

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)**

---

**TUESDAY, JUNE 4, 1974**

Afternoon Sitting

[ [Page 3679](#) ]

**CONTENTS**

Afternoon sitting Privilege Correction of printed *Hansard*. Ms. Sanford — [3679](#)

Routine proceedings

Oral questions.

Conflict of interest of Mines department employee.

    Mr. Richter — [3679](#)

Provincial involvement in electric kettle study. Mr. Curtis — [3679](#)

Change of name of Canada Manpower. Mrs. Jordan — [3680](#)

Viewfield road property purchase. Hon. Mr. Hartley answers — [3681](#)

Reduction from Mincome for election work. Mrs. Webster — [3681](#)

No illegal operations at Plateau Mills. Mr. Fraser — [3681](#)

Approval for pulp- shipment to Saskatchewan, Mr. Chabot — [3681](#)

Details of hop field workers' accident.

    Hon. Mr. Macdonald answers — [3681](#)

Officials travelling on European transit tour. Mr. Curtis — [3681](#)

Forest development road activity north of Hazelton.

    Mr. Chabot — [3682](#)

Penalties and procedures re Residential Premises Interim Rent Stabilization Act. Mr. Curtis — [3682](#)

Fire Marshall Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 100). Committee, report and third reading — [3682](#)

Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 103). Committee and report stage — [3682](#)

Municipal Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 142). Committee stage.

On section 14.

    Mr. Curtis — [3683](#)

    Hon. Mr. Lorimer — [3683](#)

On section 22.

Mr. Gibson — [3683](#)

Hon. Mr. Lorimer — [3683](#)

Report and third reading — [3683](#)

Statutes Act. (Bill 111). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3683](#)

Mr. L.A. Williams — [3684](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3684](#)

Securities Amendment Act, 1974 (Bill 116). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3685](#)

Mr. L.A. Williams — [3685](#)

Mr. Cummings — [3686](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3686](#)

Land Registry Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 121). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3687](#)

Mr. Gibson — [3687](#)

Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1974. (No. 2.) (Bill 121).

Second reading Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3687](#)

Mr. Smith — [3688](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3688](#)

Real Estate Amendment Act, 1974 ' . (Bill 124). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3688](#)

Companies Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 127). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3689](#)

Community Care Facilities Licensing Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 109). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [3689](#)

Mr. McClelland — [3690](#)

Mr. L.A. Williams — [3691](#)

Mr. Fraser — [3691](#)

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [3691](#)

Tuberculosis Institutions Amendment Act, 1974. (Bill 113). Second reading.

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [3692](#)

Committee of supply: Department of Transport and Communications estimates.

On vote 235.

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [3692](#)

Mr. McClelland — [3693](#)

Mr. Gibson — [3694](#)

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3700](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [3700](#)

Point of order Suspension of Mr. D.A. Anderson from the service of the House — [3702](#)

Routine proceedings

Committee of supply: Department of Transport and Communications estimates.

On vote 235.

Mr. Smith — [3702](#)

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3703](#)

Mr. L.A. Williams — [3703](#)

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3705](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [3707](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3709](#)  
Mrs. Jordan — [3709](#)

On vote 239.

Mr. Curtis — [3710](#)  
Mr. Morrison — [3710](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3710](#)  
Mrs. Jordan — [3710](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3711](#)  
Mr. Curtis — [3711](#)

On vote 242.

Mr. Morrison — [3711](#)  
Mr. McGeer — [3711](#)  
Mr. Curtis — [3712](#)  
Mr. Chabot — [3712](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3712](#)  
Mr. Morrison — [3713](#)

On vote 245.

Mr. Morrison — [3713](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3713](#)  
Mr. Fraser — [3713](#)  
Mr. McGeer — [3713](#)  
Hon. Mr. Strachan — [3714](#)  
Mr. Morrison — [3714](#)

Committee of ways and means — [3715](#)

Supply Act No. 2, 1974. (Bill 148). Introduction, first reading, second reading, committee, report and third reading — [3716](#)

Municipalities Enabling and Validating Amendment Act, 1974. (Bin 152). Hon. Mr. Lorimer. Introduction and first reading — [3716](#)

---

The House met at 2 p.m.

Prayers.

**MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen):** Mr. Speaker, I would like today to ask the House to join with me in welcoming between 35 and 40 senior citizens from Oliver, along with their driver, Don Norris.

**HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General):** Mr. Speaker, I have two announcements. Perhaps the most important is that it's Ginny Galt's — of the Canadian Press — 23rd birthday. She's attained the ripe age of 23 and I think that the House should recognize that.

The second, Mr. Speaker, is that seated on the floor of the House we have today not only Mr. Epp, the Deputy of Corrections in my department, who the House has met before, but Chief Judge Laurie Brahan of the provincial court, who will have to take off immediately because he is sitting — he does sit around the province in the provincial court from time to time — he's sitting now in the City of Victoria.

He has had opportunity to drop into the House during the lunchtime break. I hope the House will welcome Chief Judge Laurie Brahan of our own court.

**MS. K. SANFORD (Comox):** Mr. Speaker, I rise on a point of privilege today, dealing with a matter which affects many of the people in my constituency. I would like, with permission of the House, to correct an error which has appeared in the printed version of *Hansard* on page 3416. That's the *Hansard* dated May 24, 1974.

When I read the Hansard of that date, I requested that I be permitted to listen to the tapes downstairs. I have done that today and I wish also to thank you, Mr. Speaker, for verifying the tapes of that date.

But the *Hansard* as it is now printed is as follows — and I would like to quote. This is the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) speaking, and she says as follows:

For the correction of the record I would like to state that, in fact, it was Mr. Peter Nicholls who suggested that there is considerable evidence to make apparent that the *Comox Valley Star's* receiving unexplained favours....

That's the end of that quote; she was interrupted at that point. But I would like to correct the record, Mr. Speaker, because it should not read Mr. Peter Nicholls, but rather Mr. P.E. Bickle.

Now this is significant for the people of my riding because Mr. Bickle is the owner of the paper which is published in opposition to the paper referred to by the Hon. Member for North Okanagan. Unfortunately, the Hon. Member did not correct the Pinks for that day.

**MR. SPEAKER:** There's nothing I can do except ask the House if they will give leave for that record to be corrected in today's *Hansard*. It will no doubt appear in today's *Hansard* in any event.

Interjection.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The correction? It will be in now, so there's nothing further the House really has to act on that I can see — unless I can get some assistance on the question from somebody. I would assume that that corrects the record.

Is there any dispute on the question from the Hon. Member for North Okanagan?

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** Mr. Speaker, I would certainly reserve the right to examine the record myself.

**MR. SPEAKER:** By all means.

**Introduction of bills.**

**Oral questions.**

#### POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST OF MINES DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEE

**MR. RICHTER:** Mr. Speaker, if I might direct a question to the Minister of Mines, I would like to ask the Minister how he is going to avoid a conflict of interest when one Peter Smart, federal NDP candidate for Esquimalt-Saanich, has appointed one Mr. Hart Horn, director of mineral resources — and I quote from the announcement: "Hart Horn, a provincial government employee in the Department of Mines, has been appointed Smart's campaign manager."

**HON. L.T. NIMSICK (Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I'll take that as notice.

#### PROVINCIAL INVOLVEMENT IN ELECTRIC KETTLE STUDY

**MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands):** Mr. Speaker, to the Minister of Consumer Services: what investigations has the provincial Department of Consumer Services initiated or what investigations is it coordinating in any way with the federal Department of Consumer Affairs on the subject of electric kettles, which are apparently emitting unsafe quantities of lead material?

**MS. P.F. YOUNG (Minister of Consumer Services):** Mr. Speaker, we are not taking any action at this time because we believe this to be purely in the federal jurisdiction of product safety.

**MR. CURTIS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Has the Minister's department been requested by the federal department or any federal authority to assist in protecting the public with respect to supposedly defective kettles? Have you had any request from Ottawa?

**HON. MS. YOUNG:** No, we have not, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. CURTIS:** A supplementary, Mr. Speaker. I gather from the earlier comment, then, that the Minister has not offered the services of her department to Ottawa in this regard.

**HON. MS. YOUNG:** The federal Minister brought the subject up so abruptly that he at no time contacted our department to ask our assistance. At the moment he has handled the whole matter in his own way. We would be perfectly willing to assist in any manner we could, and we will go on record at this moment of offering assistance to the federal Minister.

But we have had no request from the federal government for any assistance at the federal level as a provincial level.

**MR. CURTIS:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Telephones work in both directions between Victoria and Ottawa. This is not a brand new matter but has been attracting public attention for several days now.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please. I think the Hon. Member can see from the answer given that it is not within the administrative jurisdiction of either the provincial government or this Minister in view of the fact that it appears to be a matter falling within the federal field.

**MR. CURTIS:** Then we differ, Mr. Speaker, in interpretation of the responsibilities of the Consumer Services department of this province.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Obviously the extent of that cannot be really debated in the House.

## NAME CHANGE OF CANADA MANPOWER TO HUMAN RESOURCES

**MRS. JORDAN:** I would prefer to address my question to the Hon. Premier, but in view of the fact that he is not here again I will address it to the Hon. Minister of Human Resources. In view of the fact that the federal government announced today at a meeting in the east that they were contemplating changing the name of Canada Manpower to the federal Department of Human Resources, does the Minister propose to register a protest with Ottawa at this overlapping of names with the obvious conflict...

Interjections.

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

**MRS. JORDAN:** Are you fellows finished your speeches?

...and confusion that is going to result for the people of British Columbia when they wish to avail themselves of either one's services?

**HON. N. LEVI (Minister of Human Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I'll ask David Lewis to make it a national issue in terms of the election. (Laughter.)

**MRS. JORDAN:** Supplementary, Mr. Speaker. Canada would do well without David Lewis. What we want is a Minister who will look after the people of British Columbia. We have a....

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

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, I would like a responsible answer from that Minister. As a supplementary, does he...?

**MR. SPEAKER:** Order, please! I am standing and you are supposed to be sitting. If you want us to go immediately to the switch-off of the mikes we can easily oblige you. The point is that we gave an undertaking that we wouldn't need those, providing Members would also give an equal undertaking that they would obey the Chair when it comes to sitting down. The Hon. Member has ignored it about three times just now. I would ask the Hon. Member to remember and respect the order of the Chair.

It is not part of question period to make speeches. There was no question involved in your statement; it was a speech. You were called to order three times. I would ask you to please observe the rules.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I asked the Minister of Human Resources if he intends to register a protest to the federal government in order that there will not be confusion for the people of British Columbia when they wish to avail themselves of the services of the British Columbia Human Resources department. Mr. Speaker, is that clear?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** The answer is no.

[ [Page 3681](#) ]

#### DETAILS OF VIEWFIELD ROAD PURCHASE

**HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works):** Yesterday I took as notice a question from the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) with regard to the purchase of property on Viewfield Road. I said we did purchase the property. I now have the details.

We paid in excess of \$400,000 — \$425,000. We had more than one appraisal. There are approximately 1.5 acres of land. There are two floors of almost a half acre of floor space: 26,196 feet. This is to be used for both warehousing and office space for the Provincial Museum.

#### NO REDUCTION FROM MINCOME FOR WORK IN ELECTIONS

**MRS. D. WEBSTER (Vancouver South):** A question to the Minister of Human Resources. I understand that quite a number of elderly and handicapped people who are on Mincome are presently working for the federal election. This is what I would like to ask the Minister: in case they are earning a small amount of money working on the federal election, will this be taken from their Mincome payments?

**HON. MR. LEVI:** No. It will be considered as though it was a windfall income and there will be no deductions made to either the handicapped person or the Mincome recipient if people work as enumerators or poll clerks.

#### NO ILLEGAL OPERATIONS AT PLATEAU MILLS

**MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo):** I asked the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources a couple of weeks ago — and I believe he took the question as notice — what he is doing about the illegal operations at Plateau Mills. I think by now he has had time to find out how illegal they really are.

**HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources):** Mr. Speaker, I did have a group of answers yesterday. I'm sorry that I don't have the Telex I received last week, I believe, from the Prince George district forester. But, in essence, it is that there are no movements that are illegal.

### APPROVAL FOR POLE SHIPMENT TO SASKATCHEWAN

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** A question for the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. Are there any permits being issued for the shipping of poles to Saskatchewan when there apparently is a shortage of poles in British Columbia?

**HON. R.A. WILLIAMS:** I believe one order-in-council export was approved in the last week or two. It was mainly in relation to the problems they have had in Saskatchewan because of flooding and the replacement of small bridges and the like. So approval was given in that regard, Mr. Speaker.

### DETAILS OF HOP FIELD WORKERS' ACCIDENT

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands asked me about an accident on May 30 in which one person lost their life. The car apparently was going 70 mph; the right rear wheel tire deflated and caused the vehicle to swerve into the median. I make no further comments about the facts but an inquiry has been ordered by the coroner. The Workmen's Compensation Board is concerned with it too and is making inquiries; the Motor Carrier Commission is also concerned with the accident. The people concerned were hop field workers. They are, I understand, represented by a lawyer in Vancouver so there may be legal proceedings as well.

**MR. CURTIS:** I wish to thank the Attorney-General for his prompt answer to that question. Perhaps we could discuss it privately later.

### OFFICIALS TRAVELLING ON EUROPEAN TRANSIT TOUR

I have a question on another matter to another Minister, if I may. To the Minister of Municipal Affairs on the subject of his forthcoming European transit tour, I wonder if the Minister could now indicate those elected representatives who will be accompanying him and those provincial government officials who will be travelling with him on the same tour?

**HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** As far as the municipal delegates I can only go by what I read in the newspaper; I haven't heard any information officially by letter or telephone. I understand Mr. Jim Campbell, chairman of the Capital Regional District, is going, Walter Hardwick is going for Vancouver, and Vander Zalm for the Greater Vancouver Regional District.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Who?

**HON. MR. LORIMER:** Mayor Vander Zalm. As far as the provincial staff going, there will be Don Jantzen, my executive assistant; Victor Parker; Brian Sullivan; and myself.

[ [Page 3682](#) ]

**MR. CURTIS:** Mr. Speaker, supplementary. Mr. Sullivan is in Transit with Mr. Parker?

**HON. MR. LORIMER:** Yes, he is the assistant director.

**MR. CURTIS:** Thank you. Supplementary. Are any other Members of the Legislature slated to accompany you on this tour?

**HON. MR. LORIMER:** Not to my knowledge, no. I have had some volunteers. (Laughter.)

## FOREST DEVELOPMENT ROAD ACTIVITY NORTH OF HAZELTON

**MR. CHABOT:** A question to the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources. Yesterday I asked him a question which he answered regarding the diversion of forest development road funds from Hazelton to the Plateau Mills region. The bell cut off the supplementary question.

The supplementary question is: will there be some forestry development road activity north of the Hazelton area during the forthcoming season toward the Babine Lake country, which they have been waiting for for some time?

**HON. R.A. WILLIAMS:** Again, I don't know if the Member knows the geography that well...

**MR. CHABOT:** Yes, I know the geography.

**HON. R.A. WILLIAMS:** ...but it is a fair distance from Babine to Hazelton. The roads are more oriented to Burns Lake in the Babine area, as the Member knows. I'm not aware of a diversion per se. We are carrying out special studies in the Hazelton area and we have consulting industrial foresters advising us at this time.

## PENALTIES AND PROCEDURES RE RESIDENTIAL PREMISES INTERIM RENT STABILIZATION ACT

**MR. CURTIS:** Mr. Speaker, to the Attorney-General. With respect to the Residential Premises Interim Rent Stabilization Act, has the Minister or his department received any complaints from municipal authorities with respect to the absence of prosecution of violators of this Act? Have there been any requests for action on the part of the department or complaints about it?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Not to my personal knowledge. I'll check the matter.

**MR. CURTIS:** Would the Minister agree that the Act is, in fact, silent on the question of penalties and procedures for enforcement of the Act?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** That's a legal opinion; you would have to ask a lawyer that. (Laughter.) I would think, though, that the Summary Convictions Act surely applies to all provincial statutes.

### **Orders of the day.**

**HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Transport and Communications):** Mr. Speaker, I move that we proceed to public bills and orders.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Committee on Bill 100.

## FIRE MARSHAL AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 100; Mr. Liden in the chair.

Sections 1 to 30 inclusive approved.

Title approved.



**HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney-General):** Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 100, Fire Marshal Amendment Act, 1974, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Committee on Bill 103, Mr. Speaker.

### SUMMARY CONVICTIONS AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

The House in committee on Bill 103; Mr. Liden in the chair.

On section 1.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Chairman, I move the amendment standing under my name on the order paper. (See appendix.)

Amendment approved.

section 1 as amended approved.

Sections 2 to 10 inclusive approved.

[ [Page 3683](#) ]

Title approved.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete with amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the Chair.

Bill 103, *Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1974*, reported complete with amendment to be considered at the next sitting of the House after today.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Committee on Bill 142, Mr. Speaker.

The House in committee on Bill 142; Mr. Liden in the chair.

Sections 1 to 13 inclusive approved.

On section 14.

**MR. H.A. CURTIS (Saanich and the Islands):** Very briefly to the Minister: This section deals with assessment notices, the assessment roll and notices in connection with the actual assessment process. I really just want to draw to the Minister's attention, with all respect, the continuing need for simplified assessment information in the hands of the property owner. I think it's correct to say that the Minister has agreed with this observation in the past and in a standing committee of this House.

There are still complicating points made on the assessment notice which serve to confuse many well informed individuals. They receive this notice and a lot of the information there really, I suggest, is extraneous; it's not essential in terms of actually getting something into the hands of the property owners to tell them precisely what their assessment is going to be for the forthcoming year.

**HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs):** Yes, I'm in agreement with the Hon. Member. This was discussed, as he knows, in our committee on assessments. We hope that this will be only for one year because in our committee on taxation one of the topics that we'll be discussing is these notices that go out both on assessments and taxation so it's my intention that this amendment is merely for this one year, that we will correct it later on.

Sections 14 to 21 inclusive approved.

On section 22.

**MR. G.F. GIBSON (North Vancouver-Capilano):** Just a question to the Minister. I've read section 651, and I wonder if the Minister would be good enough to advise us why this Act is repealing it.

**HON. MR. LORIMER:** These amendments accommodate changes to the *Coroners Act*. Section 651 formerly required municipalities of over 5,000 to pay the cost of the coroner's inquest. Now under the new *Coroners Act* of this year, that will no longer be required; it will be taken over by the provincial government.

Section 22 approved.

On section 23.

**MR. CURTIS:** An observation only, Mr. Chairman, that this is an excellent refinement of the step taken last year. I think municipalities will be particularly pleased that as long as there is evidence that the municipal council through its staff made every reasonable effort to communicate with residents who would be affected by this requirement, that it will not be quashed, or is not subject to being quashed in the courts. I know this has caused a problem in a number of municipalities. Frankly, I congratulate the Minister for seeing that this has been done.

Sections 23 to 31 inclusive approved.

Title approved.

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

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill 142, *Municipal Amendment Act, 1974*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Second reading of Bill 111, Mr. Speaker.

## STATUTES ACT

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, as the House knows, there is an interpretation comparison, Mr. Chairman, and by inference was using that as something which would some amendments which

have been suggested to that bill, withdraw the bill and perhaps introduce it in a new form, but that's another subject

matter.

We have actively working on our statutes the former Deputy Minister of my department, Mr. Gilbert Kennedy, who still has that status in the department. And we have taken out of the *Interpretation Act* the form of statutes, and there are some minor changes in terms of the enacting provision which are already in effect. That's the significance, and the only significance, as I see it, of this bill. I move second reading.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS (West Vancouver–Howe Sound):** Mr. Speaker, this is a move in the right direction but it's with great regret that the government hasn't gone far enough in dealing with statutes, their production, their distribution and the notice to be given of changes to our law which result from the actions of this Legislature and of the Lieutenant-Governor -in-Council.

I would have thought that it might have been appropriate if the Hon. Attorney-General had considered establishing a committee on statutory instruments so that some careful review could be made of the way in which our statutes are being prepared and in which our orders-in-council are being prepared, and the wording used in those instruments.

I'm not speaking of a committee of this Legislature; I'm thinking of a committee which could be supportive of legislative counsel and of the various solicitors who are now seconded from the Attorney-General's department to the several departments of government.

All one has to do is to consider the bills which have been before the House this year, and which are currently before the House, to recognize that, depending upon the skill and experience of the particular legislative draftsman, the bill is either in conformity with standards which are adopted by legislative counsel or they are not. It's easy for a person who has had any experience in reading the bills to recognize those which emanate from the legislative counsel's office directly under the responsibility of the Attorney-General or have emanated from other departments of government. I say directly under the responsibility of the Attorney-General because I know that he takes a major interest in the role the legislative counsel performs, which is a very valuable one.

Now the same applies, as I say, to the preparation of orders-in-council. The majority of the statutes which we are enacting in this legislature provide for the use of wider and ever-increasing 'powers of regulation. I think it is important that those regulations also become uniform in their style and uniform in their language. All one has to do is read part II of the *B.C. Gazette* and again recognize the differences which arise because persons with different backgrounds and different experiences in different departments are writing orders-in-council. As a matter of fact, in some cases I wonder whether the people who are writing orders-in-council are not functionally illiterate.

However, it seems to me that a committee on statutory instruments could do much to improve this situation. I would like to know whether or not the Attorney-General is prepared to give this some consideration as we bring this legislation forward now.

I know the Attorney-General's department and Legislative Counsel have been assisted by a committee of the British Columbia bar. We know how that functions and we make no criticism of that technique. However, we also know that the burden of that work is falling upon one or two individuals, members of the bar, who work without compensation. It is an onerous task they perform, one that the people of British Columbia should be pleased they perform because I am sure it prevents many mistakes from ever coming before this House, and heaven's knows, Mr. Speaker, enough of them get here anyway — that is, in the form of legislation.

Now I would seriously suggest to the Attorney-General that he's established all kinds of commissions; he's got administration and justice commissions and so on which are given responsible jobs, but, really, so far as the people of British Columbia are concerned, little could be of greater significance than that legislation passed in this House and order-in-council proclaimed under that legislation be clear and available.

If I may say one thing in conclusion, Mr. Speaker, on the question of availability it seems to me that there should be regularly published those statutes in respect of which proclamation is given, and particularly those statutes when only some of the sections have been proclaimed and others are inoperative.

But frankly, Mr. Speaker, the situation has become such that with delays in communication there are many people who are practising law in the Province of British Columbia who are ill-equipped to advise their clients as to what the law is because from day to day they are not certain whether the legislation has been proclaimed or whether individual sections have been proclaimed. It seems to me that some periodic, perhaps monthly, news sheet should emanate from the Attorney-General's department so there could be no doubt that there will be full knowledge throughout the province of those laws which are in full force and effect.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Member has made valuable points, points that have given me concern. I'll be glad to discuss his remarks,

[ [Page 3685](#) ]

as they appear in *Hansard*, with the legislative counsel and also with the commissioner for statute law revision.

I may say that I would hope we could introduce computer printing in the statute field because that will greatly assist not only in getting out the statutes quickly, but in terms of meshing them and producing the finished copies very quickly. That's the kind of programme I will discuss with my colleague, because the computer services of the government are under, the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan). But in this whole field of statute printing and assemblage and so forth, there is a great deal to be offered in terms of modern computer printing. That is being actively pursued at least in terms of investigation of this point.

I am glad the Hon. Member mentioned the Canadian bar giving their assistance in terms of statute preparation — when we have the opportunity, really, to get them out in time — because this is a voluntary service and it has been on a confidential basis that it has been maintained and has to be maintained. I pay tribute to those people who have voluntarily given of their time. I'm not going to mention particular names of the chairmen of that subsection, but they have been of valuable help to government. It is much better for us to find our statute law mistakes before they end up in court than to have them elucidated by a judge in court.

I'd like to say, too, that I want a chance to pay tribute to legislative counsel...

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** ...even though I'm on second reading of a bill and not in committee. But Alan Higgenbottam, Phil Harrington and Alan Rogers — you know, the load of work these people have had on their hands and in their heads in this session of the Legislature has been tremendous. Every once in a while somebody wants them to not only express the thing right legally, but to help them with the policy, or even to formulate the policy, or guess what's in the Minister's mind. They have to be almost sitting psychiatrists with Ministers, and particularly the Attorney-General in terms of his legislation, and offer counsel advice as well as draftsmanship.

I pay tribute to them and they are a rare breed. It's hard to find them. They are shorthanded and I hope to expand that office in the near future.

Mr. Speaker, I move that the question be put.

Motion approved.

Bill 111, *Statutes Act*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Second reading of Bill 116, Mr. Speaker.

## SECURITY AMENDMENTS ACT, 1974

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker there is an important side of the activities of my department which consists of security regulation and supervision. There has been in the past a securities commission in the Province of

British Columbia, and because the members will be retiring I want to express my appreciation for their services. Two of them, of course, are in government and in the House, which was one of the reasons why we are making this kind of a change that is contemplated in this Act, that's Victor DiCastrì of my department and Jim Fyles of the department of the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources. The other is Bill Hobbs who is a retired solicitor from the Attorney-General's department. They have been the securities commission. But it has rather been, and it is no fault of these gentlemen, an in-House operation. And Bill Irwin, the Superintendent of Brokers, of course, has necessarily had delegated upon him many of the functions that really belonged to the commission.

So we want to do several things: we want to upgrade the status of the Vancouver Stock Exchange, which is our only money-generating institution in British Columbia, competing with difficulty with the Toronto Stock Exchange and the New York and Montreal Stock Exchanges. We find that the amount of venture capital that is raised locally is only about 10 per cent of that generation which is really required for the Province of British Columbia. About 90 per cent of it is generated outside, so we want to give the Vancouver Stock Exchange status and class and inspire, as we can, a great degree of confidence in our financial institutions on the part of the investing public of the province who range from wealthy people to some people who perhaps shouldn't be speculating at all. But it's a pretty wide range.

We are establishing in the department the Corporate and Financial Services Commission. This will be experienced people who can lend their time, of course, on a part-time basis to act as a kind of an appeal tribunal, not only over the old decisions of the Securities Commission but, I'm glad to say, over the orders and regulations of the Vancouver Stock Exchange itself.

So we're taking it from being an in-house procedure to a body to which we will appoint experienced people in this field. I hope the objectives I have outlined will be realized as we begin to secure, as it were, additional help in this field.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Mr. Speaker, very briefly, I wonder if the Attorney-General, when concluding this debate, would indicate whether or not he sees for

[ [Page 3686](#) ]

the Corporate and Financial Services Commission any responsibilities other than those related strictly to the Vancouver Stock Exchange. A seven-man commission to be, in effect, a regulatory or supervisory body over one stock exchange seems to be a bit heavy-handed. It may be that the Attorney-General sees this commission exercising authority over other areas of corporate or financial service regulation in the Province of British Columbia.

I know that in the Attorney-General's department he has many divisions and responsibilities between the Superintendent of Brokers and Superintendent of Insurance which are passed back and forth and so on. I'd like to know whether this commission is likely to exercise a regulatory or supervisory role over more areas than just the stock exchange.

Truly, Mr. Speaker, when one considers the policies of this government as enunciated in legislation which we have before us, I don't see that there'll be much of a problem in regulating the Vancouver Stock Exchange. It's likely to become the only stock exchange museum in the world, where no trading takes place but people can go and say: "Well, this is where it used to happen. This is where capital was at one time generated for risk ventures in the Province of British Columbia but that's all been resolved by actions of the provincial government. No longer do we have any need for active trading on the floor of the exchange." Therefore, we could just place the stock exchange under the library commission or the museum or something like that.

**MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver-Little Mountain):** Mr. Speaker, I'm pleased to rise to support this bill. People who venture into the Vancouver Stock Exchange are sometimes taking an awful chance. They actually get a better deal at the race track because they return 76 per cent of the money.

Now, there is a need to raise speculative money and a citizen should have a right to take a flyer, but he shouldn't be scalped. Some of these brokers should not be allowed to manipulate the market; they should not be

allowed to get the corner on the market.

You noticed when an amateur managed to corner the market how quickly they responded to it: they suspended all trading. Well, this is a little bit back in the history of the Vancouver Stock Exchange. How about the bunco squad? Well, this is pretty well a well-known fact. We all know this through the history of the stock exchange.

How about the washing of stock in the Toronto Stock Exchange? This was a nice neat way; it was well engineered. We've had many, many examples of the stock market being raped.

Basically, I hope this will protect the citizens of British Columbia and actually of Canada because we do have a fair mining exchange here. I feel the Attorney-General should be commended for bringing this. Actually, he's a very nice little Attorney-General and I think he's a nice Minister...

**MR. CURTIS:** Smear.

**MR. CUMMINGS:** ...and I'm very, very pleased to support it.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Attorney-General closes the debate.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, I wish you had also said how great the Minister of industry (Hon. Mr. Lauk) is and how well he is doing in his portfolio. I know it's not his bill but he is a great Minister. (Laughter.)

Mr. Speaker, this appellate body will be given broader functions because we recognize the number of appeals that come and have formerly been handled in-house in the department, some under the *Companies Act*, *Societies Act*, *Trust Companies Act*, *Investments Contract Act*, maybe the *Personal Information Reporting Act*, things of that kind. So the body will have much more to do than just look at the Vancouver Stock Exchange. That, of course, isn't the whole field of securities; there are many other orders. I appreciate that that's the way we should go.

It will not be a heavy-handed thing. It will be possibly some retired people and others, and they'll just meet occasionally as the need arises. It's not a big bureaucracy in any sense, but it takes the appellate thing out of government's hands where increasingly the trend should be in that direction.

In terms of the Vancouver Stock Exchange, all I can say to the Hon. Member is: have faith! The exciting things this government is doing for the Province of British Columbia are going to generate not only drilling activity in the north but trading on the Vancouver Stock Exchange.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Yes. Have faith in this province and in this government!

I move second reading.

Interjections.

Motion approved.

Bill 116, *Securities Amendment Act, 1974*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Second reading of Bill

[ [Page 3687](#) ]

121.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, this bill might be more properly considered in committee if the

Hon. Members have questions.

As I see the significant sections, there is a redefinition of "navigable water" to give the Department of Highways wider discretion as to those access rights that will be vouched safe for the people of the province. In law "navigable water" has a narrow meaning, meaning commercially navigable.

There are greater powers for an approving officer to refuse approval where land can be subject to flooding or erosion or land slips.

There is a provision for consolidation of parcels without the expense of a survey; for example, if somebody is putting together from subdivided lots one unit in the form of a farm or something of that kind.

Another significant one is that we're allowing Indian bands to subdivide their reserve land on what has to be a leasehold basis. In the past it had to be fee simple so far as the roads were concerned. Now, because they do not have the fee as such, we are nevertheless permitting them subdivision rights.

**MR. GIBSON:** Mr. Speaker, just very briefly, when the Minister rose in his place in this House and asked leave to introduce an amendment to the *Land Registry Act*, I was tremendously excited. I raced out to the Sergeant-at-Arms' office to obtain the earliest possible copy of the bill because I was anticipating that it would contain something about the registration of the beneficial nationality of the ownership of land in British Columbia.

Interjection.

**MR. GIBSON:** I was disappointed, Mr. Speaker, that it didn't. What we have here is basically a housekeeping Act.

I just want to implore the Minister to bring in that other legislation quickly: bring it in before the end of this session because we need it, Mr. Minister. Every day there's more of British Columbia going into the hands of foreign owners.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I know that on the principle of this bill we can't elaborate at any great length on this topic, so I'll simply make that representation, that very earnest representation to the Minister.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Attorney-General closes the debate.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** I move second reading.

Motion approved.

Bill 121, Land Registry Amendment Act, 1974, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health):** Second reading of Bill 122.

## PROVINCIAL COURT AMENDMENT ACT, 1974 (No.2)

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** I think we should be proud of our provincial bench in British Columbia which handles, in terms of the cases and the people who appear before the court, I think the estimate is 97 per cent of the people or caseload in the Province of B.C.

I was talking to Chief Judge Laurie Brahan just a short while ago. He is sitting, as I pointed out, in the City of Victoria because he visits around and practices as a judge on the bench when he gets that opportunity, and helps to ease the caseload.

He had on his docket today some 20 cases this morning — they were mostly traffic. He has another case load this afternoon. So it is a hard-working bench, dedicated, increasingly qualified in terms of legal training, but facing, really, a massive legal, social and judicial problem, and tackling that with their judicial institutes, their retraining and their closely knit liaison without, as I say, any political bench or any other bench, with the prison services in terms of their knowledge of it, with the police function and with the probation services and the parole boards and even the work of the Departments of Human Resources, Education and Health.

So while they are in a front line, they must nevertheless tie in with the broader picture, and they are tying in with that broader picture.

I don't think it is in the bill in terms of its working but we have improved their salary position to roughly equivalent to Ontario. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that our judges do not and are not permitted to earn income outside of their judicial salary. It would be a bad thing if, as has been the case in the past, they were still engaging in some kind of private practice or business enterprise because that would lower their position, in my opinion, as judges of this court.

We do think that the retirement age should be 65. But at the same time we do want to take advantage of the services of those judges who will be between the ages of 65 and 70. They will be assigned, not by myself, because I am very keenly concerned that there not be political interference, but they will be assigned by the chief judge. They will be working actively for the province. The additional factor that is

[ [Page 3688](#) ]

involved here is mobility because these judges can serve where the need is greatest, rather than being in any particular judicial district.

So that is the principle of this bill; that's one of the main things. The other things that are happening, and are referred to in the bill, are a pension plan which is better than the old thing under the *Municipal Superannuation Act*, and which is long overdue in terms of the judges. Because some of them are appointed late in their term of life, I think we are guaranteeing 10 years minimum and I think it is 3 per cent per year. Also we are thinking in terms of severance pay for some of those people who have given long service to the Province of British Columbia. For example there is Judge Evans up in the Kootenays, who everybody remembers, who gave great service to the province not only on the bench but in terms of the social problems surrounding the Doukhobor situation. People like him would be retiring almost without any kind of pension. We are working out a system of separation allowance for people who have given that kind of service as they reach the retirement age.

We are also looking at our part-time judges — mostly lay judges — who in some cases are working for \$100 a month, sometimes for more. It has been a kind of a crazy-quilt with no particular sense to it, so we intend to meet with them and, depending on the work they are doing, to adjust their remuneration accordingly.

I take pleasure, Mr. Speaker, in moving second reading of this bill.

**MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River):** Just a couple of questions to the Attorney-General. When he closes the debate I would like to know if he would inform the House how many of the present judiciary are over the age of 65 and in that area between 65 and 70; and whether it would be your intention to allow those judges to continue through until their 70th birthday before retiring them under the provisions of this bill, or will they be phased out of the judicial system within the next year or so and be replaced by other judges coming into the court system in the Province of British Columbia.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, I haven't got the figures with me at the moment. As a matter of fact, I was not too concerned, in introducing this legislation or helping to formulate it, as to the numbers because I was not thinking of individuals who might or might not be over this or that line. If we are thinking in terms of the legally trained judges, the number is relatively small as I understand. But in terms of the total judiciary in B.C., including the part-time judges, I would think the number might approach close to 50 people. It would be in that category. In the case of the trained, I don't think it is more than 10 or 12. I will try to get that by committee stage if



the Member wishes the exact figure, or I will give it to him separately.

In terms of their use, this depends on a number of factors: the recommendation of the chief judge; the inclination of the person concerned as to how much service he wishes to give, bearing in mind that he will have the pension and it will probably be a per diem thing, so it is really his volunteering of services that will be an important factor in the situation. On that basis, the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council can decide who the supernumerary judges should be.

Motion approved.

Bill 122, *Provincial Court Amendment Act, 1974 (No. 2)*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Second reading of Bill 124, Mr. Speaker.

### REAL ESTATE AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, the present *Real Estate Act* requires sellers of subdivided land to provide a prospectus to the purchasers containing all the facts about the land. That is the Act that is now before the Legislature. It deals also with sellers of strata lots which, in effect, is a subdivision in the sky, and cooperative corporations which, in effect, is selling an apartment or a strata lot by means of the purchase of shares rather than the actual building or title to the strata lot and it deals with conversions.

We've had a lot of forced conversions in this province where tenants have been obliged to purchase or get out. We have protected them within limits in the *Landlord and Tenant Act* that is presently on the books, but there are loopholes there. So we are increasing the prospectus requirements, the requirements at the local level for municipal approval of conversions of the three kinds I have mentioned. In addition to that, we will be legislating in terms of an amendment to the *Landlord and Tenant Act* to group these things together in terms of the rights of tenants, reinforcing the kinds of protection that are also contained in this bill.

In addition we are dealing in this bill with a problem that has been before the House before — that is the sale of land of over five parcels which is situated outside the province but is being sold inside the province. We are providing in the bill that that kind of sale must be by a proper prospectus, proper provisions as to the deposit and when that can be recovered, and that it must be through a duly licenced agent of the Province of British Columbia so

[ [Page 3689](#) ]

someone will be responsible if it is land in Arizona, Brazil, or wherever it may be. Those are the basic contents of this bill, Mr. Speaker. I move second reading.

Motion approved.

Bill 124, *Real Estate Amendment Act, 1974*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting of the House after today.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Second reading of Bill 127, Mr. Speaker.

### COMPANIES AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, a number of these amendments would be understood only by lawyers, and they would not understand them. (Laughter.) A number of the other ones are significant in terms of draftsmanship and cleaning up a little bit the *Companies Act* which has been passed.

The experience of that *Companies Act* on the whole has been pretty good but it is still under surveillance. It is a new departure which we therefore monitor in terms of its usefulness as a social and business instrument for the

community in British Columbia.

There is one section in here which I think would be of importance to refer to the Legislature. That is the one whereby in the past, in the *Companies Act*, chartered accountants and certified general accountants only, were permitted to audit the books of reporting companies. This was a little unfair to the industrial accountants who had been doing some of that work and also to the APAs, who are the accredited public accountants.

We do not provide holus bolus that these people can engage in this work, because the standard of accountancy in a province is very important in the business community, but we do provide that these people will be able to go before a committee, and if qualified, then they will be able to practise as accountants in terms of the reporting companies. I move second reading.

Bill 127, *Companies Amendment Act, 1974*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. LORIMER:** Second reading of Bill 109.

## COMMUNITY CARE FACILITIES LICENSING AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Mr. Speaker, the *Community Care Facilities Licensing Act* has been under some criticism of recent years. Mainly because of the regulations pursuant to the Act, but we felt that there is need here to not only do some housekeeping around this Act — that is, you know, cleaning up some of the sections of the Act that required it, in wording and so on. But it also, we felt, should be expanded.

At the present time, there is a Provincial Community Care Licensing Facility Board, and that's all there is. We feel that the community should have the right to set up, or we should in communities have the right to set up local boards that are much closer to the area, much closer to the scene and who would know and understand the needs of their particular areas. Now naturally, they're going to be tied down with regulations that govern the provincial body, but at the same time, there can be a much closer touch with the community.

As you know, the Community Care Licensing Boards license day-care centres, license rest homes, license personal care homes and a number of other boarding and rooming kinds of facilities. So it's a very important area, we feel, and always has to be under very close scrutiny.

At the present time the board is opening up the new regulations that are now being considered, to the public of the Province of British Columbia and the public will have input as to what those new regulations shall be.

For instance, I've heard a great deal of criticism around how many square feet do you have in a day-care centre for a child. Should it be 45, or should it be 30, or whatever? A criticism such as, "if that were the case, I shouldn't have had children because my home doesn't qualify" et cetera, et cetera.

Well, what we're trying to do is bring some sense out of the nonsense that has been pretty well evident in this area. So, Mr. Speaker, we are, generally speaking, opening the Act up, giving us the opportunity, as I said, to have the local community input, local community boards. We'll define that board and I believe that the Act does that quite well. It gives us the power, in this new amendment, to pass the administration of the Act from one department to another by order-in-council, which we feel is important.

The Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) is intimately involved in the day-to-day activities of this whole area of community care licensing facilities. So this gives an opportunity for us to pass that kind of resolution in executive council and provide that this in fact occurs.

We'll also be able to permit municipalities and regional districts to handle local licensing matters under the new amendment. Specifically, let me say that in the Capital Regional District, we have now passed a great many of the duties and responsibilities

of the Health Department over to the Capital Regional District. This, I'm sure, will excite them more than it will excite some areas because if they desire they can grant community care facilities in this area, licenses in this area. So I think it's rather important.

Now we also say in this amendment that it will permit either the Minister of Health, the Minister of Human Resources or the Minister of Education to appoint board representatives from the community; rather than before, if you will recall, when it was always civil servants on this board.

Interjection.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** No, there's nothing wrong with civil servants, Mr. Speaker, but at the same time we feel that there should be input from consumers or general people out in the public. So either of the three Members with power to appoint to this board will now be able to appoint people from outside of the civil service, which I think is very important.

Interjection.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** It will be mandatory now, yes. However, Mr. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams), through you, Mr. Speaker, in the past the only people you could appoint were civil servants and now that's been altered, so that we can appoint those people who are not civil servants.

The board is also going to be given under this new amendment the power to issue certificates to people who have taken required courses, schooling in day care and in other areas — pre-school supervisors and the like. In other words, people who are actually going into the career of service to people in this way.

The board will also be given the power to establish local community-care facilities, licensing boards, with the members of these boards being appointed by the Minister or Ministers as it's outlined in the Act.

Also, Mr. Speaker, it stops other government departments and municipalities from moving in on a family operating a community-care facility in their own dwelling house and there's been a lot of discussion around that in the past. You know, the first night there's a couple of boarders, all of a sudden they descend upon him. Well, this won't be the case and I think that this new Act, in section 7(b) will pretty well stop that kind of foolishness, where really nobody quite understood where they were going.

Anyway, I think, Mr. Speaker, that the amendment itself is pretty well self-evident, the need for it. I think it's the kind of an Act that if there's to be a great deal of discussion in any of the sections, I think that it probably, by virtue of the fact that it's a bit diverse, would lend itself to answering questions in the committee stage.

Mr. Speaker, I would therefore move second reading of Bill 109.

**MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley):** Just a couple of points about the bill and I agree basically with what the Minister said, certainly with regard to private homes being used as community-care facilities. The Minister will recall that I asked some time ago in the House that community-care facilities be licensed at the local level because of various problems that occur because of the centralization of the licensing procedures.

I bring up the same story again, though, that this side of the House has been concerned about the expansion of the bureaucracy again. I wonder whether it's necessary to go this far to have more boards appointed at salary levels. The provincial board idea, I think, is a good one and certainly the community representation, but I wonder why we need to have more boards at the local level and why the medical health officer and his staff can't be expanded in a manner by which they could do the local community licensing.

There is a danger as well, Mr. Speaker, in these kind of boards just overriding the municipal responsibility which they have the power to do under the terms of this Act and I would hope that any such boards would be

structured in such a manner, perhaps even with municipal representation on them, so that they don't just override bylaws, which are set up by the municipalities in most instances for a good reason.

A board can come along like this and it may find itself in conflict and has the power now to really cut the municipal council out of the action. I would hope that that won't happen. Perhaps the Minister will consider making sure that there are representatives from the municipal council as well and perhaps the local school board too, on these boards if lie's going to insist on having provincial boards established.

I would hope too, Mr. Speaker, some way or other there's more concern placed on the attitudes and psychological makeup of the people who are applying for licenses in this field. Too often, I think, we get people applying for these kind of licenses who really haven't looked into the whole operation correctly, aren't equipped to handle the care of people in intermediate situations or personal situations, are of the wrong kind of attitude and psychological makeup and probably should never be in this business at all.

This is where I find that most of the complaints we get arise — from individually operated rest homes — because there was no investigation done into the capability of the people who are applying to open up these kinds of facilities.

Some way I would hope that the medical health officer would also be required to have someone from the Mental Health Branch on this local board as well.

[ [Page 3691](#) ]

With those few reservations, Mr. Speaker, I welcome and this party welcomes the move into more locally-controlled granting of community-care facilities licences.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Mr. Speaker, the reason I had the brief exchange across the floor with the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke) was because as I read the Act the local boards, once the decision has been made to appoint them, will be comprised of individuals who are appointed by three Ministers of the Crown: the Minister of Health, Minister of Human Resources (Hon. Mr. Levi) and the Minister of Education (Hon. Mrs. Dailly).

That would seem to indicate that the local boards are going to be three in number, that that is going to be their complement.

Now that may be fine in some communities but I would suspect that in the City of Vancouver, for example, or in any of the major urban centres, that a local board consisting of three members only is going to be hard-pressed to fulfil the responsibilities which the Minister so clearly outlined would be theirs.

I wonder if the Minister, in closing the debate, could also indicate in what way there will be active coordination between the various local boards. He spoke about the problems whereby, in one jurisdiction the regulations said there had to be 40 cubic feet in a facility for child, another one 30 and so on. It would seem to me that it would be unfortunate if these local boards in exercising their responsibilities, were making decisions which might interfere or conflict with similar decisions made by a local board in a neighbouring community. Again, this would most often apply in the larger urban centres.

If I have one area of concern with this amendment bill it is the power that is being given to override municipal bylaws. I know that in the establishment of community-care facilities difficulties are encountered in obtaining exemptions or changes in municipal bylaws, getting permits issued so that the community-care facility can be established in a residential area. It is a problem. But the problem is one of communication between the people who are interested in the establishment of the facility and of these people who reside in the local area where that facility will be situated.

Changing the power of granting the licence and overriding the bylaws from the municipal government to the community board or the facilities board established under the Act is not going to make that problem go away. I hope that the Minister and the board can address themselves to this particular problem.

I think it is unfortunate when, against the stated objections of individuals in a particular residential area, a community-care facility is allowed to establish and then there is continuing turmoil which surrounds that facility, interferes with the performance of its duties and generally creates a very bad situation in the community.

Municipal councils are affected by decisions of this kind and I would hate to see the provincial government, through these boards, putting itself in the same position. It seems to me that the direction in which we have to move is to clearly establish the need in the minds of the people in the community for a special facility and then actively promote the establishment of such an organization and see to it that it starts to work with all the backing that it can possibly get. That, rather than having an order made at the top that this facility is going to be established and that is it.

**MR. A.V. FRASER (Cariboo):** I just want to deal with appointments, really. This bill provides for appointments, but appointments in general. To this Minister, I wonder why he doesn't consult with MLAs on different appointments — or does he? If he doesn't want to do that at least he should have the courtesy, I think, when they are notified of the MLA getting a copy of these appointments because you read about them afterwards if you are fortunate enough to catch them in the press.

What I'm saying, really, is that this Minister hasn't had any liaison, certainly in my case. I would appreciate being advised, if he doesn't want to consult, after he has made the decision. Really, what I am saying is that things are not always better with "Coke", as they say. (Laughter.)

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Mr. Speaker, there were very good points brought up by the opposition on this particular bill. And I share a lot of your concerns about the whole area of the direction to go — whether we should be liberal in this whole question of licensing, or whether we should be more confining.

Believe me, there are lots and lots of people on both sides of that issue, Mr. Speaker, who are not less than eloquent, because they are talking continually on this whole subject.

But let me just say this to the Member for Langley (Mr. McClelland): Mr. Member, you brought up the two very best reasons yourself for local boards and some more autonomy at the local level around this whole question of licensing. You know, despite the appointment and who it should be and how it should be, we recognize that you don't have to appoint civilians.

For instance, if I wanted to, according to this, my three appointments as Minister of Health could be three people from the local health services. I suspect that....

Interjections.

[ [Page 3692](#) ]

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Yes, well, I was just getting to that. I was just going to say, however, that I had better not do that. We had better sort of share this thing so that people representing council or people representing the local health services and others — really representing the needs of that community — can do a better job. Frankly we have to have these locals. Where they are civil servants, of course, they won't be remunerated. Where it is somebody else.... I don't know; I won't guarantee. We just have the right here.

What we're saying is that we'll certainly pay any travelling expense and out-of-pocket expenses. Where we go from there is a matter that we're going to have to discuss as a cabinet around this whole question when we're drafting the regulations.

The second thing that you indicated that was very important was the attitude of the local applicants. We don't know that attitude of the local. In other words, he might have a bad attitude and he shouldn't be permitted anything, despite the fact that he's got a beautiful facility ready and waiting to serve. But local people only know that guy and what he's thinking and his record and so on. So that's another reason, and a good one, that you brought up that says to us: "Let's as quickly as we can somehow or other decentralize this whole area."

Also, Mr. Speaker, around the questions that were raised by the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) regarding turmoil around the local facilities and so on, again, I believe that it's these local people.... And it's not three, as I read the Act, Mr. Speaker. I believe that we have at least we have to appoint three each — except for the Minister of Education, who appoints two.

As I recall the old Act — these are just the amendments.... Maybe I shouldn't make too broad and sweeping a statement on this because I might be found to be less than truthful. But as I recall the old Act, it strikes me that there is more breadth than what is indicated in this amendment.

Mr. Speaker, we want to resolve more problems at the local level, and that's what this is really all about. We want to provide better opportunities for people at the municipal council level, the union boards of health and Department of Education the municipal level, the union boards of health and the Department of Education one way of going about it.

Regarding the appointments, I'm sorry that there hasn't been enough consultation with the Member for Cariboo (Mr. Fraser). I'm sure that I can remedy that, if the Member for Cariboo can remedy some of his antics when we start discussing things at the local level. Anyway, Mr. Speaker, I have a broad back, but I don't like it when it's got knives in it.

I welcome all the advice on this Act, Mr. Speaker. I therefore move second reading.

Motion approved.

Bill 109, *Community Care Facilities Licensing Amendment Act, 1974*, read a second time and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Second reading of Bill 113, Mr. Speaker.

### TUBERCULOSIS INSTITUTIONS AMENDMENT ACT, 1974.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't really think that this bill requires a great deal of debate. What we've done here is that we have said to the municipalities of the Province of British Columbia that we' will accept, as a provincial government, full responsibility for tuberculosis in your communities.

Up to now the communities have been paying their share. That share, I believe, is something in the order of around \$1 million, or something less.... No, it wouldn't be that much. It's \$250,000. I think the whole question is about \$1 million, and the municipalities have been paying 25 per cent of the total cost.

So what we are saying here is consistent with the health policies of this government — taking more responsibilities off the shoulders of the local people.

I move second reading, Mr. Speaker.

Motion approved.

Bill 113, *Tuberculosis Institutions Amendment Act, 1974*, read a second time-and referred to Committee of the Whole House for consideration at the next sitting after today.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

### ESTIMATES: DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS (continued)

On vote 235: Minister's office, \$100,716.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Mr. Chairman, I rise on this Minister's estimates somewhat sadly in that I have to read in the paper the charges that were raised in the hall after the Second Member for Victoria (Mr. D.A. Anderson) left these chambers.

Mr. Chairman, it is saddening; really, I have a hard time saying the kinds of things that are in my heart. This kind of pathetic grab for headlines, this real pathetic grab, by calling a person in this House "liar" or "misleading"....

The term "liar," Mr. Chairman, in this session of

[ [Page 3693](#) ]

the Legislature has been used as a club to pound and smash away at the parliamentary process in this province. I don't really think that we have to argue at great length or debate who was right, wrong or indifferent. We know perfectly well that anybody can rise in this chamber from day to day — we've got *Hansard* now — and he can interpret what someone else is saying in a slightly different manner than what he meant in the first place.

Certainly I have never backed off from my original position, but that's neither here nor there, Mr. Chairman. I don't really think that this Minister's estimates, any more than the Attorney-General's (Hon. Mr. Macdonald's) estimates or the Minister of Agriculture's (Hon. Mr. Stupich's) estimates or the Premier of this province's estimates, should be carried on and on and on — not really eliciting information about those estimates, but trying desperately to assassinate character, trying desperately to hammer the process of this province.

Mr. Chairman, despite the fact that the Member over there doesn't like this government, remember this: there will be other governments later. If you ruin the parliamentary process now just because of the fact that you don't like the incumbent, it seems that a terrible disservice has been done to this entire process.

I, for one, feel that this is so much stronger a process than the republic process. I feel that it is much stronger than....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to address himself to the Minister's responsibilities.

**MR. FRASER:** Are you going to vote against the private bills committee recommendations?

**HON. MR. COCKE:** Mr. Chairman, that's the exact situation we have here.

**MR. FRASER:** You're the one that's wrecked the parliamentary process.

**HON. MR. COCKE:** We've been going along accepting charges on this Minister's estimates, and I just feel that the Members in this House should all start thinking in terms of their own conscience and where they are going.

**MR. McCLELLAND:** There's just one item I wish to raise about ICBC under this Minister's estimates, Mr. Chairman. It has to do with non-owned trailers, commercial trailers, There is a firm in Vancouver — I imagine that there are several of them — which rent out trailers to licensed carriers but don't own any of them themselves. They own the tractors and rent out the trailers.

In the past their insurance rate has been based on the marketable value of the unit, which they buy on a per-time basis for these non-owned trailers. For instance, if the estimated cost or value of the trailer is \$30,000, then they get \$30,000 worth of insurance. They are considered to be an overflow carrier for the commercial transport operations. They buy what I understand is known as a non-owner policy.

The company with which I am concerned — Triple-A Trailer Services in Vancouver — has, I think, 11 or 12 units on the highway plus one tractor-train unit. The company has bought 12 policies at a value of \$10,000 each for these trailers, for which they paid a premium of \$502 for each of these 12 units.

In the past they have bought their insurance, Mr. Chairman, on a per-trailer basis. Now they find that ICBC has no policy for tractor-train units. Instead of getting their insurance, even though they seem to be paying on a per-trailer basis, they're getting their insurance based on a per occurrence, per-accident basis. It doesn't matter how many trailers the unit happens to be pulling.

So what has happened here is that the company had a tractor-train unit on the highway pulling two trailers. The unit was involved in an accident, the trailers were totally destroyed and when the company went to claim their insurance, a rebate of their insurance payment, ICBC would only pay them for one trailer worth \$10,000. But they had lost two trailers worth \$20,000. So they are on that occasion \$ 10,000 out of pocket.

Now what I want to know from the Minister is whether or not there are going to be some changes in the ICBC policy so that these tractor-train units are covered, because the only other solution for an operator in this kind of circumstance would be to inflate the value, to double the value of a single unit. Then, likely, ICBC would come along, if there was a claim anyway, and say: "I'm sorry, but that's an inflated value and we can only pay you for what the thing is really worth.

That brings me to another point in the same case. The tractor which was pulling these units also was totally demolished. It was insured for \$30,000. A premium was paid for that amount of insurance and ICBC is now saying.... As a matter of fact, the \$30,000 value was confirmed by the people who sold the trailer. Only six weeks ago it was worth \$30,000. Now ICBC comes along and wants only to pay \$20,000 to replace this unit. So there's another \$ 10,000 that this company is out.

Basically I understand that that's in the hands of a lawyer now and they are involved with negotiations with ICBC for the tractor unit. But the trailer unit — there seems to be a vacuum in ICBC policy here for all of the truckers who pull this kind of train unit. I'm afraid that if the truckers go to ICBC and inflate the value of their units and then find themselves with

[ [Page 3694](#) ]

two trailers demolished, they are going to get into the same kind of situation where ICBC will say: "I'm sorry, but your unit is worth only half of what you said it is, and you are only going to get half payment." That's exactly what's happened here.

I wonder if the Minister would comment on that policy, or lack of it.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I don't know the details of the case. It's the first I've heard about it. But as a general principle I think I can state that if there were two trailers insured and two trailers are destroyed, two trailers should be paid for.

**MR. McCLELLAND:** I agree.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I can state that as my opinion of what the general policy should be.

Insofar as the tractor being insured for \$30,000 and they only want to pay \$20,000: as you know, when you get into that field of valuation and original valuation and depreciated valuation.... It's probably somewhere in there where the argument lies.

That can happen in almost any case. It's a normal insurance practice, really, to compensate for the actual value, not for what someone said it was. But, certainly, if you send the details, we'll check into the whole thing.

**MR. McCLELLAND:** I'll have it for you.

**MR. GIBSON:** At the time of adjournment of debate on the Minister's estimates last night I was going through some of the history of the denial of simple justice to the municipalities of this province in the sense of the guaranteed payment of full municipal taxes by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia and the need for this



Minister to give them that guarantee.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Member that he should address his remarks specifically to the administrative responsibility of this Minister and also that he should not go over information already given to the House. Rather, if he has new information, raise that.

**MR. GIBSON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, to address the second point first, clearly I'm not going over information which has been given to the House. I was up to January 9 in my recital of the record and I'm proceeding forward from that date.

On the other matter, with respect to the administrative responsibilities of the Minister, he is, of course, the Minister responsible to this House for the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. It would strike me that his salary vote is the only place where we can discuss matters related to the administration of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that the decision must be clearly his administrative responsibility alone. If it is a matter that has to be dealt with in cabinet, it would not, strictly speaking, be proper to raise it under this Minister's vote.

**MR. GIBSON:** Mr. Chairman, it's clearly the decision alone of this Minister whether he makes the recommendation to cabinet that the ICBC should pay municipal taxes under section 11 of the ICBC Act. It's that Minister's decision and no one else's. He has the power to stand up in this House right now and say he will do that, or he has the power to say he won't do that. Therefore, since that's his power, I say it must be debated under his salary estimates.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Hon. Member continue, as long as he relates his remarks to the administrative responsibility of this Minister?

**MR. GIBSON:** Now, at the time of adjournment last night, I had just commenced to read into the record a very short letter, dated January 9, to the ICBC from the municipal clerk of the District of North Vancouver. You may recall I referred to order-in-council 4265, which was issued in December of 1973, to allow for the payment of taxes in 1974 only. This letter commences:

"Order-in-council 4265, dated December 20, 1973, has been received by the council and concern has been expressed that payment of municipal taxes is authorized for the year 1974 only.

"The council feels that zoning and construction should not be proceeded with until there is assurance that the policy will be continued and full taxes will be paid in subsequent years.

"Yours very truly."

A very short, simple request, Mr. Chairman. A request that we have reason to believe from previous correspondence that the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia agrees with in principle. The bottleneck is that Minister.

This policy was again reaffirmed at a later meeting of council on March 11. Subsequently, the acting mayor at that time, Acting Mayor Slattery, wrote to the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Seymour (Mr. Gabelmann) and myself with respect to this problem on March 12. He sent at that time a copy of the letter to the Hon. Minister and to another gentleman in the Department of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, who apparently has had some of the

negotiating responsibility with respect to this land in North Vancouver. The letter from Mr. Slattery to the Hon. Member for North Vancouver–Seymour and myself summarizes in a reasonable way the history of this dialogue.

A suggestion was made at that time that it would be a good thing if a meeting could be arranged between members of the council and the Minister to try and work this out. I want to stress that nobody in this particular case wants to get into a wrangle; we just want to get those taxes paid. We're not looking for a fight.

A meeting in due course was arranged with the Minister, to no real effect. We have, in an April 1 council meeting, the council considering the matter again and it again being unsatisfactory from their point of view — and from my point of view, Mr. Chairman, I assure you.

I have other internal documentation showing the way in which the council has been wrestling with this problem, culminating in a recent letter of May 24 from the mayor to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia which relates both to the question of wrecks on the Dollarton Highway property and specifically to the subject of municipal taxation.

As I related the other day, the mayor indeed did meet with the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia and something may be coming to pass on the wrecks. I certainly hope so, Mr. Chairman, because the original negotiations for this land specified that the land would be a clean operation. We have this quote from *The Vancouver Sun* of May 13:

"The scene resembles the aftermath of a demolition derby. On Friday, 12 wrecks were parked just off the highway in full view of two apartment blocks, and a dozen more damaged cars lay at the rear of the lot.

"Mrs. Davidson, mother of three, said mothers in her block have a constant battle on their hands keeping young children from playing in the wrecks. She said there are 74 children on the block."

That's just an example of how the wishes of the municipality and even commitments to the municipality have been ignored. This was to be a clean operation with no wrecks, and there it is with wrecks on it. They're going to get them off, they say. I say, get them off quickly and then let's get on to the resolution of that other problem. It's a matter of simple justice. It's a matter of whether taxpayers in one particular municipality, whether it's the District of North Vancouver or any other around the lower mainland or around this province, should have to absorb the burden of not having taxes paid on a provincial government installation for the benefit of the municipal taxpayers in other areas adjacent serviced by those facilities.

I say, it's the clear policy of this government in other areas to pay those municipal taxes. The only reason that's not being done here is a Minister who is just too stubborn to say: "I will go to the cabinet. I will ask that an open-ended order-in-council be passed authorizing the payment of taxes not just in 1974 but in the years beyond." The Minister knows that can be done. I say that it's simple justice not just to this municipality but to municipalities all over the province that he should do that. I hope he will have something to say about that, Mr. Chairman.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, I've already explained to the Member my position on this. That Member has in his possession internal documents, minutes of meetings of council held in camera, and a variety of other correspondence. He referred to a meeting that I had with the members of the council. When those members left my office, they had a message to take back to that council. I gathered from them that they had the correct impression from what I had said. I expected the matter was solved.

I was disappointed when I received words to the reverse of that. I did make a commitment and I've made a commitment to every municipality. As I explained earlier, we set out to be good corporate citizens. We didn't have to do that; it was a clear demonstration of our intent. We went through all of the processes of permits, zoning — anything — to meet all of the normal requirements of any other citizen, corporate or otherwise. We found ourselves faced with other demands.

Now, you talk about the wrecks that were there. Okay; they're there because we had to have a place to put them. Had we been allowed to build that claim centre, those wrecks wouldn't have been there. The claim centre would have been finished long ago and operating as a first-class part of ICBC.

I have already given a clear indication of my good faith and that's where the matter sits.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria):** Mr. Chairman, earlier on, the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cooke) made reference to statements made in the House previously. He accused the opposition and me in particular of attacks on the parliamentary process and a disservice to our system, which in his view is better than the republican, as though that had a great deal to do with it.

But never once was there any effort to face up to the real question which was raised in this House by this particular matter which he referred to and by another one which was, of course, the appointment of ICBC agents. The other one was the handing out of ferry contracts.

The opposition numbers 17 against the government majority. The government numbers 38. For us to request information from cabinet Ministers

[ [Page 3696](#) ]

on public matters that we feel are of public importance is in no way, we feel, an attack upon the parliamentary process. For us to rise in our seats, as we have done time after time, to try and get information which should be made public, we think in no way attacks the parliamentary process but indeed strengthens it because we are here as the people's representatives, we are here to question the Crown, the executive, on precisely what they are doing and how they are doing it. We are carrying out a role which has been handed down or developed over the centuries from the time that parliamentary democracy first began. The Attorney-General seems to be concerned about this, but it happens to be the facts.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. As I said to the Minister of Health (Hon. Mr. Cocke), and as I will say to you, would you please address your remarks to vote 235?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The question that comes is why both he and the Minister of Transport and Communication (Hon. Mr. Strachan) refuse to face up to the questions that have been asked in this House in the one instance since, I think, around the 18 of February and in the other well before that, indeed, dating back into last year. Why is it that we are not getting answers to straightforward questions dealing with the two issues?

I just fail to see how requests for information, requests for clarification of Ministerial statements, constitute this savage attack from this enormous group here in opposition upon that hard-pressed group over there.

Interjections.

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

Interjections.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The Premier perhaps fails to understand either the need to have....

**HON. D. BARRETT (Premier):** Call us all names and get it over with.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The Premier once more interrupts.

The question is this: why is it that we have, in this case, direct conflict of testimony and no effort made by the cabinet to clear it up? It is simple enough to enforce certain rules of the House and not to enforce others, which are there just as much by custom, by constitution, which require that in cases where there are such discrepancies, Ministers make reasonable efforts to clear up the inaccuracies and if they cannot and have shown that indeed they have failed to be candid with the House, they resign. Those are rules of the House as well as rules dealing with statements made in this House, and the Premier should know it.

For example, take the case of the appointments of ICBC agents. We have clear statements from the man involved, Mr. Sharpe — the man appointed — that he went to the Minister for assistance. I quote the *Sun* of February 20: "I thought it could be that he would be a bit of help," added Don Sharpe in a telephone interview from his office in Kamloops. He said there had been nothing in the letter he had written to Cocke except that 'I just asked

him if he could help me."

**AN HON. MEMBER:** What's wrong with that?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The Member shouts, "What's wrong with that?" The thing that is interesting is that he was, of course, the only agent appointed at the time, apparently, who did not qualify. Fair enough — the Minister appoints a friend, the rules are bent, altered or changed but why is it that the reason and excuse for this is put upon the Insurance Agents' Association of British Columbia when, in fact, they made no such request? That is why, again on the 20th February in a similar article in the *Sun*, the request was made: "Anderson asked Cocke and Strachan to apologize and withdraw the answers they had given Tuesday to questions on the same matter." That is not an enormously difficult request to accede to if it happens that the information is in fact inaccurate. If it happens that we get replies to questions, there may be cases....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Member that I thought he might raise something new, but the points he has raised have already been raised a number of times. The Minister has indicated that he has given his full answer on this matter. I would ask him to either raise something new or discontinue.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, the point is this: I have been referring to the *Sun* article, which I did not refer to yesterday, dealing with this case. I am trying to point out that the request was made reasonably, that in the light of the conflicting testimony, we get some explanation for it; or if it was indeed inaccurate, that the men apologize and withdraw the answers they have given.

You, Mr. Chairman, who sometimes sits in the chair when the House is in full session, are fully aware that most of our difficulties stem from the fact that we are simply not getting replies to reasonable questions. That was, as I felt then and feel now, a reasonable question.

[ [Page 3697](#) ]

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would point out that this is a matter of opinion and the Chair must rule as the standing orders apply. As the standing orders reads, the matter may not be repeated over and over again.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** We have precedents in this, Mr. Chairman. I'm sure 67 times will be the limit which we won't get to today. But the question still remains: why is it, when you have a clear discrepancy in testimony, when you have here a clear statement made by the Minister dealing with this particular appointment, you do not get reasonable doubt cleared up by either of the Ministers?

This is why we in the opposition have to sometimes repeat certain questions to Ministers who feel they can use their majority, who feel they can use their position, who feel they can use the executive power they have to disregard the parliamentary process in this Legislature. That is precisely what they are doing. And I submit to you that that probably is far more destructive of the British parliamentary system than the opposition raising questions which is their right and their duty to do, The statement is clear: "When, on the recommendation of the agents' association, which said that there would not be enough of them to do the job, they came to us at the end of the year indicating quite clearly that they just couldn't handle it, ICBC at that time made a decision to expand the number of agents who would qualify."

Hamilton, the head of the agents' association, in his statements had a very different story indeed. It goes back to this interview that he had on a radio station where he was interviewed by one Mr. Webster who said: "There is one thing I want to get back to: did the insurance agents of B.C." — that is the Sharpe case again — "make any representations to Strachan on the ICBC to appoint new agents because of attrition in those who had earlier been qualified as licenced people?" The reply came back: "No, we did not. None whatsoever." Webster went on: "Well, as a result of what was said by Strachan as your representation, six new agents have been appointed and 13 others have been appointed who were in the process of being qualified are being dropped in error from the list." Hamilton said: "Nothing to do with any representations by our association. We have been in touch with them on a daily basis for a year and a half. "

The question which just defeats me, the question which came up on the 20th February, which came up when I put this matter on the order paper, as I stated I would do in an attempt to get it dealt with in that way by a committee, is: why, under the circumstances we cannot have a Minister recognize his responsibility to clear up the discrepancy, to come to the House and simply not leave either the name of Hamilton blackened for having lied on the air or indeed, the name of the Minister blackened if Hamilton was telling the truth?

Why is it that when we ask questions on this, when we recommend that there be an apology, if indeed there was a misstatement of fact, why is it that we get total silence for virtually three months from the Minister of Health and the Minister responsible for Autoplan, namely, the Minister of Transport and Communications?

Is this a destruction of democracy as both Ministers shouted about? Is this a destruction of democracy to try and find out what it is that really took place? Are we, in our position in the opposition, to leave go by statements which clearly say, if the Minister is truthful, that Mr. Hamilton, the head of the insurance agents of British Columbia, on that programme did not tell the truth at all and indeed lied to Webster and the thousands of people who were listening? That is the question that I am trying to get to, Mr. Chairman, because of the two people, they cannot both be correct. Both have knowledge of the facts, therefore there must be, indeed, deliberate deceit on the part of one or the other.

You can understand this, Mr. Chairman. There is a statement made by a member of the public; it can be cleared up in no time by the Minister. His reputation can be cleared. Yet there is no effort made to do that thing. Why not?

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Maybe he was mistaken.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, there is always the case of mistake. Yet in almost 100 days no effort was made to correct the mistake.

The second case is the one that deals with a firm in my constituency, a company in my constituency which employs approximately 50 or 55 people, I understand. It was a case of this firm, which competes for business around the world, which has tried hard to bring to Victoria a high-income, high-skill, non-polluting industry. They have tried to have their design work sold elsewhere as well.

They found that when it came to contracts with the British Columbia government they were not given the opportunity of bidding. Yet, the statement was made again in the House that an opportunity had been made because they had been asked for "the same thing" as the Seattle firm which got the contract without tendering.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please! I would point out to the Hon. Member, on this issue as well, that he should try to raise some new matters since this subject has been canvassed at length.

[ [Page 3698](#) ]

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, may I remind you of the decision of the Speaker...?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please! I'd just draw to your attention standing order 43. It says:

"Mr. Speaker or the Chairman, after having called the attention of the House, or of the committee, to the conduct of a Member who persists in irrelevance or tedious repetition either of his own arguments or the arguments used by other Members in debate may direct him to discontinue his speech."

So I would ask the Hon. Member to....

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, I would refer you to the decision of the Speaker of the House, Mr. Speaker Dowding, at the last day of the fall session in which he said this matter should be discussed during the estimates of the Minister. It has been raised, as I understand it, just once before in these estimates.

Now, if repeating a second time a matter on which you cut me off yesterday, developing it some length and

perhaps requesting again an answer from the Minister is tedious and repetitious when it's only the second time it has been raised in the debate, I will be very surprised indeed.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please! The matter which you were discussing — these plans for a new ferry and so on — has been discussed a number of times, not twice. I would ask the Hon. Member to remember what has already been said and to be sure to raise new information.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, I will certainly remember what has been said and I will do my best to raise new information. I would simply remind you, Mr. Chairman, of something which I believe you are unaware of: namely, the decision of Mr. Speaker Dowding that this thing should be raised at this time during the estimates of this particular Minister. It has been raised, I understand, during these estimates in debate but once before, yesterday.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please! The Hon. Member is correct in that it should be raised during estimates. However, it has to be done within the rules of the House and the committee. I'm simply cautioning him that he should raise some new matter.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, I appreciate the Chairman's caution. I'm happy to carry on, and perhaps he can judge for himself rather than anticipate problems which may or may not exist. I again refer him to the decision of Mr. Speaker Dowding. That perhaps may be tedious and repetitious but I understand that you haven't looked at it yet.

Interjection.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The company in question is a Victoria firm employing approximately 55 people. They are engaged as marine architects. They're attempting to get business, naturally in British Columbia but also elsewhere as well. They've done work for people in other parts of the world and their reputation obviously is an important factor.

The company naturally wanted to be in competition for British Columbia ships because they feel, naturally, if they can sell at home, the possibility of them selling elsewhere will be enhanced. In turn, if they fail to win domestic contracts, clients overseas may well question their abilities to do work for them.

You understand that, Mr. Chairman; it's a very important fact that the reputation of the firm is at stake in this area. Careless and inaccurate statements by the Minister or other people can damage that reputation very substantially.

When I asked the Minister on September 24 whether or not there had been tenders called so that this British Columbia naval architects firm could have an opportunity to compete and bid on the proposed new ferries, the Minister indicated the competitive estimates for design had been obtained from two firms. On May 24 this was reported to him.

Now, he said in *Hansard*, page 168:

Competitive estimates were obtained...from the Victoria, B.C., naval architects, CELL (Case Existological Laboratories Ltd.) for design fees for a trailer ship and a 274-car ferry.

He added that:

The same thing...

Mark those words.

...was asked of another firm and we find that the amount of money being asked to provide this and the time required to do the job is much less with the firm whose plans were in this place the other day.

I just remind you once more of the fact that we would not even have known of this other firm being involved had it not been for an accidental visit to a committee room by a Member of the press corps who stumbled by accident

onto the entire designs, the models, the rest, which had been laid out for the Minister's viewing, presumably, and other people's viewing as well. The public, ourselves and the press would have had no knowledge of this had it not been for that accident.

Anyway, I stress for you, Mr. Chairman, the words, "the same thing." The same thing was never asked of those two firms. That's the critical point.

Later on, I questioned the Minister further on that. I think it took six questions to get him to admit that, in fact, some contract had been given to the Seattle firm, a contract for \$ 10,000 for preliminary

[ [Page 3699](#) ]

design sketches.

On October 24 the Minister announced to the press that the Seattle firm had been awarded the \$577,000 contract to design these two ferries, 376 cars apiece and the trailer ferry. He indicated in that press report that the Seattle firm had received the contract because its bid was more than \$100,000 lower than that of CELL, it had promised to prepare the designs in one-third of the time and nine of the B.C. ferries now in operation were based on its design.

Now, that simply didn't coincide with information I had in my possession. So I asked the Minister then and I asked him subsequently on at least six occasions to table the May 24 report which he referred to as the report which indicated that he had received competitive estimates for design from two firms. He indicated that there was a May 24 report, and he has since then never released it to me or anybody else. claims, with, I think, a certain amount of justification — and I've tabled letters in the House on this as you are well aware, Mr. Chairman — that the parameters given to the two firms were quite different and the procedure used was quite different.

The B.C. firm was asked at a luncheon meeting and then by telephone to give a rough estimate of the cost of ferries of a particular size and configuration. The firm will use the ferry authority and the Highways department's own cost schedules to determine what their fee should be — just exactly what was laid down by the department itself. The Department of Highways' manual concerning consulting engineers was the one in use. That's what an engineering firm can charge in cases such as this.

The claim of the Minister that the Canadian firm was charging \$100,000 too much can be challenged for two reasons: (1) It's a fixed government set proportion of total cost. (2) It's simply not true. Later information provided by CELL indicated that the difference could conceivably be \$15,000, which would be higher in the case of CELL.

Then we come to the second aspect: the question of time. I refer you once more to the statement made earlier that it would take three times as long. Well, it turns out that instead of three times as long, you're dealing with the question of 15 days: the difference between 75 days and 90 days. Indeed, since the tender call for the ferries was mailed from the Minister's office on January 10, which is just a week short of the three months from the time the design contract was awarded, it is clear that the three-month quote by the Canadian firm was not much longer and certainly not three times as long.

The firm in question, as far as competence, was the one that designed the stretching of the B.C. ferries. If it was capable of stretching ferries and capable of doing that job, it seems very curious that it lacked the capability of putting in another bid on the ferries themselves. Certainly, in light of the Minister's statement that the firm itself had been already asked for bids, it seems curious that his department apparently changed its mind as to the competence....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please! I would point out to the Hon. Member that I'm sure he appreciates the spirit of the standing orders. I believe the intention of this particular standing order is to avoid having the House hear over and over again the same facts repeated. It doesn't matter if it's once or twice or several times, I think it takes up the time of the committee. I would therefore ask the Hon. Member to try to raise new matters rather than keep repeating matters that are already on record.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, I can quote from letters not yet quoted: the Nickum-Spaulling letter which was tabled in the House on October 10 and dated May 18, 1973; Case Existological Laboratories, dated May 8, 1973 and tabled November 6, 1973; we have the Premier's letter of November 2, 1973 to the Case Existological Laboratories; we have the letter from Mr. Weston, operations manager — this one was not tabled in the House — to Nickum and Spaulling Associates Inc., naval architects and marine engineers, 71 Columbia Street, Seattle, Washington, dated May 31, 1973; a letter from Peter Hart, director of operations of CELL, to Mr. Weston, operations manager of the ferries.

I could quote from these, which I don't believe have been quoted from before. But the question remains the same whether I quote from them or not, Mr. Chairman.

The fact is that reasonable questions have been asked. Statements have been made: in the one case damaging to the reputation of an individual; in the other case damaging to the reputation of a firm. Both these deserve some sort of clarification; both demand it.

The Ministers in question have decided over the months and months and months on both these issues that they will be silent. Their response in the House yesterday as well as today is one of attack, absurd attack, on the fact that this requesting of information to clear the name of companies, to set the records straight, to clear the names of the individuals and set the records straight there, as well as to clear the name of the insurance agents' association, the professional association, is somehow anti-democratic.

Well, I challenge that view most strongly.

**MR. CUMMINGS:** Smear, smear!

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The Member follows suit of the Minister. He simply yells "Smear" whenever there are questions which Ministers appear unwilling

[ [Page 3700](#) ]

or unable to answer. But the questions remain, and we are sent here to ask this type of question. We're sent here to do what we can to find out what the truth is or otherwise of these statements that are made. We're sent here to make sure that the people have an opportunity of questioning the executive; and we represent the people and we are questioning those with executive responsibility in running this province.

They have made statements which are damaging to individuals. They have made statements which are damaging to companies. They have made statements which are damaging to professional associations. There is simply no way that the statements they have made can be anything more than what I said yesterday. On the one hand you have evasions, evasions of questions. Then there is the question in the case of CELL and in the case of the agents' association — what appears to be deliberate evasion. And that is unavoidable.

We have the opportunity of setting the record straight. I appeal to them again to do so, because if they do not set the record straight, we're simply abusing and using this House to attack individuals, companies as well as professional associations, in a way which is thoroughly unpardonable.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. The Hon. Member made a remark which I would just ask him to clarify. He said that it "appears" the Minister is making deliberate evasions. I would ask him to temper his remarks. I think that this is unparliamentary. It is unparliamentary indirectly as it is directly.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** It is also equally unparliamentary for Ministers to make statements damaging to individuals and make no effort to clear it up, and you, Mr. Chairman, perhaps should point that out to them too.

**SOME HON. MEMBERS:** Hear, hear!

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. The Chair applies the rules. Any Member may rise on a point of order or



state a point of order at any time. I'm simply drawing to the attention of the Hon. Member that he's coming very close to making a deliberate attack on a Member of this House, and I'm just asking him to....

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, as I stated yesterday, there are questions which are unanswered which need to be answered. As I stated back on February 20 when this thing first came up with respect to one of these two issues, if inaccurate statements have been made by Ministers, apologies are due. Explanations are due. They were due then and they are due now. If we don't get them, the conclusion is inescapable that it was deliberate and it was not truthful.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Is the Hon. Member...?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, the Member says I don't answer questions. Then he says when I do answer them — which indicates that he was wrong in saying I don't answer them — that he doesn't like my answers.

Now, Mr. Chairman, yesterday that Member in this House, while he was speaking, made a statement that was absolutely wrong, but I'm not going to indulge in the kind of actions that he's indulging in. I have described to him the situation as I saw it. He refuses to accept that. That's his privilege.

I have never attacked any firm in this House, nor did I attack the individual he's referring to. At no time did I attack them, undermine them or anything else. He won't accept my answers. I described the situation as I saw it in both cases. I've answered.

Quite frankly, Mr. Chairman, the Member has my sympathy. He really has, because all we get is this continual, scurrilous character assassination. Even though I have set out the facts as I've seen them, he won't accept them. That's his right. But that doesn't give him the right to continue this scurrilous character assassination.

As I say, I'm sorry for the Member, and I suggest he go talk to his doctor.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would ask Hon. Members of the House to remember that in the parliamentary tradition it is the thing to treat each other as honourable Members. I would ask that both the Member for Victoria and the Hon. Minister obey the spirit of this principle.

I would ask the Hon. Second Member for Victoria to continue.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, the questions we raised simply are not being answered. In a contemptuous manner they are being rejected.

The fact is, was the firm of CELL asked to put in bids on the same thing as that American firm, as stated by the Minister? Is that true or not?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order, please. I would just point out that the Hon. Member did indicate sometime during his speech that he had asked some of these questions about six times. I recall that these questions have been asked a number of times.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The six-time question was a...

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

[ [Page 3701](#) ]

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:**...request for the May 24 report, which would set the record straight at least one way or the other.

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

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** He has it and he won't give it to us.

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

In accordance with the standing orders of the House I would ask the Hon. Member to raise some new information, I will give him one more chance; otherwise, I will have to ask you to discontinue your speech. Will the Hon. Member continue? But do not repeat questions which have been repeated already a number of times.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Some questions, Mr. Chairman, get repeated because they are fundamental questions, and the question of truth or otherwise is a fundamental one. That is why it gets repeated.

The firm in question, according to the Minister, was asked to put in bids on the same thing. Now this, according to all correspondence, is not so. According to the statement of the company, it is not so.

The one document which could probably throw some light on it, the May 24 document, the Minister refuses to make public. He refuses to deal with the issue of this particular case. That is why the question has come up again. It has come up frequently because he won't deal with the issue.

The issue is whether or not he, in his mind, or at least when he answered in Hansard on page 168 — the date was September 24 — when he said the same thing was asked of another firm, and we find that the amount of money being asked to provide this and the time required to do the job is much less with the firm whose plans were in the place the other day....

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

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** We want to know if it is true or otherwise.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** I did caution the Member now twice. I will ask the Hon. Member to discontinue his speech.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Well, Mr. Chairman, I....

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Will the Hon. Member be seated?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Chairman, I have no intention of discontinuing questioning on this particular matter, which goes fundamentally to the roots as to whether that Minister is or is not telling the truth.

Interjections.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Would the Hon. Member be seated and remain seated?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** No, Mr. Chairman, I cannot remain seated and let the vote go by without having some answers to these questions, and you know that.

Interjections.

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

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The statements are clear. The opportunity for correction is clear. The opportunity has been given time after time, and we are simply not getting replies. These are pretty fundamental questions.

Interjections.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The reason they are fundamental is that we want to know, and we have the opportunity of finding out in this House, representing the people, to ask this type of question. I just fail to see, Mr. Chairman, why these questions — repeated rarely in comparison with some other questions asked in this House — cannot be answered.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Mr. Speaker, while in committee I cautioned the Hon. Member not to be repetitious. We allowed him considerable latitude. Then I asked the Hon. Member to discontinue his speech. He refused to obey the Chair and he continued to speak.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Thank you.

Does the Hon. Member disagree with that summation?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** The summation is correct, Mr. Speaker.

**MR. SPEAKER:** The Hon. Member has, on quite a number of occasions, set himself as the judge of his actions — and the jury, as it were, of his actions — in the House, contrary to the rules of this House and contrary to the orders of the Chair.

It is not the content of his remarks that is the

[ [Page 3702](#) ]

concern of the Chair. What is of concern is the disobedience to the order of the Chair, which basically, I think, undermines the system which we enjoy in this province and in Commonwealth countries.

There are certain ways of doing things in parliament of long tradition. If this conduct continues, as it has now on five occasions in this session, not only will it lead to a new Guinness Book record, but it will do great harm to the parliamentary system.

In view of that circumstance, I have no alternative but to ask the Hon. Member to apologize to the House. Will the Hon. Member do so?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** I will never apologize for requesting the truth from Ministers.

Interjections.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I don't think that is the question. The question is apologizing, really, to the House when you attack the Chair by your conduct. You do, in effect, undermine the system and you do an offence to all the House. I would therefore ask you to apologize to the House for disregarding the orders of the Chair.

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Mr. Speaker, the system is undermined more when Ministers do not tell the truth.

**MR. SPEAKER:** In view of that, I have no course but to view the refusal of the Member to discontinue his conduct.... I take it you will not obey the order of the Chair when he asks you to desist. Is that correct?

**MR. D.A. ANDERSON:** Not under these circumstances.

**MR. SPEAKER:** I have no other course open to me, in view of this continued refusal, but to apply the next remedy that I have and the House has in defence of its privileges and in defence of its rights. I must therefore name you: David Anderson, I name you for your conduct. I call upon the House for some remedy.

**HON. MR. MACDONALD:** Mr. Speaker, in view of what has been said, and the naming that has taken place, I therefore move that the House dispense with the services of the Hon. Member until tomorrow.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would the Hon. Member absent himself in the event there may be some debate? But please stay within call. Is there any debate on the motion?

Motion approved.

**MR. SPEAKER:** Would you call the Hon. Member back? I would ask the Hon. Member to stand at his place. It is usual on a motion of this kind that the Hon. Member be suspended from the services of the House within the precincts for a period of five days on the first offence. And on this occasion, the House has determined that it shall be for one day. I assume that this means that you return to the House at the next sitting, tomorrow. In the circumstances I hereby order you to absent yourself from the service of the House, including the buildings, until tomorrow.

The House in Committee of Supply; Mr. Dent in the chair.

ESTIMATES: DEPARTMENT OF  
TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS  
(continued)

On vote 235: Minister's office, \$100,716.

**MR. SMITH:** There is a matter that I wish to bring to the attention of the Minister, one which is causing a great deal of concern to a number of small businesses in the Province of British Columbia. The businesses I refer to are the private adjusters who for many years provided a service to the public by making their professional skills and service available to the total insurance industry, both the general and auto field, in the servicing of claims.

Now, as I understand it, there is a minimum of at least 26 small adjusting firms in the Province of British Columbia with 30 or 40 offices scattered throughout the province that presently are on the verge of bankruptcy. The reason for that -is the fact that they have been told by ICBC that their services will not be used by the Crown corporation in adjusting any claims in the Province of British Columbia.

Now, if that was being done to save money for the taxpayers of the province, because after all it's a Crown corporation, it would seem reasonable for the Minister and the management of the corporation to make that decision. But in the Peace River country alone we now have a staff of 12 people, all paid by ICBC, adjusting nothing but ICBC claims. They are doing part of the work that a staff of six adjusters was able to do under the private enterprise system.

It's obvious that the cost to the insured people in the Province of British Columbia is certainly higher for providing only part of the service that private industry was able to do on behalf of insurance industry generally before the advent of ICBC.

I think that a government and a political party which has always claimed to be in favour of the little man is doing a great disservice by not using these

[ [Page 3703](#) ]

people who elect to remain independent businessmen in the field of adjusting claims. In most areas of the province, particularly in the rural areas, the majority of adjusting work is in the field of auto insurance claims. They had no voice in whether or not they would like to have a Crown corporation service all of the auto insurance in the Province of British Columbia. Yet because of the advent of the Autoplan, they are slowly and surely being forced out of business.

I've had conversations with an independent adjuster in Fort St. John, and he doesn't mind me using his name — his name is Ron Bayko, Bayko adjusting agency. He is a young man, married, with a family, trying to build a business for himself and his dependents upon the professional service that he renders, namely adjusting all the claims for any company that wished to avail themselves of his services. He's recognized as a professional in the field. He tells me that he was coerced by ICBC concerning the fact that they would employ him on a salary, and suggested to him that if he didn't become an employee of the corporation, he wouldn't be in business very long.

Well, I guess the corporation intends to make that suggestion come true because today his business has

shrunk to the point where it's less than half what it was a year ago.

As I say, it would be different if the corporation was saving money for the taxpayers of the province, but they're not. They're not providing any better service, they've doubled the number of people on the payroll of the corporation, and in Fort St. John, as in many other parts of the Province of British Columbia, they're forcing the small, independent insurance adjuster out of business.

[Mr. G.H. Anderson in the chair.]

I don't think the policy of any government should be to harm small, individual people who are trying to make a go of a business for themselves, including the Crown corporation. Certainly, Mr. Minister, I think the services of these people could be used as they were in the past, on a contract basis, on a fee for service. I think there is a way, if they're given at least part of the adjusting, that they can remain in business and perform a valuable service to the people in the Province of British Columbia.

I'd suggest to the Minister that these people are all professionals, many of them with many years of training and experience behind them. I'd like the Minister to comment on the position and the policy of ICBC.

As I understand it, the offices have been instructed by management not to use the services of any of the independent adjusters in this province. If that is correct, then I think it is a very sorry day for British Columbia and it certainly does nothing to build up the credit of the insurance corporation we now must go to to buy auto insurance in this province.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I have listened to the Member with interest. Many of the staff that we now have working as adjusters for ICBC did, of course, come out of the existing adjusting force. As a matter of fact, I think they all came out of the existing adjusting force. So there is still the same amount of adjusting to be done not only in the automobile field but in the general insurance field.

I notice, for instance, in the report of 1972 — and I imagine that the figures for this year are higher — that the direct losses incurred in the property insurance field alone amounted to about \$60 million, which requires a lot of adjusting services.

I could go through the report of the Superintendent of Insurance showing all the other areas of adjusting required by the private adjusting force.

Certainly I have not instructed them not to use the services of any independent adjusters. But I will check on that part of it.

**MR. SMITH:** Just a supplemental question to the Minister. I understand that there are somewhere between 26 and 30 firms scattered throughout the Province of British Columbia. They are small adjusting firms, generally with a staff of one or two or three people. But collectively, they have performed a good service, basically because around 75 to 80 per cent of their total adjusting business came as a result of auto adjustment claims in the past, and the other 25 to 30 per cent from the general insurance field — the adjusting of fire losses and public buildings and this sort of thing.

Now, they can't survive, Mr. Chairman, if they lose the revenue they used to receive on a fee-for-service basis for adjusting auto claims. They are going to be forced out of business in British Columbia.

Certainly I would hope that the Minister would find some way of at least jobbing out some of the work so that these people can remain in business in the Province of British Columbia. They shouldn't be forced to become an employee of ICBC in order to maintain themselves and their families in this province.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Over the past several days, in debating the Minister's salary vote, questions have been posed to him concerning the operation of ICBC. I'd like to make one more attempt to see if we can't get some positive answers on information which the Minister has or, at least, has the means of obtaining and giving it to this

House.

I'd like to know exactly what the capital investment of the Province of British Columbia is in

[ [Page 3704](#) ]

ICBC.

I'd like to know precisely what its premium income is, now and projected, for the balance of this year.

I'd like to know what its operating costs are, now and projected, on the budget basis for the balance of the year.

Only in this way can we know whether or not the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia is fulfilling the promise the Minister made to this House in the spring of 1973 when the legislation to establish the corporation was introduced, debated and passed.

It is particularly important that this information be made available now, in view of the recent announcements by the government that tax revenues are going to be made available for the reduction of the premium costs to automobile owners and drivers.

We are entitled to know and the people of British Columbia are entitled to know whether or not the general revenues of this province are going to be used to subsidize the operation of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

In March of 1973 the Minister was very closely questioned in the course of the debate on subjects which, in retrospect, I suppose he could not answer. He was being asked what rates could be charged for automobile premiums. He was asked this in the light of published statements of the New Democratic Party that insurance would be available for \$25.

He said at that time that it was not possible a year in advance to determine or make public what the rates would be. In so doing he said:

I can give assurance that there is inherent in a government automobile plan economies which reduce markedly the overall insurance costs.

I am quoting from *Hansard* of March 5, 1973. He went on to say:

Whatever the British Columbia motorist may pay for his automobile insurance in 1974, the portion of the premium dollar returned to him in claims will be far greater than if the present system were to continue. Subject to that, the non-profit features of the plan means that from year to year insurance costs and rates will be determined by the motorists themselves and only insurance costs and experience will be charged against the plan.

We seem to be moving markedly from the position which the Minister set before this House at that time. He went on to say:

The plan will be self-sustaining. All services rendered by any department of government or otherwise will be paid for from moneys belonging to the plan. Payments of all losses and expense of administration will be made from plan funds. In administering any plan under the Act, the corporation will assume responsibilities relating to the reduction and the frequency of accidents as well as to costs.

The Minister concluded that section of the debate by assuring the people of British Columbia that it was not introducing compulsory automobile insurance. He indicated, accurately, that this was done by the previous administration. But he went on to say:

What this administration is doing is to ensure that this virtual tax is not exploited for private profit or squandered in wasteful administrative costs.

Mr. Chairman, we're entitled to have answers from the Minister on those matters.

As I said, he either has the knowledge or he has the means of getting the knowledge at his fingertips. Over all the days that his estimates have been under consideration he has had upwards of nine assistants from his department and from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia available to him here on the floor of this House to give him information to enable him to respond to the questions placed by the Members. The information has not been given.

As the debates continued in the spring of 1973, serious charges were raised with respect to the way in which this Insurance Corporation of B.C. might be operated. In the course of responding to those arguments the Minister said some further things.

In the second reading of the bill to incorporate the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia the Minister, referring to sections of the bill which were under attack from the opposition, said, with regard to one section:

It is also in there to fulfil the pledge I made that no public money be used to operate this corporation.

"No public money be used to operate this corporation!"

We are entitled to know whether the announced policy of the Government of British Columbia is to use public money for the operation of this corporation.

The Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan), in her remarks in that debate, raised serious questions as to the use of public moneys for subsidy purposes. The Minister responded to her by saying that it was utter rot.

Well, Mr. Chairman, the Minister has the ability to prove whether it is rot or not with respect to the proposed plan.

Again, later in the same debate, in responding to questions posed by the Hon. First Member for Vancouver—Point Grey (Mr. McGeer), in wondering why the organization of the Insurance Corporation of B.C. would be different from British Columbia Rail and British Columbia Hydro, the Hon. Minister responded by saying:

For the very simple reason that I have given a guarantee that there shall be no subsidy of any kind toward the insurance company. "No subsidy of any kind."

Mr. Chairman, we are entitled to have these answers at this time, particularly in the light of the announcement made in Kamloops by the Hon.

[ [Page 3705](#) ]

Premier, which in some vague way indicated that general revenues were to be made available to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. The Minister yesterday, in speaking to the board of trade in Vancouver, put a figure of \$40 million to \$50 million out of revenues coming to the Province of British Columbia through the gasoline tax which would be made available to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia.

We are entitled to know at this stage in the debate whether or not those millions of dollars from general revenue are being used to subsidize the operation of ICBC. I trust the Minister won't stand in his place and suggest, as he and others have, that by asking these questions — questions which are being asked by others in this province, that are on the minds of any persons who are concerned with the future of ICBC, and the finances of this province — it is somehow or other expressing disloyalty.

We are entitled to have these answers at this particular stage because that is the only way we will ever know whether or not there is, in fact, a true reduction of insurance premiums by the use of tax revenue or whether there is, in fact, a subsidy to support what is proved to be a wasteful administrative operation.

Interjection.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Well, the Hon. Member for Saanich and the Islands (Mr. Curtis) raises a question: if the Minister can tell the board of trade, he can tell us. Yes, that's something else about the process in which we are involved in this House: significant announcements are made by Ministers of the Crown not in this House, which was a pledge I understood this government to make when it came to office,, but rather elsewhere in the province where it may serve them to better political advantage, as in Kamloops.

Mr. Chairman, why can't we have these answers? We have had the senior officers of ICBC here in this House for several days. They know the answers. With the computer technology available to that corporation, they must know their income and their costs to the minute. If they don't know their income and costs to the minute with the facilities at their disposal, then surely that monstrous corporation is in serious trouble.

Now, it may be that the answers to the questions which I pose might prove to be embarrassing to the Minister or to the government. The people of the Province of British Columbia are entitled to have the answers, embarrassing or not.

Other provinces which have gone into the insurance business have had to admit after experience that their initial premium rates were too low, that they had to raise premiums in order to meet their losses and their cost of operation. No one in the

Province of British Columbia would fail to understand that if that were the case. If the government has made a mistake, then let the government be honest enough to admit the mistake. No one will criticize the government for an honest mistake, but the government will certainly be criticized if it adopts policies and practices to take general revenues to subsidize the ICBC and give it the appearance of success.

It is the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia; it does belong to the people, as the ads have proclaimed. The people of this province are entitled to know what the facts are. They are particularly entitled to know what the facts are, Mr. Chairman, because for those persons who do not contribute to the gasoline tax revenues of the Province of British Columbia, they cannot be expected to lose \$40 million or \$50 million from general revenue only to subsidize the motorists of the province.

I trust we are not embarking on a financial policy whereby revenues from various sources are going to be earmarked for specific governmental responsibilities. We've had it said by the government that revenues from Bill 31 are going to help build chronic-care hospitals. That was an indication that perhaps the government was prepared to devote specific sources of revenue to specific purposes. It's bad fiscal policy. I suspect the government will not do that, but it's good politics to talk about it.

I think the government should put politics aside at this particular time and give us the answers to the questions posed time and time again so that we can determine whether or not the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia is living up to the guarantees that were given by the Minister when the legislation was before this House for debate.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I don't know how often I have to stand here, accused of not answering questions when I have answered questions...

**MR. D.E. LEWIS (Shuswap):** Hear, hear!

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** ...either straightforwardly out of information I have or answers that are contained within the annual report which under the laws of this province I must file with this House each year.

If anyone is playing politics, it's certainly the people across the way.

The Member says: "We must know what the premium income is." I've answered that question already in this House not once but several times.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** But they're absent all the time.



**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** The premium income to the end of February is in the annual report.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** That's right.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** He says: "We must get the answer. What is the premium income?" There it is, my friend, If you want the premium income up to date, as of March 30.... I gave it in April: I gave it May; I'm now giving it again May 30.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Vehicles: \$179,117,000.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Write it down.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** What else do they say? Capital investment. That's in the annual report. Operating costs. That's in the annual report.

He says if I can tell the board of trade, I can tell the House. At no time did I give any figure to the board of trade as to how much money would be utilized in order to offset the gasoline price increase.

In the course of my speech I made a comparison between the revenues available to the Province of Alberta out of the increased oil price: \$900 million odd. I said the Province of Saskatchewan will have increases from their oil revenues of about one-third of that. The Province of British Columbia will have somewhere around \$40 million. That's what I said. Then I went on to talk about the statement that was made by the Premier the other night.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Did the press quote wrong?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Well, I haven't had a chance to read the papers yet. But I watched the television news last night and, knowing what I had said, I would say there was a clear reflection of what I said. At no time did I say we are going to take \$40 million and utilize it for any specific purpose. To the best of my recollection, at no time did I make that specific statement.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Speaking from recollection. "To the best of my recollection."

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Now, the Member says, in the light of the Premier's statement....

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** You don't even bother to read the annual report.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** I read the annual report. Why don't you go on another trip?

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Just cheap politics.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** We get along better when you aren't in the House. Your whole party gets along better without you.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Just cheap politics....

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** Go for a trip. Go to Nanaimo.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I agree that what I said last year I said. No question about it. Since then there has been a changed set of circumstances, worldwide, which adds to the cost to the motorist. What the Premier said is that he gave ICBC instructions to examine certain factors. I can't stand here and tell you what is involved and....

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Just a minute. ICBC was given instructions to examine certain attitudes and objectives and to come in with recommendations. Until we have fulfilled that order I can't possibly tell you what is involved. As a reasonable man I think you'll understand that. This will require a considerable amount. When I was asked how long it would take the other day, I think I said I don't expect it until September. There is a great deal of work involved in carrying out the instructions we were given. I think that as a reasonable man you will agree with that.

Now, the Member asked how I can put a dollar figure on the money that will be available to ICBC. I can't put a dollar figure on that. We did get \$18 million advanced to the corporation but, as the annual report indicates, that was paid back to ICBC.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** What are the budgeted expenses for the balance of the year? You must know that. You must work on a budget of income and expense.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Is there a budget?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I'm not going to be able to satisfy the Member. I'm under commitment to file an annual report to this House. The annual report I have tabled this year is signed and audited by the Comptroller-General of this province. There will be an annual report next year.

We've been in operation as an operating company in that field for two months. You want us to give a whole multiplicity of answers that we just haven't had enough experience to give you. That's it, Mr. Member. You may not want to accept it but that is the situation. This is the first year of operation; we've been in operation in the automobile end of it for two months. There is no way I can give you a whole set of

[ [Page 3707](#) ]

figures.

You'll get your annual report and all of the questions you've been asking about what it is going to be like at the end of the year will be in that annual report. I'll table the annual report and they will all be covered. That's my responsibility and I'll fulfil that responsibility.

**MR. L.A. WILLIAMS:** We want to know now before you change the rules.

**MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan):** I don't want to repeat the debate that has been going on for these last many days, as mentioned by the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams), and the lack of answers from the Minister, but I would like to comment on just two points that are relevant.

Many Members in this House have said — and the last Member as recently as five minutes ago — that the government is not acting in a responsible manner in many of its programmes and, in this instance, ICBC. They brought in a programme last week which is designed as a smokescreen to cover the inadequacies of the administration within this corporation.

The Minister's statement now must surely serve to emphasize to all Members of this House, including the Members of the government side of this House and to the public, the absolute, irresponsible, pig-in-a-poke attitude that this government takes toward its administration.

The Minister can't answer detailed questions on the operation of ICBC. The Premier of the province suddenly gets up and decides that he has a windfall profit from the increase in gas prices, through no efforts of his own, and announces a policy in Kamloops that this is going to be a big dividend to the drivers of British Columbia. But, Mr. Chairman, he doesn't know before he announces the policy what the actual benefit is going to be in terms of revenues to the province in income from the windfall profits. He hasn't said to ICBC before he announces the policy, "Examine these revenues in a ballpark way and tell me how this is going to benefit the individual gasoline consumer in this province."

In other words and in short, Mr. Chairman, it is another example of the land freeze, Bill 42, when the government got a great idea and flipped it in without any understanding of economics or any understanding of how legislation by government affects the marketplace. It then has a rippling effect down to the small people and wage earners in British Columbia.

Here again — and I could list several — ICBC is a monument in itself to this government's complete inability to understand the complexities of business or the responsibilities of business in itself, let alone the responsibilities and possible conflicts that arise when government is in business.

The Premier waxes with motherhood and says the average person in British Columbia is going to get a benefit from this windfall profit. But nowhere can he prove it; nowhere during these estimates has there been any semblance of responsibility, any semblance of really understanding where ICBC is going and how it is, in effect, going to benefit the individual drivers in British Columbia.

I would like to read a letter relating to this that arrived this morning. In fact, I just opened it during the debate.

"Dear Mrs. Jordan:

"I would like you to read my views on the new savings government has for us in this new gas raise.

"I am a construction man living in Vernon and working at Mica Creek. I have worked there for many years now. I use my car to go to work and I am home every weekend and sometimes during the week if I can make a fast trip or when something of importance arises. I am a married man with four children. I now pay higher auto insurance than ever before because my car is being used to go to work. I now pay more for gas because of the increase in price and I cannot deduct my car or my gas from income tax.

"I am being penalized for working away from home, trying to support a family on a government project and by a government system that was designed supposedly to help the individual people in British Columbia."

Then he goes on to make a suggestion. But before I read that, surely, Mr. Chairman, the result of all the debate in this House, plus such a simple letter as that, must reach the ears of these Ministers who are supposed to be responsible to the great public concern for their inability to advance government programmes on a sound, economic basis and on a responsible basis, and the general concern and unease there is by the working people in this province, for whom the government suggested they were elected to help, about the pig-in-a-poke policies that the government is bringing in and about the actual effect of these policies on the individual.

The Premier said this was the finest and fairest way to do it because they didn't want to give one cent to anyone outside British Columbia. I would condemn him for that attitude right away. It is becoming a matter of increasing concern not only to Members of this House but to many people in British Columbia — the niggardly and insular attitude this government is taking toward other Canadians.

It talks on one hand about giving our resources to the federal government, which I would oppose. It talks in the same hand about being Canadian through and through. But its actions in recreation and

[ [Page 3708](#) ]

conservation, its actions in terms of economic investment, and its actions in this instance are distinctly and now not so subtly anti-Canadian.

Are we so niggardly in British Columbia that we are not willing to have other Canadians in British Columbia unless we milk every penny out of their pockets? The Premier of this province should hide his face in shame for perpetrating this type of a feeling. He should be around this province, able to stand up proudly to speak of his programmes such as ICBC, which he has dared to liken to the Bank of British Columbia and it isn't. He should be standing up and making us proud to be British Columbians and Canadian.

Instead, he is fostering division among the people in the province themselves by penalizing people who work through his programme. He is certainly fostering anti-Canadianism with his policies and with his attitude toward other Canadians in British Columbia.

This gentleman says:

"I would like to suggest an alternative to Mr. Barrett's plan. Anyone who drives into the gas pumps with B.C. licence plates on either his or her vehicle should receive a coupon or receipt for these gas purchases. At the end of the year or the end of the month, send these receipts to Victoria and receive a rebate on their purchase."

Mr. Premier, if you listened to a workingman's position in this province, who is not going to be helped by your great programme, who is no great businessman, who doesn't set himself up as the be-all and end-all of what's good for people, who can make such a simple and workable suggestion as that to help you achieve what you say you want to, then surely, with all your executive assistants and advisers, you can come up with a simple, workable, benefiting programme for the individual gasoline consumer in this province that is fair.

He points out how, as a working man with four children who has to travel over 80 miles to and from work to support his family, and by working on a Crown power project is in turn serving his province, he can be helped instead of penalized by your programme. I think it's a very simple way.

We lived in the United States, and the federal income tax system in the United States allows for income tax deduction of all state and federal taxes. All you did was save your receipts from your gasoline purchases and do just what this man suggests, send them in with your income tax at the end of the year and the individual family and the individual worker and the individual purchaser received the benefit of that tax rebate in their own pockets without the establishment of an expensive bureaucracy, but with the true intent of helping the individual people.

I would urge the Minister to listen to this man's suggestion. It may not be the only simple suggestion, but it's certainly one, and it's certainly workable.

For my own personal feelings, I'm not anti-Canadian; I'm proud to be British Columbian and hope as many Canadians as can come to British Columbia. I would condemn any business, any tourist resort, any Minister or any government that tries to milk these Canadians of their last penny, I, frankly, would like to see, as we have proposed over and over again, the complete removal of any amount of the tax on the purchases of all fuels in British Columbia, to all individuals in British Columbia who use it, without any fanfare, without any tricky-Davey actions. Then the Minister of Transport and Communications can stand up and say honestly that there are not going to be any government subsidies for ICBC.

Another small point I'd like to bring up for a moment, Mr. Chairman — I brought it up during debate on Monday — is an incidence of the bureaucracy and the inefficiency that's growing in ICBC, about a man whose car had sugar put in the gas tank.

You'll recall, Mr. Chairman, that he took it into the service station over a month ago and in short, he's been without his car. ICBC has bungled and fiddled around trying to assess whether or not he's going to receive the benefits of ICBC insurance. At the last point, an adjuster had been sent up from Kelowna to assess the situation, and I advised the House at that time that he took samples of the sugar, or whatever product it was, back to Kelowna to be analyzed, one month later, to see whether or not this man could have his car back and if ICBC would pay his repairs and, I hope, compensation for him being without a car.

Mr. Chairman, I mentioned it to the Minister. He took notes down and he got up in the House and he said: "Yes, yes. We'll look into this." I wish to advise the Minister that it must have been looked into because the insurance adjuster from Kelowna, working for ICBC, came up to Vernon again, not to settle the claim, not to help the man get his car back, not to make adjustments for the storage area that this car has been taking in a very small service station in Vernon, but to advise him that the samples he had taken were too small. They were insufficient for them to examine and he had come all the way back up to get larger samples. So with this Minister's fine intervention and his concern for this particular case, we see nothing but more bungling, more inefficiency.

Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, of all the major sins that have been committed around ICBC, surely if you don't wish to remedy those, you could at least put one of these multitude of bodies to work in trying to help some of the individual people in this province who are having a very difficult time, who are losing money and who are becoming completely and utterly frustrated through the

[ [Page 3709](#) ]

attitude of ICBC.

I hope the Minister will stand up now and comment on the suggestions of this gentleman as to how he can be honest with this House in terms of assuring us there's no government subsidy going into ICBC, and to meet the commitment that we've asked for that the windfall profits from fuel brought to British Columbia by the efforts of people outside British Columbia should go directly to the British Columbians in a direct benefit in their pocket, and that he will remove the tax or involve a direct rebate system of that tax money. Also that he'll give me assurance that this poor man in Vernon will get his car back and that ICBC will meet its commitment and stop fiddling around.

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Shall vote 235 pass?

**MRS. JORDAN:** No, Mr. Chairman. I hope the Minister's going to answer.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I've already answered the question with regard to the statement made by the Premier. I can't remember exactly what I said; I think I asked you to send me the man's name and details. Evidently some of my staff took the note. I don't know whether the visit of that man had any relation to the fact that you raised it here or not, because you certainly didn't send me the details and the man's name and so on, as I recollect it. But if you want to send the man's name and address or whatever identification you have of him, I'll check into it.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Mr. Chairman, I want the Minister to get one of these people to go off the floor and phone your adjuster in Kelowna and tell him to get off the pot on that case and get it settled. You don't need to fiddle around.

If the Minister is confused, then you shouldn't be carrying the responsibilities that you are. This is the problem — confusion right through ICBC. I would ask the Minister to comment on this gentleman's suggestion of a very simple way to pass the benefits of the windfall profits from the oil industry, petroleum industry, down to the direct consumer in British Columbia. What's wrong with his suggestion?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Madam Member, I've already answered that question. The instructions that were given to ICBC, we're going to follow out those instructions. Until we have carried out those instructions, I can make no further comment.

How can I go and phone anybody about a case in Vernon when days after you first raised it, I still don't know the man's name?

**MRS. JORDAN:** I gave you his name the other day.

Vote 235 approved.

Vote 236: general administration, \$335,000 — approved.

Vote 237: engineering branch, \$391,000 — approved.

Vote 238: weigh-scale branch, \$1,627,298 — approved.

On vote 239: Motor-Vehicle Branch, \$6,018,468.

**MR. CURTIS:** On vote 239, directing the question to the Minister, I understand the intention is to relocate the Motor Vehicle Branch in the greater Victoria area, to move out of the old armouries building which forms part of

the parliamentary precinct. I wonder if the Minister could indicate: is this move going to be to the former Victoria Press building, if not, to what building and is there an approximate date? Is this a 1974 project, 1975 or longer?

Obviously, to any observer, to the casual visitor to the Motor Vehicle Branch, the facilities have been hopelessly overcrowded. The individuals who are employed there have to work under extremely awkward circumstances, and have done so for a number of years. So I don't oppose the move to another location, but I would like to know a little more about it and this seems to be the appropriate vote.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, it is the intention to relocate the Motor Vehicle Branch. Some sections will be moved immediately, but the main move will not happen until the back end of the property is prepared for that move.

**MR. CURTIS:** Is this a matter of months then? Is it within this calendar year, fiscal year, or is it going to spread over into the 1975 fiscal year? Also, just before you rise to answer that, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, is there any move out of the greater Victoria area with respect to the Motor Vehicle Branch establishment as we have it now?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** There's no intention of moving the Motor Vehicle Branch away from the Victoria area.

**MR. CURTIS:** No portion of it?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** No. I'm informed that the main move...it's unlikely that it will happen in this fiscal year because there's quite a lot of work to be done at the back end of the building before it will be ready.

[ [Page 3710](#) ]

**MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria):** Mr. Chairman, there are just two or three items here. I'd like an explanation of how the temporary assistance has nearly doubled in cost.

Also, the remuneration for the issuance of licences has a rather healthy increase. I have asked the question previously in the House about how people are paid for handling these. I assume that those are agents other than the ones in the building.

There's a very large increase of motor licence decals. That's vote 044. It has gone from \$38,000 to \$100,000.

The final item is.... I see we have a very large amount in 047. That is the highway safety promotion and research. I wonder if the Minister could comment on those items.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Well, as far as the increase in the remuneration for the issuance of licences, there was an increase in the amount from 3 per cent to 4 per cent. That would account for that increase — plus, of course, a slight increase in the number of licences being issued.

The other question was the highway safety promotion and research?

**MR. MORRISON:** Yes, 047, which has got \$600,000 in it. Could you tell us what that programme will be about?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes. Well, it's a continuation of a programme that was done by the automobile insurance board — the sort of programmes that were done prior to Christmas on driving while impaired. We are trying to develop....

**MR. MORRISON:** It's an advertising programme?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Oh, yes, for safety and warning and letting you know what happens if you do get into trouble of that kind.

**MR. MORRISON:** Then how come the decals jumped from \$38,000 to \$ 100,000? That's vote 044; you issued them this year.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Oh, yes. It's been increased due to the fact that in 1975 decals will be issued on all licence plates, whereas previously they were only issued for passenger vehicles.

**MR. MORRISON:** You're doing that in 1974, now.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes, we're doing that in 1974, that's right. And it's the same thing for 1974-75. But it wasn't allowed for in last year's because at that time the decision hadn't been made that we were going to go that route.

**MRS. JORDAN:** I would like to ask the Minister how you arrive at the demerit system and whether it's public knowledge. My understanding — and I might add that it was through personal experience yesterday, and it's been the first time it's ever happened — is that there is no public knowledge of what demerits there are for which driving offences.

I've heard other people mention that when they have received a so-called ticket from a police officer and they've asked what the penalty is that goes with this ticket, some are given the answer and some are told that this is a matter to be decided in Victoria. Yesterday I was told myself that this was a matter that would be decided at the head office in Victoria.

I found this a most disturbing situation because it appears to me that there should be a publicly known set of demerits for the various common driving offences — speeding, double-parking, this type of thing — and that the police officers should be quite at liberty, when questioned, to advise the motorist what that demerit is.

Interjection.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Madam Member, they're laid out in the regulations of the *Motor-vehicle Act*, and they've been there for quite a long time. Since 1968 they've been in the regulations of the *Motor-vehicle Act*. I think, as I recollect it, there are going to be a few changes. All drivers were circularized some time ago. Some of you may have read the column in The *Vancouver Sun* by Jess Odam which listed the demerit points. But perhaps it's time we circularized all drivers again with the list of the demerit points so that they have the information.

**MR. FRASER:** Why can't the policemen tell the motorist?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Why don't we have the policemen?

**MR. FRASER:** No, I say: why can't a policeman tell the motorist?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I can't think of any reason why the policeman can't tell the motorist.

**MR. FRASER:** When he gives the motorist that answer, he's just lazy, then, isn't he?

**MRS. JORDAN:** Well, look, he was a pretty nice policeman.

I want to commend this policeman because he looked at my licence and my occupation, which is listed as MLA, and he gave me the ticket. I respected

[ [Page 3711](#) ]

him for this, because I did have an incident one time where I wasn't given a ticket, and our young son was with us at the time. The officer came up and was quite rude at the beginning. Then, when he saw that I was an MLA, he withdrew and was very polite and didn't give me a ticket.

I was very disturbed because our son said: "Gee, Mom, he sure changed his tune when he found out who you

were." I felt that this was a very bad example.

**MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River):** You should have insisted on a ticket.

**MRS, JORDAN:** I did, but he was bigger than I was.

I felt that this was a very bad example to set before a young person. I also felt that as an elected Member I should be more responsible; and if I'm not, then I have to pay the penalty.

This officer was extremely polite and handed out the ticket with all due firmness, for which I respected him. But I do think, Mr. Minister, that there should be changes. I think it should be quite public and common knowledge what the demerit system is and which demerits apply for what.

I'm sure he wouldn't, but I said to the policeman at that time that if they decide in Victoria, the NDP MLAs might get a more severe penalty than the opposition MLAs. He said that he doubted it, Nonetheless, I'm sure you wouldn't want there to be any question about the demerit system, and I hope it will be made public and very soon. You don't have to sign your name to the ad, mind you. You can just put it in under Mr. Hadfield's name.

**MR. CURTIS:** Mr. Chairman, I'm going to resist the temptation to comment on the events surrounding the bringing to justice of the Member for North Okanagan, tempting as that may be.

**MRS. JORDAN:** Be nice for a change.

**MR. CURTIS:** Oh, it's really very pleasant; I mean it in all good sense. I'm just trying to be pleasant.

I would like to get back, Mr. Chairman, to code 047 in this vote as raised by the First Member for Victoria (Mr. Morrison) — the \$600,000 figure where nothing shows for the previous fiscal year. Surely this is not a completely new amount. It must be a collection from other votes, perhaps, in other departments. Is that not correct? This kind of advertising, it seems to me, has carried on for quite some time — through the change of government and through 1973. So it isn't zero to \$600,000. Yet I can't find, looking through the estimates, similar reductions in other votes.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Well, that's quite a story, Mr., Member. I hope I won't be accused of being political if I tell the House this story. Under the legislation as it has been the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles was instructed to collect \$25 from everyone who obtained 10 points.

**Interjections.**

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes. That amount of money has amounted to approximately \$600,000 per year. That money has never been shown in the general revenues of the province, nor has it been shown in the expenditures of the province. I just couldn't live with that kind of bookkeeping. That's why it's now being shown in the general revenues of the province and it's shown in the expenditures here.

It was collected by the Superintendent of Motor Vehicles and assigned to the automobile insurance board to be spent by the automobile insurance board. That's why you find a new item for \$600,000 for the first time in the budget: because I couldn't live with that kind of bookkeeping. It must show a revenue and it must show an expense.

Vote 239 approved.

Vote 240: *Motor Carrier Act*, \$499,712 — approved.

Vote 241: Data Processing Centre, — \$4,178,372 approved.

On vote 242: communications branch, \$4,935,898.

**MR. MORRISON:** One comment on vote 242 as we go by it. I notice that the telephones have gone from



\$2.7 million to \$4.5 million. I hope we can get ones that work.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I made a fairly lengthy statement in the House some time ago on the matter of the telephone system and what's being done.

Vote 242 approved.

On vote 243, British Columbia Ferries — \$49,925,552.

**MR. P.L. McGEER(Vancouver Point-Grey):** I would like to ask the Minister whether the salary for the general manager of the B.C. Ferries at \$26,000 is appropriate. Mr. Chairman, this is scarcely the salary that the....

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It's \$33,000.

[ [Page 3712](#) ]

**MR. McGEER:** Mine says \$26,000.

**AN HON. MEMBER:** It's an error.

**MR. McGEER:** It's \$33,000? That's better. We got him his \$7,000 raise. (Laughter.)

**MS. R. BROWN (Vancouver-Burrard):** I would just like to say a couple of words about the gift shops on the ferries. I think this is a marvellous opportunity for us to sell some of our B.C. art and B.C. crafts. I would like the Minister to consider this rather than the sort of imported — I don't want to use the word; well, I won't use the word — "stuff" that is presently on it. I really would appreciate it if we could use the gift shops on the ferries to sell some of our B.C. culture.

The second thing, very briefly, would be better coordination to the public transportation system of the ferries and better coordination of the ferries with each other. Thank you.

**MR. CURTIS:** Just one minor point. I think the Minister announced some time ago in dealing with his estimates that he had invited naval architectural firms to submit conceptual designs for new Gulf Islands ferries, or perhaps he said smaller ferries.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** So-called minor ferries.

**MR. CURTIS:** "So-called minor ferries" was the exact phrase? Thank you.

Again, could we have an indication from the Minister as to a likely programme date for these vessels? I realize you are just inviting a basic hull design and there will be a lot of work associated with that. But is this something to be undertaken within the following fiscal year or is there a programme which will see one or two ferries replaced in each of several years? A little explanation there, I think, would be of interest.

The Member for Mackenzie (Mr. Lockstead) — it isn't an attack — is very unhappy about one of the ferries operating in his riding which presumably was brought down here to handle increased capacity in the Saanich and the Islands riding. Obviously, some of the smaller vessels are nearing the end of their effective and useful life. Again, that kind of long-term projection, I think, would be helpful to the committee.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes, well, some of the smaller ferries, as I said at the time, go back to 1923, some 1949, some 1950, some 1956. What I made the other day was an announcement that we were going to ask a number of B.C. naval architects for conceptual submissions. It will be a step-by-step programme.

I've discovered how long it takes to go from getting the idea and then getting the ferries. It's a matter of two to three years. I would expect that it would just go step-by-step and bring them all up to date over a fair number of years. It's not something that is going to happen overnight.

**MR. CHABOT:** Just a brief word on vote 243. I notice there is an increase in wages from \$21 million to \$25 million, which is a 20 per cent increase, almost as inflationary as the proposed settlement in the construction industry, unless there are a substantial number of new employees being engaged in the operation of the British Columbia Ferries.

Also, operating and servicing of vessels has increased substantially by 50 per cent, by \$4 million more this year in the operation of the coast ferries. The capital expenditures have doubled.

Could the Minister give an explanation as to why the 20 per cent increase in employee costs over one year and the 50 per cent and doubling of the operating and servicing of these vessels?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Operating and servicing of vessels, code 030, Well, as those ferries get older they require more refitting and, of course, there have been substantial increases in the costs of doing all work related to ferries. That's operating and servicing.

What else was it?

**MR. CHABOT:** The \$20 million to \$25 million on wages.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Oh, the wages. Well, there was an increase and there has been an increase in the number of employees, too.

**MR. CHABOT:** How many? Five, or three, or four?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I'm told it's about 300 more. But one of the big items in operating costs is the tremendous increase in the cost of fuel. Bunker fuel has gone up tremendously in cost. That's one of the big items in the increase in operating costs.

**MR. McGEER:** Would the Minister of Transport and Communications give us some idea of how much the food costs are going to go up on the ferries next week? Have we got the new menus printed? Will it be 20 per cent, or what?

**AN HON. MEMBER:** Just a liberal amount! (Laughter.)

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** That information is already public, I understand, being broadcast over the air. I haven't got both menus here to give the

[ [Page 3713](#) ]

comparison. We did check with the shore side restaurants and cafeterias of similar quality and we related our prices to theirs. It's still the best buy in British Columbia.

**MR. MORRISON:** Earlier in the Minister's salary I asked a question which he said he would answer at this time concerning the computer cash registers which are on order for the ferries. He said he would take it as notice and advise us in the vote.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I'm afraid I lost it. Well, I had it written out here.

**MR. MORRISON:** He is going to give me the answer. Okay.

Vote 243 approved.

Vote 244: Motor Carrier Commission, \$ 100,000 — approved.

On vote 245: aircraft maintenance and operation, \$3,732,400.

**MR. MORRISON:** Earlier in the debate the Minister said he would answer all those aircraft questions which I asked him. I don't want to go through them again, but I would like the answers.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Aircraft high-frequency, single-band radio system was one of the questions. I think I answered most of the others.

I just haven't got the information on the length of all of the airports and so on. I have sent a letter to every regional district asking them for reports on the airports within their communities and what their airport requirements are.

Now, with regard to aircraft high-frequency, single-band radio system. The above system was designed primarily for air-medical dispatch communication purposes between our new Cessna Citation aircraft and dispatch personnel to be located at Victoria airport. A radio system was needed to reach these aircraft anywhere within the province at any time while in flight on routine assignments. The Department of Highways' existing mobile radio system was designed for land-mobile purposes and is therefore not suitable for air-to-ground communication. High-frequency radio, though not as reliable, is uniquely suited to long-range communications' needs.

The design of the ground-based portion of the HF-SSB system is important. A little-used site near Brentwood Bay, presently occupied by the RCMP, was available for this purpose.

**MR. MORRISON:** Whereabouts was that?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** One-half of this site has been leased to the provincial government by the RCMP at no monetary cost to the government. The government does have the responsibility, however, of maintaining the grounds at site, approximately four acres. The ground-based portion of the system is under construction and is expected to be operational in about two months.

One aircraft is already equipped with the necessary high-frequency radio, while the other is to have its radio installed shortly.

**MR. FRASER:** I'd like to ask the Minister to tell us how many aircraft the government owns, how many of them are jets, what is the estimated value of these aircraft, and how many pilots are on the payroll.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** The number of aircraft: seven; the number of jets: two. What was your third question?

**MR. FRASER:** The estimated value of the aircraft.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** What, of all of them?

**MR. FRASER:** Yes, all of them.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** About \$2.8 million for all the existing aircraft.

**MR. FRASER:** And how many pilots?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Fourteen pilots.

**MR. McGEER:** No one took more interest, I don't believe, in the air force than the Premier when he was Leader of the Opposition and the Minister of Transport and Communications when he was Leader of the Opposition. They really watched the former Minister of Highways, Mr. Gaglardi, in his junketing, but he was a piker.

Gracious me, I almost feel embarrassed for the former Minister. Only one jet aircraft is hardly the retinue that we have today. Lo and behold, two former Leaders of the Opposition, when they get into office, are just running wild on an air force.

Interjections.

**MR. McGEER:** I'm just looking at the costs here. They're runaway. I don't think the former Premier (Hon. Mr. Bennett) or the former Minister of Highways (Mr. Gaglardi) would have had anything more than maybe one jet aircraft. That was enough for them; they didn't need two.

I would like to ask the Minister, Mr. Chairman, since we are now big in aircraft in British Columbia —

[ [Page 3714](#) ]

and they are pretty costly, looking at the figures that are in vote 245 — how many hours a year do these aircraft fly in total? What is the cost per trip? It used to be \$950 per time up to Kamloops for Mr. Gaglardi, which gives an indication of what the real cost is of putting one of these things in the air. The question comes whether it is wise to have seven aircraft and 14 pilots for the amount of flying that is done. Might it not be better to charter aircraft when the government needs to charter aircraft? What is the cost per hour, Mr. Minister?

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I haven't got the costs per hour, but you have the total expected cost of operating these aircraft. I would like to draw your attention, too, to the fact that this is the first-time they have been in the estimates., In the past they have always been hidden in roads, bridges and ferries. I was going to say go back and make the comparison with previous years — you get the number of hours in the....

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** I'm trying to answer a question. Now there are logs that I table each session — and you have the cost. It can be worked out, but I haven't got it worked out.

Again, for the first time, I draw your attention to the fact that the estimates make available to the Member information that was not available before. I agree that it looks like a substantial sum of money. It is a substantial sum of money. But, as you know, we are updating the aircraft. In the past those aircraft were unpressurized, and in a province like British Columbia I just didn't think it was right to ask our public servants to fly in unpressurized aircraft over the mountains of British Columbia or through some of those steamy valleys. Let me say further...

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** ...admittedly the planes....

Interjections.

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

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Since we have upgraded the quality of the aircraft they are receiving more use than heretofore. In the past, Mr. Chairman, some of our top public servants, when they were required in some other part of the province, because we had aircraft that were unpressurized, would have to take a day to fly by commercial airlines, say to Dawson Creek, take a day to do their work and a day to come back.

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Now, now, look — scheduled flights. Now they can get up there, do their work and get back. It's getting full value out of the public servants of the province.

I want you to notice the very small percentage of flights that include cabinet Ministers as compared to what it used to be in the Province of British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman, before I sit down on this matter of...

Interjections.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** ...aircraft and pilots, there is a...

**MRS. JORDAN:** When are you getting a tele-prompter?

**MR. CHAIRMAN:** Order please! Let's have a little quiet.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Mr. Chairman, I want to tell the House that some time ago a fully licensed female pilot in British Columbia made application to the three major airlines for a job as a pilot. The result was that one of the major airlines returned her application immediately, saying she was too short; the other one said she was a little too old — she is 29; and the other one didn't answer until she took a trip to Montreal and demanded an interview. They told that female that it was just a matter of time before women would be accepted as pilots. I want you to know that that young lady, fully qualified in every way, shape and form, is now employed in the government services here.

**MR. FRASER:** I just have a short question for the Minister. Is it correct that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartely) uses the aircraft more than any other Minister? I would like to know why.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Bring it up during his estimates, will you?

**MR. MORRISON:** Mr. Chairman, I noticed that the Minister said he would make that information available when those replies came in on the other questions that I asked. I assume that that is correct.

**HON. MR. STRACHAN:** Yes. I'll check *Hansard* as to what the questions were.

**MR. MORRISON:** In closing, I would just like to be a little facetious if I may. I hope you accept it in the way I've said. I would like to know what goes on in Sandspit because I see those logs constantly going

[ [Page 3715](#) ]

in and out of Sandspit. What happens up there? (Laughter.)

Vote 245 approved.

Schedule A approved.

Vote 1: legislation, \$1,784,834 — approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that by leave of the House the rules be suspended and reports of resolutions from the Committee of Supply on March 1, 8, 11, 15, 20, 22, 26, 27, 29, 30 and April 1, 2, 4, 23, 24, 26, 30 and May 7, 15, 16, 23, 30, 31 and June 3 and 4 be now received and taken as read.

Leave granted.

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

Motion approved.

The House in Committee of Ways and Means; Mr. Dent in the chair.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Chairman, I move that toward making good the supply grant of Her Majesty for the public service of the province there be granted from out of consolidated revenue the following: \$48,042,719 to make good certain sums expended for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1974; \$2,172,796,528 toward defraying the

several charges and expenses for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1975.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the resolution be now read a second time, taken as read and agreed to.

Motion approved.

Hon. Mr. Barrett begs leave to present Bill 148, intituled *Supply Act No. 2, 1974*.

Leave granted.

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

Motion approved.

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

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of Bill 148.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that the report be adopted.

Motion approved.

#### SUPPLY ACT, NO. 2, 1974

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves introduction and first reading of Bill 148, intituled *Supply Act No. 2, 1974*.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that by leave of the House the rules be suspended and the bill be read a second time now.

Leave granted.

Motion approved.

**HON. MR. BARRETT:** Mr. Speaker, I move that by leave of the House the rules be suspended and the bill be referred to Committee of the Whole House to be considered forthwith.

Leave granted.

Motion approved.

The House in committee on Bill 148; Mr. Dent in the chair.

## SUPPLY ACT, NO. 2, 1974

Sections 1 to 5 inclusive approved.

Schedules A and B approved.

[ [Page 3716](#) ]

Preamble approved.

Title approved.

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

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr., Speaker in the chair.

Bill 148, *Supply Act, No. 2, 1974*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

## MUNICIPALITIES ENABLING AND VALIDATING AMENDMENT ACT, 1974

Hon. Mr. Lorimer presents a message from His Honour the Administrator: a bill intituled *Municipalities Enabling and Validating Amendment Act, 1974*.

Bill 152 introduced, read a first time and ordered to be placed on orders of the day for second reading at the next sitting of the House after today.

Hon. Mr. Barrett moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 6:13 p.m.

## APPENDIX

*The following amendment is referred to on page 3682:*

**103** The Hon. *A. B. Macdonald* to move, in Committee of the Whole on Bill (No. 103) intituled *Summary Convictions Amendment Act, 1974*, to amend as follows:

By adding, after section 1, the following as section 1A:

"Amends s. 4

"1A. section 4 is amended by adding after subsection (2) the following as subsection (3):

"(3) No action or suit shall be brought for a penalty or forfeiture under an Act except within six months after the cause of action arises, unless the time is otherwise limited by the Act."

---

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

Copyright © 1974, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada