

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

---

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

---

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1973

Morning Sitting

[ [Page 2523](#) ]

**CONTENTS**

**Routine proceedings**

Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act (Bill No. 34). Second reading.

Mr. Williams — [2523](#)  
Mrs. Jordan — [2525](#)  
Hon. Mr. Cocke — [2528](#)  
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2529](#)  
Hon. Mr. Hartley — [2531](#)  
Mr. Phillips — [2532](#)  
Mr. McClelland — [2534](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [2535](#)

Division on second reading — [2537](#)

Debt Collection Act (Bill No. 48). Second reading.

Mr. Smith — [2538](#)

Division on adjournment of the House — [2539](#)

Mr. Gardom — [2539](#)  
Mrs. Jordan — [2540](#)

Division on adjournment of the debate — [2541](#)

Mr. Williams — [2541](#)  
Mr. Rolston — [2542](#)  
Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [2542](#)

---

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 11, 1973

The House met at 10 a.m.

**Prayers.**

**Introduction of bills.**

**Orders of the day.**

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** I move the House proceed to public bills and orders.

Motion approved.

34. **HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move we proceed to adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No.

INSURANCE CORPORATION OF  
BRITISH COLUMBIA ACT

(continued)

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound adjourned the debate.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I won't be very many moments. We are opposed to this bill in principle because it is a necessary handmaiden of the automobile insurance bill which we have already opposed. When the Minister introduced this legislation he said it was part of the necessary machinery accompanying the *Automobile Insurance Act*. If it is machinery, then may I suggest, Mr. Speaker, to the Minister that it is a "Rube Goldberg" kind of machinery which is largely designed to operate for the sole purpose of making sure that all of its separate parts keep moving without any real production taking place — a lot of activity, a lot of commotion, a lot of noise but not very much in the way of results. It is probably significant that the Hon. Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) who introduced this bill last night should also be involved in the current controversy about the doughnut.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Hear, hear!

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Quite obviously this Minister is bent headlong on taking the people of British Columbia into the hole.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Well, Mr. Speaker, did you ever see a doughnut that didn't have a hole as a necessary part?

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways):** Many have jam in the middle.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Oh, but those aren't doughnuts, Mr. Speaker — those are bismarcks. (Laughter).

**AN HON. MEMBER:** He's a Bismarck.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** That's right. But speaking about jam in the middle, Mr. Speaker, brings me directly to one of the matters that concerns me about this particular bill. It is the provision that this insurance corporation is to be managed and directed by a Minister of the cabinet, who is to be selected by the cabinet, and by not less than two or more than four other persons who will be its directors. It is significant, Mr. Speaker, that there is one provision which indicates clearly that the receipt of funds, moneys, pay, allowances under this bill by any Member of the Legislative Assembly is not deemed to be in breach of the *Constitution Act*.

That simply means, Mr. Speaker, that any of the backbenchers who don't get selected into the cabinet in the next few days will have four more spots open for them — you can console yourselves with being directors of the insurance corporation.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** There's only four of them in the room. Every one of them could get a job.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** That's right. How many are there here? Well, there's seven backbenchers here, so if four of you don't get in the cabinet in the next few days then there is still hope for you in the insurance corporation.

The Minister when he opened the debate spoke about the size this insurance corporation would become. It would be the largest insurance company in British Columbia, if not one of the largest in the country itself. I wonder who is going to operate this multi-million dollar corporation. Which one of the cabinet members has got the experience and the time to take on the task of controlling the destinies of this corporation?

I know all the cabinet Ministers are all very hard working men and women — woman, that is. There is only one woman in the cabinet, Mr. Speaker.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** So far.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** However, we may hope to correct that and improve the cabinet thereby, I'm surd.

How many of those cabinet Ministers have got the time to devote to the task of controlling this large corporation? There is a weakness — one of the weaknesses — in the bill which we have before us now. The Minister is turning quickly to read the bill

[ [Page 2524](#) ]

so that he may perhaps be able to....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Oh, I see. I was just hoping that you had read it before today, Mr. Minister.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, one of the aspects of this legislation which causes me the greatest concern is the heavy-handed and autocratic manner in which the corporation is to be allowed to function in the Province of British Columbia. During the debates which raged earlier in this session...No, they didn't rage. During debates that we had earlier in this session about automobile insurance, the Minister and Members of the government party spoke about those big powerful insurance companies and All the terrible things that they were doing to the people of British Columbia.

Yet, when we look at the bill before us, we find that this government, in order to establish this corporation, is granting powers to this corporation such as no insurance company ever had or ever expected to have — unique powers such as the power to expropriate.

Why do we have to create another Crown agency with the power to expropriate those properties which it may need to acquire in the conduct of its business? Why do we have to have this extreme power in the hands of this corporation? Is there some feeling on the part of the government that the Minister who will have charge of this corporation and his directors won't be able to negotiate fairly and properly for the acquisition of those properties which they must have in order to carry on business? Are they going to have to expropriate?

They don't have to worry about expropriating insurance companies — they are in the position to put them out of business anyway. An expropriation would involve some form of compensation to anyone who is put out of business by this legislation. You don't have to spell out an expropriating power — you have already confiscated those in the automobile insurance business, whether they be companies or agents or adjusters or whatever the case may be.

It is an excess of power which the government is granting to this fledgling corporation which is supposed to replace those all-powerful insurance companies who theretofore have been carrying on business in the Province of British Columbia.

It's typical legislation of this government. It always amuses me that they have so many good ideas, they say; yet when they bring them into practice, they don't use the carrot in order to ensure their success but the club and the

whip.

Speaking about clubs and whips, what is going to make this insurance corporation so big when it gets into the field of fire and general casualty and other classes of insurance? It is the ability to require all government agencies, all organizations which are in receipt of grants from government to insure through this corporation. That means the school boards, the school districts, the municipalities, the hospital districts, the regional districts....

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Homeowners' grants.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Homeowners' grants? Say, I never thought about that. Would it be possible, Mr. Speaker, that if a person applies for a homeowner's grant — home acquisition grant — in this province in order to acquire their residential property that this government might say, "Well, of course we'll give you an acquisition grant; however you must insure through the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, the Minister had never thought of this before, and it had never occurred to the government, I'm sure. But this is the kind of authority that they give themselves in this legislation. Here's another one that I'm sure the government had never thought of: when they go into the business of life insurance, through their close connection with the labour movement... a close connection in the sense that the labour movement is up here and the government is down here — that's the kind of connection. Anyway, through that close connection, it just may be that we will suddenly find in the course of labour negotiations in this province that unions will be insisting that the pension plans, the group life plans, be written through the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. Wouldn't that be a convenient idea.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** This is the way that this kind of control is given to this corporation in this legislation.

Last of all, Mr. Speaker, that aspect of this bill which is part of its principle and which gives me the greatest concern is the matter of the funding of this corporation. We were told by the Minister that automobile insurance, when it was operated as a plan in this province, would be operated at cost; that premiums paid by automobile owners and the drivers in this province would meet the cost of administration, cost of losses — I trust it will also cover necessary reserves that must be established in order that the plan may function — but it would flat out on that basis and there wouldn't be any claim on government revenues, on consolidated revenue.

Yet when you look at this bill, you find that this corporation is given a pipeline right into the Treasury of the province. Any money that it may require can

[ [Page 2525](#) ]

come directly from consolidated revenue at the decision of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council. It's not necessary to come to this Assembly to have any of its funds approved; it gets them from the Treasury by request to the cabinet. If it is to be encouraged to go out on the market and borrow moneys for any of its purposes, it is afforded the full guarantee of the Province of British Columbia in support of any security that may be issued.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Permissive? No one would expect in the legislation that they would force you to do this. Of course it's permissive. It's permissive because you may never have to go out into the open market and borrow your moneys; you've got the pipeline right into the Treasury. Why would you ever have to go and borrow? But if, Mr. Speaker, borrowing is required, the government extends its full guarantee.

This is an opportunity given to this corporation which is not available to the municipalities in this province. If you want to build a water system or sewer system and you go out and issue municipal bonds, you can't get the

guarantee of the province to support those bonds. But anything like the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, this new creation that we have of the government, is going to be given the right to call upon the government, to stand behind its guarantees.

You know, Mr. Speaker, when the government embarked on automobile insurance it was clearly dealing with a limited aspect of insurance, solely within the province — one that they could control and, if properly administered, one which might prove to be a success.

Now that they're going into fire and general casualty, they are embarking upon a class of insurance which leads them into grave areas of difficulty and high potential loss. It's noteworthy that this corporation can engage in the business of insurance and reinsurance because what will happen, Mr. Speaker, is that this corporation will be obliged to reinsure.

We will find, once they get into these classes of insurance that they will still be thrust into the reinsurance market where they will be obliged to call upon the assistance of those major world insurance companies.

They'll end up in London, like all insurance companies do, seeking to spread the risk. They will be dealing with those same big, powerful insurance companies that they are putting out of business in the Province of British Columbia. Not my friends, Mr. Speaker, but companies which know the business they're carrying on and companies which are within the regulatory power of government.

You, Mr. Speaker, through you to the government, are avoiding your responsibility when you fail to control and regulate those companies. By embarking on this kind of a programme you are attempting to compete with those with whom you cannot compete but those with whom in the final analysis you must do business.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** No, I wasn't, Mr. Speaker. One day, Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) will have a sudden clear vision which will show him at last that, although the government may be in the business, it's costing the taxpayer in the Province of British Columbia to keep the government in that business in order to satisfy a philosophical aim which the Hon. Minister has so long held.

Mr. Speaker, the government shouldn't be in this field. It's not its business. There isn't anybody on the cabinet benches — well perhaps there's one on the cabinet benches — who could manage, control this kind of industry. I don't know who on the backbench would form the four commissioners or directors of this corporation.

It takes men of long experience and great skill to function in this field. The government may be able to buy them, but you shouldn't be in this business. You should be regulating the business. You should be taking the advice of such consultants as may be required to demonstrate to you the kind of regulatory powers that you should have and exercise.

You shouldn't be in and compete, because by competing you can only survive by taking the extreme power that you have taken under this legislation — by forcing either the insurance companies themselves out of business in the Province of British Columbia, or by forcing selective insureds to do business with your corporation.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking on the principle of this bill, *The Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act*, I have some difficulty, because as I read it through and look at its companion legislation I find it sadly lacking in principle. It's called companion legislation to another bill. I suggest that if this is the type of companionship we're going to have in British Columbia, then the average person in British Columbia doesn't need any enemies because they're going to find it in their companions.

The lack of principle that's in the other bill and is in this bill relates to the fact that this government continues to exercise its philosophical hang-ups with-

out any conscience as to how it's affecting the individual people in British Columbia. I speak in terms of the taxpayers who are going to have a white elephant around their necks and who have, as the previous speaker mentioned, the rare privilege of contributing their tax dollars to a philosophical corporation and to have the rare privilege of having their hard-worked-for tax dollars used as a means to dictate to them how they should buy insurance, who they should buy it from, and at what rate.

The Minister may say well, if we go into the fire and life and theft insurance it won't be on a monopoly basis. We will get again the same answer we're getting over and over again, "Trust us. We did it before but we won't do it again." Through you Mr. Speaker, I suggest to that Minister that the people of British Columbia have serious cause for concern and have much evidence to suggest that this government cannot be trusted in its business activities.

There are so many conflicts in this bill, one of which I would point out as the previous Member did. That is that there is room on this board for a politician, either from the cabinet benches or from the backbenches. One wonders, Mr. Speaker, if that politician in that appointment must comply with other bills before this House, ones specifically that would require that director to be responsible for loss of salary of that company.

We've heard from Members of this government suggesting that they must meld the civil service to their liking. This is a frightening statement for the people of British Columbia to contemplate. We see in their legislation and in this legislation their desire, without a mandate, to meld the practices of the people of British Columbia to this government's liking.

I happened to have the privilege of being at a life insurance underwriters' meeting a very short time ago. There are many young men and women in this business. They were devoting several days at their own cost and at their own initiative in examining how they might better offer the people of British Columbia a more efficient service, a more economical service, a broader service and the benefit of sound knowledge in how life insurance can be used to an income tax advantage and to protect their families.

Mr. Speaker, they were enjoying themselves and they were enjoying their work. I would suggest that 99 per cent of them, as in many other businesses, are as dedicated to their work as this cabinet likes to feel it is dedicated to its work. I looked at them and I felt very sorry for them, because they were blithely dedicating themselves into a position where the axe is bound to fall very shortly as a result of this Act.

Has the government talked to them, Mr. Speaker? Has the government made it clear to the life insurance industry — I don't mean the "big companies," as they always like to call them — but the average agents and salesmen and saleswomen in British Columbia that they're on the pecking order of this government and that they will be amongst the next?

Another matter of serious concern in this bill, Mr. Speaker, is the fact that this government has stated through its Minister, who is piloting the bill — if you can call it piloting; I hope I never fly with him — through this Legislature, that this is going to be one of the biggest insurance corporations in Canada.

Mr. Minister, I suggest to you through the Speaker that you have every intention of marrying this corporation with other provincial government corporations in other provinces such as Manitoba and Saskatchewan. I suggest, Mr. Minister, that you're setting up an area of conflict and this is in danger of being a sell-out of the tax dollars of the people of British Columbia.

The people of British Columbia contribute to the economic disparities that exist in Canada, including Saskatchewan and Manitoba, through their equalization payments through the avenue of the federal government. I suggest to you, Mr. Minister, that the taxpayers of British Columbia are not prepared to accept subsidization, should that be the case, from taxpayers of other provinces; nor are they prepared to have extra tax dollars of their own used to subsidize Crown corporations in other provinces of Canada. They are quite willing to do it through the equalization grant but not in excess of that Mr. Minister.

Manitoba is committed, through powers of their Legislature and through their own statements and the statements of Premier Schreyer, to invest their tax dollars in corporations both inside Manitoba and outside Manitoba. The reason for investing their tax dollars in corporations outside Manitoba, Mr. Speaker, is in order to have those corporations headquarter in Manitoba.

We see the writing on the wall, Mr. Speaker, that British Columbia tax dollars will be used in monopoly insurance situations, and are quite likely to be used to subsidize insurance in sister provinces of the philosophy of this government. And there will be a hassle, if not a loss to British Columbia of the headquarters of that company.

Mr. Speaker, I caution the Minister through you that there is no way that the people of British Columbia will stand for a Crown corporation financed by their tax dollars on a monopoly basis with other provinces and headquartered in other provinces.

This legislation, like so much of the other legislation that this government brings in, is full of loopholes and unstated statements. As they call "Trust us," we look at it as being a bill with little evidence of principle.

The Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. Williams) pointed out quite rightly the

[ [Page 2527](#) ]

length of the tentacles of this legislation — it's like an octopus. It has the potential of reaching into every home in British Columbia on a compulsory basis. He's quite right when he says he sees in this legislation the "avenue whereby the government can tell almost every homeowner" — well, every homeowner in British Columbia — "in which company they're going to take their fire and theft insurance and their life insurance."

Every volunteer agency in British Columbia who receives any form of government moneys — and nearly every one does — will be subject to this Act and be subject to taking their insurance at the price set by the government on the basis that the government says — no quarterly payments; yearly payments as in the automobile insurance. Compulsion, Mr. Speaker.

This isn't a takeover bill of the insurance industry, Mr. Speaker. It's the old NDP squeeze play — get the control of the people, get the money of the Treasury which this bill has through the Minister of Finance and the *Revenue Act* of British Columbia which is before this House, and you don't have to worry about the little agents and the other insurance companies. You just squeeze them out of business in the glorious socialist fashion.

We don't see in here, Mr. Minister — unless I've misread the bill and I would certainly stand to be corrected if I have — any reassurance to the small insurance agent — life insurance, fire, theft insurance agent in British Columbia — that this Minister is not going to exercise the same unconscionable acts that he did in the automobile insurance. There's no clause in here to say that agents can't be fired without cause and without notice. This is a very legitimate question under the principle of this Act, Mr. Speaker, because this very Minister has legislation before this House that allows this government to fire a little insurance agent without cause and without notice.

Interjection by an Hon. Member,

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, Mr. Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), welcome back to work. It's nice to see you looking so well. But I would have thought a man of your integrity and imagination and verve for the future in life would not rely on the past so much but would come up with some new and innovative and equity-type programme. He was an insurance agent himself, Mr. Speaker. I wonder if he was fired without cause and without notice; and if he had been, what he would have said.

This is a government, Mr. Speaker, that says it's for the little people. But every piece of legislation that comes in kills the little people. Even the poor little doughnut vendor — the only holes around this place are not in the doughnuts, Mr. Speaker — they're in the heads of the people of this government that draft this type of legislation. They should be sent rolling down the decks of the B.C. ferries right into the Gulf of Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, there's nothing in this bill to protect the current life insurance agents and those people that I saw working so diligently the other day from losing their lifetime investment. Most of these, as I mentioned, were young people. They're building up offices and equipment — and what's more important, they're putting their life into this. What's to happen to them.?

Mr. Speaker, there is ample evidence here to suggest this is another bill of this socialist government without conscience. We can't support unconscionable legislation.

You don't have to go into the insurance business, Mr. Speaker. If they're concerned, they have every avenue — there are two insurance men in their cabinet. Let them come up with proper types of regulations to see that the current insurance business is responsible and equitable.

The Minister keeps saying, "When we borrow money for this we won't have to use tax money because we'll borrow on the open market with a provincial guarantee." I think to date they are going to use the provincial guarantee for something like 12 multi-million dollar borrowing projects, in fact into the billions of dollars.

This points out again the lack of business acumen of this government. The provincial guarantee, which has one of the highest if not the highest rating in the financial world, was created not by hare-brained schemes, but by sound planning, sound financial management....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, why don't you go and be governor of Alabama if you like that state so much. I've been there. I don't think it's so great.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Speaker, the statements by the Premier and Minister of Finance of this province, the actions by the Ministers like the Minister of Highways, have caused the financial institutions in the world to look at British Columbia with considerable concern and grave doubt as an area in which to invest. I don't blame them because many people in British Columbia are concerned about their own individual British Columbian investment. And there is cause for concern.

Mr. Speaker, that guarantee which brings a very favourable interest rate to the municipalities of British Columbia and to British Columbia itself — to any other area of borrowing that has the provincial guarantee — will be in serious jeopardy if it is

[ [Page 2528](#) ]

expanded too far and if this government continues its actions which are shaking the confidence of the business world not only in British Columbia, but in other parts of the world where we must at times draw our resources.

If the Minister is going to Manitoba to talk to the Manitoba government about this megalopolis Crown corporation — Crown subsidization of insurance — I suggest that he detour back east and take a business course while he's on the way.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** When? Who said that? When am I going to go?

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Speaker....

**HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works):** Can you tell us the answers?

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, well, well — the little Minister of Public Works has come awake.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.



**MRS. JORDAN:** Yes. Fixing the light is about his speed. If he'd only see the light, the people of British Columbia wouldn't have so much concern because certainly the statements made by that Minister in this House have left British Columbians quaking in their boots as to what influence he has in this cabinet.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Speaker, I mentioned before, there is really no concrete evidence in this legislation as to what the government is going to do, only the suggestion — as with their other legislation. There's no protection in this legislation for the individuals who are going to be hurt by its enactment.

I suggest that some of the statements here, combined with other statements made by this government, do put a stress on the provincial borrowing credibility. I suggest that there is the avenue of subsidization of other provincial insurance programmes by the taxpayers of British Columbia. I suggest that there are going to be problems when it comes to headquartering this major monolithic company this Minister is bent on creating; not creating it for sound reasons, but because he's always had his hankering for power. Now he is in a position where he thinks he can grasp it, and in grasping for this power he is snatching away the democratic rights of the people of British Columbia.

For this reason, Mr. Speaker, we cannot support this legislation. I suggest that in time it's going to be a white elephant around the necks of this government and the people of British Columbia. A white elephant is bad enough, but when it's a gargantuan white elephant involved in subsidizing other province's....

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It's not a white elephant.

**MRS. JORDAN:** You're right, Mr. Member. It's not a white elephant; it's a red elephant, and the people of British Columbia don't believe in red elephants, and Mr. Member ...

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** You've been seeing pink elephants. (Laughter).

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, I would suggest after sitting in this Legislature for the past few weeks that seeing is believing, but feeling — feeling the pinch and the force of this legislation and the hunger for power of this government, that feeling is the naked truth, Mr. Minister, and we're not going to support that feeling.

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

**HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance):** I haven't very much to say on this bill because I am sure the Minister who introduced the bill will be able to handle it very nicely.

However, the Hon. Member alluded to some of the cabinet's past in her dissertation, and I would just like to bring her up to date on my past, Mr. Speaker, with respect to this bill.

I was 18 years in the life insurance business. Eight of those were as a manager of one of the major life insurance companies in Canada; I had the third-largest branch in that \$2 billion operation, so I think I have some sort of background in the insurance business.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Not as much as the Member for North Okanagan.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Not quite as much, possibly. But, I think I have a little bit of background in the insurance business.

So, Mr. Speaker, I have a great connection in that business as well at the present time, and I've been around; I've listened to what they have to say. There's no great threat hanging over the life insurance agents in the Province of British Columbia and the Hon. Members across the way know that.

They know also that this is the enabling legislation which will permit us to go into what the people demanded — a car insurance programme. This is the enabling legislation, Mr. Speaker.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Mr. Speaker, in 18 years in the business I have known a great number of people

[ [Page 2529](#) ]

seeking charters to go into the insurance business. And what kind of a charter do they seek, Mr. Speaker? Do they seek a restrictive charter that will restrict them to one line of insurance only? Of course they don't. They ask for a charter that will permit them to get into the insurance business, period.

Not being able to forecast the future, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing monopolistic about this. The fact of the matter is that it gives us an opportunity to respond to the needs of the province.

We've already heard from school boards, hospital boards and a number of other public institutions who say, "At least get in there so that we can have a look at what your programme might be like and so that you can bid on the business."

That's not to say that we're committed to that course. But the fact of the matter is that it should be available in law.

Mr. Speaker, I think that this bill speaks for itself. It's an answer to a public demand for universal car insurance in the Province of B.C. And this group over there indicates that they represent the little people in the province; the little people have spoken, Mr. Speaker. They know who represents them and that's this party that is now the Government of British Columbia.

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

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The intervention of the Minister is very interesting. He talks about automobile insurance and says that this was only necessary for automobile insurance. Well, of course that isn't so at all.

And the second point he made was that hospitals and school boards requested that a government scheme be set up so that they can see what the government has to offer. In other words, what they are saying is allow competition so that they can compare your scheme against any other schemes. And that's precisely what the Minister said.

And yet we get monopoly schemes on automobile insurance; we get monopoly attitudes on the part of the government. Yet he justifies it on the grounds that the school boards and the hospitals have asked for more competition. That's an absurd attempt to confuse people in this area.

If it's true, Mr. Minister of Highways, why are you setting up a compulsory monopoly scheme in the automobile industry? Why are you doing that? Have you answered that question yet? You have waffled around it as much as you can and now your own colleague has shown that there really is no truth that can be placed on either statement because perhaps you are not sure what you are doing, or perhaps you are simply not telling us what your intentions are.

The worst feature about this bill, Mr. Speaker, and it comes up in other legislation, is this desire of the government to get into fields which have traditionally not been areas where governments have succeeded. We've seen this automobile insurance legislation and we can accept that. We would have accepted that, provided there had been compensation, and in particular, provided that competition were allowed.

If the government's schemes are so great; if the government really believes they are so good, we really don't see why they have to set up monopoly schemes. This government setting up monopoly schemes is an admission in advance that they don't think they can meet the competition and therefore they are going to wipe it out. Furthermore, they are going to wipe it out by confiscation and without compensation.

Sure, there have been minor changes made about agents transferring licences, but I don't think that really has done much to deal with the major points of compensation.

The Minister of Health states that this bill stands by itself. Well, it doesn't. It's part of a series of bills we've had to deal with in this House. This one we started dealing with after, I believe, 11 1/2 hours of debate yesterday — sorry, 10 1/2 hours of debate. Twelve and half hours after we started discussions in the morning, we started considering this, and yet this is, I think, a particularly important bill which the Premier intends to force through by his programme of having us stand and speak here hour after hour for well over half the day, day after day.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** That's what you were elected for.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** I was elected....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Why don't you go back and check with some of those labour unions....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, he's like those nineteenth century mill owners who said, "That's what you've got a job for. You should work 13 hours a day."

In case the Premier is worried about why we want the extra time, I was speaking to my colleague from Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) last night. He was going home to read bills. I wasn't, I might add. I went home to sleep. I tried to do some reading of bills this morning. We have other things to do. There happens to be a committee meeting that I'm meant to be on at this time. There happens to be correspondence from constituents.

You say that we're elected to work in this way. Perhaps we are. But I don't see why we should have

[ [Page 2530](#) ]

important legislation handled as carelessly as the Premier would like us to do it.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** It's been on the order paper for weeks.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** And you've been running this House badly for weeks, Mr. Premier.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Would the Hon. Member proceed with the principle of the bill.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, perhaps if you would rule the Premier out of order when he interrupted me on this subject....

**MR. SPEAKER:** I called for order but you kept on in the same vein instead of getting back to the bill.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** I don't actually recollect order being called at the Premier's intervention in this debate, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Indeed it was.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** I'll accept your word that it was called when he was speaking.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I kept banging the gavel but to no avail.

**MR. D. A. ANDERSON:** In any event, back to the bills themselves, Mr. Speaker. We have this entry into the private field where traditionally and historically governments have not succeeded. We have plenty of examples in western provinces of this same failure on a year to year basis going right back to the NDP government in

Saskatchewan in the 1930's. We have this failure and yet we're going into more and more and more.

And we're going about them all in much the same way. The mining industry, for example — entry into that by way of legislation which allows entry by the government into any business without compensation simply by use of the production lease and the powers to regulate that we passed in principle last night, unfortunately.

We have entry into the forest industry, again a resource industry. Columbia Cellulose, Ocean Falls — the same type of thing. Entry into areas where traditionally governments have not had a great deal of success.

We've had the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement (Hon. Mr. Levi) talking about entry into the food distribution system in the province — the co-ops that he wants to sponsor to take over from the normal supermarkets and chain stores. Well, that's fair too I guess. But we'd like to see....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Taking over by way of special tax concessions which is precisely what you're attempting to do in this area here with your own corporation on insurance. I'm sure it worries the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) to hear some criticisms of these things which they think they can sneak through in principle and get into practice without people really knowing. They know full well they are not elected and have no mandate from the public to go into general insurance. The mandate was for automobile insurance and not elsewhere.

This bill and the others like it that we've had recently indicate clearly to us the difference between the way this province is going and the way the parties on this side of the House — and this party in particular — would like to see it go. We want a strong private sector because we believe that only a strong private sector can provide the tax base necessary to provide social services. We don't think that entry into areas such as this, where you force out taxpaying private corporations as the government intends to do, as they are obviously doing in the mining industry and probably will be doing shortly in the forest industry, is the way of creating a tax base which can pay for the social services which the people of this province would like to have and, in fact, deserve.

We feel that legislation of this nature, which is confiscatory, which takes away without compensation, the rights of existing businesses and businessmen and workers in the province is simply the worst possible way to set up a system which can be considered fair by the people of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, we reject this bill and the companion bills that go with it. We think that if the government was sincere in attempting to get automobile insurance, if they were sincerely trying to get a good deal for the people, they would allow the competition which they won't be allowing and they would not allow the benefits that this bill gives the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

There's just one point that shows the favouritism that the government corporation will be given which has not been mentioned by my two colleagues from Point Grey and West Vancouver. In this Act we're setting up a corporation which is going to be exempt from the *Companies Act*. Sure, the Attorney General is going to bring in amendments to the *Companies Act*. Sure, we're going to have a much better *Companies Act*. But this corporation is exempt from it and it says so in section 31.

That's the type of legislation we're bringing in — legislation which deliberately favours the state corporation over any private corporation, legislation which deliberately allows the state corporation to get in,

[ [Page 2531](#) ]

take over the business by way of expropriation or otherwise of people who are currently paying their taxes, acting responsibly and acting under the overall regulation of government. There's a difference between the government regulating, making sure that industry operates effectively for the public good, and governments getting involved.

The way that this corporation is being set up, excluding the government corporation from the government's own regulations which exist on other companies, indicates to me that we're into an area of favouritism, an area of the

government taking advantage of the private sector by way of legislation that will be most damaging to the ability of the private sector to pay the taxes that we need.

It's part of the whole trend which started off with the favouritism shown in contracts for buses in Manitoba. There the corporation wasn't even in the province and yet favouritism was shown. Now we're setting up the corporations within the province. If private industry, the NDP backbench or anybody else thinks it's going to be fair and honest and open, they'd better start looking at what's happened, even up to now, in dealing with corporations outside the province. This government has already shown itself to be quite willing to play favourites and use patronage in the case of these buses and, of course, in the case of the bill we passed a short time ago, allegedly called *Fair Employment Practices Act*.

We just cannot have a situation where the government which is meant to represent all the people, which is meant to regulate on behalf of all the people, starts playing favourites and showing favouritism to corporations be they private or public against the public interest. That's what we're facing at this moment. That's what we're facing with this insurance bill. That's what we faced with the Minister of Municipal Affairs' (Hon. Mr. Lorimer's) non-tender purchase of buses over the price at which he could receive them elsewhere.

We feel that that is a pretty poor trend, a pretty poor start for a new government.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Mr. Speaker, I thought the remarks made by the previous speaker, the Second Member for Victoria, really indicated his lack of experience, certainly in the political insurance field (Laughter).

That sure woke them up anyway, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the comments of the previous speaker indicated the Second Member for Victoria's complete inexperience in the provincial political and the provincial insurance fields both. His arguments can all be put to sleep very, very easily if he even knew the political history of his own colleagues in the House and the political history of that once-elected Liberal Party in Saskatchewan.

Of course, the Liberal Party doesn't really take its promises seriously. When they ran and were elected in 1964, they said, "Elect us and we will do away with SGIO" — the Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office. Did they do away with that? No, they didn't keep their promise. When they looked into it, they found that the Saskatchewan government insurance had not only developed the best car insurance in the world but by going into competition in the fire and casualty field, it made it possible for the first time in the history of that province — some 27 years ago — for farmers to insure their farm buildings. It lowered the rate of fire insurance on all farm buildings in that province.

The Liberal Party, under the late Ross Thatcher, knew very well that they would have been defeated much, much more quickly had they tampered with that legislation. So the arguments from that corner of the House are very, very empty. If they knew the history of their own party and what they tried to do, what they promised to do and what they failed to do, they'd just hang their heads. They'd say nothing on this issue.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** I would like to ask leave, Mr. Speaker, just to reply to that comment.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Mr. Speaker, the Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot), the ex-Minister of Labour, for some reason is up to some very nasty political mischief. (Laughter).

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** He waved an advertisement here in the House that was four years old. Well, we've looked into this....

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. Would the Hon. Member please be seated?

Although on other occasions in the House the Hon. Member for Columbia River has made certain reflections and innuendoes, he has not on this

[ [Page 2532](#) ]

occasion made one that justifies you interrupting this debate on a question of privilege. Would you kindly therefore confine your remarks to the bill before us?

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey):** Oh, they both told you not to say anything, didn't they? (Laughter.)

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Yes. I'll just say, Mr. Second Member for Point Grey, that at least I'm up-to-date.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order. When a matter of privilege comes up it must be taken up immediately. But there's no question of privilege and I ask the Member to resume the debate. Now, if in any way that is not correct, would the Hon. Member point out where I am wrong?

Thank you. Would you proceed then without further comments?

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, for the past almost three years we've had compulsory insurance in this province, in that if a person didn't have insurance, didn't have the dollars to pay the fine, he went to jail.

Did any of those great defenders of the little people ever speak up against that? Not one of them.

**MR. GARDOM:** I did.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** You didn't vote against the amendment in 1969 to the *Insurance Act*, my friend.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Yes, you were given wide scope and I'm merely replying to some of your comments.

When we saw the removal of traffic violations from the courts of this province...At one time if you had a traffic violation you went to court and you paid a fine, but two-and-a-half or three years ago the insurance companies were allowed to collect those fines to fatten their coffers. Did any one of those Members across there speak out for the little person who was forced to pay fantastically high insurance rates, merely because he went through a stop sign, or had a traffic violation?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Will the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) resume his own seat? (Laughter).

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Now, Mr. Speaker, when that change was made it opened an entirely new area of income for the fire and casualty insurance companies. Yet there was no justice. Those people allowed the courts of this province to jack up the rates of car insurance for everyone having a traffic violation. Instead of paying those dollars into the court coffers of this province they were paid into the coffers of the insurance industry.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. HARTLEY:** Did they oppose that? They did not. We stood alone and opposed that amendment, Mr. Speaker.

So, Mr. Speaker, the people who have been speaking this morning not only failed to stand up and speak out to see that justice was done for the people, but allowed the insurance companies to start collecting the fines for traffic violations that should have been paid properly into the coffers of this province.

Now for the first time the people of British Columbia are going to be able to buy their insurance at cost. The people are going to be able to deal with an insurance company that's wholly owned within this province. The people are going to be able to see the reserve dollars — the dollars that will have to be set up on an actuarial basis — invested in British Columbia.

One of the reasons that B.C. is owned by so many corporations whose head offices are outside British Columbia is that the citizens of B.C. over the years have bought considerable amounts of insurance. But they have bought that insurance from foreign-owned corporations. Those foreign-owned corporations have used the reserve dollars that were set up to protect the insurance of B.C. citizens to buy B.C. Our own dollars were used to buy and develop the resources of this province, yet we did not own those industries. We did not control the development of those resources.

So to this end, Mr. Speaker, this will be one of the first great steps wherein British Columbia will start to repatriate its own economy. Through this development of giving the people of B.C. the opportunity to deal with a wholly-owned B.C. insurance industry, we are starting to repatriate our economy. This is a very, very important step.

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

**MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the previous speaker was trying to impress us with his knowledge of the insurance industry so he could be appointed to this board, why,

[ [Page 2533](#) ]

I don't know whether he impressed the Premier or not.

Mr. Speaker, I must say that I am most disappointed in Bill 34 — the *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act*.

When I started studying the Act and thinking of its implications, I had to think to myself that perhaps the government had been scared someday in its early childhood by a bogeyman called "competition." It affected the government so badly, Mr. Speaker, that now they have to run around corners to avoid seeing this fellow.

That's exactly what they are doing with Bill 34, Mr. Speaker. They are running up blind alleys to get out of this man's way, and in their rush to avoid recognizing some of the good features of this man called "competition" — this bogeyman, as they call him — they are trampling headlong over the rights of innocent people.

This is exactly what is happening in this bill. They are knocking them to the ground. In many cases, where

there are established insurance agents and established people working for insurance companies, they are tearing their hearts out, smashing their rights, and yet they try and justify it by saying it's for the little man.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that the government's insensitive approach comes from their early teaching that this creature comes from a jungle. Competition is not necessarily a jungle. There are many hard working individuals, conscientious, honest individuals working in the insurance business today. And it's not a jungle.

No one, with maybe the exception of one cabinet Minister, has enough business insurance, Mr. Speaker, to even run an insurance agency, let alone a multimillion dollar corporation. And that cabinet Minister's experience, Mr. Speaker, as he just pointed out to us, is in the life insurance field. Is this where Bill 34 is taking us — into the life insurance field?

We've heard a lot of prattling and twaddling from the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) about how good this bill is going to be, and I can only think, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways has his eventual aim as being general manager of this large corporation that he's creating when he retires from politics.

By Bill 34, Mr. Speaker, the government has taken a gluttonous approach to the insurance business in the province, and no one knows where it's going to end. Their greed has made them insensitive to the well-being of thousands of honest, conscientious people employed in the industry today.

The only justification, Mr. Speaker, that the Minister of Highways could have had when he introduced Bill 34 is that he had been asked by certain, school boards to go into the insurance field because they said they were being taken by the present people they bought their insurance from.

I wonder how much trouble these same school boards took to find out and to get competitive bids. Because after Bill 34 is introduced, Mr. Speaker, they will have no place to get a competitive bid. This bill makes it compulsory that they buy their insurance from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

The Government of Saskatchewan introduced similar legislation in 1944. They set the rates and no organization in Saskatchewan that received any help from the government had the opportunity to get a competitive bid. That was the diet in Saskatchewan for 20 years.

Then in 1965, as the previous speaker was mentioning, when the Liberal government of the late Ross Thatcher came to power, over many screams from the competition they took out of the Act the clause that would permit these institutions to get a competitive bid. They took off the blinders and they let the sunshine in. If you want to go back and check you'll find, Mr. Speaker, that many, many of these institutions found that for the last 20 years they had been swindled by the Saskatchewan government insurance. That's a fact. Some of the savings were as high as up to 50 per cent. That's what happened in Saskatchewan.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman who introduced this legislation knows that. But to get this insurance company off the ground he's got to make it compulsory. If you take all of the organizations and clubs and groups in British Columbia that receive grants from this government — many of them through the perpetual funds — that's going to include a lot of insurance. I hope, Mr. Speaker, that the people of British Columbia don't have to be fleeced by this insurance company the same as the people of Saskatchewan were fleeced. And they were fleeced in the general insurance business, they were fleeced.

In Saskatchewan they didn't have any perpetual funds. This has been mentioned before — the ultimate aim of this insurance, Mr. Speaker, is to see that every person who gets a homeowner's grant will have to buy their insurance from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. This is another case, Mr. Speaker, of a government institution having unlimited power.

Last night, Mr. Speaker, the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) said the government already has unlimited power. This is the philosophy of communism — the government only has power



when it's given to them in bills like this. This Bill 34, like many other bills that have been passed through the Legislature this year, does give the government unlimited power.

No one in British Columbia is safe, Mr. Speaker, from the power that this government has taken unto

[ [Page 2534](#) ]

itself during this session of the Legislature. It's unbelievable when you think of all the bills that have been passed; and here's another one — unlimited power: the power to confiscate, to commandeer, and all of it without proper compensation.

We will never know, Mr. Speaker, whether or not the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia makes money or loses money. Other government services will be used and after this insurance company has been in business for a couple of years it will take a team of skilled accountants to figure out all of the input that went from other government services.

Will the MLAs that are going to be appointed as directors have any experience in the insurance field? Or will they, like the cabinet Ministers, be able to hire executive assistants? The power is given to them in this bill. It's very clearly spelled out that the directors may hire such people as they see fit — an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to hire more party hackmen, more party supporters, and to create a bungling bureaucracy that will take years to unwind.

Mr. Speaker, this is just the beginning. We now allow competition in certain other fields under this bill. But I will guarantee you that as soon as this insurance corporation is in effect for a couple of years, all competition in all fields of insurance in British Columbia will be eliminated. That's where we're heading in this insurance bill. This is just the very beginning.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** "That's the purpose of the bill," is right. This Insurance Corporation of British Columbia is going to put an umbrella and cover every phase of insurance in British Columbia. After all the talk and the rot and piffle that was used by the government. They used to peddle it to us about open government, sending problems to committees. They bring in this bill and it's never been near a committee.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** There has been a royal commission and three years of committees when you weren't here.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** This legislation that is before me today has never been near a committee of this House. Yet when you were in opposition, everything that came up you wanted to send to committee. But now you've changed your attitude. It's a bunch of rot, that's what it is. You're forcing this bill on this Legislature, ramming it down our throats. Your government is becoming decomposed, Mr. Speaker. The government is becoming every day more and more offensive to freedom-loving British Columbians, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. G.R. LEA (Prince Rupert):** Author!

**MR. PHILLIPS:** You're the author of that one, my friends. The way you're running this Legislature these days, you're the author of that one. You're forcing this Legislature to sit from 10 a.m. until 11 p.m. every night, sometimes without lunch. It's simply disgusting!

Mr. Speaker, this government is leading this province on a treacherous path that will lead to the complete deterioration of democracy in this province. Every bill we debate on the floor of this Legislature leads us further down that slippery path. I'm certainly not going to vote for it.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Langley.

**MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley):** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hadn't intended to speak in this debate but I just wanted to make a couple of points. One of them has to do with a comment the Premier made across the floor

last night when he indicated that a little competition is sometimes a good thing. Mr. Speaker, why don't we allow a little competition in the insurance field? What are we afraid of? The socialists seem to think that there is something supreme about monopoly, that it is some kind of magic way to save money. But you won't save money, Mr. Speaker; I think that in fact we're going to find out that with a monopoly we're going to end up paying a whole lot more for our insurance in this province than we might have.

The Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley), in defending this bill, Mr. Speaker, said that the Liberals in Saskatchewan didn't dare tamper with this bill when they took office. I don't very often like to find myself in the position of defending the Liberals, but that statement isn't entirely correct. Certainly when the Liberals took office in 1965 they tampered with that Saskatchewan Government Insurance Office to a very large degree. In fact, they removed the monopolistic features of it and opened it up to competition again.

Mr. Speaker, that's one of the things we're asking for in this corporation that we're setting up in British Columbia — open it up to competition.

When the socialist again took office in Saskatchewan did they then turn it back into a monopolistic corporation? No, they didn't, because they didn't dare tamper with that portion of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

The other thing that bothers me is the short shrift we're giving to the agents in British Columbia. We might as well accept the fact that this corporation, when it's fully effective, will effectively do away with the private insurance agents in British Columbia. That bothers me.

I want to read just one letter, Mr. Speaker, which tells the story far better than I could. It was

[ [Page 2535](#) ]

addressed to Mr. Strachan, Department of Highways, Parliament Buildings, Victoria. The letter says:

"This is my first letter to a politician. I am the wife of a real estate and insurance agent. Briefly..."

She also says she's a Liberal voter but she hopes the highways Minister will read on in spite of that. It says:

"Briefly, do you realize the hardships you are inflicting on families and insurance agents throughout the province by confiscating private business without any compensation? There are three main points involved:

"(1) Loss of income in 1973. Because auto insurance premiums now can only be written for less than a year, premium income is decreasing on a graduating scale as each month goes by. Our small business will lose thousands of dollars in 1973 before government insurance goes into effect.

"(2) Lower commission rates. Starting in March, 1974, I understand that your government will not allow agents as high a commission rate on auto insurance.

"(3) Retirement or pension income. As you know, a small business owner has to provide his own retirement fund and much of this money has to come from the sale of his business at retirement age. This new legislation has drastically cut the sale value of the insurance half of our business.

"In spite of all the above losses, the costs of doing business — rent, staff salaries, heat, hydro, office supplies, telephone et cetera — will continue to be just as high or possibly higher as inflation continues.

"Mr. Strachan, my husband and his partner have worked very hard all their lives to build up a business, support their families and be worthy members of this community. They are both slightly over 50 years of age and were reaching the point of looking forward in a few years to selling a successful business and enjoying retirement. I wish you could see the utter discouragement and heartbreak you have caused to these two men whom I know so well, and to the many, many others in B.C. whom I do not know, by destroying a lifetime's work with this harsh legislation.

"I never believed I would see the day when a provincial government in our Canadian democracy could expropriate a family's business without access to court action. I know you are a supporter of the unions, Mr. Strachan, but I believe you would not have dared to cut a union member's or a teacher's salary and to take away a large part of his pension fund arbitrarily without

compensation How can you justify doing this to families who have worked so long and so hard and risked their own capital to be independent?

"I hope that you will have the time to give me the courtesy of a reply, especially as I heard on a news broadcast just now that you are considering amendments to the insurance legislation. "

Mr. Speaker, that says far better than any Member in this House could say what this Insurance Corporation of British Columbia will do to the small independent agents in British Columbia.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Hon. Minister closes the debate.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Speaker, I've listened with interest to the remarks that have been made from across the way regarding this particular piece of legislation, Bill 34. The remarks they've made about this legislation are similar to the remarks that have been made about other legislation, which indicate two things very clearly: either they haven't read the legislation or they don't want to understand the legislation.

For instance, they talk about this legislation affecting the individual and forcing an individual to buy insurance and so on and so on because he happens to get the homeowner grant. They know very well that the wording of this legislation limits it absolutely, completely, clearly to corporations, municipalities, associations, boards, commissions or societies. Where do you find an individual in that definition? Nowhere.

But they deliberately stand up and they moan and they wail and they cry and they groan and they talk about everything but the legislation. Thank heavens they're not introducing legislation in this House. If that's their attitude, if that's the meaning they put on those kind of words, then by God the people of this province were saved in time!

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the phrase "by God."

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** With God's help.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I would just ask him to withdraw it.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I find the use of this phrase by the Minister of Highways offensive.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** With God's help the people of this province were saved just in time.

Mr. Speaker, they talk about competition. They talk about the private companies. They seem to believe that private companies in this province have some special privilege that the people don't have. That in essence has been the gist of their argument — that the private companies have to be protected from something called the people and the rights of the

[ Page 2536 ]

people to go into business. That's all they've been I saying all during this debate.

Private companies have these rights and privileges. I They must be left undisturbed, completely alone, through all eternity — no matter what the experience may be, no matter what the pressures of society may be, no matter what the requirements of society may be.

They say we had no mandate to bring in this bill. What the previous administration had done was ignore a demand from a section of the community to produce such a bill. The school trustees, in examining the whole matter of insurance for the school buildings, made recommendations to the previous administration and they repeated their recommendations to this administration. The recommendation says, "the scheme be operated by a government department or Crown agency." That's exactly what we're doing.

Certainly the legislation allows the corporation to go into the other fields, as determined by the Executive Council. Some objection was taken to the fact that it allows us to order commissions or boards to take their insurance

from this corporation. In view of that kind of letter and in view of the fact that the public purse, for instance, pays 50 per cent of the capital cost of our hospitals, pays practically every penny of their operating costs, is there any reason why part of the charge on the public purse of this province should be a profit to a private corporation whose headquarters are in New York?

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes, but that's exactly what they've been proposing. They've been exposed clearly as defenders of major insurance corporations with interests, headquarters and controls outside the Province of British Columbia. That's what they're doing and that's what they have been doing all through this particular bill.

They point to a section which allows a Member of the Legislative Assembly to be appointed to the board. They point to the section which allows payments to be made to MLAs. Had they read the bill, they would have realized that the bill states very clearly that a Minister designated by order-in-council shall be the chairman of the board and a director. Unless that section was in there to allow that director to be paid any expenses incurred as a director, that MLA would forfeit his seat in the House.

That's why it had to be in there. The bill says that a Minister designated — and a Minister happens to be an MLA too — shall have the right to compensation for expenses incurred in the duties of serving this particular corporation. It's also in there to fulfil the pledge I made that no public money be used to operate this corporation. Why should the Minister involved, whoever he may be, in the service of this corporation expend moneys on his travel or whatever it might be and then charge it to the office of the ministry he holds? That's why that's in there.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** No salary.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** No salary, no salary but to be sure that every penny expended in the service of that corporation gets charged to that corporation and not to the public Treasury through the accounts of this province. That's why it had to be in there. But you sit there and bring out all the innuendoes, which indicates very clearly that you hadn't read the bill or you're misleading the people.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Pardon? I didn't explain it clearly? You know very well that's the situation in this province. You were in the cabinet. No, no way; it had to be written that way, no other way. The Member over here talked about reserves. He hadn't read the bill, because the bill makes it very clear that the reserves are in there, must be in there — 125 per cent. It's in the bill, and he says that he hopes there will be some proposal for reserves. It's right in the legislation. That's all we got from Member after Member — statements about things which indicated very, very clearly they hadn't read the legislation.

The Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) got involved in some procedure about somehow or other we are going to use tax dollars from B.C. through this bill to subsidize tax dollars somewhere else. What utter rot. What utter rot! This legislation makes it very clear — and had you read the legislation...well, you didn't understand it.

It says three things: the accounting of the automobile insurance section and the general insurance section shall be kept separate and clear; there shall be an annual report and a financial statement tabled in this house. And as I recollect the legislation, in here it states that the Department of Finance also has a role in the checking of the accounts.

This is a separate corporation to be set up in the Province of British Columbia with the authority of this House. Now what's the matter with that? What's the matter with that? Any insurance corporation can do that. Insure and reinsure — the Member over here said that. Every insurance corporation can reinsure; every insurance company reinsures. You just don't know anything about the insurance business.

However, Mr. Speaker, they talked about the questions raised about this; why didn't this go to committee? His own leader, the former Premier, the Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Bennett), when he was asked about that he

said he agreed it shouldn't go to committee. He agreed it shouldn't go to

[ [Page 2537](#) ]

committee. Don't you even listen to your own leader? It had a royal commission — \$344,000 — there was an election on the issue, and there it is. This is a vehicle that's required to implement the automobile insurance.

They talked about the agents, destroying the agents. Mr. Speaker, what they are trying to destroy is the rapport that I've built with the agents' representatives in the Province of British Columbia. I wish I had brought the letter with me which I received from the agents' representatives just the day before yesterday. And talk about reading letters...

**MR. PHILLIPS:** You're tired, you're tired.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** That's what you're trying to do — you don't want this to work. You're praying that this won't work; you'll do everything in your power to prevent it from working. That's it, you're right I'm getting agitated because I know that your allegiance is not to making this work; your allegiance is trying to make it not work. That's what you're trying to do.

**MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo):** Don't lose your temper now, don't lose your temper.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I'm not losing my temper. I'm just trying to impress you, because you seem to have been hard of hearing, hard of learning.

However, Mr. Speaker, I'm not making accusations against the corporations.

I just want to quote from the address delivered by Mr. Tright, the President of the Wawanesa Mutual Insurance Company on March 9 of this year at the annual meeting of the policyholders. If you read the superintendent of insurance report, they've been losing money.

The President says written premiums increased by \$2.5 million to \$54.5 million. There was a small underwriting loss of \$149,000. Now you may examine the books or the report of the superintendent of insurance. That's a comparatively small loss for an insurance company, but it's a loss.

It's on that basis that the insurance companies have been telling the people of this province that they've been losing money — on an underwriting loss. However, the president says, "After investment income and allowing for income taxes of \$1.6 million, the policyholders' surplus increased by \$2.4 million.

That's the kind of money that has not been involved in the past in the estimation of the rates being charged the automobile drivers in the Province of British Columbia. Under this legislation, under this corporation, that's the kind of money that will be included in this separate estimate of cost operation for the automobile insurance of this Province of British Columbia.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair]

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Speaker, many things have been said. I'm telling the Members of this House, and especially the Members across the way, that if you vote against this bill you're voting against automobile insurance in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I'm asking the Liberals, the Conservatives and the Social Credit Members of this House to put themselves on the record now. Will you campaign in the next election against automobile insurance? Will you promise the people that if you are elected in the next election you will repeal the automobile insurance legislation which this bill authorizes?

Mr. Speaker, this bill allows for competition. The insurance companies have said they want competition; we're going to give them competition.

Mr. Speaker, when I look out over the Province of British Columbia I think of the name of this corporation. The Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. I.C.B.C. When I look out over the great Province of British Columbia and I think of this legislation, I say to the people of this province, I see B.C. in good hands. (Laughter). I move second reading. Mr. Speaker.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 31

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Nunweiler	Nicolson
Brown	Radford	Sanford
D'Arcy	Cummings	Dent
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Hartley	Gabelmann
Lea	Young	Lockstead
Gorst	Rolston	Steves
Kelly	Webster	Lewis
Liden		

NAYS — 15

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder	Anderson, D.A.	Williams, L.A.
Gardom	Wallace	Curtis

[ [Page 2538](#) ]

PAIRED

McGeer	Barnes
Brousseau	Lauk

Bill No. 34 read a second time and referred to a committee of the whole House at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move we proceed to adjourned debate on second reading of Bill No. 48.

DEBT COLLECTION ACT

*(continued)*

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member for North Peace River adjourned the debate.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** On a point of order, Mr. Speaker. Would the Hon. Premier....

**MRS. JORDAN:** Before he goes.

**MR. SMITH:** I guess he has left for lunch. That obviously means the rest of us stay here and debate right through our lunch hour.

**MR. SPEAKER:** That is hardly a point of order.

**MR. SMITH:** It certainly is a point of order.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. SMITH:** Is the Attorney General prepared to accept an adjournment until after lunch?

**MR. SPEAKER:** No. Standing orders have not been changed on that subject as yet. Is the Hon. Member prepared to debate Bill No. 48?

**MR. SMITH:** Yes, I will continue, advisedly and under objection. I think we should be adjourning for a lunch break. We went through a number of days when we had no lunch break at all. We have debated bills on the floor of this House from 10 o'clock in the morning until 6 o'clock in the afternoon with a very short break for supper and then back at it again. If it is the decision of the government to steamroller the opposition and go on with these bills — sure, I'll debate the bill. Right now, I'll debate them.

The Premier can go out to lunch and so can the rest of the cabinet but the opposition will sit here and debate these bills when they come up and when you go.

**MR. PHILLIPS:** When Members have all gone for lunch.

**MRS. JORDAN:** What about the diabetics in the House. Don't you have any consideration at all?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Organized labour would never stand for that.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Yes. That's the threat. Organize, organize, organize or your rights are trampled.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. Would the Hon. Member now proceed with the bill.

**MR. SMITH:** Yes, Mr. Speaker, in speaking to Bill No. 48, the *Debt Collection Act*. It is a bill that in many respects has a remarkable resemblance to a bill that a former Attorney General had prepared a number of notes on for presentation to this session of the Legislature if that had worked out that way. So there is some similarity between this Act and a previous draft of an Act that was prepared to come into this House.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MRS. JORDAN:** There they go.

**MR. SMITH:** I think an Act of this nature, perhaps not in this exact form but of this nature, is one that we could well experiment with in the Province of British Columbia. It was the recommendation, yes, of the Law Reform Commission that such an Act be passed in the Province of British Columbia.

I think, Mr. Speaker, that really the Act will have to be tried out because it is a bit of an experiment and it will have to be tried out for at least a year before we will really know the full force and effect of it, and know whether it will operate properly or will have to be amended at some future date. I am sure the Attorney General is aware of some of the ramifications and complications within the Act.

Personally, I have some reservations about provisions within section 14 which deals with what the Act calls unreasonable collection practices. In setting up the provisions of this particular section of the Act we may well find that in attempting to improve collections within the Province of British Columbia between creditors and debtors, we have provided creditors with a means of avoiding payment of legitimate debts in that the subsections of section 14 are quite extensive and provide a lot of provisions that might be exercised by, the debtor to his advantage rather than anything else.

But I believe that the only way we're going to find out, Mr. Speaker, if this Act will work is to accept it,

[ [Page 2539](#) ]

temporarily at least, in its present form. If we find that the Act is being used as a means of escape by people who owe legitimate debts and should be paying them, then we might have to move in the direction of more teeth within the Act to give protections on both sides of the fence, not just one.

There's another section of the Act that I would certainly like some clarification on because it's not clear in my mind just exactly what is meant — that's section 16. This is in respect to the debt pooling and the position of the collection agent.

It says within the Act that the agent shall not act for or represent any of the creditors. It seems to me that in many instances that will pose a problem. In my experience with some of these agencies and debt collectors — mainly credit bureaus and such — they have been extremely beneficial and helpful in arranging a situation between two parties — arranging not only a pooling of the debts that a person might owe, but also in arranging with a debtor a means of payment that was satisfactory. They've done this at no great expense to either party.

They have acted as an unofficial — I guess you could say — arbitrator in the matter and they've given, I think, very good advice to some people in that situation. Certainly, it has helped to arrange for settlement of claims and payment of claims without resorting to courts and any of the costly procedures that we are involved in sometimes in the matter of both creditor and debtor relationships between two people, or organizations and other debtors.

I would hope that we preserve the position of a credit bureau or collection agency. In many cases in smaller communities this is all that's available — where they do get involved. Well, I know they get involved in representing both sides and they sit in a position of mediator, really, between the two sides and try to arrange something that both sides will agree to. They do it without any great charge for their services.

I would hope that we would preserve the position of these people not only when they help arrange a pooling of the debts of an individual, but also where they're perhaps representing not only the debtor, but the person to whom the debt is owed.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

These are the things that I see about the bill — not in the form of a great harangue or criticism of it — but areas that I believe we will have to have some experience in before we are able finally to determine whether the legislation is workable in its present form, or whether a year or so down the road we will have to amend the legislation.

I believe that these are the points that I have to bring before the House at this time. But, Mr. Speaker, I think we all realize that we've had a rather hectic week. It is the lunch hour, and I therefore move adjournment of the House, Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 15

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser



Phillips McClelland Morrison  
Schroeder Anderson D.A. Williams L.A.  
Gardom Wallace Curtis

NAYS — 33

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Nunweiler	Nicolson
Brown	Radford	Sanford
D'Arcy	Cummings	Levi
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Calder	Hartley
Skelly	Gabelmann	Young
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Steves	Kelly
Webster	Lewis	Liden

PAIRED

McGeer Barnes  
Brousson Lauk

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

**MR. GARDOM:** Mr. Speaker, this bill contains a very remarkable principle....

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**MR. GARDOM:** I'm playing to almost an empty House here, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter). This bill contains a very remarkable principle, a very remarkable section, and even more than that, Mr. Speaker, a most remarkable surprise. I want to ask the Attorney General whether it happened by accident or by design, It seems to me that with monotonous regularity, calculated regularity, I'd say, this government has avoided the means of access to one of the foremost pillars of democracy, and that is the courts of the land.

In the statutes that have come before us the government has gone out of its way to see that there is not any availability to the free, impartial, independent and unpolitically fettered wisdom and decisionmaking processes of our courts.

We don't find any access to the courts in the

[ [Page 2540](#) ]

*Mineral Act*, in the *Land Commission Act*, in the *Energy Act*, or in the *Automobile Insurance Act*. Those are terribly restrictive statutes. With expropriative powers, and expropriation, will follow: with confiscatory powers, confiscation will follow.

They are statutes denying the rights of individuals. We don't find any access to the courts in those statutes. The Attorney General says, "Look at this bill." I'm looking at it, and it's amazing to me that in this innocuous little bill you find for the very first time that this government has recognized that there should be a right to the courts.

Under one section — section 7 — if a director refuses to issue a licence or cancel a licence, then there's an appeal to the county court and an opportunity for a trial de novo, meaning that all of the facts can be presented right from the very start. It's not an appeal in that sense: it's a complete re-hearing.

But why do you go ahead and enshrine something that is a fundamental tenet in our democratic system in a little two-bit bill like this, and throw it out, totally throw it out, in the most dramatic and individual right-stealing legislation that has ever probably come across and ever been presented in a province in Canada? Why do you bring it in here and why do you leave it out of the others? It just points to one thing, Mr. Speaker. It seems to me that this government is becoming, historically, very ethically out of balance.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the *Debt Collection Act*, No. 48, I must second the statements made by the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom). It is astonishing and remarkable to find that in one bill in this House we find the right of appeal. It's about time we found that right of appeal to the courts in all the legislation that we are debating.

But you know, Mr. Speaker, I often find another incidental point that the shorter the Act the longer the explanation. The longer the Act by this government the shorter the explanation, But while most of it's procedure, I would like to deal with one or two Sections in principle. In reviewing the bill I think paragraphs 12, 13 and 14 appear to be relatively good and beneficial to British Columbia. The overall principle of section 15, as it applies to the whole principle, may be a good law as it prevents bailiffs from seizing somebody's car on the street without the owner knowing about it, as I understand it.

I suggest that clause (c), in speaking to the principle, may present difficulties and may unduly favour debtors, in that regulations make it next to impossible to seize chattels depending on the hours of the day during which a removal or a seizure can be effected. And I wonder if the Attorney General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald) should consider making these hours specific in the bill.

I think another unfortunate aspect of the bill, without speaking specifically to the section but reviewing the principle as it relates to section 15, is that it doesn't make it clear whether the section relates to the chattels ordinarily used in business, rather than as home or personal items.

I wonder if the Attorney General would consider clarifying that point. Would you consider an amendment?

I must also speak about the concern that there is for the individual credit companies in small communities. It has been pointed out to the Attorney General, but I think he should pay attention to this. In small communities there is often only one credit agency and, quite frankly, I have the honour to represent one of these. He's not a crook, he's not a rip-off artist, he's not a millionaire travelling in disguise. He's a young man in his late thirties who worked for a bigger company in another business, and he bought a credit agency, he paid good, hard cash for it, and....

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, Mr. Attorney General, we really don't care about his age — we care about the fact that this legislation is going to put him out of business! You'd better start caring about that, because you've got another point of confiscation. The small credit company or agency cannot survive in a small community if it can't act for both parties, and anyone will acknowledge the Attorney General's right to examine that action at any time within a legal means, but not to prohibit it by law.

What he is trying to do, I suppose, is open up another avenue where the government can get into business. Is that the point, Mr. Attorney General, when you fiddle around about the age of the individual? I am giving you a case now where a man who has worked hard, saved his money, bought an agency, is going to have his income reduced, if not almost solely cut off, and lose his business because of the actions of your legislation, through you, Mr. Speaker.

We don't think that's a laughing matter and I can assure you, Mr. Attorney General, that he doesn't think it is

very funny.

I think the Attorney General, before he gets up to close this debate, should give serious thought to this and make some provision whereby credit agencies can act on behalf of the two parties. So often it's the business that the agent is working for. They pay the costs and the debtor gets the benefit from it.

[ [Page 2541](#) ]

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Yes, they should. There are very few members of the NDP in the House and they should be here listening to this debate and be aware that this legislation that they believe in so strongly is, in fact, putting more people out of business.

Mr. Speaker, in light of the fact that so few of the cabinet Members and so few of the Members of the government are in the House during this lunch hour, where they are forcing debate and trying to ramrod through legislation, I move adjournment of this debate.

**HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General):** There is no provision for this under standing order 34, so I suggest the motion to adjourn is out of order.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** On the point of order....

**MRS. JORDAN:** I didn't adjourn the House, I adjourned the debate.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Order, please.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Would the Attorney General like a hearing aid?

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I refer to standing order 34. The marginal note says "adjournment of House or debate," and the order says:

"A motion to adjourn (except when made for the purpose of discussing a definite matter of urgent public importance) shall always be in order; but no second motion to the same effect shall be made until after some intermediate proceedings have been had."

Upon consulting with authorities, I am informed that the motions are two separate motions — the motion to adjourn the House and the motion to adjourn the debate. Therefore I declare the motion to be in order.

**MRS. JORDAN:** A point of order, Mr. Speaker. Were you presupposing this motion, as you'd already looked up the answer? (Laughter).

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The motion is that we adjourn debate on the motion that Bill No. 48 be read a second time now.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 10

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder		

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nimsick
Stupich	Nunweiler	Nicolson
Brown	Radford	Sanford
D'Arcy	Cummings	Levi
Lorimer	Williams, R.A.	Cocke
King	Calder	Skelly
Gabelmarin	Lauk	Young
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves
Liden	Lewis	Kelly
Curtis	Wallace	Williams, L.A.
Anderson, D.A.		Gardom

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound.

**MR. WILLIAMS:** Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There is an element in this bill which I think has been escaping the attention of some of the Members. In the regulation of collection agents and bailiffs under this Bill 48 it cannot be overlooked that one of the areas in which these people carry on their business is in the matter of credit reporting. We support what the Hon. Minister proposes in this bill, but I can't let the opportunity go by without expressing some regret that the bill has not been expanded to indicate more clearly the limitations upon the activities of those who are in the business of credit reporting.

I have looked at the bill and it would be almost impossible to amend. I hope that the Attorney General when he is closing would indicate whether or not the government has in mind providing some regulation and control.

One of the aspects of the credit reporting business which is seriously lacking is the opportunity which must be given to a person whose credit is being reported upon to have a copy of that information. Time and time again occasions have arisen when accounts have in fact been paid and yet somehow or other that information does not go back to the credit reporting agency. They continue to report a bad credit rating when in fact the indebtedness which has given rise to that bad credit rating has been cleared up.

One of the ways in which this could be regulated is to ensure that when a credit reporter is giving any information as to the status of an individual insofar as financing purposes are concerned, a copy of that

[ [Page 2542](#) ]

report be made available to the individual and he be given a clear opportunity to rectify any errors or omissions that there may be in that report.

I note that the director — formerly the inspector — has been given some increased powers with regard to the combination of these two businesses. There have been instances when unfortunate practices have arisen by reason of the debt collector and a credit reporting agency being one and the same group. Certainly those practices should be stopped. In that respect I believe that the powers given to the director are worthwhile Bearing in mind always that it is possible to disassociate these two areas of business and yet still have a real connection between the way in which they operate, this will create a serious problem for the director when these instances do arise to make absolutely certain that a real division between the areas of business takes place.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I recognize the Hon. Member for Dewdney.

**MR. P.C. ROLSTON (Dewdney):** Mr. Speaker, I too stand on just about the same point that the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound does. I really just want clarification.

Really what I am asking is maybe the director should issue a policy statement on this — and I'm referring to section 5, subsection (2), section (g). I think we should be looking at that at this stage and not in committee. I think the director should issue a policy statement that you should not threaten customers by divulging their credit to other creditors I want to impress upon you that in the Fraser Valley — in fact in most of British Columbia — the credit reporting and the collection business work side by side. There are very few places — I think Toronto Calgary and probably Vancouver — where you could have them separated and where they can make a living being separate. But the small credit bureau, certainly out in my riding, just could not operate with them not being together. So I am a little concerned and I think you can clarify this for us.

I could itemize the advantages of the joint operations: the paid collections can be recorded instantly; special problems that come to light when reporting collections are available to the other departments; disputed accounts are recorded instantly and credit counselling is made available in most parts of the province. The reporting staff and the manager usually live in the district. They're more knowledgeable of the district and the needs of the district and the special problems. They are closer to the debtor and usually can face each other and deal with things straightforwardly.

Again, in most of British Columbia I think you'll find that both are working together. Evidently you need at least 25,000 people in a business area before you can even consider separating them. From what I understand, it's unlikely that they are separated.

I guess what we are asking is for some kind of description of this discretionary power that the director has. I think that there is a lot of trust in the present director but that can always change. I'd like you to clarify this at this time.

**DEPUTY SPEAKER:** The Hon. Attorney General closes the debate.

**HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General):** Mr. Speaker, in reply to the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith), he made some valid points. We'll try to watch that balance. We're also concerned that the pooling of debts continues. If this section proves to be an impediment, we'll have another look at it.

I won't reply to the Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) who isn't in the House at the moment because he was saying that this was a good bill in comparison to others. Well, I can't discuss the other ones without being out of order, so I can't reply to that Member. Even to say I agree would be to put myself out of order because I'd be reflecting on bills other than the one before the House. So I can't do it.

With respect to the point about credit reporting raised by two Hon. Members, the purpose here is to give control in those rare situations where there is an abuse in that a debt collector is using his credit reporting business to threaten the debtor with, "If you don't pay, you're going to get the dog-gonest credit rating throughout the whole of B.C. that you've ever thought about." And you may never even find out about it. Now that has happened occasionally.

All this is is a power in the director that if that abuse is occurring he can insist that you can't combine those two businesses. But I would think that in many cases in many parts of the province the two things will go hand in hand without that kind of abuse creeping in, as they have in the past.

In respect to credit reporting legislation, we certainly agree that that has to come in very soon, probably October of 1973, 1974, 1975 — very soon. I move second reading.

Motion approved; second reading of the bill.

Bill No. 48 referred to a committee of the whole House at the next sitting after today.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 12:35 p.m.

---

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

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