those buckers and fallers who are making \$14,000 to \$18,000 a year — those are the little people they are really worried about. We do not need to have Socialism in this province, Mr. Speaker, in order to have properly regulated properly operating car insurance and I am opposed to this amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The question is that the motion in reply to the opening speech of His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor be amended by adding the words "but this House regrets that the speech fails to disclose any proposals for implementing a universal government automobile insurance plan whereby automobile insurance will be provided at cost to the public."

The amendment was negated on the following division:

YEAS-13

Cocke	Calder	Dowding
Hartley	Clark	Nimsick
Lorimer	Macdonald	Barrett
Hall	Strachan	Dailly, Mrs.
Williams, R.A.		

NAYS- 39

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

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! The Honourable Member for Revelstoke-Slocan.

MR. B. CAMPBELL (Revelstoke-Slocan): Mr. Speaker, I rise to take my place and I have a little bit of sympathy now for the federal Members of Parliament who were listed recently in the Vancouver *Sun* with their speaking engagements or the number of times in which they had spoken in the federal House of Commons because I think that those who regularly read the Victoria *Daily Colonist* probably believe that I speak every day in every debate because I've been listed. However, the whip did tell me today that we had a contract. He said that I would speak today, but I began to wonder whether he had a contract all right, but a contract out on me.

Mr. Speaker, because of the lateness of the hour and because of the fact that there are a number of speakers to follow me I intend to get into the main gist of my remarks and to keep those as brief as possible. But first of all I

would like to very briefly outline some of the events of the past year in the Revelstoke-Slocan constituency because it's been a very good year.

At Revelstoke, an excellent start was made on Blanket Creek Provincial Park which will have 60 camping spaces and will be ready for use this coming summer. And, as I insisted, boat launching facilities and a fine public beach have been planned with it.

Blanket Creek bridge was completed in November of this past year at a cost of \$480,000 and it will be painted this coming spring. And in the same location an \$80,000 day-labour project is under way with a road down into that park.

Differences with the C.P.R. about specifications for construction of an eastern access into Revelstoke were resolved by the highways department late in the year and design work on this structure is now underway.

There is no subject on which I have had more correspondence, more personal discussions and conversations, or more telephone calls with the Hon. Minister of Highways than an eastern access for Revelstoke. As the Hon. Minister is fully aware, with a contract now having been let on the remaining section of Highway 23, I consider an eastern access for Revelstoke as the top priority in my constituency for new major highways projects and I again take this opportunity to publicly remind the Hon. Minister of the importance which I attach to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, one matter that has concerned me in the Revelstoke area since my election is the matter of the stumps that are exposed to view in the vicinity of the city and its airport when the Arrow reservoir is drawn down.

I've had discussions and correspondence with B.C. Hydro and then on November 10 of this past year I met with Dr. Shrum who agreed with me that they are unsightly and that it is desirable that something be done, even though the authority fully met the requirements of the comptroller of water rights insofar as clearing was concerned.

I should perhaps explain that the Arrow reservoir is being drawn down earlier now than was anticipated. That it is down for more of the recreational period of the year than was anticipated and that when Mica Dam becomes fully operational, water will first be drawn down out of Mica, leaving the reservoir in the immediate Revelstoke area at full pool for a longer part of the year.

At any rate, after meeting with Dr. Shrum he agreed to send personnel in to look at the size of the problem and to prepare cost estimates for the authority's consideration.

I'm pleased to announce here this evening that B.C. Hydro is now planning to have some of these stumps removed on a trial basis this spring. Depending on the cost of this trial work, it may be possible to clear some 50 acres this year, and I will be writing the City of Revelstoke asking its

[[Page 126](#)]

council to let me have its views as to which area should be cleared of stumps first, and will then pass on the city's recommendation to B.C. Hydro.

Mr. Speaker, an important road to the Revelstoke economy is Highway 23 and as I've said on many occasions the completion of this road would create many economic benefits to such communities as Revelstoke, Nakusp and New Denver and I was pleased on opening day to be able to announce that a contract has been awarded on this section. I'm pleased with the agreement of the Hon. Minister of Highways and the Treasury Board for this very expensive 15.3 miles of road.

A very happy highlight in the constituency during the past year was the opening of the new \$390,000 Victorian Hospital at Kaslo officially opened by myself and the Honourable Minister without Portfolio (Mrs. Jordan) on behalf of the Minister of Health. A hospital referendum was held in the regional district in December and included in it was a new \$1 million hospital for Nakusp. We look forward to the date that Nakusp's hospital is open and it was my pleasure to report last year the opening of the \$3 million Queen Victoria Hospital at Revelstoke, so

that my constituency is being very well served in health matters.

Speaking of Kaslo, the six miles of paving carried out on the Kaslo-New Denver road this past year have been much appreciated and my support of a continuation of this programme is well known to the government.

I'd like to commend the Hon. Minister of Highways on his programme of roadside picnic sites which are being developed throughout the province, in particular the ones which have been developed in my constituency at a number of spots. They're great for the travelling public and for local people and I look forward to additional ones between Ainsworth and Kaslo. The department at my instigation is also attempting to find sites in the Nakusp-Edgewood area. Much road work was carried out during the past year on the side roads in the lower Slocan Valley and the residents appreciate very much the increased attention their problems are now receiving.

I was pleased to announce new bridges for both Rosebery and New Denver and I hope that the Treasury Board will soon authorise the calling of tenders on these two projects. With regard to the \$500,000 highways establishment building planned for New Denver the low bidder had to withdraw from the job and I hope that the Minister of Public Works will soon be advising me that a contract is being let to the next low bidder so that the construction can start just as soon as winter is gone.

Still on highways matters, work on two contracts totalling \$144,000 is presently underway on Halfway River bridge on Highway 23, north of Nakusp, while a day-labour programme totalling close to \$450,000 was carried out just south of Halfway River this past summer and fall

In the budget debate last year I urged consideration of a seal-coating programme on Highway 6 between Nakusp and Edgewood and along the road into Edgewood from Highway 6. A contract of close to \$200,000 was let on December 9 on this project. Work will be carried out during this present year and residents of communities along Highway 6, south of Nakusp, will especially appreciate having this work done as many of them travel this road on a daily basis.

One matter of disappointment to myself and constituents was the determination by the highways department late last August after very lengthy and exhaustive investigations that the Slocan Bluffs and tunnel immediately north of Slocan City could not be removed.

This is a very high and dangerous rock section on Highway 6 and the normal impression in looking at it is that the rock should be blasted into the water. However, I was informed that this would create some very unstable backslopes in the rock face which would be extremely dangerous at a later date. Further, the fill placed in the lake would not be stable and there could be underwater slides.

The alternatives are limited to the Department of Highways, but the highways department is still actively investigating the possibility of a higher route and I'm keeping in touch with the minister regarding this project.

Two new liquor stores were constructed in the riding during the year, replacing quite outdated and antiquated premises. The New Denver store is already in use and the Revelstoke store which is self-serve, should be open and in service by April.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as this House is aware, our provincial government makes an outright grant to senior citizens' homes on one-third of the approved costs basis. I'm pleased to report that the official sod-turning ceremonies for the Arrowtarian Senior Citizens Home at Nakusp took place last September with the Hon. Isabel Dawson and myself in attendance. This is a very commendable project and the provincial government grant will be expected to exceed \$35,000. Moberly Park Manor at Revelstoke was officially opened the year before and the provincial government grant was \$63,000.

Now, this has only been a brief outline of some of the activities which took place in my constituency during the past year. I think it indicates excellent progress and I thank the ministers and officials of their departments for the cooperation they have extended to me in representing the people of Revelstoke-Slocan. And I think that in ending this section of my speech I'd perhaps repeat a phrase or a cry that was heard very often in this chamber just four

sessions ago, I would say to the Hon. Premier through you Mr. Speaker, that I'm ready, let's go, go, go.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. CAMPBELL: Mr. Speaker, I now turn to what the Vancouver *Province* quite accurately described as the curious case of Kaiser Resources.

Earlier this month the *Wall Street Journal* disclosed that some top officers, directors and key people of Kaiser Steel in Oakland, California, had set up a private company in Canada to buy 63,200 shares in Kaiser Resources Ltd. — shares which were to be for sale only to Canadians.

Now this company — KRL Investments Ltd — was a federally-chartered company with its head office registered in Halifax, but apparently operated out of a desk drawer in the office of a lawyer in Toronto.

This paper company then bought \$750,000 worth of shares of the initial \$30 million stock offering of Kaiser Resources, stock which — according to the prospectus — couldn't be sold to or for U.S. citizens or residents.

Now, the directors paid the same price as the public did but most of their stock was sold at a tidy profit before it was disclosed publicly that Kaiser Resources was in serious difficulties.

Now the involvement of directors in this deal was not disclosed to any of the agencies regulating such matters. In fact, it was first denied and then reluctantly admitted to when the *Wall Street Journal* broke the story.

[[Page 127](#)]

There are probably some hair-splitting legalities in the matter insofar as the technicalities respecting insider trading are concerned. There are those who say the only question that has to be answered is whether the sales and the profits were fortuitous, or whether advantage was taken of inside information. But I say this, and that is the action was most definitely morally wrong, and in direct violation of the intent that there be 25 per cent Canadian participation in Kaiser Resources through 25 per cent of its shares being made available only to Canadians.

MR. NIMSICK: I object to the Hon. Member passing reflections on my constituents.

MR. CAMPBELL: The Hon. Member from Kootenay now apparently represents California as well.

Now, Press reports indicate that KRL Investments has now filed insider trading information with the Ontario Securities Commission and suggest that the commission's requirements have now been fully met and the subject is closed in that province.

This must not be the case here in British Columbia where the Securities Act is tighter than the Ontario one in that it also establishes the role of "associates" as insiders. As well, it is also being determined here as to whether or not there has been a violation of Kaiser Resources' prospectus.

But I ask the government to go one step further and that is to refer the whole matter to the standing committee on railways and mining.

Because of its actions, Kaiser has thrown into serious question its right to further diversify its interest in this province.

The railways and mining committee should be asked to fully investigate the relationship between Kaiser Steel, KRL Investments and Kaiser Resources, and should also be asked to make a recommendation to this House as to whether Crows Nest Industries should be permitted to continue with its stated desire of constructing the Kootenay and Elk Railway.

The Kootenay and Elk Railway is a wholly-owned subsidiary of Crows Nest Industries, which is itself 60 per cent owned outside of Canada. It is the coal which would be committed to the Kootenay and Elk Railway by Kaiser

Resources that makes it a viable proposition.

I say that stock transaction deal disclosed by the *Wall Street Journal* has all the appearances of an upper-class boiler room operation being carried out by men in \$500 suits who stay in \$75-a-day hotel rooms. People don't like it; and they won't accept pinhead niceties as sufficient explanation.

Mr. Speaker, turning to my last subject, during the past summer I was extremely critical of certain projects which were carried out under the federal government's opportunities for youth programme. Projects that were located within my constituency were, quite truthfully, a complete waste of taxpayers' money,

However, I offered my criticisms at the time fully aware that when you point the finger that three of them are pointing back at you. Therefore, I sketched out briefly, at the time, a proposal for a positive youth programme.

I believe that young people are responsible, they will react responsibly. But to be constructive they have to be challenged constructively. But to put the subject in perspective I should perhaps summarise very briefly the two particular projects with which I found fault.

One was a geodesic home which was funded with a \$1,500 grant. They were landed immigrants who received the grant and worked on the project. The other was \$4,500 to the Pacific Community Self-Development Society. It only got to the foundation stage — \$27,000 of taxpayers' money was spent on it. A reliable contractor estimates the value of the work that was done at about \$4,500. It was — to use a term favoured by the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs — a \$27,000 boondoggle. There were, of course, some successful projects carried out under the opportunities for youth programme, because not even Mr. Pelletier can perhaps spend \$25 millions without doing some good.

However, this year they are going to be extending in that they are going to be spending an additional \$9 million. In the Canadian Press Report which appeared in the Vancouver *Province*, it was noted that an important change this year is that the provinces will have more to say about the location and nature of projects.

Pelletier denied that any province will have a veto but a project that was opposed by a province would not get funds. Now I recommend that the government of this province not go near this programme with a 10-foot pole. In fact through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Hon. Minister of Rehabilitation who appears to be provincial government spokesman on this matter, I say stay away, 2,000 miles away from it. Because the claim by Mr. Pelletier that only something under 1 per cent of these programmes was the failure rate is just so much hogwash. Because a member of Mr. Pelletier's department told me that they considered this \$27,000 boondoggle a failure and yet the minister himself defends it in correspondence.

When a reporter, again according to the Canadian Press, asked Mr. Pelletier as to whether he regarded \$2,000 for a film on the eating of spaghetti frivolous he replied that a Canadian filmmaker, Norman McLaren, might have made the same type of experimental film years ago when McLaren apparently made an animated film on gas cooking.

But the point that seems to fail the federal government in this and in other matters is that these funds are taxpayers' money and that money like this shouldn't be wasted and shouldn't be spent frivolously.

Mr. Speaker, some 14 months ago I wrote the governments of all of the United States and the other nine provincial governments here in Canada as to their programmes respecting youth employment.

I'm able to report that of those who responded, very few had special programmes, while a good many governments make a point of giving employment opportunities to young people within their own government departments. The type of programme that is additional to those I'll just give two examples of.

The State of Washington has the Neighborhood Youth Corps where each enrollee is paid \$1.60 per hour for eight weeks at 26 hours a week.

Ontario has Youth in Action which is cost-shared with municipalities and community agencies. Alberta has an Ecology Corps which was expected to employ up to 1,300 students this past summer.

Now I found that most governments — in both countries — restrict their activities in the field of providing summer jobs for young people to providing jobs within government departments and state or Crown agencies. Now this is commendable and good. And I'm pleased to report that the Social Credit government of this province ranks extremely high in its employment of young people in this manner.

I have canvassed all government departments, the Pacific

[[Page 128](#)]

Great Eastern Railway and B.C. Hydro, and, with only a few departments remaining to be heard from, I am pleased to report that during the summer of 1971, 4,922 jobs were provided for students and unemployed young people by our provincial government and its Crown agencies.

The jobs ranged from employment in the Attorney General's department — 50 undergraduates of the law faculty of the University of British Columbia employed in such offices as the Public Trustee's office and as temporary security officers in the correction service; the forest service, 1,210; the water resources service, 44; the Minister of Public Works' department employed 172 high school, university and B.C. Institute of Technology students; the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority, 314 — and the Pacific Great Eastern Railway who don't specifically take on students and unemployed young people to the exclusion of other applicants, for temporary summer vacancies filled 692.

With regard to the parks branch of the Department of Recreation and Conservation, Bill 12 funds provided increased opportunity for a department already heavily involved with the employment of young people. In fact this department had the enviable record of having employed 1,548 young people last summer.

I won't go on to list much further — the Minister of Agriculture's department employed 52, and the Highways Department employed 678 students directly, and I'm sure that contractors engaged on projects for the Department of Highways employed many hundreds more.

I estimate that the provincial government along with its Crown agencies met a student payroll approaching \$5 million this past summer. I call that an excellent achievement.

To provide a comparison the Ontario government, with a population nearly four times ours and many special programmes especially designed for young people, hoped to employ 14,000 young people this past summer. So that here in British Columbia our government employed over a third of that number with no special ballyhoo involved — and I repeat, with a population only a quarter of that of Ontario.

The information I have gathered indicates that British Columbia on a per-capita basis leads all of North America in the employment of young people. I suggest that this is quite an accomplishment and deserving of high praise.

This province is showing the way in a positive and in a constructive wide-ranging manner and it is my suggestion this evening that its programmes be further extended and enlarged — that a good thing be made even better.

I would suggest consideration of a positive youth programme that would apply to all students and unemployed young people between the end of grade 10 and age 24. They would have to be Canadian Citizens, residents of British Columbia for at least three years and special wage rates would be allowed to apply in certain circumstances. Most American states take it for granted that specially-created jobs should not carry with them what would normally be paid if the jobs were to be continuing ones. It would be indefensible, in my mind, to create a situation in which students were to compete for jobs and worse yet, displace from jobs older men and women with families to support. It is possible, however, to put students into unfilled vacancies, such as the P.G.E. has done, in

jobs of short duration, or to create new jobs in a way which does not injure existing members of the working force.

I have some constructive suggestions I would like to make, Mr. Speaker, and I hope that the government will give them consideration during the course of this year with a view to implementing an expanded new programme for the summer of 1973.

I do not propose that the government heads into a broadened programme without considerable thought and study and one of the reasons that the federal programme turned out to be a youthful bonaventure — with, I predict, electoral results of titanic proportions for the Liberals — was that it was hurried into with little preparation.

I would suggest the provincial government consider setting aside \$2.25 million in addition to the employment programme which it is currently carrying out within its own departments and Crown agencies. This additional sum of money is equal to \$1 per capita, and it would be made available to municipalities, regional districts, etc., on a per capita basis.

For every \$1 the province puts up, the community would have to put up 40 cents. This means, for a municipality of 10,000 population, the provincial government would put up \$10,000 while the municipality would put up \$4,000. The reason I suggest that the regional districts be involved, to the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs through you, Mr. Speaker, is that there are many small, unorganised communities who have parks developments within their communities who are attempting to do many things in the recreational area and who have no means of taxation of local residents except through the regional district. This would allow them to utilise special funds made available.

As well, I would suggest the government consider putting up 20 cent per capita to any community participating in the programme for the purchase of materials. My reason for suggesting a grant toward the cost of materials is to insure that communities don't just set young people to work, cutting grass and pulling weeds. There should be some physical facilities constructed as well.

But, Mr. Speaker, the private sector of our economy has a responsibility regarding summer employment for young people as well — a responsibility it is already meeting quite well insofar as the employment of post-secondary students is concerned. As an encouragement to business and industry to hire even more young people, I would like to see the provincial government consider paying the employer's share of unemployment insurance and medical plans in any plant where trade unions are willing to forego their dues on student paycheques, on the understanding that the money is to be used instead to pay the student's share of U.I.C. and medical plan costs and thus increase the student's take-home pay.

The cabinet minister placed in charge of any special committee given the responsibility of increasing job opportunities for young people could write the mayor of every community in the province asking for the recommendation of a service club willing to sponsor a community youth employment corps.

Young people wishing to find either part-time or summer employment would register with the corps. The municipality would provide office space and a telephone while the provincial government would provide stationery, printed materials and pay 75 per cent of the wages of the young person hired as the local community employment corps co-ordinator. The service club would pay 25 per cent of his salary and provide assistance and advice.

Mr. Speaker, this Social Credit government was one of the first governments in Canada to lower the legal voting age when it gave our 19-year-olds the franchise following the 1953 election.

It was the first government in all of Canada to lower the

[[Page 129](#)]

age of legal majority, when it introduced legislation during the 1970 session reducing the age at which a person is an adult from 21 to 19 years.

It is a government that is already doing very much for the employment of young people, as figures I used earlier in my talk well illustrates.

Mr. Speaker, I hope it will give very serious consideration to some of the opinions I have expressed here today with a view towards greatly expanding its already considerable involvement in the field of youth employment by the summer of next year.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Cariboo.

MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo): Mr. Speaker and Honourable Members, I am pleased to be able to take part in this throne speech debate as the representative for the citizens of Cariboo.

AN HON. MEMBER: Where's that?

MR. FRASER: In the best part of British Columbia. Many accomplishments and achievements have been made since the second session of the 29th parliament, which prorogued on April 2, 1971.

As we enter the second century as a province of Canada, I am sure even greater things are in store for our province and its citizens.

In 1971 we celebrated our centennial year, and I would at this time like to congratulate the B.C. centennial committee and all the local centennial committees in our great province for a wonderful job well done.

I feel everyone in our province enjoyed these celebrations immensely, as well as the visitors to the province, and many worthwhile lasting projects were achieved which probably would have never been possible had it not been for the support given by our citizens from all parts of the province.

Some changes have taken place in this legislature since we prorogued last session. I would like to congratulate the Honourable Member for Columbia River (Hon. Mr. Chabot) on his elevation to the Executive Council as Minister of Labour. Since his appointment last April he has done an excellent job in his portfolio and this is no surprise to his colleagues on the back bench. I wish the Honourable Member for Columbia River every success and I know that the portfolio of labour is in excellent and competent hands. We will miss his roars from the back bench but I am sure he will make his presence known from the ranks of the Executive Council.

MR. NIMSICK: You can bet on that.

MR. FRASER: If the Hon. Member would be quiet a minute, I have got a word for you people too.

The New Democratic Party continues with its carping criticism of this government, making irresponsible statements which cannot be supported by facts. The Honourable Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Barrett) asked twice during 1971 for an emergency session of the Legislature and also has called for an emergency election. At a Press conference in November of 1971, the Honourable Leader of the Opposition laughed about, as he said, the pathetic promise of this government made in early 1971 that 25,000 new jobs would be created in British Columbia, indicating nothing had been achieved.

A few hours after the Leader of the Opposition had made these irresponsible statements, the unemployment figures were released by Ottawa and the facts were that 73,000 more people were employed in British Columbia than a year earlier. Three times as many new jobs than had been promised, by this government.

The Leader of the Opposition and the M.L.A.s from the New Democratic Party seem to be all up tight about the seven safe seats they refer to in the central and northern interior.

Well, I believe that the riding of Cariboo that I represent is referred to as one of them and I think I know something about the other six and I would just say to the members of the New Democratic Party that they'll always be safe as long as the only alternative that the people have is the New Democratic Party.

I want to tell you at this point, Mr. Speaker, that the reason that they'll always be safe to Social Credit, is due to the fact that this Social Credit government, in the last 20 years, has done more for the central and northern interior of British Columbia than any government since this province became part of Canada.

I have very little comment to make about the small group of Liberals in this House, Mr. Speaker, because they will soon be eliminated from this House. I say this because they are members of the Liberal Party of Canada. When the next federal election is called they will be thrown out of office and I predict the few Liberals in this House will suffer the same fate, when a provincial election is called.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to report to this House that the citizens of the riding of Cariboo enjoyed a very good year in 1971. A much better year than 1970. Almost everyone that wanted to work was able to find work, and the economy of the Cariboo expanded rapidly. The cattlemen enjoyed an excellent year, receiving good prices for their cattle. The lumber and plywood industry of the Cariboo operated at full capacity and enjoyed good markets. New industry continues to come to the Cariboo. In 1971, work proceeded on anew copper mine at McLeese Lake. This mine is being brought into production by Gibraltar Mines Limited, at a cost of \$75 million, employing 1,000 men on construction at the present time. The mine plans on being in production by mid 1972 and will provide permanent employment to 400 people.

The new pulp mill at Quesnel is also under construction at a cost of \$85 million. This pulp mill is being built by Cariboo Pulp and Paper Company Limited. They presently have approximately 1,000 men employed on construction and plan on being in production by August of this year. When they commence production they will provide permanent employment to another 400 people.

The new Cariboo forest district has been established at Williams Lake. This will provide better service for all Cariboo citizens dealing with the forest service. The Cariboo Forest Service has established their headquarters in the beautiful new provincial building at Williams Lake. This structure was completed and opened in 1971 by the Honourable, the Premier.

The Honourable Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. Mr. Williston) mentioned in his address yesterday that British Columbia had five forest districts. I would like to correct him and remind him that there are now six forest districts in British Columbia with the opening of the Cariboo Forest District late last year.

Mr. Speaker, never in the history of the Cariboo have opportunities and the future looked better and this is the

[[Page 130](#)]

result of policies of this government over the years, which encourages a good climate for investment which in turn creates jobs for our citizens.

The economy of the riding of Cariboo will be excellent in 1972, providing full employment for its citizens as well as providing many jobs for new citizens.

Mr. Speaker, there are some issues going on in this province that are of great concern to the citizens of Cariboo. First of these is the supply of natural gas to Vancouver Island. You are aware that much discussion has taken place about this project and no doubt a lot more discussion will take place before this issue is settled.

I would first like to congratulate the government on the policy decision to bring natural gas to Vancouver Island. It is badly needed on the island and is a pollution-free fuel. The discussion taking place at the present time, is how do we get it to Vancouver Island at the least possible price to the consumer. I am sure these are the main objectives of all of us in this House.

At the present time six applicants have signified interest in bringing the gas from the mainland to Vancouver Island. Three applicants propose to tap the main line of West Coast Transmission Company at Williams Lake in the Cariboo riding and build a line from this point to Powell River and then across to Vancouver Island.

The three other applicants propose to tap the West Coast Transmission line at its southern point in Huntington and bring the gas line from Tsawwassen under water to Swartz Bay on Vancouver Island.

The provincial government in the original directive to interested parties made it quite clear that any submissions received must not only serve Vancouver Island, but must also serve the community and industry of Powell River. I agree completely with these guidelines.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to go on record as supporting the route from Williams Lake to Powell River and then Vancouver Island for the following reasons. This is commonly now being referred to as the northern route, Mr. Speaker.

1. The mileage from Williams Lake to Powell River and across to Vancouver Island is much shorter than the route from Williams Lake to Vancouver across to the Island and back to Powell River. Williams Lake to Powell River and then to the island requires 374 miles of main transmission line which includes in it one underwater crossing of a length of 15 miles. The other route proposed from Huntington to Tsawwassen to Swartz Bay and back to Powell River is 504 miles, Mr. Speaker, including two underwater crossings with a length of 35 miles.

Because of these facts the cost will be much less and consequently will result in less cost to the ultimate consumer. The Williams Lake to Powell River and Vancouver Island route is a 25 per cent shorter route than the other route and should result in that much difference in cost to the ultimate consumer on Vancouver Island.

2. Gas is not a monopoly in the same sense as electricity. It is merely a competitive form of energy, competing with oil, wood, coal and electricity in the homes and industry. Therefore, it is clearly a risk situation and should be done by private enterprise.

I am opposed to all applications to deliver gas to Vancouver Island via Huntington to Tsawwassen and then Swartz Bay because it will be a much more expensive route and consequently will cost the eventual consumer more money than it should.

This route is now being referred to as the southern route. I am very much opposed to the application from B.C. Hydro and Power Authority to build the transmission line to the island. They have no experience in building natural gas main transmission lines while other applicants have. If they were given the right to build the transmission line for gas to Vancouver Island they no doubt would waste a lot of public funds because of their lack of experience in this field.

I further feel B.C. Hydro and Power Authority have very heavy responsibilities ahead of them in developing and servicing the citizens of British Columbia for their present and future electrical needs. I feel this responsibility is far more important to our citizens than having B.C. Hydro experimenting with installing natural gas transmission lines.

I would also remind the Honourable Members that if B.C. Hydro were given the right to build the main transmission line to Vancouver Island it would require the government of the Province of British Columbia to acquire large sums of capital funds so B.C. Hydro could finance the project.

Keeping in mind the huge amount of capital funds that the Government of British Columbia are going to have to raise in the immediate future for B.C. Hydro to keep up with the ever-increasing demand for power, I do not want to see the Government of British Columbia with the added responsibility of raising capital for main line natural gas transmission lines.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken so far about the location and construction of the natural gas main transmission line to Vancouver Island and Powell River. I would now like to say a few remarks about the distribution of gas after the main transmission line has delivered the gas to the island.

At the present time in the Province of British Columbia natural gas is distributed in British Columbia by four companies. B.C. Hydro and Power Authority contributes 60 per cent of the gas consumed in British Columbia, and

the three other companies distribute the other 40 per cent.

Why I am very much opposed to B.C. Hydro building the main transmission line to Vancouver Island is that I feel they should be given their share of the distribution rights when it arrives on the island.

I realise that B.C. Hydro can make a reasonable profit on distribution and it also helps them to negotiate a better price to the supplier because they have the heavier load factor they would have.

In view of all these factors Mr. Speaker, I would suggest the distribution of gas franchise from Vancouver Island be distributed on the same percentage basis that now exists in the rest of British Columbia. In other words, B.C. Hydro would get rights to 60 per cent of the total gas distributed on Vancouver Island and Powell River and private enterprise applicants would get the remaining 40 per cent.

The citizens of the riding of the Cariboo are very concerned about the future electrical power requirements for British Columbia. As all Members of this House are aware, the provincial government has requested that British Columbia Energy Board make a study of the future power requirements from now until 1985.

I am sure that the British Columbia Energy Board will do the best to estimate the future requirements as well as to recommend how and where the power is to be obtained. Due to the discussions in our province about the future power requirements, several hydro projects have been discussed and are being investigated by the British Columbia Energy Board.

I believe it is now anticipated that they will present their report about May of this year. While no member of the

[[Page 131](#)]

provincial government has stated that the Moran dam will be built on the Fraser north of Lillooet, the constituents of the riding of the Cariboo are very concerned about the possible construction of the Moran north of Lillooet.

The Moran dam, if built, would be located approximately 20 miles north of Lillooet. A 700 ft. dam at this point on the river would intercept the drainage from approximately 56,000 square miles or about 60 per cent of the total Fraser River drainage area of 90,000 square miles. The river level would be raised so that it be created a reservoir with a usable storage estimated at 9,582,000 acre feet. The reservoir would extend upstream 170 miles almost to Quesnel, my home town. Apart from the structure itself and a distance of 20 miles up stream from the dam, the total reservoir would be entirely in the Cariboo Riding.

Naturally, Mr. Speaker, when the constituents of Cariboo are so directly affected, they are very concerned about the discussion taking place about the proposed construction of this large dam.

AN HON. MEMBER: Are you for or against it?

MR. FRASER: If the Hon. Member will be quiet a minute and wait he'll find out.

As member for Cariboo, Mr. Speaker, I have been contacted by hundreds of constituents in the Cariboo by telephone, letter and in person. I would say that almost 100 per cent of the citizens in the Cariboo are very much opposed to the construction of this dam. And today I want to tell the Legislature why they are opposed.

I wish the Honourable Member for Atlin (Mr. Calder) was here, because he remarked on this aspect today, that everybody was tearing down this proposed dam but nobody was saying why. Well, I intend to try and show this House why we are opposed.

Our Premier has stated that unless the problem of the fish can be resolved the Moran dam will not be built. I know our Premier is a man of his word, so I am sure the dam will not be built because no solutions to the fish problem have been resolved and probably will not be in the foreseeable future.

If the Moran dam is constructed, the annual loss of salmon stocks above and below Moran would be almost \$24 million.

The annual loss of potential salmon production would be \$71 million.

The Fraser River sockeye provided 46 per cent of the total British Columbia sockeye pack during the period 1952 to 1969. About 44 per cent of the Fraser River sockeye catch originated from races that spawn above Moran. Approximately 15 per cent of the total British Columbia Chinook salmon catch is produced in the Fraser River system with one-third of this total originating above Moran.

Hatcheries and artificial spawning channels could not compensate for salmon losses.

About 66 per cent of the sockeye rearing capacity of the Fraser system are in the large lakes on tributaries upstream from Moran Canyon. Most of these lakes are only partly utilised, thus potential for increase of sockeye stock is all above Moran.

Anticipated loss of up to 85 per cent of downstream migrants in the reservoir could only be overcome by capturing the fish before they enter the dam and transporting them by truck or pipeline to the river below. This costly operation would not be feasible.

There is no precedent where salmon have been successfully passed over a dam as high as the proposed Moran. Moran dam is not necessary for flood control in the Fraser Valley. Dykes can provide this protection. In 1969 the federal and provincial governments agreed on a 10-year, \$40 million programme of dykes and drainage improvements. Dykes are being built two feet higher than water levels reached in the 1948 and 1894 floods.

The Fraser River carries over 10 million tons of sediment towards the Straits of Georgia every year, the bulk of which deposits at the delta. Removal of this changes the delta ecosystem. Can you imagine Mr. Speaker, what would happen to the reservoir up-stream from the dam if this amount of sediment was deposited in it? It would not take many years before it was plugged with sediment.

The Fraser River is not like the Peace River. It is classed as a navigable water course, and a permit would be required by the province from the federal government for its construction. The present federal government has indicated they will not grant such a permit. While I am sure they will be out of office when this permit is required, if and when, I am sure future federal governments would also deny a permit for the construction of this dam.

I have not heard any one view on the discussion on the proposed Moran dam mention anything about the possibility if this dam is built, the remote possibility of a war, and this structure being hit by a nuclear bomb. I suggest to you, Mr. Speaker, and the Honourable Members that there would be very little left of the lower Fraser Valley, or the citizens in it if this came to pass.

I realise, Mr. Speaker, that more electric power must be found, and soon, to satisfy the ever increasing needs of this dynamic province. I am sure if all the conditions I have outlined are considered as well as the effect on the environment you will agree that no one would consider seriously the building of the Moran dam on the Fraser River.

I am sure that other sources for generation of electric power can be found in our great province such as smaller dams than Moran that will not affect the environment, and then on thermal or nuclear power as it is perfected.

The Honourable Minister for Lands, Forests and Water Resources outlined yesterday where sites they now have can be expanded without any further flooding and I believe this is the immediate answer to our problems up to about 1978 to look after our future power requirements. Hopefully by that time nuclear power and the problems they are having with that can be sorted out.

Mr. Speaker, the total population of the Cariboo riding are very much opposed to the construction of the Moran dam on the Fraser River. I agree with their opinions, and feel that they should be considered before any

decisions are reached. I am sure if the British Columbia Energy Board recommends the construction of the Moran dam on the Fraser that their members of the board will get very fast reaction from all citizens of the Cariboo.

Mr. Speaker, I have spoken in this House before about the inadequacy of the provincial government's policy on municipal sewage treatment directives. As they exist now, the policy of the provincial government is to have primary sewage treatment plants installed by 1975 as a minimum in all municipalities in this province. I might add that generous financial assistance is provided by the provincial government to encourage the construction of these plants.

However, I feel that this policy is just not good enough and the government should be insisting on nothing less than secondary treatment plants. I firmly believe that secondary

[[Page 132](#)]

treatment plants can be installed at the same cost as primary plants, but they do a much better job of treating the wastes from the systems. I realise that some municipalities have proceeded with primary plants to meet the deadline, but some have not. I do not feel it is too late to instruct the municipalities that the minimum treatment level required in British Columbia is secondary not primary.

The level of treatment of municipal sewage is the subject of discussion in all municipalities in this province, Mr. Speaker, and has spilled over into many municipal election campaigns.

The most recent example of how the citizens of the City of Prince George, in the Honourable Minister of Land's riding, feel about it was shown at the recent municipal elections in Prince George in December last.

The City Council of Prince George in 1971 voted by a vote of 4 to 3 to install a primary treatment plant. They have nothing at the moment. They just run the sewage raw into the Fraser River. Four aldermen voted for a primary treatment plant and two aldermen and the Mayor voted for a secondary treatment plant.

Mayor Moffat was very upset over this vote and he was up for re-election as well as two aldermen that voted with the Mayor for secondary treatment.

Mayor Moffat stood on a platform for re-election that if re-elected he would try to reverse the vote of the council of 1971 from primary to secondary treatment in 1972. One of the aldermen that had voted for primary treatment filed for the office of mayor against Mayor Moffat on the platform of primary treatment. Mr. Speaker, as the Honourable Member for Fort George knows, Mayor Moffat had only been in office for two years, and while he is a very capable person he is very outspoken. Consequently when election time rolled around and prior to announcing his campaign platform he was as popular as a skunk at a garden party and could not have been elected as dog catcher let alone be re-elected as mayor of the large and fine City of Prince George.

I say he was re-elected because of his stand for secondary treatment. I would remind the lady Members of this House that Mayor Moffat is no friend of theirs and this is what made him very unpopular prior to taking his stand. He is definitely opposed to Women's Lib. He thinks the ladies should belong and stay at home.

I don't agree with Mayor Moffat, but Mayor Moffat said this publicly, and he still believes in it.

I might say that the alderman who opposed Mayor Moffat was very well thought of in Prince George, and had eight years of experience as an alderman; however, he campaigned on primary treatment for the city.

Honourable Members, the result of the vote was 2 to 1 in favour of Mayor Moffat because he had campaigned for secondary treatment of their municipal sewage. All the candidates for aldermen that ran for re-election who supported primary treatment were defeated, and all the candidates who supported secondary treatment were elected. And since January 1, the City of Prince George has decided to install secondary treatment facilities, not primary facilities.

I want to publicly thank Mayor Moffat and the citizens of Prince George for this decision, and suggest to the Honourable Member from Fort George (Hon. Mr. Williston) that as a minister responsible for pollution in this province, he take heed of what his constituents did in Prince George and up-grade the minimum requirements for sewage disposal throughout British Columbia to a minimum of secondary treatment.

Mr. Speaker, last year this Legislature passed the Ecological Reserves Act, Bill No. 80. The purpose of this Act was to set up 100 ecological reserves in the province by 1975.

An ecological reserve is a parcel of land which is set up for study purposes and put in reserve so no other use can be made of this property.

I am sure Honourable Members of this House thought as I did, when this legislation was discussed, that this was an excellent piece of legislation and probably overdue. I am sure the intent of the legislation was to set up small parcels of land not presently being used as reserves for further study and preservation.

A committee of professors from the University of British Columbia was set up to make recommendations for the establishment of these reserves. Their recommendations would be passed on to the affected departments of the provincial government, such as the lands department, the forest service, agriculture, and so on. Following this screening process a recommendation would be made to the land use committee of the Executive Council, and if they agreed an order-in-council would be made establishing the ecological reserve,

Mr. Speaker, this is all fine, but some university professors are abusing this legislation by proposing large areas in this province as ecological reserves.

In the riding of Cariboo there have been many large areas applied for — areas from the size of 5,000 acres to 15,000 acres. The areas that have been applied for in Cariboo already have been committed by the provincial government for other use such as grazing for cattle and logging.

In the administration of this Act no provision has been made for notification of affected land users in the area concerned. While most of the applications have been denied which have been received from these environment people, I would recommend to this House that at this session of the Legislature an amendment be made that would require public notice be given in the area affected after the recommendation for establishment of a reserve has been made by government departments and a public hearing be held in the area affected prior to the reserve being gazetted by the Executive Council.

At the present time the citizens that have legal rights to the Crown land affected have no way, except by accident, of finding out that their area is going to be taken away from them.

I am all for preservation of environment Mr. Speaker, but when Crown land has already been committed for other purposes such as cattle grazing and forestry production, I do not think this should be cancelled in favour of ecological reserves.

If this Legislature does not amend this bill at this session we wind up with a beautiful environment, but there will not be any citizens around to admire as they will be forced to leave our province to make a living. Mr. Speaker, and Honourable Members, between ecological reserves in the Cariboo and the proposed construction of the Moran dam, if they all become a reality there will not be a Cariboo riding remaining in existence, and this would be most unfortunate. Particularly so for the Hon. Member, Mr. Speaker, because I don't think the Cariboo people sent me down here so they could say about me that I was the last member for Cariboo. (Laughter).

Mr. Speaker, considerable interest has been shown by several members of this House and citizens about the recent coroner's jury held in Williams Lake as to enquire into the death of the late Frederick Quilt. Mr. Quilt was a constituent

of Cariboo and naturally I am very concerned about all the details surrounding this unfortunate death.

I would just like to read this into the record to give you a little background in the area of this part of my riding on the relationship of the police as related to Indians where this unfortunate Mr. Quilt lived and also in Williams Lake and the entire Chilcotin country which is part of my riding.

The police have been advised by the band manager for the Anahim Reserve, and he was the former chief that: (1) he was perfectly satisfied with the inquest; (2) he did not concur that it was a whitewash; (3) the relationship was not strained between the members of the Alexis Creek detachment of the R.C.M.P. who are still received by the Indians.

An Alexis Creek constable chaired a community committee which succeeded in having television brought into the Alexis Creek-Anahim area. I would like to tell this House that this young constable, whom I dealt with on behalf of the first citizens' fund, is a fine citizen. He was chairman and he is also one of the constables affected in this controversy. But he is a fine community citizen.

AN HON. MEMBER: Does that make him chief at the inquest?

MR. FRASER: I don't know. The point I'm trying to make here is that the relationships between the Indians of the Chilcotin and the R.C.M.P. have never been better, that I've seen over the years being a lifelong resident of the Cariboo.

AN HON. MEMBER: That doesn't mean very much

MR. FRASER: Now you be quiet and let me finish this. I would now like to read to this House, Mr. Speaker, the verdict of the coroner's jury in this case and I quote:

We find that Frederick Quilt of Stone Reserve, age 55, died November 30, 1971. We find this death was unnatural and that it was accidental. We attach no blame to any person in connection with the death. We recommend that assistance be provided to minority ethnic groups as to their rights pertaining to the law and obligations in giving testimony.

Mr. Speaker, I want to draw to the attention of the Honourable Members of this House the last sentence in this verdict, and ask a question. Where was the Department of Indian Affairs representative at that coroner's jury? Where, where, where? I ask you that as many times as I can.

They have a large staff of this department in Williams Lake, but where were they when this inquest was being conducted? As usual when they are badly needed by the Indians they are absent.

I am happy to note that in the throne speech this government is considering the feasibility of an Indian court case-worker programme and the provision of assistance to such a programme. I hope this government does not take too long in considering this assistance as it is badly needed now and will help our first citizens where the Department of Indian Affairs or the Government of Canada has failed them so badly.

I would say to the Honourable the Attorney General that some doubts have arisen following the coroner's jury verdict into the death of the late Frederick Quilt. I would further say that these doubts must be cleared up immediately and I would request as the member for that area that the Honourable Minister order the chief coroner for the Province of British Columbia to review the evidence taken at Williams Lake at the time of the coroner's inquest was conducted and have the chief coroner make a report to him. Thank you.

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Esquimalt.

MR. H.J. BRUCH (Esquimalt): Mr. Speaker, it's again my privilege to take my place on behalf of the people of Esquimalt constituency in this throne speech debate. I want to congratulate the mover and the seconder and especially to congratulate the Hon. Member from Columbia River (Hon. Mr. Chabot) on his appointment. He has again offered to open lines of communication to labour but it is very difficult to communicate with people who have extreme political bias and it's going to take the patience of Job to try and overcome some of the bias that is very

obvious among some of the labour leaders. Well Mr. Speaker, some members don't seem to realise that you can accept your responsibilities and be non-partisan at the proper time. That doesn't prevent you from being partisan in the election field or on the campaign trail. But when you have a responsibility to administer — the Minister of Labour has the responsibility to administer the Labour department and the trade unions have the responsibility to administer the wellbeing of their trade union membership — when they put the political consideration first it becomes very difficult to carry on the proper line of communication.

Mr. Speaker, a little earlier this evening the Hon. Leader of the Opposition gave us a big dramatic performance about the issue being the wellbeing of the little fellow in British Columbia against the big New York insurance firm. However, Mr. Speaker, I have not heard a word from the Leader of the Opposition or the Hon. Members opposite — who have always given us the great play about them being the representatives and the voice of labour, of the working man in the province — about the issue that has occurred just in recent weeks where union members were ordered not to go to New York but to Washington, D.C., for trial.

I have not heard one member opposite yet decrying that factor. When they talk about American domination of business, "Oh, this is terrible." But American domination by the big labour bosses seems to be alright. This seems to be okay.

I hope that the Leader of the Opposition is going to explain this little disparity as the debates go on. I think that the Hon. Minister of Labour should look into this particular matter because there is cause, there is reason, to argue that international unions have their place. But certainly they should have the courtesy and the decency if they're going to try members in British Columbia to come up here and take care of the situation right here in British Columbia, not turn around and say "pay your own way down to Washington, D.C.", to be tried on a union issue.

Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of issues in regards to my constituency. We've heard mention made here by some of the Opposition about being a nothing throne speech and a lot of their replies have been less than nothing.

It's amazing how the Hon. Members opposite seem to expect the budget debate during the throne speech debate — forgetting the basic allocation of debate. Because the throne speech debate is supposedly a debate on the government's handling of the affairs of the province since the Legislature last met rather than a projection of the budget and the programme for the coming year which is rightfully the budget debate.

[[Page 134](#)]

AN HON. MEMBER: Now we know.

MR. BRUCH: On some of the matters that have come up in the past year we have had considerable controversy in the constituency in regard to a proposed development of the Ocean Cement property. One of the aspects of their proposal I think has very serious implications because while under the total development proposals there was some provision made for schools and public property they conveniently suggested that in this big development of some 5,000 housing units the schools should be built on the piece of government property that lies within the boundaries of this particular development.

I would again reiterate that we should have legislation that should require a percentage of a subdivision for public use for schools, for playgrounds or for hospital facilities or for park purposes.

This should be incorporated into subdivision development on larger developments. It should be a requirement of a percentage of value in smaller subdivisions, there should be a percentage contribution made that would help to acquire sufficient blocks of land for future public development.

I would also like to see something provided in low-density zoning because we happen to have in this area almost entirely a single-dwelling self-owned individual home and to get a proposal of 5,000 rental units on a high-density basis being placed into the middle of this type of an area is not quite good enough. I would like to see serious consideration being given zoning certain of our areas into a low-density proposition and they should be kept that way.

Now Mr. Speaker, we dealt with another piece of legislation last year. That was the tax on mobile homes. Of course, we see the situation here in this debate where the Opposition tries to take advantage of certain issues and present them in certain ways. I have here a letter that says "Memorandum to the mobile home-owners from the office of Dave Barrett, M.L.A., Leader of the Official Opposition, Province of British Columbia."

Mr. Barrett in his letter said:

During the last legislative session Bill Number 78 was introduced by the Social Credit government which has the effect of placing unfair taxation on the mobile homeowner in British Columbia. The N.D.P. Party M.L.A.'s voted against this legislation and below is a copy from the official record of each M.L.A.'s vote on this measure. We feel that the mobile home-owner should not be forced to pay taxes without having equal access to the home-owner grant and we believe that the 5 per cent sales tax on mobile homes is unfair and unequal.

This is very nice, Mr. Speaker, when the Leader of the Opposition will say this to the mobile home-owner. But why doesn't he give the same song and dance to the home-owners of this province? Because what he is in fact saying is that it is alright for the home-owner to pay the sales tax on his building materials.

The Leader of the Opposition is in effect saying that the mobile home-owner should not have to pay sales tax on the materials that go into the building of that mobile home but the home-owner who builds a home on a piece of property, he should have to pay for it. You see? This is the equal treatment.

Secondly when he talks about the tax on mobile homes being unfair, he forgets the factor that it's been a battle all through to get municipalities to ever allow a mobile home park into their area and if these people are not going to carry a small share of the load for the services that are required in that community there isn't going to be a municipality or regional district that is going to provide a place for mobile homes.

Very basically, when you take the assessment on a mobile home, the Leader of the Opposition knows so well that this could be an absolute sham because no mobile home-owner should be paying more than \$1 in taxes. And so in effect he is saying to the home-owners of the province that he believes that the mobile home-owners should have a free ride at the expense of the home-owners throughout British Columbia.

I wish that he had the courage enough to tell all the home-owners that this is what he is advocating as policy of the New Democratic Party.

You know, Mr. Speaker, it was very interesting to hear the great experience that the Leader of the Opposition and the N.D.P. members had in taking that trip to Washington state.

I wished they had taken it many years ago. You know they play it up as something new now. They say: "Why don't the government members do the same?" I want to inform the Hon. Member that I have addressed the Washington State Legislature on three different occasions. In fact in 1955, when I first attended the Washington State Legislature, it was the first time that an outside member had attended and they made me an honorary citizen of the State of Washington.

But I want to say that is a good step that the members did go because there is a relationship across the border that cannot be denied — there is a relationship in total in Canada that we have to consider these people across the border because many things that happen there affect us. Many things that they have learned can give us valuable advice.

You know, I hope and trust — because we've heard so much about the Moran dam and nuclear power and all the rest of it — I hope and trust that the members did look into some of those matters down in the state of Washington.

Interjections by Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please!

MR. BRUCH: Let the Honourable Member make his speech and I'll make mine.

Mr. Speaker, on this issue of nuclear power we find that in the State of Washington they had to shut one down even though it was subsidised. They had to shut one down. There are too many ifs, there are still too many questions on the nuclear power issue.

You know, Mr. Speaker, this issue is comparable to an issue that we had in this Legislature in regards to a heavy water plant. And these same Liberals stood up and screamed to high heaven that the government was remiss because this heavy water plant was going to Nova Scotia.

Those suckers bit, those suckers bit and look at the devastation that it has caused, the drain it has caused on their taxpayers — because, yes it was a bright little idea, but very basically there are too many unknowns as yet. Now if they want to carry this same theme through, that's fine. We don't know everything about nuclear power but a few scientists are recommending it — so let's barge in. Then why on earth don't they have the same open minds in regard to the Moran proposal?

What is the Moran situation? Here they've been arguing and debating the Moran dam for the last 20 years and nobody knows to this day whether a dam can be built there.

[[Page 135](#)]

I think it is high time that the drillings are being done. That the core samples are being taken to find out whether or not one is possible.

I've heard Hon. Members on both sides on an emotional issue talk about, oh, the salmon fingerlings, they have to be taken by truck or pipe. This is not correct because we had presentations to members of the Legislature that a flume system has worked out elsewhere. They're saying there is no precedent in successfully taking the fingerlings over a dam. Down in the State of Washington they've taken fingerlings over a dam at a 700 foot drop...

AN HON. MEMBER: Eighty-five per cent killed.

MR. BRUCH: Eighty-five per cent killed when they hit the face of the dam but as soon as they projected the water and it fell over into the pool, they had less than a 15 per cent kill.

They say that flood control is not required for Moran dam. This is another blind statement, but let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, I think it's a serious thing that this Legislature has to consider — when you have over a million people with the threat of flood hanging over their heads — a repeat of the 1948 situation.

Mr. Speaker, the issue was mentioned tonight: What if a bomb is dropped? Well, we know full well that up on the Peace River dam, it was built in such a way to withstand a bomb and certainly they are going away from the building of concrete dams and going into the earth-filled dams for that specific reason.

There is another factor that I think has to be considered, because certainly some parts of the world may have to risk nuclear power and the end effects of the disposal of waste — the heating of water and all the rest of it. But here in Canada we are privileged with about a third of the fresh water supply in the world and as a result we have a different situation in its entirety.

Mr. Speaker, one issue that I dealt with in the last session is in regard to the provision of ski facilities for the young people and in particular on lower Vancouver Island.

Since the last session the government has not only completed its own survey but has commissioned an outside survey on the possibilities and the report is favourable and I hope and trust that the government will move as quickly as possible in the land acquisition so that we can have this ski facility in operation for next winter so that the young people in this area can also benefit from some of the winter sports, the same as those available in other parts of British Columbia.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who's going to do the logging?

MR. BRUCH: Mr. Speaker, in this particular case there is no logging to be done, it's already logged out.

AN HON. MEMBER: Who did it?

MR. BRUCH: The company that happens to own the land.

Mr. Speaker, during this last year we had several federal-provincial conferences and premiers' conferences and all the rest of it and we also had lengthy debates in the House of Commons in regard to tax reform.

With the proposals that the federal government put forward on the change in tax sharing, I feel that the provinces are very definitely coming out second best. The federal government, instead of giving the provinces the 28 per cent of the total tax pie and the federal government taking 72 per cent on the new one, they're going to take 76.6 per cent of the tax share. I think this is deplorable under the circumstances where the provincial and the municipal governments are finding it increasingly difficult to find the tax money to carry out their responsibilities.

Many of the federal functions are duplicating and any left-wing project, any far-out project can get funds. They have fellows in environment behind practically every tree. But basically they haven't a responsibility to carry out and all they're doing is creating problems. I think it is deplorable that this type of a situation should arise at this time.

I believe also that the people of Canada, in particular British Columbia, are becoming more and more frustrated at the complexity of the taxation formulas because there is too much left at discretion. There is too much left upon interpretation and even the accountants, the tax people, don't know what to expect.

I think this is the wrong approach in taxation. I believe that we have to get back to a simplicity in taxation and I believe that we should have a straight taxation percentage, that if we simplified the tax structure to the point that there would be a straight \$5,000 exemption for a family and a straight \$5,000 exemption for a business or an industry — and over and above that you paid a straight 20 per cent on the income in excess of that \$5,000 — the governments both federal and provincial would get more money than they are getting under the present situation. We wouldn't be muddling around in exemption and loopholes and ways to trying to beat the tax and it would simplify the matter. Just as a negative income tax would simplify the matter of assisting those people who need assistance and do away with the bureaucracy that is taking us down the drain in government today.

Mr. Speaker, with the late hour I am going to leave my other remarks for a future debate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for South Peace River.

MR. D.A. MARSHALL (South Peace River): In speaking to the motion that is before us and in giving very strong support to it from that very important mid-section of British Columbia — known far and wide as the vestibule of Heaven — the great south Peace River country, I must agree with the Leader of the Opposition. He is for once correct and this is not an insecure seat.

But I would be remiss if I did not express my appreciation to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor for the message contained in the opening speech delivered at our third session of the 29th parliament.

The challenge is indeed great to assist in the outgoing growth of the economy resulting from the efforts of private enterprise and initiative of the individual entrepreneur in times when, in our world, marked differences in philosophy place many barriers for us to overcome.

This speech reinforces the ever increasing faith of the people of British Columbia as they look to the world beyond our borders and the insecurity that threatens and are content that our economy will continue to flourish; employment will increase and we will have a subsequent increase in the standard of living.

We should reflect, Mr. Speaker, for just a moment, to the past centennial year. A year pointing out in the most

manner, a tribute to the leader of this province who has contributed so much in the name of the people of British Columbia. One of the finest tributes that I feel can be given to any individual, certainly by the people in the area in which one lives is to be elected to this Legislature.

My tenure has been one of the greatest experiences of my lifetime and it has constantly been enhanced by the security extended to me in my knowledge resulting from the friendship, advice and leadership of the Premier of this province.

While from time to time, as the Hon. Member from Richmond (Mr. LeCours) stated earlier, members constructively criticise our government, I know this is encouraged by the Premier and received in the manner in which it is given.

Mr. Speaker, I would first want to deal with comments made by the leader of the Liberal group (Mr. McGeer) regarding conditions at Williston Lake and personally I'm sick and tired of hearing and reading about all the so-called devastation as a result of this lake.

No one in this legislature is in as close proximity to the great Peace River valley as I am. The panorama of the breath-taking beauty unfolds from our living room window and nobody is more concerned and more-aware of the benefits of the Bennett dam and Williston Lake.

The June floods have naturally disappeared as a result of this dam and many more ferry crossings and much improved ferry crossings have been made possible to residents of British Columbia. I have read very much in the Press of what this lake has done to the Mackenzie delta and now I hope they will publish a few of the facts.

We were going to have a national environmental week in the south Peace River with the theme: "This winter flush your toilet often because the Mackenzie delta needs the water." Then, by golly, it wasn't too long after I read that we were killing the young muskrats when we did have finally a normal snowfall.

I would respectfully point out to the leader of the Liberal group that his expertise re this lake is akin to the fellow who thought that Johnny Cash was a pay facility.

I would like to just quote a few quotations from a few experts and I am quoting from the Chetwin *Echo*, dated January 5.

The recreational potential resulting from the creation of Lake Williston was examined last fall by outdoor experts who toured the lake. Among those who toured the lake were Lee Straight of the Vancouver *Sun*, Mike Crammond of the Province and Ted Peck, outdoor writer and broadcaster.

The fish were abundant, so much so that the veteran outdoorsman found them no challenge at all. Arctic greyling and Dolly Varden, char rose to almost every cast and as the *Sun's* Lee Straight put it, it was only a matter of swimming the lures, either hardware or fly, through the right lie to take these voracious, Arctic fish. The visitors expressed some concern over the possible effects in severe winters of the loss of bottom land animal forage areas due to flooding but it was noted that there was still feeding ground available on the slopes. Examination of brush areas, frequented by the moose and deer indicated, according to Crammond, a balanced ecology.

I would like to repeat that; according to Crammond, it was a balanced ecology.

The *Sun's* Lee Straight observed in regard to game possibilities, that only a few rugged residents and wealthy non-resident hunters, hunted the upper trench before now and if anything the new lake has provided access, hazardous access, but manageable.

Ted Peck, who sees the lake as having great potential for recreation, commented on the debris this way.

"Quite frankly, there is not as much debris on the lake in big quantities as I'd expected and I understand that big masses of debris in the major arms of the lake have decreased in the last year or so and I expect will continue. I offer these as evidence, Mr. Speaker, with a little bit more expertise than we have heard here before.

In our centennial year, of course, Mr. Speaker, the most significant happening in our part of the country was the opening of the Pacific Great Eastern extension to Fort Nelson. We continued the heritage left to us by our early pioneers who also pitted their strength and skills to build transportation systems.

Now, as it was then, we have opened up colossal stores of riches, minerals, giant stands of timber and land beneath which lay pools of oil and natural gas. The importance of communication links has always been and will continue to be a major importance in opening up land to support people.

But also of major importance is human resources. Those of the north, like the early pioneers, have brought with them the same determination and drive which caused the earlier settlers to reside in Peace River south.

I caution our government, however, Mr. Speaker, that we do not want to see the adage of the land of the north being the land of opportunity become largely a myth. As we push our frontiers further to the north, we do not want to create just islands of human endeavour which remain isolated from the rest of the country which is hardly aware of their existence.

Regretfully Mr. Speaker, I must state that I am most disenchanted with our Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce — a department which should be one of the most aggressive, thought-provoking, ideaconscious, sales-promoting departments of our government, but which now suffers badly from a complete paralysis.

This department does nothing to ensure that these pockets of rapid development, if only for a limited period of time, do not become centres of higher-than-average unemployment, points of a high concentration of welfare recipients, reservoirs of high school, vocational school and in some cases university students who cannot be absorbed into the mainstream of their own community.

This situation will always exist and will continue to exist as long as no concentrated effort is made to process our natural resources at their point of origin or as closely to it as possible.

Agriculture opened up the great Peace River country and it is still its economic mainstay. Yet the Department of Industrial Trade and Commerce does nothing to stimulate production of new products nor does it contribute very much to production facilities, market development or sales contacts in the promotion of agricultural products.

Free enterprise, Mr. Speaker, the system that I support — not corporate free enterprise and here there is a very distinct difference, and here I am talking of those integrated corporations who, in themselves have become a state — but the individual entrepreneur, the small businessman receives little encouragement, no substantial assistance and no advice from the Department of Industry, Trade and Commerce.

I will be discussing this more in later debates in this House.

[[Page 137](#)]

Mr. Speaker, I noticed and I do not think it unique to my riding, that 100 years of peaceful progress in the Province of British Columbia was reflected in the music and dances of many lands whose people have contributed to the growth of this province.

I have studied music for many years and I cannot help but paraphrase it with a statement, that as the state of the economy is reflected in the state of mind of people, the history of a people is found in its song.

As I listen to the music of the younger generation and particularly to lyrics in their music, I cannot help but wonder what future history will record when today's music and lyrics also lend credence to the state of mind of

people. To give an example: "It's sad to see the small towns disappear," and here I read the recently published federal Department of Urban Affairs' report entitled "The Urban Future." According to this report, 95 per cent of all Canadians will live in urban centres by the year 2001, with 73 per cent concentrated in 12 cities or metropolitan centres and of those approximately 15 million people in Toronto, Montreal and Vancouver.

We very foolishly are doing everything to hasten that process and how very wrong we are. I urge all levels of government, particularly municipal levels, to take a drive in the country, for the retention of the rural life is a prime importance to them.

Further, Mr. Speaker, the report of T.J. Plunkett Associates of Montreal, who represented the Union of B.C. Municipalities in this 1968-70 joint study into provincial-municipal finance, found that most of British Columbia's municipal population today is highly-urbanised and most district municipalities, once mainly rural, are virtual cities. The majority, some 68 per cent of these people, are concentrated in the 21 municipalities of Greater Vancouver and Victoria.

So, I repeat again, Mr. Speaker — take a drive in the country — for the retention of rural living is of utmost importance to municipalities.

While on the subject of this report, I should like to reiterate and restate my comments with regard to the provincial home-owner grant, that I made in this Legislature last year. I felt there was, in my mind at least, some glaring disparities in this grant and expressed some concern as to what its continuation unchecked and unchanged might involve and concluded by suggesting to our government that whether it is paid in part or in total, it should be dependent upon the home-owner's ability to pay.

The conclusions arrived at from the report of T.J. Plunkett state that these grants discriminate against all classes of property taxpayers except one, and its discontinuance would be politically impractical. However, it stated and concurs with my statement these grants should not be increased further and provincial grants in future should be developed along lines of merit and need.

Another popular song from today's youth is "What the World Needs Now". This ballad, like most of the popular ballads appealing to today's youth, is trying to tell us something — expressing a frame of mind. The youth sees our world — full of hate and wars. They look at governments that are forever oppressive and ambitious. I would strongly suggest that you talk to youth. I think you could go out to Quadra Island and find these same answers. Ask them what they think of government and why they leave their lovely homes — the running water, sewer, automatic heat — or, in total, the total materialistic society. They will tell you they want no more of malicious bureaucrats, wars and punitive laws. They feel that we have become a society of complacent acquiescence and they are aware of a hostile world and environment, which, to them, seemingly is without any hope. We advocate optimism — the youth considers optimism cowardly, because they feel optimistic people prefer fiction to reality, forgetting the hard cold facts of life.

Again, finally Mr. Speaker, another musical ballad giving some good news with a promise and hope in "There's a New World Coming". I read an article recently concerning overweight problems in our society — the writer in his research found that people were able to control their weight easier when they had received good news rather than bad. My only reflection here is that our world would indeed be better with more skinny homo sapiens running around.

We could mention a great deal more regarding attitudes of today's youth, but more importantly I feel we should shrug off that comparison that we have had problems with the younger generation, and try to remember that man's evolvement has resulted in accelerated change, greater capacity for realisation of cause and effects, particularly as we compare what the children know today compared with what they knew a decade ago.

Mr. Speaker, as you talk to youth today, if you say you believe little of what they complain about, one must believe that they care about the quality of life, which is more than mere material affluence. This, we must believe because we can see around us evidence of constantly accelerating social change.

The greatest social change I witness every day is that men and women want more and more in material wealth for doing less and less. It is an aphorism to state that an ever-increasing segment of society feels that it is their right to reach out with its hands into the pockets of those who are truly contributing to the welfare of the economy. The Good Book says that we are our brothers' keepers — well, brothers, that is a two-way street and we don't destroy the productive to the sole advantage of the unproductive. Ever increasing levels of taxation in the middle-class makes it axiomatic that a rapid deescalation of initiative will result, a situation itself that will occupy a unique sociological dimension.

I give thanks each day that our government at least tries under great opposition pressure from the federal government to keep the moral and economic ships on an even keel. I trust that they will continue to criticise and manage in this great province to keep us from the totally disastrous federal policies.

We will see many changes in federal politics because I think people are concerned with issues, not charisma of a leader and as I stated before, the state of the economy is reflected in the state of mind in people and we must have some new medicine to determine a cure. I personally feel that in both federal and provincial politics there is no great role for parliament if it is dictator-centred, and it is one of my foremost prayers that we will not further the tragedy where the form and image is as important as the content and the substance in the elector's mind.

Mr. Speaker, as I mention those who are reaching their hands into the pockets of others, my great concern is the children of welfare recipients and the leaders this system produces. Yes, Mr. Speaker, I say what takes place with the children of welfare parents.

As these children start kindergarten they begin to notice that perhaps they are a little different from their playmates and by the time they are in Grades 2 and 3, they realise that

[[Page 138](#)]

they don't dress quite the same way, their homes and furnishings are somewhat different and by the time they are in Grades 5 and 6, are resentful of their parents, when they don't have ski-doo's and motor bikes and become not only resentful but embarrassed of their parents.

As these children reach into the higher grades, they constantly are endeavoring to make up for their embarrassment by ferreting out other means to impress their fellow students. They are the ones who put the tacks on the teachers' chairs, damage school property and revolt from discipline.

As we might consider them the leaders in the future, and as we are all aware that predicting and projecting into the future is of utmost importance, I suggest that in shaping guidelines our educational system as well as our welfare system, take a hard, sincere look at this ever-increasing problem.

Our educational system — as well as our parents — have created the syndrome that we must get an education — the university degree — to buy and afford all the materialistic things that society dictates we must have, the boats, cars and lovely homes. I find in talking to students that they are being taught a great deal about the "isms" — socialism, fascism, communism, but very little really about humanism and although in reality these are the people truly concerned. Social values must become more important in our educational system. Perhaps as a passing comment to the somewhat over-zealous "Canada for Canada" fans I think they should find out more if they are concerned about Canada's so-called silent surrender why 92 per cent of our school textbooks are published in the United States.

In our educational system, we keep the individual in a student-oriented society to the age of 24, 25 or 26 with little or no association with the adult society or the adult business community. We are so concerned with the sole factor of the young person's education with no concern of teaching him how to integrate into the complex adult society we have created. We teach him what he can do for society, but nothing about how to live within that society.

Mr. Speaker, I have mentioned that it is sad to see the small towns disappear. Indeed it is, for as they disappear there is more amalgamation of schools and the rural students must suffer with longer periods of time on

school buses; a reduction in capacity for study and learning because of being tired after two and three hours on a school bus and many more absences as a result of cold weather.

I have dealt with the policy covering transportation of rural students and the necessity of closing up walk limits on many occasions and I will not belabor the points on this occasion. I will simply state that I am very annoyed at the government's stand: "that it would cost many many millions of dollars to do this province-wide."

We conducted a survey in school district 59 and to reduce the walk limits to one mile in Grades 1 to 3 involves some 10 students only. From Grades 3 and up, it involved some 59 students. Many of our children in the North walk on main highways as in the rest of the province and many in the rain, but in the winter cold can kill — and I cannot see many millions here.

Secondly, I do not feel that the whole province must have it, as I have suggested before this can be done on the basis of a mean average winter temperature. While it is the purpose of the boards and Department of Education to administer as well as possible the taxpayers' money, it is also their purpose to provide a service and I trust they will do their utmost to alleviate this situation.

Mr. Speaker, I sat in the galleries at the House of Commons in Ottawa and once again I felt the frame of mind of youth expressed. I sat in very fortunately the midst of a school visitation to the Legislature and I could not help but put myself in their place as I listened to these students' comments and the debate on the floor of the house.

I made a point of talking to some of them later, and they found it very difficult to understand why if some measures are favored by your party, it was naturally good; if favored by another party and not your own, it was just as automatically bad and they also couldn't understand why, to doubt your party's stand on any issue and wonder if for once, your opponents might be right and wiser, was considered disaffecting and disloyal.

Another point they commented on was the banging of desk tops in support of other party members and hurling gibes and counter-gibes across the House in the manner of exuberant schoolboys.

I had to confess to them that particularly when personality gibes and attacks made on members, I too felt a twinge of embarrassment, a feeling of repugnance to thump my desk in this type of support.

My point, Mr. Speaker, is simply this: that our parliamentary system which serves us so well, does not have the total respect it richly deserves in the eyes of the young people and we cannot single out this system with the view that it is beyond improvement.

We must, Mr. Speaker, in employing reality realise that many problems confront our own nation. It is toward these changes in our parliamentary attitude that we must direct much effort and thought and maintaining an atmosphere in our own minds: a new mood if you wish, for changes based not solely on self-gratification, but of concern for social values and our fellow man.

I commented earlier, Mr. Speaker, on the role of government, and at this point I should like to extend my appreciation to the Honourable Minister of Agriculture, who, this past year did involve the backbencher with government, with the visit of Japanese business interest.

We were most pleased to have representatives of the Yamaha Tsusho Co. Ltd., of Tokyo, tour our great Peace River country, to see first hand the immenseness of our country and agricultural production. In turn they were amazed and impressed not solely with the agricultural production but with the immenseness of our area and particularly our fresh air. A representative of this firm, Mr. Terrutara Hayashi at the time of this visit made a small purchase of honey which later resulted in a very large sale for a producer in the later part of the year. Also at this time much interest was shown with small seed production, of our farmers and more particularly, our plans to seek out the export possibilities with Japan for a readily marketable form of feed to supply their growing cattle demands.

You might recall, Mr. Speaker, that I have mentioned many times in this House the capability of the Peace River country to produce large quantities of forage crops, more particularly, alfalfa hay. Recognising the fact that the

Government of Japan places great emphasis on the production of meat in all forms and the other point in favor: that Japanese importers are not anxious to rely solely and that they are looking for other sources in the Northern Hemisphere.

We also recognised that the Department of Regional Economic Expansion had given many large grants to

[[Page 139](#)]

individual plants to stimulate production of alfalfa pellets, and that the alfalfa pellets other than considered in the production of formula feeds and concentrates, are not for ruminant animal use.

We then came up with plans thanks to the help of several very predominant farmers to produce cubes — alfalfa cubes. To qualify this properly, it is of the utmost importance to divorce entirely from the commonly recognised pellet. The 1/4" small pellet is a highly concentrated product of ground material. The larger, less dense cube is a product of chopped material but most importantly, the cube, unlike the alfalfa pellet is for ruminant animal use.

Consumption of alfalfa pellets is related to the total production of formula feed and concentrates in Japan. In the fiscal year 1968, Japan produced 11,356,000 metric tons of formula feeds and concentrates which was a 10 per cent increase over the previous year and this particular figure this increase which has remained quite constant since that time. While the projected increase of from 10 to 15 per cent increase in the production of formula feeds appeared good, we are cognizant of the very rapid increase in Canadian production of pellets and the gearing up of production capabilities in California where one plant built, alone, has a capacity of 280,000 tons a year.

The export of cubes to Japan however, Mr. Speaker, presented a completely different set of circumstances. In 1968 the exports of cubes to Japan totaled some 8,500 metric tons; in 1969 it jumped to 16,000 metric tons and in 1970 were 35,000 tons.

It can be seen very readily then, Mr. Speaker, that since Japan's first purchases in 1968, an annual increase of almost 100% has been realised. As we have the relative advantage of being close to Japan, have highly-productive land and as Japan expects that by 1977 total production of meat will be almost double that of 1969, the potential of capturing some of this market indeed appears bright.

We then compiled very complete pro-forma financial statements, projections and feasibility study and we found the following:

That the studies were indeed very encouraging, it would be very feasible at this particular time to construct a plant. A diversification of this type would appear encouraging to the grower. Encouraging as the prospective export and domestic markets appeared the participating farmer with little cash reserves and dwindling borrowing power found it impossible to bring this dream to fruition.

Subsequently, Mr. Speaker, many sincere efforts have been put forth, particularly with the Department of Regional Economic Expansion, about which I intend to speak more in later debates, to obtain the capital funds for grower participation in construction and operation of these very necessary facilities. This is something I hope our Dept. of Trade Industry and Commerce will come up with a very good answer.

While on the subject of agriculture, Mr. Speaker, I feel that I must bring to the attention of this house a very blatant political point of blackmail by the federal government as it concerned the Prairie Grain Stabilisation Act. I, like all grain producers, received in the mail, a prairie grains policy progress report from the Hon. Otto Lang. In this report was an insert which stated, and I quote: "The figures on this insert represent the amount you should receive as a transitional payment under the Prairie Grain Stabilisation Act when (and I repeat when) the legislation has been passed." This bill has reached the report stage in the House of Commons and can be dealt with after the House of Commons reconvenes. The House has adjourned until February. The amount is calculated on the basis of \$1.45 per eligible acre with a maximum of 640 acres eligible. In the bottom of my insert under asterisk, I would receive \$928.00 when the legislation was passed.

They found of course, as we all know, that this was not possible, they could not buy the farmer and it was, as this was not passed, but the public should be made aware. Many farmers, with the increases in deductions from their gross sales, would be paying out more than they could possibly receive back under this plan.

Whether you produce grain, potatoes, fruit, etc., the agriculture industry is sick. I am not going to go into detail regarding the plight of producers at this time, but I do want to relate the only offer of hope extended by the federal government.

As you are perhaps aware, Mr. Speaker, four persons were charged with possession and cultivation of marijuana in the South Peace River. It grew very well I understand, and from the point of view that it would be a cash crop — no quota. Next to the Bonaventure repair deal, it offers one of the best bargains yet for a producer — just as ridiculous but more humorous.

The special committee on youth recommended that anyone 18 years or older should be allowed to cultivate, harvest or sell marijuana. And I thought what a great, great way to get young people interested in agriculture again. This is a crop that would make a fantastic profit and we could smoke it and our troubles would melt away. And also by smoking it, it would put the farmers in a frame of mind so that they would stop throwing wheat at our Prime Minister, and making rude noises at him.

I have only one further comment in this regard Mr. Speaker, that Western Canada supports the party that does the right thing and it has done it before and it will do it again.

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, I want to say how pleased I was to hear of the job creation programmes of our government, more particularly the spurring of gas explorations in our part of the province. Unlike the federal government who finds work a very dirty four letter word, neither employing it or creating it, this will have an immense effect on our party of the province.

However, I must state, Mr. Speaker, I am most disappointed that no mention was made of a proposed road from Fort Nelson to Fort Simpson. I had the opportunity this year of flying over all this northern area and when one sees the tremendous amount of freight that is presently being shipped out of Hay River on Great Slave Lake down the Mackenzie River, one cannot help but wonder why we are being so lax in starting a programme of construction on this road. This freight is brought in along the Mackenzie Highway and the Great Slave Railway, with a road or a link between Fort Nelson and Fort Simpson, the Alaska Highway and the Pacific Great Eastern Railway would short circuit a great percentage of this freight and have this volume moved through British Columbia.

The federal government made a decision to reallocate the funds and equipment which were being used to build the road from Fort Simpson south to Fort Liard near the British Columbia border. This road has now been discontinued and the funds and equipment put into building the Dempster Highway linking Dawson City with Fort MacPherson and eventually to Inuvik. The federal government alleges that the

[[Page 140](#)]

apparent lack of interest by the government of the Province of British Columbia was a factor in their decision to pull out of the Fort Simpson, Fort Liard project.

And the volume that goes through Hay River now is staggering and is only a drop in the bucket compared to what will be shipped when the proposed pipeline from the North Slope commences.

And I would suggest that due to the high rate of unemployment and the generally depressed construction industry in the area, an immediate start on this proposed link would alleviate in no small measure this problem.

I have spoken of this proposed communications link, a vital transportation link many times before, with no answer as to our government's position. And I think the time has now come for an answer. I am impatiently awaiting our government's reply

MR. SPEAKER: The Honourable Member for Nanaimo.

MR. F.J. NEY (Nanaimo): Mr. Speaker — Dollar dollar dollar dollar I have a bid a dollar I have a bid a dollar ten a dollar ten a dollar twenty I have a twenty dollar I have twenty thirty going once going twice, sold to the dairy farmers. Now, I didn't do that to wake everybody up tonight. (Laughter). That's the market place, the auction yard, an honest market place. And things aren't quite the same down on the dairy farms of Vancouver Island anymore.

And the big problem is the invasion of package milk by the big chains into Vancouver Island. And it is creating a problem that the farmers are having to sell their milk for lower utilisation which means the difference of \$7 down to less than \$4.

Last year they produced about 962,000 lb. of milk and yet their sales were down 232,000 lb. In a year, when because of a strike they sold an extra 300,000 lbs. on Vancouver Island. So things are in bad shape.

And I'm saying this now that we have to look at this, or the whole farming industry as far as dairies are concerned on Vancouver Island is going to deteriorate to a very, very sad stage. The time has come now where we should either amalgamate the five dairy areas, or alternatively make the big chains who sell milk on Vancouver Island buy an equivalent ratio of milk from the farmers on Vancouver Island. In any event, some incentives should be set up to compel the chains to buy a fair share of their milk on Vancouver Island. Because the dairy farms on Vancouver Island today are in jeopardy.

Now I just want to say a couple of words on wildlife. And I'm not talking about wildlife around here, I'm talking about the pigeons in our Capital City. We're advertising all across North America "follow the birds to Vancouver Island." And what happens? They're going to sterilise them — not the tourists, the pigeons. (Laughter).

This is happening at a time when wildlife is retreating and retreating from the ever-growing population of our world. And I'm saying now, why do we have to poison the pigeons? It's going to create a hazard for other birds, Mr. Speaker, who may come along and eat those pellets. Then there's the ecological hazard of the droppings of the pigeons.

Now, I recognise that they may have a problem in the Capital City, and I think that many people will recognise that Victoria is the crumpet-eating capital of Canada. But, there's no danger that this will become the pigeon pie capital of Canada.

Pigeons can be a very attractive tourist attraction. They do it in Trafalgar Square in London, in St. Mark's in Venice, and many of the great capitals of the world. And they are a pleasure to add to the environment. Now I've talked to the Pigeon Racing Association in Nanaimo and they're prepared to come down and trap the pigeons alive and we can build lofts at the Swartz Bay ferry...

AN HON. MEMBER: Yes, but they're homing pigeons and they'll come back.

MR. NEY: ... and Nanaimo ferry place and the tourists can feed them, as a tourist attraction all through the year.

If you don't get a new ferry on the Nanaimo run they'll be the best-fed pigeons in British Columbia next summer, when the tourists are waiting for the boats to come in.

Tourism is increasing in British Columbia, and it's increasing on Vancouver Island. We've got a seventh of the population of British Columbia but nearly a third of the tourist party. Last year two million tourists came to Vancouver Island, it's increasing by 10 per cent per annum. Last year on the Nanaimo run alone the number of recreational vehicles increased by 23 1/2 per cent. That Pacific Rim Park is going to act like a catalyst in the tourist industry.

Yet with all this coming now — and the tourists are increasing, the boat traffic is increasing, as a matter of

fact the ferry system last year shows figures of 14 per cent increase — with all the millions spent we don't even have a decent waiting room in Nanaimo. When people come off the boat on a rainy cold night they have to stand in the rain, sometimes for 10, 20 minutes, maybe even longer waiting for their transportation to come along if there's any mixup.

We should have in the City of Nanaimo a proper waiting room outside with a sufficient lavatories for our people, and I hope we're going to have this very soon. With this increase in traffic we need an extra ferry for next year. Because we're trying to create a situation to make the tourists want to come back to Vancouver Island. How are we going to get them if we don't make them comfortable?

Last year on the Nanaimo run 1,300,000 passengers travelled, on the Swartz Bay run 1,700,000. And then there is the C.P.R., the Anacortes run, the Black Ball Ferry, all these people are coming on and it's increasing every year and the hazard on our island highways is getting worse and worse. Now, I know that it would cost a lot of money to make a four-lane highway all the way in one year. But I do say that the time has now come where at least take those long straight stretches that don't have any geographical problems, widen them out into four lanes at minimum cost. Then when you're going up the hills let's have some passing lanes and let's make things easier for the tourists and for our citizens. Because this is all in the interest of tourism of our own citizens, and safety on our highways.

I'd like to compliment the government on the assistance and the encouragement they've given to the skiers around Nanaimo. The skiing is getting very popular on Green Mountain — it's a great sport — we'd like to make it a tourist attraction as well, and I do suggest that maybe now the time has come when the government can even consider giving more support to the skiers on Green Mountain, and for that matter even Forbidden Plateau, even though it's out of my constituency. We in Nanaimo are ready to boost the skiing industry all we can.

While we're on the subject of tourism, one more thing. We can't keep on taking more and more cars to Vancouver Island. I think everyone recognises that although we are

[[Page 141](#)]

doing our best to get them here, we should try to create a tourist climate where we encourage people and make it attractive for them to leave their cars at home. They've done it in Hawaii, they've done it in Bermuda and they're doing it in many places of the world. I say this — put a bicycle path from Victoria, right up to Campbell River — and this is nothing fancy-dancy, because they've been doing in Europe for hundreds of years, in Amsterdam and many other countries over there.

Let's put this bicycle path right up and we'll attract thousands of bicycle enthusiasts from all over North America. Bermuda has made money out of it and we can do the same. And bicycle paths are not very expensive.

One other little item I want to talk about is the complaints I've had within my constituency about young people who go to university four years with intentions of becoming professional men, and I'm talking specifically now of the law.

I don't want to rouse you so late in the night, gentlemen, but last year there were 900 applicants for the faculty of law, and only 200 accepted. I feel this that it's very discouraging for our young people to go to university from four years and then find only one out of four can be accepted into the faculty.

The law profession, I believe, should take more responsibility for the training of these students and consider cutting down the time of university even by one year, and spend that time the old fashioned way, in an apprenticeship — and there's nothing wrong with that.

Some of the best supreme court judges you ever had never went to university.

This would lighten the load a little bit of the taxpayer and it would allow some of the back log of these young students who want to get through the faculties to get through.

Because there is that "baby bubble" now, it came from the last war, and these students are having just a little tougher time at this particular period than normal.

So I do say if the lawyers want to run their profession, I think they should start now considering taking a little more responsibility for the training of the people that will be in law tomorrow.

There's still lots of need for lawyers in the public sector. I've talked to some judges, and they have told me this.

Last but not least — it's a very short speech tonight because I said I'd do this in 12 1/2 minutes and I think I have — I'm going to put one more plea out for the old age pensioners society in Nanaimo and all through British Columbia. Municipal taxes are doubling every 10 years right across Canada, right across United States. In some cases the crunches come so hard that they're just lashed by inflation with their backs right to the wall. I'm not suggesting a moratorium for taxes for the old age pensioners, but I do think now for those that are really in financial distress that we should consider a supplemental home-owner allowance form. It's very simple and it could be done quite nicely.

Hon. Mrs. Jordan moves adjournment of the debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Bennett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 11:34 P.M.

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

Copyright © 1972, 2001, 2013: Hansard Services, Victoria, B.C., Canada