

Monday, March 23, 1970

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

The Hon. *W. D. Black* presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:—

JOHN R. NICHOLSON,
Lieutenant-Governor.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith amendments to Bill (No. 49) intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Superannuation Act*, enclosed herewith, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
March 20, 1970.

(ENCLOSURE)

Section 1: By adding, after clause (b), the following as clause (c):—

“(c) adding, after subsection (3) of section 8, the following as subsections (4), (5), and (6):—

“(4) Where the increases provided under subsection (2) of section 8, including increases under clause (d) of subsection (3) of section 10, are less than two dollars and fifty cents per month for each year, not exceeding twenty-five years in total, of completed pensionable service in the case of retired employees, or one dollar and seventy-five cents per month for each year, not exceeding twenty-five years in total, of her husband's completed pensionable service in the case of a widow of a former employee or pensioner, the Commissioner shall increase the superannuation allowance for those retired employees or widows who were granted allowances prior to the first day of April, 1957, by an amount required to pay the amount of the total increase under this subsection.

“(5) The employer shall reimburse the Commissioner for the amount required to pay the increases under subsection (4).

“(6) Subsections (4) and (5) come into force on a date to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor by his Proclamation.”

Ordered, That the said Message, and the amendments accompanying the same, be referred to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the proposed amendments to Bill (No. 49) intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipal Superannuation Act*, a draft of which is annexed to the Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, be referred to the Committee having in charge Bill (No. 49.)

Resolution reported.

Report adopted.

On the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House proceeded to the Order "Public Bills and Orders."

The following Bills were read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today:—

Bill (No. 65) intituled *An Act to Amend the Securities Act, 1967*.

Bill (No. 73) intituled *An Act to Amend the Summary Convictions Act*.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 74) intituled *An Act to Establish the Municipal Finance Authority of British Columbia*, a debate arose.

The House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS—35

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gagliardi</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>	

NAYS—17

Messieurs

<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>			

Bill read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 78) intituled *An Act to Amend the Hospital Act* was read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 79) intituled *An Act to Amend the Health Act* a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Dowding*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 82) intituled *An Act to Amend the Motor-vehicle Act* a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Macdonald*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 83) intituled *An Act to Amend and Repeal Certain Provisions of the Statute Law* a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Strachan*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 63) intituled *An Act to Amend the Pollution Control Act, 1967*.

The debate continued.

Motion agreed to *nemine contradicente* on the following division:—

YEAS—52

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Price</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Smith</i>
<i>Brousson</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Bruch</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Hall</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Calder</i>	<i>Dailly, Mrs.</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Richter</i>

Bill read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

The following Bills were read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today:—

Bill (No. 50) intituled *An Act to Amend the Fruit Growers Mutual Insurance Company Act*.

Bill (No. 51) intituled *An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter*.

Bill (No. 52) intituled *An Act Respecting Montreal Trust Company*.

Bill (No. 54) intituled *An Act Respecting Yorkshire Trust Company*.

The House continued to sit after midnight.

TUESDAY, MARCH 24.

The Hon. *R. G. Williston* (Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources) presented the Annual Report of the Forest Service for 1969.

166 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. *Patricia Jordan*, Minister without Portfolio, the following questions:—

1. Was any newspaper, radio, television, or other form of advertising placed by you, or on your behalf, and paid for from Vote 291, 1969/70, for publication between July 1, 1969, and August 31, 1969?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total cost of the advertising, (b) what was the name of each company or individual supplying the service, and (c) what amount was paid in each case for this service?

The Hon. *Patricia Jordan* replied as follows:—

“ 1 and 2. *Nil.*”

202 Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources the following questions:—

1. Is the construction of a pulp-mill planned on the Similkameen River near Princeton?

2. Is the construction of a pulp-mill planned for the Okanagan Falls area?

3. If the answer to Nos. 1 or 2, or both, is yes, (a) is the company now doing business in British Columbia and what is the name or names of the companies involved, and (b) has a study been made of this company's effluent-disposal programme and policies and have they met with Pollution Control Board standards?

4. Has a study been made of the effect of dumping effluent into the Similkameen-Okanagan watershed?

The Hon. *R. G. Williston* replied as follows:—

“ 1. No.

“ 2. No.

“ 3. Not applicable (*see* Nos. 1 and 2).

“ 4. A general water-quality study is being made concerning Okanagan watershed.”

204 Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources the following questions:—

1. Is British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority planning to build a dam near Gold Hill to divert water from the Lardeau watershed to the Arrow Lakes watershed?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, will this diversion affect the rainbow trout spawning-grounds on Gerrard Creek at Gerrard?

3. What is the purpose of this proposed dam, will the building of such a dam increase hydro power production in Canada and, if so, by how many kilowatts?

4. How much money is the United States paying toward the construction of this dam?

5. Will the land to be flooded be cleared before it is flooded?

The Hon. *R. G. Williston* replied as follows:—

“ 1. No.

“ 2, 3, 4, and 5. Not applicable (*see* No. 1).”

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. today.

And then the House adjourned at 12.02 a.m.

Tuesday, March 24, 1970

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *W. E. Greenhalgh*.

On the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House proceeded to the Order "Public Bills and Orders."

Bill (No. 13) intituled *An Act to Amend the Payment of Wages Act* was read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 14) intituled *An Act to Amend the Supreme Court Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 15) intituled *Jury Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The following Bills were committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 16) intituled *An Act to Amend the Consumer Protection Act*.

Bill (No. 17) intituled *An Act to Amend the Land Registry Act*.

Bill (No. 18) intituled *An Act to Amend the Constitution Act*.

Bill (No. 19) intituled *Corrections Act*.

Bill (No. 20) intituled *An Act to Amend the Landlord and Tenant Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *Hall's* proposed amendment to section 2 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 2 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—17

Messieurs

Wallace
Brousson
Gardom
Cocke
Hartley

Lorimer
Hall
Williams, R. A.
Calder

Clark
McGeer
Macdonald
Strachan

Dowding
Nimsick
Barrett
Daily, Mrs.

NAYS—34

Messieurs

<i>Ney</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell, B.</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>		

PAIR:

Messieurs

Williams, L. A. *Vogel*

Bill (No. 22) intituled *An Act to Amend the Labour Relations Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The Committee further reported that in consideration of section 2 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division on section 2 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—39

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>
<i>Ney</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	

NAYS—12

Messieurs

<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Dowding</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>

PAIR:

Messieurs

LeCours *Williams, L. A.*

The following Bills were committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 23) intituled *An Act to Amend the Chiropractic Act*.

Bill (No. 26) intituled *An Act to Amend the Mental Health Act, 1964*.

Bill (No. 27) intituled *Land Act* was committed, sections 1 to 28 reported complete without amendment.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

The Committee asked leave to sit again.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House reverted to "Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees."

Mr. *Jefcoat* presented the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture, as follows:—

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

March 24, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Agriculture begs leave to report as follows:—

Pursuant to motion of February 17, 1970, your Committee was ordered convened to study the following matter:—

That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture to study the following:—

- (1) The benefits or otherwise of separate classification of highly specialized commercial farms, marginal farms, hobby or retirement farms, and other such groupings when considering public programmes:
- (2) Efficiencies which might be accomplished in off-farm sector relating to the supply and marketing channels handling the food, the processing, the merchandising, and the financing.

The Committee to hear representations from the food and agricultural industry, organizations, and individuals, and report its findings to this House.

Ninety-one requests were mailed to food processors, wholesalers, and various food producer and agriculture organizations. A total of five briefs were presented to the Committee. These briefs were presented by the following:—

- (1) Federation of Agriculture:
- (2) British Columbia Turkey Breeders:
- (3) British Columbia Region of National Farmer's Union:
- (4) Western Food Processors:
- (5) British Columbia Egg Marketing Board.

Based upon the submissions to the Committee it would appear that the average income to the producer is too low, and that they do not receive an adequate share of the consumer price of products. It is for this reason that this Committee wanted to hear from processors, wholesalers, and retailers. Their submissions are essential if the Committee is to establish where the consumer dollar is applied.

The Committee is very disappointed with the lack of interest shown both last year and this year. It is essential that the Committee receive reports from the processors and marketing groups as well as producers. This lack of co-operation and information has prevented the Committee from completing a meaningful report. Therefore, the following recommendations are made:—

- (1) That the Minister review the terms of reference and recommend, at an early date, terms for next year, subject to the approval of the Legislature:
- (2) That these terms of reference be spelled out to all sectors of the industry throughout the year recommending that they be prepared to appear before the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture in 1971:
- (3) The Committee further recommends that food processing, marketing organizations, and producers, be notified by the Committee of the terms of reference and requested to appear early in the next Session.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

W. F. JEFCOAT, *Chairman.*

The report was taken as read and received.

Mr. Capozzi presented the Report of the Special Committee on Automobile Insurance, as follows:—

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 24, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Special Committee on Automobile Insurance begs leave to report as follows:—

The organizational meeting was held on Thursday, February 5, 1970. Mr. Capozzi was elected as Chairman and Mr. McDiarmid as Secretary.

The Committee received briefs and the following people appeared before the Committee:—

February 17, 1970: Mr. W. D. Mitchell, Mr. Ed Thompson, Mr. F. W. Barchard, general manager, transportation division, British Columbia Hydro; Mr. Byron Straight, actuary.

February 24, 1970: Mr. Carl Wilcken, actuary, Insurance Bureau of Canada.

February 26, 1970: Mr. Ed Lewis, British Columbia manager, British Columbia Economical Mutual Insurance Company; Mr. Ron Hunt, president, Victoria Insurance Agents' Association; Mr. Gordon Root, public-relations counsel, British Columbia Automobile Agents.

March 3, 1970: Mr. Brian Williams, Mr. Lyle Woodley, Mr. Kenneth Burnett, British Columbia division, Canadian Bar Association.

March 5, 1970: Mr. Baines, vice-president, Independent Insurance Conference of Canada, Mr. Price, local chairman, Independent Insurance Conference of Canada; Mr. Robert Parkin, chairman, facility.

March 10, 1970: Mr. R. B. Stocks, manager, British Columbia Federation of Agriculture; Mr. Norman Binyon, chairman, Canadian Independent Adjusters' Confederation of British Columbia; Mr. Blair Baillie, past president, Canadian Independent Adjusters' Confederation of British Columbia.

March 12, 1970: Mr. Donald Martin, general manager, Canadian Royal Insurance Group; Mr. Norman Manning, Guardian Union Royal Exchange; Mr. Chamberlain, actuary for this group; Mr. Ray Hadfield, Superintendent, Motor-vehicle Branch.

March 17, 1970: Mr. H. D. Vanam, president, Canadian Indemnity Company, Winnipeg; Mr. John S. McGuinness, John S. McGuinness Associates, consulting actuaries.

March 18, 1970: Mr. Jack Robertson, president, Insurance Agents of British Columbia; Mr. Bill Longman, president, Central Surveyors Incorporated; Mr. Rudkin, president, Wesco Insurance.

The Committee is grateful to Mr. Thomas Cantell, Superintendent of Insurance, who attended all meetings and provided a great deal of valuable information to the Committee.

- (1) To consider whether section 14 of chapter 20 of the Statutes of British Columbia, 1969, which provides *inter alia* that no action shall be brought against any person for recovery of damages to property occasioned in an accident involving a motor-vehicle exceeding two hundred and fifty dollars and costs, should be proclaimed in force or amended and, if so, to what extent:

The no-fault coverage proposed under section 79 of Bill (No. 75) suggests that possible savings could be attained through the elimination of certain legal fees and adjustment costs. It further suggests that restricting the recovery of claims for damage to vehicles of less than \$250 to Small Debts Court would make people more responsible for their own accidents and repairs.

While in theory this has some justification, it became clear that the following could result:—

While the public might appreciate the reduction that could result in insurance costs, there would be considerable ill feeling when an accident occurred and the individual who was not at fault was obliged to go to Small Debts Court for the first \$250 damage. If uninsured the individual would have no recourse to recover any additional damage. This section if implemented could in effect require everyone to self insure for all damage over \$250.

In the case of property damage it would deprive a resident of all right to recover damages to property in excess of \$250 simply because he may have been involved in an accident involving a motor-vehicle. At the same time, the owner of the vehicle would have no responsibility for damage done by his motor-vehicle over \$250 even where he was at fault and no matter how irresponsible his actions might have been.

The possible result is that insurance premiums for property damage would be determined not by the driving standards of the individual who is insured but by the driving standards of the most irresponsible motorists.

It could also complicate the position of both residents and non-residents as to render it most difficult for them to clarify their rights while at the same time placing non-residents in a somewhat more favourable position than residents.

The brief submitted by the Victoria Insurance Agents' Association is very comprehensive and is attached for consideration. The essential theme in this presentation is contained in the following:—

“Legislation of this kind which largely removes the burden of paying for property damage caused through negligence from the guilty to the innocent is not likely to prove to be in the best interests of the public.”

It is therefore the recommendation of the Committee that section 79 of Bill (No. 75) not be implemented at this time.

The Committee recommends that consideration and additional study be given to the following proposal of the insurance law subsection, British Columbia Branch, Canadian Bar Association, whereby the right of subrogation in respect to motor-vehicle damage would be withdrawn from insurers licensed to do business in the Province of British Columbia.

This envisages the retention of the individual's right to sue either for his deductible, or if he does not wish to carry collision coverage, then for the full amount of damage to his property. In other words, the law would be left as it is and all persons would have the right to sue or be sued in tort as heretofore, save and except that no insurer would have a subrogated right of action. This could result in a reduction in insurance premiums on the compulsory auto insurance coverage because (a) those carriers of the compulsory insurance would no longer be required to pay for property damage to other vehicles where such vehicles are insured and (b) investigation and adjustment expenses would be significantly reduced.

The Committee further recommends that the Automobile Board be asked to study a proposal whereby the cost of the compulsory package for third party liability would not be increased on a per accident basis, but a "deductible" amount would be inserted as a responsibility of the insured after each accident. Any unsettled claim would be paid from the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund and the insured's driver's licence would be suspended until the Fund had been reimbursed.

In the event the Legislature decided to implement section 79 the Committee submits that the section should be amended as follows:—

- A. Property damage in section 79 (1) should be limited to motor-vehicles.
- B. That there should be no recovery in excess of \$150 (replacing the \$250 limit) for damage to a motor-vehicle, with a limit of \$300 for any one occurrence.
- C. The problems raised above created by section 79 (2) involving the rights of non-residents should be exhaustively studied and some solution found before the Proclamation.

- (2) To consider whether the accident benefits described in the Second Schedule to the *Insurance Act* should apply to a motor carrier as defined in the *Motor Carrier Act*:

There is quite a basic difference between the position of the private automobile and the public transit operator.

The private owner generally decides who will ride with him and under circumstances which he either condones or agrees to.

The public transit operation is largely restricted to movements in high-density traffic and requires the carriage of a large number of passengers who are standing or moving about and board or disembark under varying conditions. Under the best of circumstances it would be difficult for the operator to determine the authenticity or the extent of any injuries which might occur.

In view of the circumstances and problems involved the Committee recommends that the Disability Income Schedule of the *Insurance Act* should not be made applicable to passengers travelling on, boarding, or alighting from public passenger vehicles. It is understood that this exemption does not apply to the death benefits nor in any way would exempt any other vehicles owned or operated by transit operators, nor interfere with normal tort liability.

- (3) To consider whether automobile insurance premiums in British Columbia, including the premium charged for accident benefits, are commensurate with the risks assumed:

The services of a qualified actuary, Mr. Byron Straight, F.C.I.A., F.G.A.P., A.S.A., were retained by the Committee.

Mr. Straight was asked

- (a) to do a general survey of premium rates:
- (b) to determine whether automobile insurance premiums could be reduced if the insurers allowed in advance for the investment income on unearned premiums and open claim liabilities:
- (c) to examine the premium increases (over 1969 rates) adopted by all the companies for the new death and disability income benefits.

The results of Mr. Straight's reports are attached.

In the opinion of the Committee based on the questioning of the individuals and groups appearing before the Committee and on the reports submitted by Mr. Straight the following conclusions can be drawn:—

- (1) While the rates in general show a certain conformity (this is to be expected since they are derived from the same actuarial base, the Green Book) there is a variance as a result of competition:
- (2) That the consideration of investment income in the calculation of insurance rates could lead to a reduction of 4 to 5 per cent:
- (3) By reducing the estimated length of disability the disability income portion of the costs in the new accident benefit rates could be reduced from 20 to 25 per cent resulting in a reduction in the estimated total costs of the new benefit claims by about 10 per cent:
- (4) By increasing the division of the premium dollar from 67 cents for "loss" and 33 cents for "expense" to 69 cents for "loss" and 31 cents for "expense" a further adjustment could be achieved. The Committee believes that in respect of the premium for the compulsory policy a more equitable division of the premium dollar should be 75 cents for "loss" and 25 cents for "expense":
- (5) Since the estimated number of automobiles that presently do not carry the compulsory package ranges between 5 to 10 per cent, and since the total cost of all claims, insured and uninsured, is therefore borne by the insured the cost of the compulsory package could be reduced by 5 to 10 per cent by requiring proof of coverage when licence plates are purchased:
- (6) While the problem of covering farm vehicles for limited highway use seems to have been solved by the special rates introduced by the company, a sample of these rates is attached, it is hoped the proposed Automobile Board would further clarify this position.

In view of the possible reductions suggested it is the recommendation of the Committee that section 250M of Bill (No. 74) be proclaimed, the Automobile Insurance Board be established, an actuary be employed, and the companies be asked to justify their rates for the present compulsory package and be required to obtain approval for future changes in these rates. This Board should be asked to study the cost and ramifications of various proposals whereby the compulsory package or portions of it could be operated by other than the industry.

It is further recommended that the Motor-vehicle Branch institute a procedure whereby proof of insurance, compulsory package only would be required, when licence plates are issued.

In the opinion of the Committee the Government has a definite responsibility to assure that the costs for the compulsory package are as low as possible since it should not legislate for excess profits, but it becomes more apparent that even

though the major costs of automobile insurance are in the property damage and collision costs the majority of the driving public wants the right to decide what kind and how much collision coverage he places on his automobile.

There were many suggestions put forward as to how collision and property damage costs could possibly be reduced: (a) Reduction of agents' commission; (b) reduction of claims costs; (c) elimination of duplication of paper work; (d) standardization of forms and endorsements; and (e) reduction of adjustment expenses.

The Committee was dismayed to learn how little is being done by the insurance industry (a) to exert pressure on the auto industry to manufacture safer cars; (b) to encourage defensive driving courses and offer reduced premiums for graduates; and (c) to reduce claims costs, adjustment expenses, and excessive motor-vehicle damage claims.

The Committee felt that better control and policing is required by the companies to reduce costs of claims. Since the insurance companies base their rates on the Green Book, which in turn is based on the claims costs of the preceding year, there is no real pressure on the companies to reduce costs. There is, however, considerable evidence that the pressure of the auto-repair industry, the agent, and the automobile owner himself on the adjuster and the insurer is a definite factor in increasing costs. It is hoped that the industry would become its own watchdog and take steps to reduce claims costs, duplication, and commission expenses.

Fundamentally, however, the public must realize that the cost of automobile insurance merely reflects in dollars the real problem of human suffering, and accidents that careless and irresponsible drivers cause. There cannot be significant changes in rates until there are safer cars and safer drivers.

The Committee was extremely perturbed to note the almost 20 per cent increase in accidents in 1969.

The Committee believes that the Automobile Insurance Board should be given powers to investigate insurance costs and that the following programmes should be instituted:—

- (1) Driver training in all schools:
- (2) Defensive-driving courses become a requirement for all major violators of the point system:
- (3) Motor-vehicle testing be mandatory on a Province-wide basis:
- (4) Legislation be introduced requiring interim payments for property damage in clear liability cases:
- (5) Legislation be introduced requiring one month's notice to the claimant in order for insurance companies or their representatives to avail themselves of statutory limitations.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. P. CAPOZZI, *Chairman.*

The report was taken as read and received.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. today.

49 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With respect to hospital construction:—

1. What was the total sum spent on construction of acute hospital accommodation in British Columbia in the year ended December 31, 1969?
2. How much of that sum was provided by the Provincial Government?
3. How much of that sum was provided by the Federal Government?
4. How much of that sum was provided by municipal governments, hospital improvement districts, and fund-raising?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. \$17,073,846.04. (The amount of \$17,073,846.04 has been arrived at on a basis somewhat different than that used in determining the comparable figure for the year ended December 31, 1968, which amount included a substantial sum laid out in the completion of the Psychiatric Unit of the Health Sciences Centre at the University of British Columbia.)

“ 2. Provincial Government grants under the old direct-grant formula totaling \$138,181.61 together with a proportion of the sum of \$16,935,664.43 provided through borrowings under the *Regional Hospital Districts Act*. The Provincial Government's statutory responsibility for assisting in the payment of principal and interest on these borrowings is set out in section 22 of the said Act.

“ 3. \$1,268,629.21.

“ 4. \$43,474.93.”

86 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With reference to the Forensic Clinic, Mental Health Services, located at Burnaby:—

1. What were the established positions as of December 31, 1969, for (a) physicians, (b) psychiatrists, (c) psychologists, (d) social workers, and (e) other staff?
2. Were any of these positions vacant as of December 31, 1969?
3. If the answer to No. 2 is yes, how many, by staff categories?
4. What services were provided during the year ended December 31, 1969, to (a) Courts, (b) gaols, (c) probation services, and (d) individuals?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. (a) Nil; (b) 1; (c) 1; (d) 1; and (e) 1.

“ 2. Yes.

“ 3. (a) Psychiatrist provides two sessions per week and (b) psychologist and clerk-stenographer, vacant.

“ 4. (a) 28 patients; (b) 14 patients; (c) 53 patients; and (d) 32 patients.”

88 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following question:—

Are any facilities or services being operated by mental health societies under section 5 of the *Mental Health Act*?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ No.”

89 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With respect to The Woodlands School:—

1. Is there a known number of patients awaiting entry?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, how many were known to be waiting as at December 31, 1969?
3. Were there any empty beds in The Woodlands School as at December 31, 1969?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, (a) how many and (b) what was the reason?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. Yes.
- “ 2. 197 (distributed among extended-care patients, training programme, and psychiatric treatment).
- “ 3. Yes.
- “ 4. (a) and (b) Three wards of 28 beds each were empty in order that renovations could be made. There were also 17 vacancies created by the movement of patients to Alder Lodge. Internal changes in ward occupancy were underway (changing one ward from male occupancy to female occupancy), after which these beds will be filled by patients brought into residence from the community. Four beds were held as a reserve for emergency returns from the boarding-home programme or for an emergency admission.”

90 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With reference to private hospitals (nursing homes) caring for all types of chronic patients (those capable of rehabilitation, those needing skilled nursing care and medical supervision, and those needing custodial care):—

1. How many profit hospitals are there in the Province and what is the total number of beds in these hospitals?
2. How many non-profit hospitals are there in the Province and what is the total number of beds in these hospitals?
3. Are any patients occupying beds in non-profit hospitals who do not qualify for \$1-per-day coverage under the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service and, if so, how many?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. 65 units totalling 3,151 beds. These are licensed under section 8 of the *Hospital Act*.
- “ 2. 22 units totalling 1,536 beds. These are designated under section 25 of the *Hospital Act* and are not licensed as private hospitals. The average number of eligible patients rather than the number of beds is included for hospitals operated by the Federal Government. The above figure excludes rehabilitation hospitals and units.
- “ 3. Yes, 34 in extended-care facilities referred to in No. 2.”

107 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

1. Was a new mental health centre opened in Cranbrook during 1969?
2. If so, is it in operation?
3. Is it fully staffed?
4. If not, when will it be fully staffed?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. Yes.
- “ 2. Yes.
- “ 3. No.
- “ 4. As soon as staff can be recruited.”

117 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs the following questions:—

In regard to the relocation of Natal-Michel:—

1. Have any private homes been purchased in the Natal-Michel area by the regional district?

2. If so, (a) how many were purchased, (b) how many were inclusive of lots, (c) who were the owners in each case and how many lots were involved in each case, (d) what was the total price paid in each case, (e) how many of these homes have been demolished, (f) how many of these are still occupied, (g) how many private homes are yet to be purchased, (h) how many of these people have purchased lots in Sparwood, (i) has any provision been made for low-rental accommodation in Sparwood for residents of Natal-Michel who do not wish to purchase a home, and (j) how many applications have been made by the people affected for rental accommodation in Sparwood?

3. Have any business premises been purchased in the Natal-Michel area?

4. If so, (a) how many have been purchased and (b) how many are yet to be purchased?

The Hon. *D. R. J. Campbell* replied as follows:—

“ 1. The urban-renewal project in the Natal area of the District of Sparwood is managed by the Regional District of East Kootenay, and the detailed information is available at the district offices.

“ 2. (a), (b), (c), (d), (e), (f), (g), and (h) As replied to No. 1; (i) and (j) the municipality has not requested this type of assistance.

“ 3. Refer to reply to No. 1.

“ 4. Refer to reply to No. 1.”

126 Mr. *Cocke* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With respect to Medical Health Officers employed by the Health Branch:—

1. What was the total number of established positions as of December 31, 1969?

2. Were any of the positions vacant?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is yes, where are these vacancies located?

4. Were any resignations received from Medical Health Officers during the year ended December 31, 1969?

5. If the answer to No. 4 is yes, (a) how many and (b) what reasons were given for such resignations?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. 18.

“ 2. Yes.

“ 3. Prince Rupert, Dawson Creek, and Saanich.

“ 4. Yes.

“ 5. (a) Two and (b) to enter private practice.”

157 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs the following questions:—

1. Was any advertising placed by newspaper, radio, television, or any other form by the Department of Municipal Affairs for publication during the period July 1, 1969, to August 31, 1969?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total cost of the advertising, (b) what was the name of each company or individual supplying the service, and (c) what amount was paid in each case for this service?

The Hon. *D. R. J. Campbell* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. (a) \$10,749.26; (b) and (c) Sooke Mirror, \$11.76; Comox Free Press, \$26.88; Parksville-Qualicum Beach Progress, \$13.72; North Island Gazette, \$19; Juan de Fuca News Review, \$21; Cowichan Leader, \$29.40; Campbell River Courier, \$18.40; Upper Islander, \$17.92; Nanaimo Free Press, \$62.16; Saanich Dogwood Star, \$12; Kamloops Sentinel, \$36; Kelowna Daily Courier, \$57.24; Cariboo Observer, \$30.96; Mica Publishing Limited (Golden), \$30.10; Golden Star, \$19.95; Town Planning Institute of Canada News, \$25; Queen's Printer (Northern Vancouver Island brochure), \$1,016.47; A Home of Your Own, \$9,301.30.”

163 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

1. Was any advertising placed by newspaper, radio, television, or any other form by the Department of Health Services and Hospital Insurance for publication during the period July 1, 1969, to August 31, 1969?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total cost of the advertising, (b) what was the name of each company or individual supplying the service, and (c) what amount was paid in each case for this service?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. (a) \$201.53, for notices of well-baby clinics, immunization clinics, pre-school clinics, and prenatal clinics; and \$294 for advertisement for a psychologist, The Woodlands School; total, \$495.53; (b) and (c) Fernie Free Press Limited, \$3.20; Golden Star, \$4.20; Mica Publishing Company, \$3.50; Nelson Daily News, \$44.55; The Arrow Lakes News, \$4.36; Castlegar News, \$4.95; Trail Daily Times, \$2.70; Summerland Review, \$2.40; Merritt Herald, \$2.20; The Columbian, \$1.92; Powell River News, \$2.10; The Review, \$2.50; Campbell River Courier, \$14.05; 100 Mile Free Press, \$9.60; Cariboo Observer, \$5; Omineca Herald, \$2.50; Northern Sentinel Press, \$14.40; Citizen, \$8.40; CHWK Radio, \$4; CHTK Radio, \$5; CKCQ-CKWL Radio, \$40; CKPG Radio, \$20; total, \$201.53; Council for Exceptional Children, Washington, D.C., \$294; total, \$495.53.”

And then the House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Tuesday, March 24, 1970

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

On the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House proceeded to the Order "Public Bills and Orders."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 79) intituled *An Act to Amend the Health Act*.

The debate continued.

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* asked leave to withdraw the Bill.

Mr. Speaker ruled that the motion to withdraw required unanimous consent of the House. Unanimous consent was not given.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *D. R. J. Campbell* that the debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the House, the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS—46

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Bruch</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Dowding</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Dailly, Mrs.</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Hall</i>	<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Calder</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>		

NAYS—4

Messieurs

<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>
---------------	--------------	---------------	------------------------

PAIR:

Messieurs

<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Brousson</i>
------------------	-----------------

The House resumed the adjourned debates on the motions for the second reading of the following Bills:—

Bill (No. 82) intituled *An Act to Amend the Motor-vehicle Act*.

Bill (No. 83) intituled *An Act to Amend and Repeal Certain Provisions of the Statute Law*.

Bills read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 27) intituled *Land Act* was recommitted, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *R. A. Williams'* proposed amendment to section 7 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 7 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—17

Messieurs

<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>			

NAYS—36

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>
<i>Ney</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Richter</i>

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *R. A. Williams'* proposed amendment to section 14 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 14 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—12

Messieurs

<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Dowding</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>

NAYS—40

Messieurs

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

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *R. A. Williams'* proposed amendment to section 35 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 35 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—11

Messieurs

<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Dowding</i>	<i>Dailly, Mrs.</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	

NAYS—39

Messieurs

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

PAIR:

Messieurs

Hall *Mussallem*

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *R. A. Williams'* proposed amendment to section 85 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 85 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—17

Messieurs

<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>			

NAYS—34

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Ney</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>LeCours</i>	<i>Williston</i>		

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *R. A. Williams'* proposed amendment to section 88 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to section 88 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—17

Messieurs

<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Daily, Mrs.</i>
<i>Lorimer</i>			

NAYS—33

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Ney</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>LeCours</i>			

Bill (No. 28) intituled *An Act to Amend the Land Surveyors Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 29) intituled *Age of Majority Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

Bill (No. 30) intituled *Professional Corporations Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The following Bills were committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 33) intituled *Litter Act*.

Bill (No. 34) intituled *An Act to Amend the Veterinary Medical Act*.

Bill (No. 35) intituled *An Act to Amend the Adoption Act*.

Bill (No. 37) intituled *An Act to Amend the Forest Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments. Bill as reported to be considered at the next sitting after today.

The House continued to sit after midnight.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25.

Bill (No. 36) intituled *An Act to Amend the Protection of Children Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

The Committee further reported that in consideration of Mr. *Barrett's* proposed amendment to add section 5 the Committee divided.

The Committee recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Barrett*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division in Committee on the proposed amendment to add section 5 be recorded in the Journals of the House as follows:—

YEAS—18

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Dowding</i>
<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Dailly, Mrs.</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Clark</i>		

NAYS—33

Messieurs

<i>Ney</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>LeCours</i>			

The following Bills were committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 38) intituled *British Columbia Professional Foresters Act*.

Bill (No. 39) intituled *An Act to Amend the Legal Professions Act*.

Bill (No. 40) intituled *Mineral Processing Act*.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. today.

And then the House adjourned at 12.35 a.m.

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *W. F. Bahan*.

Mr. *McGeer* rose to a question of privilege with respect to proceedings in the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, and moved,—

That the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, having been convened in camera without authority so to do being granted by the Committee, and before the statements of accounts of the Liquor Control Board had been discussed or other vouchers had been examined and the Chairman thereof having, contrary to the rules of the House, refused to convene a meeting open to the public, in compliance with parliamentary procedure, and thereby depriving members of their rights and privileges, this House hereby instructs the Chairman of the Committee to reconvene, in open meeting, to consider such vouchers and financial statements as remain to be disposed of before going into camera.

Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

Mr. *Nimsick* asked leave to move adjournment of the House to discuss a definite matter of urgent public importance, namely, the application to the Canadian Transport Commission to connect the Kootenay and Elk Railway Company with the Great Northern Railway Company at the United States border.

Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

Pursuant to Order, the House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

The Chairman reported progress.
Report to be considered at the next sitting.
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Mr. Speaker delivered a reserved decision as follows:—

Honourable Members,—With the indulgence of the House I reserved my decision on a grievance raised as a matter of privilege by the honourable first member for Vancouver-Point Grey. The honourable member first referred to Standing Order 71 (1) which provides that the Standing Orders shall be observed in Select Standing Committees to the same extent as the same may be applicable to a Committee of the Whole House and then stated that a meeting of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing had been convened in a manner contrary to the rules of the House.

The essential question to be determined is whether the honourable member has a point of order or a point of privilege. In the Journals of the House, 1968, pages 134 and 135, I find that the Chair in similar circumstances considered what constituted matters of privilege. Reading in part from that ruling at page 135:—

“The 17th edition of May, at page 42, describes ‘Parliamentary privilege’ as ‘the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the high court of parliament and by the members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions. . . . The privileges of parliaments are rights which are absolutely necessary for the due execution of its powers. They are enjoyed by individual members because the House cannot perform its functions without unimpeded use of the services of its members; and by each House for the protection of its members and the vindication of its own authority and dignity. When any of these immunities, both of the members individually and of the assembly in its collective capacity, which are known by the general name of ‘privileges,’ are disregarded or attacked by any individual or authority, the offence is called ‘a breach of privilege’ and is punishable under the law of parliament.

“In the same edition of May the privileges which attach to members of parliament individually are enumerated as follows: (1) Privilege of freedom of speech; (2) privilege of freedom from arrest or molestation; (3) privilege of access to the Crown.

“In Bourinot’s ‘Parliamentary Procedure,’ 4th edition at page 303, ‘questions of privilege’ are described in general terms as referring to all matters affecting the rights and immunities of the House collectively, or to the position and conduct of members in their representative character.

“The power of this House to define those privileges is sanctioned by the *Constitution Act*, R.S.B.C. 1960, chapter 71, and such privileges have been largely codified in the *Legislative Assembly Privileges Act*, R.S.B.C. 1960, chapter 215.

“As explained by Dawson in the 2nd edition of ‘Government of Canada’ at page 399, the privileges of the individual member are primarily designed to enable the member to attend his parliamentary duties without interference and to encourage members to speak and act freely without fear of undesirable consequences.”

As I have earlier indicated, the honourable member based his grievance on an alleged breach of Standing Order 71 (1) and the motion offered by him addresses itself to procedures “contrary to the rules of the House.”

I must therefore conclude that the issue is clearly a point of order and not a point of privilege. Points of order must, of course, be resolved in the Committee and not in the House. Reference Journals, 1968, page 52.

W. H. MURRAY, *Speaker*.

At the hour of 6 o’clock p.m. Mr. Speaker left the chair.

Wednesday, March 25, 1970

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

Pursuant to Order, the House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

194. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$56,600 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Minister's Office, to 31st March, 1971.

195. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$458,522 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, General Administration, to 31st March, 1971.

196. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$512,500 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Grants and Subsidies, to 31st March, 1971.

197. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$5,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Housing and Urban Renewal, to 31st March, 1971.

198. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$53,750,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Grants in Aid of Local Government and Home-owners' Subsidies, to 31st March, 1971.

238. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$33,813 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Minister's Office, to 31st March, 1971.

239. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$394,460 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, General Administration, to 31st March, 1971.

240. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$11,913,015 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Government Buildings (Maintenance), to 31st March, 1971.

241. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$12,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Construction of Provincial Buildings, to 31st March, 1971.

242. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$2,250,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Rentals, to 31st March, 1971.

243. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,120,032 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Safety Inspection Division, to 31st March, 1971.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.
Report to be considered at the next sitting.
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

On the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House proceeded to "Private Bills."

The following Bills were committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 50) intituled *An Act to Amend the Fruit Growers Mutual Insurance Company Act*.

Bill (No. 51) intituled *An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter*.

Bill (No. 52) intituled *An Act Respecting Montreal Trust Company*.

Bill (No. 54) intituled *An Act Respecting Yorkshire Trust Company*.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. tomorrow.

Mr. *Chabot* presented the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries, as follows:—

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 25, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries begs leave to report as follows:—

Pursuant to motion of February 24, 1970, your Committee was ordered convened to study the following matter:—

Resolved, That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries to receive and study the following reports from the Forest Service:—

- (1) Slash-burning in the Interior:
- (2) Damage to forest values by mining development:
- (3) Application of the 30-50-per-cent contractor clauses in tree-farm licences.

Also to consider and report to the House on the total management responsibilities of the quota holders within any sustained-yield unit which is being cut to the maximum allowable harvest under close utilization standards.

Six meetings were held and representations were heard from the following: Forestry officials; Columbia Cellulose Company Limited; Rayonier Canada (B.C.) Limited; MacMillan Bloedel Limited; Weldwood of Canada Limited; Eurocan Pulp and Paper Company Limited; The Western Independent Log Haulers Association; Prince George and District Truck Loggers Association, Cariboo Lumber Manufacturers' Association; The Truck Loggers Association; and The Independent Squamish Logging Operators Limited.

The Forestry Committee appreciates the co-operation of the Forest Service in collecting reports and submitting information on the various subjects.

Slash-burning in the Interior Under Section 116 of the Forest Act.—The Forest Service indicated to the Committee that in 1969 slash-burning was carried out in an orderly arrangement with industry and that escapes were negligible and the volume of timber destroyed was *nil*. Co-operation exists between industry and the Forest Service on slash-burning.

Your Committee recommends that the Forest Service continue to hold annual meetings with the Interior associations to assess the slash-burning guidelines on an annual basis.

Damage to Forest Values by Mining Development.—The Committee considered the report from the Forest Service on damage to forest values by mining development, no representations were received on the subject. The Forest Service indicated that after a further year's experience regarding submission of the notice of opening of a mine or quarry that there are now no undue delays in processing the notices through the offices of the District Inspector of Mines and the District Forester. There still appears to be a problem with timber being cleared without authority resulting from the mining companies failing to submit the "Notice of Opening of a Mine" or by failure to submit the notice in sufficient time prior to commencement of operations.

While the situation has improved, there is still a need for better co-operation. Your Committee recommends that the Forest Service in co-operation with the Department of Mines and Petroleum Resources, endeavour through meetings with the mining industry to reach a satisfactory solution to the problem of mineral exploration in forested areas.

Application of the 30-50-per-cent Contractor Clauses in Tree-farm Licences.—Your Committee appreciates the study undertaken by Mr. I. T. Cameron, Assistant Chief Forester, Operations, British Columbia Forest Service (Chairman); Mr. C. Joergensen, vice-president, Columbia Cellulose Company Limited, representing the licencees; and Mr. I. S. Mahood, owner director, Millstream Timber Limited, representing the contractors operating in tree-farm licences on the application of the 30-50-per-cent contractor clause in tree-farm licences. Your Committee heard several representations on this report from the licencees and the contractors.

The parties concerned expressed acceptance of the recommendations with the exception of Recommendation Nos. 5 and 8.

Your Committee was unanimous that the contractor clause should be based on volume rather than costs. After consideration it was agreed for the purpose of clarification that Recommendation No. 5 should read as follows:—

"In recommending acceptance of phase contracting, the Committee underlines that such contracting must relate directly to a particular share of the prescribed volume of annual allowable cut required to be offered. Within this context it is recognized that where 50 per cent of the harvest is to be offered for contract the licencee has the option of offering the volume in 'full contracts' or offering the same volume in 'phase contracts.' 'Phase contracts' should, whenever possible, offer a balanced share of the phases. The contribution of phase required to be contracted will ordinarily be measured by giving weight to the dollars expended thereon. In other words, if hauling is 10 per cent of the cost in a 'full contract,' then in determining the volume contributed by the hauling phase, the volume credited would be limited to 10 per cent of the volume required to be offered for contract. As a normal rule, where greater volume of contracting is done than required in a particular phase this excess would not be transferred to reduce the amount of contracting offered in another phase. In cases where this stipulation constitutes an impediment to effective planning of a contractor programme, for reasons of lack of suitable contractors, or unusual conditions prevailing within a particular tree-farm licence then the Minister may waive this stipulation after first hearing objections, if any, by contractors engaged within the particular tree farm."

After reviewing Recommendation No. 8 of the report your Committee recommends that all unsettled disputes arising between tree-farm licencees and contractors would be arbitrated within the provisions of the *Arbitration Act*.

Your Committee recommends the implementation of the report along with the amendment to Recommendation No. 5 as outlined.

Your Committee is of the opinion that the appendix to the report is not in accord with the intent of the contractor clause and recommends that it be deleted from the report.

Your Committee recommends that the Forest Service, at the next session of the Legislature, submit a report regarding the implementation of the recommendations so that a further review can be undertaken.

Consideration on the Total Management Responsibility of the Quota Holders within any Sustained-yield Unit Which Has Been Cut to the Maximum Allowable Harvest under Close Utilization Standards.—Your Committee received one representation on this subject and, from the lack of submissions, it is the opinion that the matter is not a contentious one.

Your Committee recommends that a further study of this matter be undertaken next year.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

JAMES R. CHABOT, *Chairman.*

The report was taken as read and received.

Mr. *Mussallem* presented the Second Report of the Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing, as follows:—

REPORT NO. 2

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
March 25, 1970.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Public Accounts and Printing begs leave to report as follows:—

Your Committee held several meetings for examination of vouchers supplied by the Comptroller-General. These vouchers were supplied from various votes on the request of members through the Chairman.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

GEORGE MUSSALLEM, *Chairman.*

On the motion that the report be taken as read and received the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:—

YEAS—37

Messieurs

<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Williston</i>	<i>Capozzi</i>
<i>Ney</i>	<i>Little</i>	<i>Bennett</i>	<i>Skillings</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Jefcoat</i>	<i>Peterson</i>	<i>Chant</i>
<i>Marshall</i>	<i>Tisdalle</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Loffmark</i>
<i>Wenman</i>	<i>Bruch</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Gaglardi</i>
<i>Kripps, Mrs.</i>	<i>McCarthy, Mrs.</i>	<i>Campbell, B.</i>	<i>Campbell, D. R. J.</i>
<i>Mussallem</i>	<i>Jordan, Mrs.</i>	<i>Wolfe</i>	<i>Brothers</i>
<i>Price</i>	<i>Dawson, Mrs.</i>	<i>Smith</i>	<i>Shelford</i>
<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Kiernan</i>	<i>McDiarmid</i>	<i>Richter</i>
<i>LeCours</i>			

NAYS—15

Messieurs

<i>Brousson</i>	<i>Lorimer</i>	<i>Clark</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Barrett</i>
<i>Cocke</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Dailly, Mrs.</i>
<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	

Mr. Speaker delivered a reserved decision as follows:—

Honourable Members,—At the opening of the sitting this afternoon I reserved my decision on an urgency motion raised by the honourable member for Kootenay and have now had the opportunity to consider the statement handed to me in accordance with Standing Order 35 (3) together with the reply of the Honourable the Attorney-General respecting the present hearing before the Canadian Transport Commission in regard to an application by the Kootenay and Elk Railway Company to connect with the Great Northern Railway Company at the United States border. I have also examined a copy of an Order in Council No. 332, handed to me in support of the motion for adjournment.

The duty of the Chair is to determine the urgency of debate at this particular time on the motion concerned, not the urgency of the matter itself, and an examination of the rules applicable to motions under our Standing Order 35 reveals that, in order to qualify, the matter sought to be raised must be of recent occurrence and raised without delay. May's 16th edition, at page 370, states that, "the fact that new information has been received regarding a matter that has been continuing for some time does not in itself make the matter one of urgency." Again, at page 370, it is further observed that, "if the *facts* have only been recently revealed that does not make the *occurrence* recent."

The relevant Order in Council is dated February 2, 1970, and the reply of the Honourable the Attorney-General above referred to is dated March 13, 1970. Whether or not the said reply or the Order in Council were only recently revealed to the honourable member is, in my opinion, quite irrelevant in view of the parliamentary authority quoted.

It is also clear that while certain facts may have come to the honourable member's attention only recently, the subject matter with which we are concerned has been continuing for some time and the urgency of debate at this particular time has not been established.

Accordingly, I must rule the motion out of order.

W. H. MURRAY, *Speaker*.

23 Mr. *Strachan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With reference to bequests made to religious, charitable, and educational organizations as referred to in section 5 of the *Succession Duty Act*:—

1. Did any such organizations receive bequests exempted under the terms of the *Succession Duty Act* in 1963/64, 1964/65, 1965/66, 1966/67, 1967/68, or 1968/69?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what were the names of these organizations for each fiscal year?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. No listings kept of bequests made through individual estates."

178 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources the following questions:—

1. Has spillage from Duncan Dam caused any flooding and erosion to lands below the dam?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what are the details of the flooding and (or) erosion and (b) what action is the Provincial Government or British Columbia Hydro taking to repair or prevent any further damage?

The Hon. *R. G. Williston* replied as follows:—

“1. The course of the Duncan River between Duncan Lake and Kootenay Lake is changeable under natural conditions and meandering has been its normal pattern in the past. The riparian lands in this stretch have, for this reason, always been subject to erosion and flooding, particularly at spring runoff. The possible incidence of erosion or flooding at spring runoff has been reduced by the operation of Duncan Dam and no erosion or flooding should be caused by the regulated spring and summer discharges. While no definitive findings have been made to date, the possibility of adverse effects caused by the larger winter flows is under active investigation. Should it be found that properties along the river will be subject to erosion or flooding attributable to these larger discharges, the owners will be protected or offered fair compensation.

“2. (a) and (b) See No. 1 above.”

180 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:—

During the year 1969 (a) what was the energy (kilowatt-hours) purchased from the United States, (b) what was the cost of (a), (c) what was the energy sold to the United States, and (d) what was the payment received for (c)?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

“During the 12 months ended December 31, 1969: (a) British Columbia Hydro received 241,952,600 kilowatt-hours of energy from the United States; (b) at a cost to British Columbia Hydro of \$90,668; (c) British Columbia Hydro delivered 276,936,440 kilowatt-hours of energy to the United States; and (d) for a payment to British Columbia Hydro of \$1,075,743.”

181 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With respect to the Peace River project:—

1. What are the total costs to date, including the dam, generating plant, controls, and transformation?

2. What are the costs of the 500-kv. transmission systems to date, including substations and controls?

3. What is the estimated cost of completing both circuits?

4. How many generators were in service in 1969?

5. What was the peak load in 1969?

6. What was the energy (kilowatt-hours) generated during 1969?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

“1. \$399,948,787 as at December 31, 1969.

“2. \$159,200,815 as at December 31, 1969.

“3. Not finalized.

“4. Five.

- “ 5. 1,151,000 kilowatts.
- “ 6. 5,159,960,000 kilowatt-hours.”

182 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With respect to the Ioco steam plant:—

1. What is the total cost to date?
2. What was the peak load in 1969?
3. What was the energy (kilowatt-hours) generated during 1969?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. \$104,000,680 as at December 31, 1969.
- “ 2. 792,000 kilowatts.
- “ 3. 1,452,814,000 kilowatt-hours.”

183 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With respect to the Port Mann gas-turbine plant:—

1. What was the peak load during 1969?
2. What was the energy (kilowatt-hours) generated during 1969?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. 100,000 kilowatts.
- “ 2. 2,803,000 kilowatt-hours.”

184 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With respect to the Chemainus gas turbines:—

1. What was the peak load during 1969?
2. What was the energy (kilowatt-hours) generated during 1969?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. 43,000 kilowatts.
- “ 2. 1,320,000 kilowatt-hours.”

185 Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

With respect to other hydro plants:—

1. What was the peak load during 1969?
2. What was the energy (kilowatt-hours) generated during 1969?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

- “ 1. 1,447,877 kilowatts (non-coincidental).
- “ 2. 7,471,521,775 kilowatt-hours.”

207 Mrs. *Dailly* asked the Hon. the Minister of Social Welfare the following questions:—

With reference to the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen for the fiscal year 1969/70:—

1. Has any advertising or public-relations work been placed for the Alliance through Western Market Surveys?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what is the full detail of services supplied and payments made?

3. If the answer to No. 1 is no, have payments been made to Western Market Surveys for any other type of services to the Alliance?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what services were supplied and what payments were made?

The Hon. *P. A. Gaglardi* replied as follows:—

“ 1. No.

“ 2. Not applicable.

“ 3. No.

“ 4. Not applicable.”

210 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Premier the following questions:—

1. Is power purchased for the operation of the High Arrow Dam?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, from whom is the power purchased and what was the cost since the dam was put into operation?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

“ 1. The power is purchased for the operation of the Hugh Keenleyside Dam, formerly the Arrow Dam.

“ 2. The power is purchased from the West Kootenay Power and Light. The exact cost of power cannot be given because the power-purchase contract has not yet been fully negotiated. Indications are that electrical-power costs will average \$3,000 per month, or an approximate total of \$54,000 for the 18 months since the dam was declared operational.”

211 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Premier the following questions:—

1. Was any of the equipment installed at the High Arrow Dam purchased from Japan?

2. Have any repairs to this equipment been necessary?

3. If so, has it been necessary to bring experts from Japan to make these repairs?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what has been the cost to date for bringing these experts from Japan?

The Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. Yes.

“ 3. No.

“ 4. Not applicable.”

212 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:—

1. Has the Department received an application from the Kimberley Rod and Gun Club for the setting aside of an area called the “Top of the World” as a wilderness area?

2. If so, (a) has the Department given this application consideration and (b) what are the results of those considerations?

The Hon. *W. K. Kiernan* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. (a) Yes and (b) the Department is preparing a recommendation.”

And then the House adjourned at 10.34 p.m.

Thursday, March 26, 1970

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *M. Henderson*.

By leave of the House, on behalf of Mr. *Gardom*, Mr. *L. A. Williams* withdrew notice of introduction of Bill intituled *An Act to Amend the Companies Act* standing in Mr. *Gardom's* name on the Order Paper.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

Pursuant to Order, the House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

258. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$40,140 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, Minister's Office, to 31st March, 1971.

259. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$149,770 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, General Administration, to 31st March, 1971.

260. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$39,024 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, Social Assistance and Rehabilitation Division, to 31st March, 1971.

261. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$5,016,086 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, Field Service, to 31st March, 1971.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.
Report to be considered at the next sitting.
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. on Wednesday next.

87 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With respect to psychiatric units in general hospitals operating under the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service:—

1. Were any such units in operation as of December 31, 1969?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many such units, (b) at what locations, (c) how many patient beds used, and (d) did any such unit commence operation during the year ended December 31, 1969?

3. Was permission granted by the Minister, during the year ended December 31, 1969, in respect to psychiatric units in general hospitals, with regard to (a) approval in principle, (b) commencing working drawings, and (c) commencing construction?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. (a) Seven; (b) Royal Inland Hospital, Kamloops; Kelowna General Hospital; Vernon Jubilee Hospital; Lions Gate Hospital, North Vancouver; Vancouver General Hospital (including the child psychiatric unit); Royal Jubilee Hospital, Victoria; Health Sciences Centre, Vancouver; Nanaimo Regional General Hospital has general beds allocated to psychiatry as required; (c) 228 beds; and (d) yes.

“ 3. (a) No, (b) and (c) yes.”

91 Mr. *Dowding* asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:—

With respect to hospital treatment of emotionally disturbed children:—

1. Did any general hospital under British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service operate psychiatric wards for children during the year ended December 31, 1969?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, where are such units located, how many beds involved, and how many children treated during the years indicated in No. 1?

3. Are any such units referred to in No. 1 at present (a) under construction and (b) approved in principle?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, at what locations and how many beds?

5. Has any request for such facilities been renewed from the Health Sciences Centre, University of British Columbia?

6. If answer to No. 5 is affirmative, at what stage of development is such project?

The Hon. *R. R. Loffmark* replied as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. Vancouver General Hospital, eight beds; 189 children were treated from the time of the opening in March. Hospitals operating psychiatric wards report that admissions and bed allocations are determined by the hospital medical staff, the attending physician, and the administration according to the diagnosis and state of urgency indicated by the admitting doctor at the time of admission, but without regard to age or sex of the patient. In many hospitals, beds are not specifically designated for any particular disorder or for patients coming within a specified age-group. One hospital reported that certain patients under 16 years of age requiring psychiatric treatment were admitted to a paediatric ward.

“ 3. (a) and (b) No.

“ 4. Not applicable.

“ 5. No.

“ 6. Not applicable.”

And then the House adjourned at 5.45 p.m.