

**Tuesday, March 28, 1972**

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Father *Don Lehane*.

On the motion of Mr. *Macdonald*, the following Bills were introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting after today:

Bill (No. 113) intituled *The Provision of Hearing Aids Act*.

Bill (No. 114) intituled *An Act to Incorporate the Land Bank of British Columbia*.

The House proceeded to the Order "Public Bills and Orders."

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 49) intituled *An Act to Amend the Social Assistance Act*, the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—32

*Messieurs*

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

NAYS—16

*Messieurs*

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

PAIRS:

*Messieurs*

<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Gardom</i>

Bill read a third time and passed.

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 67) intituled *Safety Engineering Services Act*, the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—36

*Messieurs*

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

PAIRS:

*Messieurs*

<i>Vogel</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>
<i>Merilees</i>	<i>Cardom</i>

Bill read a third time and passed.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:

Bill (No. 78) intituled *An Act to Amend the Insurance Act*.

Bill (No. 82) intituled *An Act to Amend the Workmen's Compensation Act, 1968*.

Bill (No. 47) intituled *Sunshine Comstock Mines Limited (Non-Personal Liability) Mineral Claims Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment.

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 47) the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—39

*Messieurs*

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

## NAYS—12

*Messieurs*

Cocke  
Hartley  
Lorimer

Hall  
Williams, R. A.  
Calder

Macdonald  
Strachan  
Dowding

Nimsick  
Barrett  
Dailly, Mrs.

## PAIR:

*Messieurs*

Vogel

Gardom

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 89) intituled *Kootenay Canal Land Acquisition Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment.

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 89) the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

## YEAS—35

*Messieurs*

Ney  
Merilees  
Mussallem  
Wallace  
Marshall  
Wenman  
Kripps, Mrs.  
Price  
Capozzi

LeCours  
Little  
Jefcoat  
Bruch  
McCarthy, Mrs.  
Jordan, Mrs.  
Dawson, Mrs.  
Kiernan  
Williston

Bennett  
Peterson  
Black  
Fraser  
Campbell, B.  
Wolfe  
Smith  
McDiarmid  
Chabot

Skillings  
Chant  
Loffmark  
Gaglardi  
Campbell, D. R. J.  
Brothers  
Shelford  
Richter

## NAYS—16

*Messieurs*

Brousson  
Cocke  
Hartley  
Lorimer

Hall  
Williams, R. A.  
Calder  
Clark

McGeer  
Williams, L. A.  
Macdonald  
Strachan

Dowding  
Nimsick  
Barrett  
Dailly, Mrs.

## PAIR:

*Messieurs*

Vogel

Gardom

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 91) intituled *Statute Law Amendment Act, 1972*, was committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 92) intituled *An Act to Amend the Municipalities Enabling and Validating Act* was committed, reported complete with amendments.

By leave of the House the Rules were suspended and the Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 98) intituled *An Act to Amend the Pollution Control Act, 1967*, was committed, reported complete with amendments.

By leave of the House the Rules were suspended and the Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 99) intituled *An Act to Amend the Podiatry Act* was committed, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

The House proceeded to the Order "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 Vancouver Charter*.

Bill (No. 51) intituled *An Act to Amend the Trinity Junior College Act*.

Bill (No. 52) intituled *An Act to Incorporate Vanco Insurance Company* was read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting of the House.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

—————  
The Committee rose and reported progress.  
Report to be considered at the next sitting.  
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Mr. Price presented the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters as follows:

REPORT NO. 1

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
March 28, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters begs leave to report as follows:

By motion of February 7, 1972, your Committee was authorized as follows:

"That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters to examine the criteria and conditions which should be met either to incor-

porate by statute an area as a municipality or to include an area in an existing municipality and to report their findings and recommendations to the House.”

The Committee held five meetings. The principal representations made to the Committee were presented by the Union of British Columbia Municipalities, firstly, in a brief submitted March 6 and in a supplementary brief which was requested by the Committee, which was presented March 20. Alderman E. J. Broome, President of the UBCM; Mayor S. A. Fleming; and Director M. H. Holmes, accompanied by Mr. C. S. J. McKelvie, Executive Director, presented the briefs on behalf of the Union, and the Committee wishes to express its appreciation to the Union for the clear, straight forward presentation and frank discussions. In addition to the presentations by the Committee, staff members of the Department of Municipal Affairs were present at most of the Committee meetings.

The Union of British Columbia Municipalities' submission was basically as follows:

Firstly, they recommended that criteria be established by legislation for both the incorporation of dissepate municipalities and for the extension of boundaries of existing municipalities.

Secondly, they recommended that the Minister be empowered to appoint a secretary whose function would be:

- (1) To determine all instances where in his opinion the relevant criteria have been met and to report his findings to the Minister.
- (2) To proceed after authorization by the Minister to assemble all relevant data.
- (3) To publicize that an inquiry will be held in connection with the proposed incorporation or boundary extension.
- (4) To convene the inquiry and perform such duties as members of the Inquiry Board may require and to advise the Board on all matters on which they are required to make a decision.

Thirdly, the Union of British Columbia Municipalities proposed that in each case an Inquiry Board be established. The Minister would have discretion to determine the number of members of the Inquiry Board, the suggestion being that in minor cases of boundary extension a single person would be sufficient, but where the Minister is of the opinion that the issue is such that it requires a Board of more than a single member, the membership should be selected as follows:

One member selected by electoral area directors of the regional district;  
One member of the Council of the host municipality (where extension of boundaries is in question); and

The two members selected would nominate a third member who would be Chairman from a list maintained by the Minister of individuals such as past presidents of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities or other prominent and respected municipal officials;

Where more than one host municipality or community is involved the Minister would specify additional Board members.

The Inquiry Board thus established shall:

- (1) Meet forthwith in the area under consideration.
- (2) Determine the boundaries, with subsequent review and revision as required.
- (3) Establish whether the criteria have been met within the boundaries so determined.
- (4) If the criteria have been met, hold public hearings and receive submissions to evaluate the opinions of all parties concerned.

The Inquiry Board would report to the Minister, who would be empowered to provide that the question of incorporation or extension of boundaries be submitted to the owner-electors and property-owners in the community and that a 60 per cent plurality would be required to carry such a vote. In the case of a boundary extension the vote would be on the basis of the extension area and the existing municipality combined.

The Union of British Columbia Municipalities also recommended that subsection (5) of section 12 be made applicable to all classes of municipalities so that in the event of an extension of boundary provisions could be made that the newly included areas would not assume the full burden of taxation for certain services unless those services were actually received by the area.

The Committee recommends that consideration be given to legislative provision in the future to incorporate the view of the Union of British Columbia Municipalities.

The Committee recommends, as well, that the provisions of subsection (5) of section 12 of the *Municipal Act* be amended at this Session of the Legislature to make the provisions applicable to all classes of municipalities.

The Committee further recommends that the Department of Municipal Affairs, by August 31, 1972, ascertain the opinion of the municipalities on the subject-matter presented to the Committee by the Union of British Columbia Municipalities.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

B. PRICE, *Acting Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

**24** Mr. *McGeer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs the following questions:

With respect to the Certificates of Opportunity Programme—

1. How many such certificates were issued as of December 31, 1971?
2. How many new jobs were provided under this programme?
3. How much money was expended on this programme through media advertising?

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

“1. 7,035.

“2. Information is not yet available although employment has been accelerated through municipal works which are now being developed.

“3. Administration and other advertising costs, \$168,716.31.”

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

With reference to the “Certificate of Opportunity” programme—

1. How many certificates have been issued?
2. What was the total cost of the certificates printed, and the cost per certificate?
3. What was the name of the company who printed the certificates?
4. What was the total amount spent on media advertising?
5. How many persons were placed in employment and, in each case, what was the duration of the employment?
6. With respect to each “employer” receiving moneys from the Government under this programme, what was their name, address, business, and total amount paid to them?

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

- "1. 8,215 as at February 3, 1972.
- "2. \$2,362.40; a cost of approximately nine cents per certificate.
- "3. Security Printing Corporation Limited.
- "4. Administration and other advertising costs, \$168,716.31.
- "5. Information is not yet available.
- "6. Programme not yet complete."

**118** Mr. *B. Campbell* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:

With respect to the regional colleges operating in this Province—

1. What is the percentage of the operating budgets provided by (a) the Provincial Government and (b) participating school districts?
2. With respect to No. 1 (b), what percentage of the school district's share is provided by the school districts and what percentage is provided by other revenues such as student fees, etc.?
3. What are the answers to No. 2 expressed as percentages of the total regional college's budget?

The Hon. *D. L. Brothers* replied as follows:

- "1. (a) 61.84 per cent and (b) 38.16 per cent.
- "2. 55.71 per cent and 44.29 per cent.
- "3. 21.26 per cent and 16.9 per cent."

**171** Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:

1. Did the Provincial Government receive any money from the Government of Canada in the year 1971 for second-language instruction in public schools?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, how much money was received by the Province and what were the terms of the agreement under which the money was paid to British Columbia?
3. Did School District No. 43 (Coquitlam) receive any of this money for the special programme that it offers Kindergarten, Grades I, II, and III pupils (in which programme the language of instruction is in French) and for the oral French programme offered in Grades V to VII in that school district?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what was the amount of money paid to School District No. 43 (Coquitlam)?

The Hon. *D. L. Brothers* replied as follows:

- "1. Yes.
- "2. \$701,258. A complicated formula under which Canada made partial reimbursement to the Province of that portion of regular Provincial grants paid to all school districts, which is deemed to be the cost in respect of second-language instruction.
- "3. See answer to No. 2.
- "4. Not applicable."

**175** Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

1. Have there been any fish kills in Kootenay Lake since the completion of Duncan Dam?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many kills and in what years, (b) what was the cause of the kills, (c) how many fish were killed in each relevant year, and (d) what species of fish were involved?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) One in 1969, (b) unknown causes, (c) one million (approximately), and (d) mountain whitefish."

**180** Mr. *Strachan* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:

With regard to the investigation proceeding under authority of Order in Council 1948, 1970—

1. What was the total sum of money expended until December 31, 1971?

2. How much of the amount referred to in No. 1 was spent on each of the following projects: Job No. 1920, Columbia River General; Job No. 1921, Murphy Creek; Job No. 1922, Revelstoke Canyon; Job No. 1923, Downie Creek; Job No. 1924, Kootenay Canal Plant; Job No. 1925, Seven Mile Creek; Job No. 1930, Fraser Canyon General; Job No. 1931, Fraser Canyon-Moran; Job No. 1939, Kemano II; Job No. 1940, Liard River General; Job No. 1950, Peace River General; Job No. 1951, Peace River Site E; Job No. 1952, Peace River Site C; Job No. 1960, Skeena River General; Job No. 1970, Stikine River General; Job No. 1982, Elaho; Job No. 1983, Homathko; and Job No. 1990, Vancouver Island?

3. Were any of the above-mentioned sums expended on investigation that included test drilling or any other type of physical or material testing?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, where were these sums expended and in what amounts in each case?

The Hon. *W. D. Black* replied as follows:

"1. \$975,170.

"2. Job No. 1920, Columbia River General, \$6,547; Job No. 1921, Murphy Creek, \$8,943; Job No. 1922, Revelstoke Canyon, \$7,270; Job No. 1923, Downie Creek, \$11,216; Job No. 1924, Kootenay Canal Plant, \$27,213; Job No. 1925, Seven Mile Creek, \$9,277; Job No. 1930, Fraser Canyon General, \$23,563; Job No. 1931, Fraser Canyon-Moran, \$209,700; Job No. 1939, Kemano II, \$19,033; Job No. 1940, Liard River General, \$4,677; Job No. 1950, Peace River General, \$6,742; Job No. 1951, Peace River Site E, \$10,075; Job No. 1952, Peace River Site C, \$6,392; Job No. 1960, Skeena River General, \$11,696; Job No. 1970, Stikine River General, \$44,699; Job No. 1982, Elaho, \$12,257; Job No. 1983, Homathko, \$41,470; and Job No. 1990, Vancouver Island, \$4,593.

"3. Yes.

"4. Investigation involving testing both relate to Moran: (i) Geophysical testing, \$12,601; (ii) test drilling, \$76,962."

And then the House adjourned at 6.02 p.m.



**Tuesday, March 28, 1972**

---

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

By leave, the House proceeded to the Order "Private Bills."

Bill (No. 52) intituled *An Act to Incorporate Vanco Insurance Company* was committed, reported complete without amendment.

On the motion for the third reading of Bill (No. 52) the House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—40

*Messieurs*

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

NAYS—1

*Mr. Bruch*

PAIR:

*Messieurs*

*Vogel*

*Clark*

Bill read a third time and passed.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

184. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$46,660 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Minister's Office, to 31st March 1973.

185. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$506,629 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, General Administration, to 31st March 1973.

186. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$515,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Municipal Affairs, Grants and Subsidies, to 31st March 1973.

187. *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 1973.

188. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$62,350,000 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 1973.

226. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$35,313 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Minister's Office, to 31st March 1973.

227. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$454,134 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, General Administration, to 31st March 1973.

228. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$14,847,150 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Government Buildings (Maintenance), to 31st March 1973.

229. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$18,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Construction of Provincial Buildings, to 31st March 1973.

230. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Rentals, to 31st March 1973.

231. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,391,014 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Safety Inspection Division, to 31st March 1973.

---

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

Mr. *Fraser* presented the Report of the Special Committee on Expropriation, as follows:

#### REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
March 28, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Special Committee to study the Report on Expropriation begs leave to report as follows:

This Committee has held five meetings for the consideration of the Report on Expropriation of the Law Reform Commission. Dr. Gosse, one of the members of the Commission, attended two of our meetings. We wish to express our appreciation to Dr. Gosse for his appearances before the Committee and for his help in explaining and clarifying the report of the Law Reform Commission.

The report of the Law Reform Commission is exceptionally comprehensive in its script and contains a great many recommendations, most of which are of a very fundamental nature. Individual members of the Committee have, to the extent that the breadth of the recommendations allow, drawn some tentative and some firm conclusions. In order for the Committee as a whole, however, to gauge properly the prospective effect of those recommendations, and in the event that they are not all practicable, to choose which should be implemented by legislation, it would be necessary, firstly, to hear the views held by those who can forecast the effect from actual experience, and secondly, to correlate those views and consolidate the various resulting opinions of the Committee members. For example, the Law Reform

Commission's suggestion with regard to a single acquisition agency is restricted to one that consideration be given to the advantages of the procedures mentioned, and expressly "not that steps should be taken to establish a single acquisition agency or to designate a particular department to be responsible for Crown expropriations," such consideration, to be carried out effectively, must be preceded by the acquisition of all information available as to those advantages.

Therefore, the Committee recognizes that:

- (1) A single statute to control expropriation is needed.
- (2) Government departments should study the subject with the objective of drafting legislation prior to the 1973 Session of the Legislature.
- (3) The proposed legislation be subjected to a Committee of the Legislature appointed for that purpose during the 1973 Session, and so recommends.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

A. V. FRASER, *Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

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

#### REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

March 28, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Pursuant to a motion on February 15, 1972, your Committee was ordered convened to study the following matter:

Resolved, That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Forestry and Fisheries to consider the reports prepared by the Forest Service pursuant to request of this Committee at the last Session on:

1. The Contractor Clause in Tree-farm Licences.
2. Log and Debris Salvage in the Strait of Georgia.

And examine into the disposal of chips, sawdust, and hogfuel arising from close-utilization policies which at the present time have caused

- (a) an apparent oversupply of chips from sawmill production aggravated by depressed markets for pulp;
- (b) reduced ability to dispose of sawdust and hogfuel coincident with a reduced pulp-mill demand and the pending restriction on burners which have been a major method of waste disposal up to the present time.

The objective would be to collect information and make recommendations concerning the short- and long-term problems relative to waste recovery and utilization. The Committee should seek submissions from interested forestry groups and from those who have had experience in using such waste for generation of steam.

Meetings were held and representations were heard from MacMillan & Bloedel; Central Interior Loggers; Cariboo Lumber Manufacturer's Association; Western Independent Log Hauler's Association; Vancouver Island Chip Supply; Western Canadian Regional Council No. 1, International Woodworkers of America;

Forest Industrial Relations; The Truck Logger's Association; The Chip Advisory Committee of B.C.; Cariboo Pulp & Paper Company; Gulf Log Salvage Co-operative; and Weyerhaeuser Canada Limited.

In addition, briefs were received from Ventura Engineering Limited; Jack Christensen, president, Tahsis Company; Bluebird Sawmills; and a group of log salvage operators.

### *30-50-per-cent Contractor Clause*

Your Committee believes on the basis of submissions placed before it that the 30-50-per-cent contractor clause is in general being lived up to by the tree-farm licence holders. Your Committee reaffirms the provisions of the 30-50-per-cent contractor clause and is of the strong opinion that any agreement made between the tree-farm licence holder and a union should not in any way be binding upon or interfere with independent contractors operating under the 30-50-per-cent contractor clause.

### *Log and Debris Salvage in the Strait of Georgia*

Your Committee concurs with the Forest Service recommendation that accumulated wood debris along the lower reaches of the Fraser River between Haney and the Mission Bridge be burned prior to the 1972 freshet. Your Committee recommends that if early high-water prevents completion of this project this spring, it should be completed by the Forest Service at a convenient time during the ensuing 12 months. The effect of this project on the Fraser River debris problem should continue to be monitored and a report prepared by the Forest Service for consideration by your Committee next year.

The problem of beach salvage for the Strait of Georgia near the East Coast of Vancouver Island was considered. It is apparent that at most, only 30 per cent of beach logs could be salvaged and utilized on an economic basis at this time. Your Committee believes that the Forest Service should encourage removal of as much usable beach wood as possible.

Your Committee recommends the continuation of Beach Clearance Licence 40 to Vancouver Island Chip Supply for such a period of time as the Forest Service may decide so that the relative efficiency of salvors working under this licence can be compared to those selling to Gulf Log Salvage at a proposed new depot at Lady-smith Harbour.

### *Pulp Chips*

Your Committee heard evidence from many sources and is convinced that the present oversupply of chips is temporary and recommends against any long-term commitment to foreign purchasers. The Chip Advisory Committee of British Columbia seems to be functioning adequately and is currently disposing of chips on a contract basis not exceeding 12 months.

Your Committee deplores the burning of chips which has occurred and it has recommended that in each pulp-harvesting area it should be the responsibility of the pulp-mill to receive all by-product chips from wood-processing plants within that area and the problems of transportation, storage, utilization, or other disposal should be the responsibility of the receiving pulp-mill.

### *Hogfuel*

To date the most efficient and most desirable method of disposal of hogfuel appears to be utilization as a fuel in specially designed burners within a pulp-mill, where heat thus generated is used in plant processing plus generation of electricity.

At this time, hogfuel is slightly more expensive than other fuels but the anticipated increase in price of those fuels is expected to make hogfuel more competitive in the near future. Not all hogfuel presently being produced can be utilized in this way and there is every indication of increasing volumes being produced in the future. Other forms of use for this material, such as mulch, particle board, etc., will absorb only a small fraction of production. Hogfuel is unsatisfactory for land fill except in highly selective areas. The burning of hogfuel in nonpolluting burners to produce energy for dry kiln operations or electricity, or a combination of both, appears to be the only likely solution to the pollution problem caused by excess production of hogfuel.

A study is under way to explore this possibility near Williams Lake, and a report is expected this spring.

Your Committee recommends that a Province-wide study of present and future volumes of hogfuel production be undertaken and methods by which it can most efficiently be utilized in various parts of the Province be studied.

Your Committee believes that the Research Council of British Columbia would be admirably suited to undertake such a study.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

H. R. McDIARMID, *Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

The Hon. R. R. Loffmark presented the Twenty-third Annual Report of the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service for 1971.

**166** Mr. Strachan asked the Hon. the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance the following questions:

With reference to Vote 108, Code 033—Payments to Hospitals \$230,000,000, Estimates of Expenditure, 1972/73—

1. Will any part of the said \$230,000,000 be paid as the payment of the Government share of the hospital construction debt?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what will be the total sum so paid?

3. If the answer to No. 1 is no, will any money be paid by the Government toward hospital construction debt under any other vote in the 1972/73 Estimates of Expenditure and, if so, which vote and how much will be paid to the hospitals as the Government share of hospital construction debt?

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

"1 and 2. Included in Vote 108, Code 033, Payments to Hospitals, are provisions for several classes of grants in respect of hospital construction. One such class of grants relates to payments made directly to individual hospital boards toward the cost of minor renovations, etc. A second class includes grants for hospital-construction projects not included in Regional Hospital District financing, e.g., hospital projects such as the Health Sciences Centre at the University of British Columbia, financed jointly by the Provincial and Federal Governments.

"The Deputy Minister of Hospital Insurance is also required to pay annual grants out of the Hospital Insurance Fund to the Boards of Regional Hospital Districts. These grants which are estimated to amount to a total of \$6,400,000 for the 1972/73 fiscal year are computed as follows:

"(a) From the estimated total expenditure provided for in a district's budget adopted for the current year there is deducted (i) all amounts received or due from

the Government of Canada on account of hospital projects to which that expenditure relates, other than amounts deducted on a previous computation; (ii) items of expense determined by the Minister to be the sole responsibility of the district; and (iii) the total amount provided in the budget for the payment of principal and interest assumed or for the reimbursement to be provided in respect of a completed hospital project.

"The resulting sum constitutes the total expense toward which the grant is made.

"(b) The capital grant is 60 per cent of the total expense calculated under clause (a) above until the share of such expense borne by the Board has reached an amount equivalent to a levy of four mills on the assessed value of land and 75 per cent of the assessed value of improvements in the district, including the amount mentioned in paragraph (iii) of clause (a), and 80 per cent of any additional expense calculated under clause (a).

"The administration and disposition of each such grant becomes the responsibility of the Regional Hospital District Board that receives it.

"3. See Nos. 1 and 2."

And then the House adjourned at 11.10 p.m.

**Wednesday, March 29, 1972**

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *Franck Patterson*.

On the motion of Mr. *Wallace*, Bill (No. 115) intituled *An Act to Amend the Assessment Equalization Act* was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for second reading at the next sitting after today.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

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

Mr. *McGeer* presented a petition as follows:

*To the Honourable the Legislature of the Province of British Columbia  
in Legislature Assembled*

The petition of the undersigned, Howard Sullivan, of the City of Vancouver, humbly sheweth:

That I respectfully and earnestly object and protest against the granting of certification to a three-party labour consortium by the Labour Relations Board of British Columbia for the hourly paid employees of National Paper Box Limited. The certification was granted without a hearing being conducted at which the employees of the plant could be represented.

Wherefore your petitioner humbly prays that your Honourable House may be pleased to recommend that the Labour Relations Board conduct a democratic vote as requested by over 80 per cent of the employees in signed petition to the Board.

And as in duty bound, your petitioner will ever pray.

Dated March 29, 1972.

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

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
March 29, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

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

On February 9, 1972, on the motion of the Hon. *C. M. Shelford* it was *Ordered*:

That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture to assess the impact on British Columbia agriculture of food products which are imported from other countries and from other parts of Canada, with particular reference to those products which are produced in substantial volume in this Province.

The Committee shall have the power to send for persons, papers, and records and to hear representations from the food and agricultural industry, from Government officials, and from such organizations and individuals as may, in their discretion, appear necessary, and shall report its findings and recommendations to this House.

1. In its study of the impact on British Columbia agriculture of imports from points outside the Province, the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture conducted 11 public hearings at which 22 briefs were presented by individuals and groups representing producers, marketing boards, wholesalers, processors, and retailers of food and agricultural products.

The B.C. Interior Vegetable Marketing Board was represented by R. Freeze, chairman; Fred Hack, vice-president; and Eric Magee, secretary-treasurer.

The Department of Agriculture was represented by M. M. Gilchrist, Markets Commissioner.

The Broiler Marketing Board was represented by chairman, Harry Leidtke.

Western Food Processors was represented by Messrs. Rankin, Penner, Kitson, Bloomfield, and Luscombe.

B.C. Cattlemen's Association was represented by Ron Pilling.

Federation of Retail Food Council of British Columbia was represented by A. C. Abbott, president, and Al Mesmer, Hi-Lo Food Company; John Kristensen, Safeway; Tom Milburn, Safeway; Merv Hampton, Supervalu; and Mrs. Joan Gadsby, recording secretary.

B.C. Federation of Agriculture was represented by Dick Stocks.

The Fraser Valley Fruit and Vegetable Grower's Association was represented by Nick DeWahl.

The Products Division of Woodward's Stores was represented by W. A. Eadie.

The National Farmers Union, Region 8, was represented by L. Butler, president, and Roy Atkinson, National President of the Farmers Union.

The B.C. Tree Fruit Board was represented by Nigel Taylor and Carl Stevenson.

The Meat Packers Council of Canada was represented by Messrs. Tolton, Ralph Towsley, W. E. Mathewson, and Martin Morgan.

The B.C. Egg Marketing Board was represented by Ed Morgan and William Brunson.

The B.C. Turkey Marketing Board was represented by Ed Pratt and C. Stanley.

The Independent Egg Industry Association was represented by Ed Lightfoot and Walter Oliver.

The South Peace Marketing Board was represented by R. Johnson.

The B.C. Coast Vegetable Marketing Board was represented by Messrs. Ed Gilmore, Walsh, and A. Barker.

The Okanagan-Mainline Egg Producers Association was represented by Messrs. A. Link, D. Lewis, and R. Pridham.

The B.C. Egg Producers Association was represented by Glen Redline.

The B.C. Grape Marketing Board was represented by Dr. E. F. Avery, Messrs. E. Raikes and L. R. Stephens.

The B.C. Swine Breeders' Association, The Consumers' Association of Canada (B.C.), and the sheep industry of the Peace River Block also submitted briefs.

2. Throughout the hearings there was evidence that present levels of food imports cause substantial damage to certain segments of British Columbia's agricultural industry. Among those most seriously affected are the vegetable, soft fruit, strawberry, greenhouse, chicken broiler, turkey, and egg industries. The food-processing industry is also under intense pressures from imports coming from low-cost areas.

3. Existing forms of protection such as tariffs, import quotas, agricultural stabilization payments, surtaxes, and other relief measures, all of which are under Federal jurisdiction, were found to be generally inadequate in maintaining a viable agricultural industry in this Province.

4. It was noted that the dairy industry is in a reasonably viable state and in this connection it is important to note that no one in Canada can import milk or dairy products without obtaining an import permit from the Canadian Dairy Commission. Similarly, no one can import feed grains without a permit from the Canadian Wheat Board. It is significant to note that neither dairy products nor domestic feed grains are under pressure from imports.

5. The Committee found that this Province, because of its close proximity to large food-producing areas in the Western United States and Mexico, is particularly vulnerable to the dumping of surplus products. Even a small surplus from these areas, dumped into our traditional domestic markets seriously affects our industries. Because of the lateness of British Columbia's cropping season, peak production of many commodities here coincides with clean-up operations on the same commodities to the south. Their cleanup, if directed to British Columbia, can impart substantial hurt to our agricultural industry. The same kind of damage is done by low price quotations from these areas, even though actual quantities shipped may be small.

6. The Committee deplors the fact that we are losing the beef finishing and processing industry and recommends that the Department of Agriculture give consideration to ways and means of aiding the finishing of beef in this Province, preferably using Provincially grown grain.

7. On the basis of the evidence presented, the Committee is able to conclude that the impact of food imports to this Province from other countries and other provinces is substantial and is a major constraint to the further development of British Columbia's agricultural industry. Accordingly, the Committee recommends:

- (a) The Government introduce legislation which would provide authority for the Minister of Agriculture to require permits for the importation of specified food and feed products and to require the identification of the source



- of such products. The use of the term "importation" includes the inter-Provincial movement of products.
- (b) That the Government of British Columbia make representations to the Government of Canada requesting that an automatic surtax based on reasonable "moving average" prices based on the previous three-year average be implemented in Canada to replace the present slow and cumbersome machinery which is presently used in combatting the effects of low-priced imports.
  - (c) That the Government of British Columbia establish a \$25,000,000 fund from which the Minister of Agriculture could authorize loans and guarantees, which would encourage substantial development of British Columbia's food and agricultural industry among British Columbia's primary producers.
  - (d) That the Department of Agriculture increase its efforts in sales promotion of British Columbia grown products and increase dialogue among producers, consumers, processors, wholesale and retail merchandisers through a British Columbia Advisory Food Council, as recommended in the 1971 Report of the Select Standing Committee on Agriculture; also that the Department of Agriculture be renamed the Department of Food and Agriculture to encompass this broader jurisdiction.
  - (e) That the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce establish a joint committee to study disparities in domestic and export freight rates between various points in British Columbia and Canada; the committee to make recommendations on methods of reducing these disparities.
  - (f) That the Department of Agriculture make strong representations to the Federal Food and Drug Directorate requesting assurance that food products entering British Columbia are thoroughly checked and found to be free from pesticide residue banned by the Province of British Columbia.
  - (g) The Committee received reports from the Egg Marketing Board and representatives of the egg producers indicating severe conflict between the areas served by the Egg Marketing Board. We note with interest that the Minister of Agriculture has indicated to the Board that they must take immediate action to overcome their internal problems. The Egg Marketing Board reaction will be carefully noted by members of this Committee.

Respectfully submitted.

W. F. JEFCOAT, *Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

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

REPORT NO. 1

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
March 29, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

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

Your Committee summoned Mr. Willard E. Ireland, Chairman of the Public Documents Committee, established by the *Public Documents Disposal Act, Revised*

*Statutes of British Columbia, 1960*, chapter 134, and, having heard the submission on behalf of the Public Documents Committee, recommends that, in accordance with the provisions of the *Public Documents Disposal Act*, approval be given for the destruction of various public documents as listed in the submissions to the Public Documents Committee for 1970 in so far as the following departments of Government are concerned: Education; Finance; Health Services and Hospital Insurance; Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce; Lands, Forests, and Water Resources; Provincial Secretary; and further recommends that the various public documents as listed in the submission to the said Public Documents Committee by the Department of Labour be transferred to the custody of the Provincial Archives.

The following departments were dealt with: Agriculture; Commercial Transport; Education, Curriculum Resources Branch, Registrar's Branch, Research and Standards Branch; Finance; Health Services and Hospital Insurance, Division of V.D. Control, Division of Laboratories, Division of TB. Control, Division of Vital Statistics, Health Branch (Local Health Services), Health Branch Central Office, Environmental Engineering Division, British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service Hospital Construction Division; Provincial Secretary, Government House; Public Works, Safety Engineering Services Division.

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

All of which is respectfully submitted.

G. MUSSALLEM, *Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

**7** Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With reference to persons receiving social assistance but excluding those who are taking part in "work activity projects" under the *Canada Assistance Act*—

1. Have any persons been placed in employment in 1971/72 with the person's salary or wages being shared in any way between the employer and the Provincial Government?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many persons were placed, (b) what are the names of the employers involved, (c) what is the financial basis of the cost-sharing between Government and employer, (d) are the salaries or wages being paid at union rates, (e) how many of these placements are on a temporary basis and how many permanent, and (f) are any of these persons receiving specific training in any occupation and, if so, how many, and in what trades or occupation and what is the duration of the training in each trade or occupation?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) 148 to January 31 under the 'On-the-Job Training' programme, there were also a very few heads of families to whom social assistance was continued for a temporary period while they were fully employed at going rates, these were cases where additional assistance was considered urgent and necessary to enhance or make possible the recipient's rehabilitation and economic independence.

"(b) It is not the policy of the Department to publish this information.

"(c) Under the terms of 'On-the-Job Training' programme, social assistance is continued at the prevailing rate for up to three months, the employer pays the

additional salary to bring the total income up to going rates in the local area and pays all fringe benefit costs where these apply. In those exceptional cases where it is considered necessary to continue assistance for a temporary period during a person's full-time employment, social assistance is continued at the prevailing or adjusted rate depending on need.

“(d) Yes, where these apply.

“(e) It is the Department's policy in all such arrangements that the employee should have the expectation of continuing employment.

“(f) Yes, detailed information on the particular types of training each participant is undertaking is not available. The ‘On-the-Job Training’ period may be extended up to three months and should pertain to a specific skill or occupation or a particular type of work.”

**68** Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With reference to the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen—

1. What was the retention rate expressed as a percentage of those persons placed in permanent employment by the Alliance in (a) fiscal 1969/70, (b) fiscal 1970/71, and (c) fiscal 1971 to date?

2. What was the retention rate expressed as a percentage of those persons placed in permanent employment by the Alliance who had been in receipt of social assistance at the time of placement in (a) fiscal 1969/70, (b) fiscal 1970/71, and (c) fiscal 1971 to date?

3. Were any persons placed in (a) permanent and (b) temporary employment by the Alliance into positions which had previously been filled by action of the Alliance?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, how many were so placed (a) permanently and (b) temporarily?

5. During fiscal 1970/71, of those persons placed in permanent employment by the Alliance who had been in receipt of social assistance at the time of placement, how many remained in that employment for (a) one week, (b) two weeks, (c) three weeks, (d) one month, (e) two months, (f) three months, and (g) six months or more?

6. Have any persons placed in employment by the Alliance been in receipt of social assistance during their employment in the periods (a) fiscal 1969/70, (b) fiscal 1970/71, and (c) fiscal 1971 to date?

7. With respect to the staff of the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen, how many employees left the service of the Alliance, if any, and for what reasons and what were their names?

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

“1. It is estimated at 80 per cent.

“2. It is estimated at 80 per cent.

“3. Yes, the nature of certain employment results in periodic shut downs and subsequent rehiring which is done through the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen.

“4. This statistic is not available.

“5. This statistic is not available.

“6. These statistics are not available; however, in this fiscal year to date, 148 persons were hired under the ‘On-the-Job Training’ programme, whereby social assistance was continued for up to three months with the employer supplementing Social Allowances up to the going rates for wages in that employment.

"7. A total of seven staff persons have resigned from the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen since its formation. The staff members who resigned, their positions, and reason for leaving as follows: Mrs. E. Anderson, Stenographer, other employment; Mrs. J. E. Caulfield, Stenographer, personal; A. B. Erskine, Clerk, ill health; Miss G. D. Gresty, Stenographer, matrimony; Miss D. R. Lucas, Clerk, further education; Miss M. E. Nygard, Stenographer, matrimony; and Mrs. K. E. Pearson, Stenographer, husband transferred."

**85** Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

1. Were any "unemployed employables" receiving social assistance placed in jobs in private industry by the Provincial Alliance of Businessmen in 1969/70 and 1970/71?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, did the Department subsidize the wages of any of the employees placed?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is yes, what were the names and addresses of the employees concerned and the amount of subsidy paid to them?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes.

"3. Social assistance was continued to some heads of households for a temporary period in exceptional circumstances of urgent need, to enhance the rehabilitation prospects for the individual concerned. It is the policy of the Department not to publish names of recipients or the individual amounts paid."

**90** Mrs. *Dailly* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With reference to the "on the job" training programme announced by the Minister on February 12, 1971—

1. Were any persons placed in such training in 1971?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many were placed, (b) what is the name and address of each employer involved, (c) what was the total cost to the Crown, and (d) what percentage of the cost was paid by the Provincial, the Federal, and the local governments?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) 148; (b) it is not the policy of the Department to publish the names of individual employers without the consent of the employee and employer concerned; however, persons were employed under terms of the 'On-the-Job Training' programme in various communities as follows: Peace River area, 8; Central and Prince George area, 3; Central Okanagan area, 22; Greater Victoria area, 13; Greater Vancouver and Fraser Valley area, 102; (c) this amount is not available at this time; and (d) the sharing agreement has not yet been resolved and is currently being discussed."

**123** Mrs. *Dailly* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With reference to day-care centres—

1. How many children are attending day-care centres in the Province of British Columbia?

2. How many families using day-care centres qualify under Plan B?
3. How many families using day-care centres qualify under Plan C?

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

- "1. As at November, 1971, 3,978 children.
- "2. As at November, 1971, 33 children.
- "3. As at November, 1971, 1,377 children."

**168** Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Premier the following questions:

1. Have there been any derailments on the Pacific Great Eastern Railway?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many derailments were there in the following years: 1965, 1966, 1967, 1968, 1969, 1970, 1971, and to date in 1972 and (b) what was the cost in each year for service in placing the rolling stock back on the rails and repairing the damages to road beds and equipment?
3. How many railroad ties could have been purchased with the amount spent under No. 2 (b)?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. 'Destruction of records' as authorized by the Railway Association of Canada, which is the basis for destruction of records for the Pacific Great Eastern Railway, provides for the destruction of train accident records after two years. Derailments for this period are as follows: (a) 1970, six out of 8,253 mainline trains hauling 396,148 cars; 1971, seven out of 9,253 mainline trains hauling 444,144 cars; and (b) the uniform classification of accounts for Class 1 common carriers by rail, Canadian Transport Commission, which is the basis of accounting for the Pacific Great Eastern Railway, does not separate derailment costs as such.
- "3. Indeterminable."

**172** Mr. *Strachan* asked the Hon. the Premier and President of the Executive Council the following questions:

1. Did the Government place advertisements in newspapers in British Columbia headed "Ontario Has Education Problems Too" in which reference was made to a statement which appeared in the *Globe and Mail* of March 14, 1972, the said advertisement quoted as being sponsored by the Government of British Columbia?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, please list the newspapers in which these advertisements appeared and the cost of each such advertisement?
3. Who authorized placing of the advertisements referred to in No. 1?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. The *Vancouver Sun* and the *Vancouver Province*; cost of both \$1,650.
- "3. The Government of the Province of British Columbia."

**173** Mr. *Strachan* asked the Hon. the Premier and Minister of Finance the following questions:

1. Did three full-page advertisements sponsored by the Government of British Columbia appear in the March 18 issue of the *Financial Post*?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) who authorized the placing of these advertisements, (b) who prepared the material for the advertisements, and (c) what was the total cost of these advertisements?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) The Government of the Province of British Columbia, (b) Baker Lovick Advertising Agency, and (c) \$13,460.85 space cost."

**174** Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources the following questions:

1. Has the Canadian Pacific Railway or the Cascade Company made application to build a pipe-line to transport coal from the Sparwood area to Roberts Bank?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, has permission been granted?

The Hon. *F. X. Richter* replied as follows:

"1. No; in 1969 the Cascade Pipe Line Limited filed a Notice of Intent to apply for a permit to build a coal slurry pipe-line.

"2. See No. 1."

**177** Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Premier the following questions:

1. Have any studies been made as to the practicability and feasibility of building a hydro dam on the main stream of the Fraser River at Moran?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what studies or other activities have been undertaken?

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

"1. Not by the Government of the Province of British Columbia.

"2. See answer to Question 23 (Orders of the Day)."

**178** Mr. *Lorimer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

With reference to the Minister's answer to Question 162, 1972, indicating 109 vendors have been paid \$3,498,060 for land for the West Coast Park—

1. What was the name of each vendor?
2. What was the acreage purchased from each vendor?
3. What was the amount paid to each vendor?

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

"1. Name of vendor and acreage purchased:

A. Johns, Lot 11 of DL 210, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
 A. Wood, Lot 1 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
 L. Poirier, Lot 3 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 21663.  
 G. Fedje, Lot 2 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19152.  
 R. Devries, Lot C of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19138.  
 R. Baker, Lot 7 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
 J. Jenkins, Lot A of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
 L. Baird, NE ¼ of Lot 406, Clayoquot District, except that part thereof included within Plan 18020 (33.8 acres).

P. Kimola, that part of Lot 193, Clayoquot District, lying west of Plan 1371RW (3.12 acres). Lot 209, Clayoquot District, containing 40 acres, more or less, except those parts thereof included within Plans 12982, 16759, and 20089. Lots 4, 5, 8, and 9 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089. Lot 210, Clayoquot District, except those parts included within Plans 18572 and 20089 (29.41 acres). Lots 10, 12, and 13 of DL 210, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089. Lot 214, Clayoquot District (40 acres).

J. Dale, McLean's Point Sawmill.

B. Swordson, Block A of DL 212, Clayoquot District (10.1 acres).

E. Collins, Lot 213, Clayoquot District, except that part thereof included in Plan 18291 (37.4 acres).

- D. Moraes, Lot A of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 15399.  
L. Tassin, Lot 6 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
E. Hillier, Lots 7, 8, and 20 of Block 2, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689.  
R. Skelly, Lots 2 and 3 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
J. Bruce, Lot 201, Clayoquot District (lease) (40 acres).  
P. Sullivan, part of Lot 425, Clayoquot District (lease).  
T. Tugwell, Lot 1 of Block 1, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689.  
J. Barton, Lot 9 of DL 424, Clayoquot District, Plan 19002.  
J. Parrington, Lot 1 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 12982.  
B. Cooper, Lot 9 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
MacMillan Bloedel Ltd., Lot 1, Secs. 69 and 70, Alberni District (situate in Clayoquot District), Plan 22802 (80 acres).  
R. Poole, Lot 1 of DL 137, Clayoquot District, Plan 15235 (8 acres). Lot 260, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
G. Sagers, Block A of DL 486A, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
J. McDonald, SW  $\frac{1}{4}$  of DL 494, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
G. Baxter, that part of Lot 137, Clayoquot District, lying to the east of a boundary parallel to and perpendicularly distant 10 chains from the westerly boundary of said lot, except therefrom a strip of land 1 chain in width measured along high-water mark, except that part included within Plan 15235 (25.5 acres).  
G. McKinney, Lot 8 of Block 3, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
R. McKinney, Lot 6 of Block 4, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
R. McKinney, Lot 7 of Block 4, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
M. McKinney, Lot 8 of Block 4, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
W. Moraes, Lot A of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 17548.  
G. Kemble, Lot 5 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
E. Gregg, Lot 8 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
J. Squire, Lot 10 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
H. McDiarmid, Lot 13 of Block 2, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
B. McDiarmid, Lot 14 of Block 2, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
M. Cooper, Lots 2 and 3 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
J. Dale, Foreshore Lot 2105, Clayoquot District (lease).  
Long Beach Resort Ltd., Lot 423, Clayoquot District, except those parts thereof included within Plans 12456, 13824, 15399, 17587, 19136, 19137, 19138, 19152, 19341, 21663, and 17548 (88.2 acres). Lot 1 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19137. Lot 3 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19341. Lots 1, 2, 4, and 5 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 21663. W  $\frac{1}{2}$  of Lot 424, Clayoquot District (80 acres).  
R. Martin, Lot C of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19136.  
E. Hillier, Lot 19 of Block 2, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
B. Williams, Lot 5 of Block 1, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
H. Savage, Lot 1 of DL 136, Clayoquot District, Plan 20624 (35.3 acres).  
Singing Sands Land Co., Lot 140, Clayoquot District, except that part thereof included within Plan 21513 (60.5 acres). Lot A of DL 140, Clayoquot District, Plan 21513 (2.9 acres).  
B. Pickering and F. Skinner, Lot 1 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
M. Rhoades, Lot 7 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
C & B Logging Co. and D. A. Manwell, Lot 487A, Clayoquot District (160 acres). Lot 495, Clayoquot District, except the NW  $\frac{1}{4}$  thereof and except that part lying to the south of the easterly production of the north boundary of Lot 259 (40 acres).  
E. Baker, Lot 1 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
J. Danielson, Lot 135, Clayoquot District, except that part thereof included within Plan 14496 (33 acres).  
K. Ziegler, Lot 2 of DL 210, Clayoquot District, Plan 18572.  
S. Lancaster, Lots 4, 5, and 6 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
J. McFarlane, J. McKinnon, and H. Nolan, Lot 7 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
R. McKinney, Lot 9 of Block 4, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689.  
D. Embury, Lot A of DL 136, Clayoquot District, Plan 20201 (13 acres).  
J. McDonald, Block C of Lot 486A, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
J. Rhoades, Lot 6 of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
R. Barr, Lot 1 of DL 210, Clayoquot District, Plan 18572 (4.45 acres).  
R. Couvee, Lots 3 and 4 of Block 1, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
A. Abbott, Lot 11 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 13824 (2.25 acres).  
G. Whalley, part of Lot 446, Clayoquot District (lease).

- S. May, Lot 1 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19152.  
 L. Lunde, NW ¼ of DL 431, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 P. Dickinson, Lot 4 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 13824.  
 J. Dickinson, Lot B of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19136.  
 E. Mouron, Block B of Lot 486A, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 R. Grindley, SE ¼ of Lot 494, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 J. Sadler, Lot 14 of DL 210, Clayoquot District, Plan 20089.  
 R. Widel, Lot 12, Block 4, DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 G. Myers, Lot 10 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 13824. Lots 1, 2, and 3 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 17587.  
 W. Silta, that part of Lot 144, Clayoquot District, lying to the east of a straight boundary joining the points of bisection of the northerly and southerly boundaries of said lot, except that part thereof described as follows: Commencing at a point on the southerly boundary of said Lot 144, distant 40 feet from the southeast corner of said Lot 144; thence westerly along the southerly boundary of said Lot 144, a distance of 348.13 feet; thence N.0°2' 20"W., a distance of 75 feet; thence due east a distance of 348.13 feet; thence southerly along a straight boundary to the point of commencement, except those parts thereof included within the boundaries of Plan 16428 (19 acres). Lots 1 and 2 of DL 139 and 144, Clayoquot District, Plan 16428.  
 Fiddle In Holdings Ltd., Lot A of DL 137, Clayoquot District, Plan 21448.  
 Norton Estate, Lots 396, 400, and 423A, Clayoquot District, except that part of Lot 396 included within Plan 22943 (327 acres).  
 S. Welch, Lot 7, Block 1 of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 D. P. Evans, Lot 16, Block 2 of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 D. Evans, Lot 17, Block 2, of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 G. Long, Lot 6, Block 3, of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 C. Couseneau, Lot 9, Block 3, of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 F. Couseneau, Lot 10, Block 3, of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689 (lease).  
 J. Wilson, Lot 6 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 13824.  
 M. Ferguson, that part of Lot 495, Clayoquot District, lying to the south of the production easterly of the northerly boundary of Lot 259 (40 acres).  
 W. Check, SE ¼ of Lot 406, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 Waterfront Estates Ltd., NE ¼ of Lot 424, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 A. Green, Lot 259, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 E. Jones, Lot 3, of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19152.  
 T. Nelson, Lot 141, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 W. Beattie, Lot 280, Clayoquot District, except Parcel A (DD 1435771) thereof (40 acres).  
 E. LeGros, Lot A of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 16759, except that part thereof lying to the south of the Ucluelet-Tofino Highway as said highway is shown on said plan.  
 E. Gooch, Lot A of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19136.  
 L. Bosch, Lots 3 and 4 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 12456.  
 Zarf Caterers Ltd., Lot 8 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496.  
 S. Bond, that part of Lot A of DL 209, Clayoquot District, Plan 16759, lying to the south of the Ucluelet-Tofino Highway, as said highway is shown on said plan.  
 Tona Forest Products Ltd., NW ¼ of Lot 494, Clayoquot District (40 acres).  
 H. Johnson, Lot 1 and 2, Block 2 of DL 191, Clayoquot District, Plan 3689.  
 E. Eason, the Fractional S ½ of Lot 435, Clayoquot District (57 acres).  
 Alaska Pine Co. Ltd., Lot 506, Clayoquot District, except a strip 1 chain wide measured from high-water mark and except those parts of said Lot 506 shown outlined in red on Plans 436RW, 437RW, and 720R (159 acres) (not finalized).  
 A. Hutchinson, Lot 433, Clayoquot District, (160 acres).  
 B. Atkey, Lot 58 of DL 437, Clayoquot District, Plan 1978 (5 acres) (lease).  
 G. MacMinn, Lot 60 of DL 437, Clayoquot District, Plan 1978 (5 acres) (lease).  
 R. Frankhauser, Lot 93, Clayoquot District (124.6 acres).  
 G. Noble, SE ¼ of Lot 424, Clayoquot District, except that part thereof included within Plans 19002, and 21582 (29.8 acres). Lots 1, 3, 4, 5, and 6 of DL 424, Clayoquot District, Plan 19002. Lot 7 of DL 424, Clayoquot District, Plan 19002.  
 R. Strom, Lot 4 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 17587.  
 Long Beach Bungalow Resort Ltd., Lot 2 of DL 423, Clayoquot District, Plan 19137 (not finalized).  
 R. Currie, E ½ of Lot 208, Clayoquot District, (20 acres) (not finalized).  
 J. McArthur (estate), Lot 59 of DL 437, Clayoquot District, Plan 1978 (5 acres) (not finalized).



Ucluelet Contracting Co. Ltd., part of Lot 445, Clayoquot District, (not finalized).  
 W. Nelson and D. Klasen, Lot 435A, Clayoquot District, (25 acres) (not finalized).  
 E. Todd, NE ¼ of Lot 435, Clayoquot District, (40 acres) (not finalized).  
 A. Brymer, Lot 10 of DL 135, Clayoquot District, Plan 14496 (not finalized).

"2. See answer to No. 1.

"3. In view of continuing negotiations it is considered to be contrary to the public interest to itemize prices paid for individual properties at this time."

**179** Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:

1. Were any grants paid to the Fort St. John Rotary Club in the fiscal year 1971/72 and to date in the fiscal year 1972/73?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what were (a) the dates of the payments, (b) the amounts paid, and (c) the purpose of the payments?

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

"1. No.

"2. Not applicable."

**181** Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

With reference to Dry Lake in the Princeton area—

1. Is there a reserve on this lake?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, is there any public access to this lake by land?

3. If the answer to No. 2 is no, does the Government plan to provide access?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. No.

"3. No."

**182** Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

1. Did the City of Nanaimo transfer ownership of Newcastle Island to the Crown?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what amount was paid by the Province for such ownership and (b) what was the date of this transaction?

3. What sums of money have been spent by the Parks Branch or other Government agencies in developing this property since the Government acquired it?

4. What sums of money have been spent by the Parks Branch or other Government agencies in maintaining this property since the Government acquired it?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) \$1 and (b) June 21, 1961.

"3. \$91,062.56.

"4. \$26,400 (estimated)."

And then the House adjourned at 6.04 p.m.