

Monday, March 3, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Capt. J. Foley.

Mr. Speaker gave his reserved decision on the matter of privilege raised by Mr. Gibson on February 27, 1975, as follows:

Honourable Members,—The Honourable Member for North Vancouver-Capilano raised as a matter of privilege last Thursday a complaint relating to the disclosure of settlement figures between Public Service Union bargaining units and the Government. He cites the Hon. Provincial Secretary as stating on February 25 to the House in question period: "I intend to adhere to the agreement I have with the union involved not to release the details of settlements until all negotiations are complete." He considers news of disclosure to the public and not to the House to be a breach of privilege of the members and a contempt.

There is no evidence from the honourable member that press releases or public statements to the newspapers and media have been made by the Hon. Provincial Secretary. Therefore the fact that the public has become aware before some honourable members of this House does not preclude the information having been received by the Employers' Council of British Columbia by some other simple means.

For example, the public may be astute enough to examine existing Orders in Council. Had they done so, certainly the information sought in question period would have been easily discovered. That means, of course, that the Honourable Member for North Vancouver-Capilano could have satisfied his curiosity without the assistance of question period. I have secured most if not all of these Orders in Council for the honourable member.

Both May and Beauchesne declare that information already available in public documents (such as Orders in Council, Statutes, or Government reports) should not be sought in oral question period. It follows therefore that such readily accessible information can hardly be the springboard for a matter of breach of privilege.

In the 18th edition of May, page 327, it states: ". . . questions requiring information set forth in accessible documents (such as Statutes, treaties, etc.) have not been allowed when the member concerned could obtain the information of his own accord without difficulty."

Thus no prima facie breach of the privileges of the House can be attributed to the Hon. Provincial Secretary, nor need this decision on these existing facts require at this time any consideration by the House as to the whole subject of privileges of parliament in relation to the subject of release of information outside the House.

G. H. DOWDING, *Speaker*

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *J. G. Lorimer*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *R. A. Williams* made a statement relating to the Columbia River Project Cost Reallocation Study Committee and, by leave, tabled Committee minutes and memoranda relating thereto.

The Hon. *A. B. Macdonald* (Attorney-General) presented the following:

Report of the Law Reform Commission of British Columbia on Civil Rights (Project No. 3), Part IV—A Procedure for Judicial Review of the Actions of Statutory Agencies.

Report of the Law Reform Commission of British Columbia on Civil Rights (Project No. 3), Part III—Procedure Before Statutory Agencies.

The Fifth Annual Report of the Law Reform Commission of British Columbia for the calendar year 1974.

The Third Report of the Workers' Compensation Board administering the *Criminal Injuries Compensation Act*, for the period January 1, 1974, to December 31, 1974.

The Second Report of the B.C. Energy Commission.

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* (Provincial Secretary) presented the 56th Annual Report of the Public Service Commission for the year 1974.

Mr. Speaker presented the report of the Librarian, pursuant to the *Legislative Library Act*, chapter 216, R.S.B.C. 1960, for the year 1974.

99 Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

With respect to the Income Assurance Program—

1. What is the total Provincial amount paid out to date and to which commodity groups?
2. What is the total Federal amount paid out from inception to date and to which commodity groups?

The Hon. *D. D. Stupich* replied as follows:

"1. Swine, \$269,512.62; apples, \$2,829,520.37; field tomatoes, \$2,014.35; dairy (to December 31, 1974), \$14,264,794.56; total, \$17,365,841.90. (Cost to Government is gross indemnity less producer's premium.)

"2. Nil."

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

And then the House adjourned at 6.08 p.m.

Tuesday, March 4, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *P. Hawkes*.

Mr. *D. A. Anderson* rose on a matter of privilege relating to information given to the House by the Hon. *Lorne Nicolson* (Minister of Housing).

Mr. Speaker stated that he would take the matter under advisement.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *Eileen E. Dailly* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

And then the House adjourned at 4.59 p.m.

Wednesday, March 5, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *Charles A. Barker*.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *Lorne Nicolson* (Minister of Housing) tabled Memorandum of Agreement dated January 14, 1975, between Casa Loma Motel Ltd. and Her Majesty the Queen in Right of the Province of British Columbia.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

Mr. *Schroeder* moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. *Richter*—

"That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply be amended by adding the following words: "but this House

regrets that in the opinion of this House the Hon. the Minister of Finance has failed to establish budget priorities in such a way as to provide adequate financial provisions for revenue-sharing with local government, incentives to stimulate housing, and incentives to develop a greater number of job opportunities in the Province of British Columbia."

The debate continued.

On the motion of Mr. *Bennett* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk* (Minister of Economic Development) rose on a matter of privilege relating to the responsibility of members for facts stated in putting questions during the question period.

Mr. Speaker stated he would reserve consideration of the matter.

By leave of the House, Mr. *Curtis* withdrew the following Notice of Question standing in his name on the Order Paper:

72 Mr. *Curtis* to ask the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

1. In each location in the Province, how many car bodies have been crushed by operation SAM (Salvage Assemble Manufacture) since January 1, 1974, to the most recent date for which information is available?

2. To which crushing plant(s) are car bodies, collected under the program, delivered?

3. How many regional districts throughout the Province now co-operate with the Department in this program?

The Hon. *A. B. Macdonald* (Attorney-General) presented the Annual Report of the B.C. Board of Parole for the year 1974.

The Hon. *Phyllis F. Young* (Minister of Consumer Services) presented the First Annual Report of the Department of Consumer Services for the year ended December 31, 1974.

The Hon. *Gordon H. Dowding* (Speaker) presented the Fifth Report of the Speaker on the *Legislative Procedure and Practice Inquiry Act*.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8.30 o'clock p.m. today.

And then the House adjourned at 6.03 p.m.

Wednesday, March 5, 1975

HALF-PAST EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Mr. Speaker made a statement relating to the accuracy of and the responsibility for facts stated in the course of putting questions during question period.

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *Lorne Nicolson* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

And then the House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Thursday, March 6, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *F. G. Patterson*.

On the motion of Mr. *Bennett*, Bill (No. 34) intituled *Citizens' Initiative 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 called for "Oral Questions by Members."

During the question period, by leave of the House, the Hon. *Lorne Nicolson* (Minister of Housing) tabled correspondence from Central Mortgage and Housing Corporation to the Department of Housing relating to Casa Loma Motel Ltd.

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the amendment to the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

The amendment was negatived on the following division:

YEAS—17

<i>Gibson</i>	<i>McClelland</i>	<i>Anderson, D. A.</i>	<i>Phillips</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Richter</i>	<i>McGeer</i>	<i>Bennett</i>
<i>Schroeder</i>	<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Fraser</i>	<i>Smith</i>
<i>Morrison</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Jordan</i>
<i>Curtis</i>			

NAYS—31

<i>Liden</i>	<i>Dent</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>
<i>Lewis</i>	<i>Brown</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Young</i>
<i>Webster</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Lea</i>
<i>Kelly</i>	<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Gorst</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Steves</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>Lorimer</i>
<i>Anderson, G. H.</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Levi</i>
<i>Rolston</i>	<i>Dailly</i>	<i>Nunweiler</i>	

On the motion of the Hon. *R. M. Strachan* the debate on the main motion was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8.30 o'clock p.m. today.

The Hon. *D. D. Stupich* (Minister of Agriculture) presented the Milk Board Annual Report for the year ended December 31, 1974.

And then the House adjourned at 5.36 p.m.

Thursday, March 6, 1975

HALF-PAST EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *G. R. Lea* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

And then the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Friday, March 7, 1975

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *H. T. Allen*.

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of Mr. *Calder* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

And then the House adjourned at 1 p.m.

Monday, March 10, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Canon *T. Bailey*.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *W. S. King* (Minister of Labour) presented the First Annual Report of the Labour Relations Board of British Columbia for the year ended December 31, 1974.

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:

On the motion of Mr. *Bennett*, Bill (No. 35) intituled *Franchise Dealers Protection Act, 1975*.

On the motion of Mr. *Gorst*, Bill (No. 12) intituled *Royal Roads Military College Degrees Act*.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *Norman Levi* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

Mr. *Wallace* presented a petition as follows:

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia in Legislature Assembled:

The petition of the undersigned, property owners and parents of school children residing in School District No. 61, humbly sheweth:

That whereas the property-owners in School District No. 61 have paid educational taxes as their statutory financial requirement toward providing public school education for the children of School District No. 61; and Whereas the *Public Schools Act* describes the system of education to be available to all school children in all school districts of the Province of British Columbia; and

Whereas regular educational services are not now being provided to the children of School District No. 61, so that these children are thereby being deprived of the educational services for which parents and property-owners have paid taxes.

Wherefore your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House may be pleased to develop a temporary alternative mode of providing regular educational services to the school children of School District No. 61.

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

Dated the 8th day of March 1975.

A. VAN KLAVEREN, 1525 Fell Street
 JOY SMITH, 1521 Fell Street
 ROBERT BRUCE, 1047 Chamberlain Street

60 Mr. *Gardom* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

Concerning the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia—

1. What is its monthly salary payroll?
2. What is its salary schedule, furnishing full particulars of job position and rate?
3. Are any employees of the Public Service engaged in any work connected with any requirements set forth under the *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act* or the *Automobile Insurance Act* and, if so, how many employees, where have they been employed, and what has been their remuneration?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* stated that, in his opinion, the reply should be in the form of a Return and that he had no objection to laying such Return upon the table of the House, and thereupon presented such Return.

90 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following question:

With regard to Autoplan during the year 1974: What percentage of all policies purchased was bought directly from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

“The percentage of new and renewal vehicle policies for the 1974/75 licence-year issued direct by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia for the period January 1974 to February 1975 was 1.31 per cent.”

91 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to the financial condition of ICBC at the most recent date for which information is available—

1. What cumulative total revenue had been received from (a) the Provincial Government, (b) investment, (c) the sale of certificates and insurance policies, and (d) all other sources?
2. What cumulative total of expenditures had been made in respect of (a) capital outlays for physical facilities, (b) salaries, (c) purchases of supplies and services, (d) payments to insurance policy-holders pursuant to insurance coverage obligations, (e) repayments of Government advances, (f) investments, and (g) all other allocations?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

“1 and 2. The *Insurance Corporation of British Columbia Act* requires that ‘The financial statement shall be laid before the Legislative Assembly on a date

within sixty days next following the end of the year (February 28, 1975) for which the statement is made if the Legislative Assembly is then in session, otherwise on a date within fifteen days after the opening of the next following session.’

“We intend to comply with this requirement.”

97 Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to land purchases for ICBC—

1. Which lands purchased were classed as agricultural land?
2. What were their legal descriptions and classifications?
3. What is the approximate size and the total cost of each?
4. What is the current use of each?
5. What were the dates of purchases of each?

With respect to land options of ICBC—

1. What lands, presently in land freeze, does ICBC have options on either directly or indirectly now?
2. What is the location and legal description of these lands?
3. What is the date of expiration of options?
4. What is the total price of these lands?
5. What is the option price of these lands?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

“With respect to land purchases for ICBC—

- “1. A site located at No. 5 Road and Steveston Highway, Richmond, B.C.
- “2. E. ½ of SW. ¼ of Sec. 31, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., NWD, W. ½ of SW. ¼ of Sec. 31, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., NWD; save and except Explanatory Plan, Parcel A15048, Parcel B15251, Parcel C15250, and the part subdivided by 36037 and 37254; Lot 56 of Sec. 31, Bk. 4 N., R. 5 W., Plan 36037, NWD. Classification ALR-2.

“3. Size, 20.8 acres; cost, \$550,000.

“4. The Corporation is permitting the Department of Agriculture to use the property for allotment gardens. Since the purchase of the property we have permitted the previous tenants to remain on a portion of this property. The previous tenants occupy a house and utilize a barn on the property and lease them from the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia on a month-to-month basis at a cost of \$130 per month.

“5. November 1, 1973.

“With respect to land options of ICBC—

“1. *Nil*.

“2, 3, 4, and 5. Not applicable.”

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision on the point of order raised by Mr. *D. A. Anderson* on March 4 as follows:

Honourable Members,—Claims of breach of privilege raised by members relating to the veracity of statements attributed to members continue to plague the records of Hansard in Ottawa and the numerous claims of privilege to be found there have consistently been rejected by the distinguished Speakers of that House whenever they occur.

I quote from the Votes and Proceedings of the House of Commons of Canada of June 8, 1970, as follows:

"If the Chair were to accept the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, and if the matter were sent to the Committee on Privileges and Elections, what would be under consideration there except the conduct of a Minister? I suggest that this is what would be under consideration, and that this could be done only by adopting the procedures and measures which have been suggested on a number of occasions by the Chair, particularly by Mr. Speaker Michener in the ruling to which I have just referred.

"It does seem to me that implicit in the question raised by the Honourable Member for Peace River is a dispute or a misunderstanding arising between members as to allegations of fact. The Minister of Finance has interpreted the situation as he sees it. Obviously, he is in disagreement on this point with the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North, the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre, and the Honourable Member for Peace River. As stated in citation 113 of Beauchesne's fourth edition: 'A dispute arising between two members, as to allegations of facts, does not fulfil the conditions of Parliamentary privilege.'

"I have to rule in the circumstances that the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for Winnipeg North Centre does not fulfil the requirements for a *prima facie* case of privilege and I cannot accept it to the extent of putting it to the House at the present time. I have to rule there is no *prima facie* case of privilege."

Let me catalogue for the record some of the more recent examples to be found in our Federal Hansard on claims of breach of privilege on these grounds. In 1972, see the following pages in the Hansard of the House of Commons: pages 490-10, 993, 1593, 1965, 2541, 1976, 3268, 3598-9. In 1973/74, pages 3047-8, 4802, 5775, 6279, 6745; and in 1974, pages 721, 168-9, 547-8, 5851, 1537.

Speakers have consistently refused to consider setting aside the order of business of the House to take up differences of this kind. The Order Paper is available to every member who seeks to carry his difference of opinion over the facts any further, by regular notice.

G. H. DOWDING, *Speaker*

And then the House adjourned at 5.50 p.m.

Tuesday, March 11, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. K. H. Prior.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Owing to a power interruption, Mr. Speaker declared a recess.

At the conclusion of the recess it was *Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8 o'clock p.m. today.

And then the House adjourned at 2.50 p.m.

Tuesday, March 11, 1975

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

By leave of the House, Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

85 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

1. Has the Department of Agriculture made specific plans to appear before the Federal Commission of Inquiry of Beef Marketing?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, will a brief representing the British Columbia Government policy be presented to the Commission?

The Hon. *D. D. Stupich* replied as follows:

"1. No, but an official of the Department will attend all hearings in the Province as an observer.

"2. Not applicable."

The Hon. *J. G. Lorimer* (Minister of Municipal Affairs) presented the Annual Report of the Department of Municipal Affairs for the year ended December 31, 1974.

And then the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Wednesday, March 12, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Dr. *F. E. H. James*.

On the motion of Mr. *D'Arcy*, Bill (No. 36) intituled *Water Facilities Assistance 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 called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *L. T. Nimsick* the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

The Hon. *D. G. Cocke* (Minister of Health) presented the Twenty-sixth Annual Report of the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service covering the calendar year 1974.

And then the House adjourned at 5.46 p.m.

Thursday, March 13, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Dr. *H. W. Kerley*.

By leave of the House, Mr. *Fraser* presented a petition as follows:

To the Honourable the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia in Legislature Assembled:

The petition of the undersigned humbly sheweth:

Whereas a large number of residents of the Village of Sayward and Sayward Valley have signed a petition expressing deep concern that decision on the future of logging operations on Northern Vancouver Island might be made at the sole discretion of the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources; and

Whereas these residents have concern which is not simply to petition on behalf of any private company but rather is the concern which will follow with respect to jobs, housing, and community investments, which will be lost if any current options for the total ban on logging in the Tsitika-Schoen are followed.

Wherefore, your petitioners humbly pray that your Honourable House agree that before any final decision is taken with respect to this issue that the Select Standing Committee on Environment and Resources be authorized to study the position set forth in this petition and attached sheets, in favour of accepting the logging industries proposal referred to at the public hearings as Option E which would mean immediate controlled harvesting of the Tsitika-Schoen.

R. J. SPROUT, Sayward, B.C.

WALTER G. WEBER, Sayward, B.C.

RON A. SMITH, Sayward, B.C.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *Norman Levi* (Minister of Human Resources) made a statement relating to a broadcast on radio station CKNW on March 13, 1975, and, by leave, tabled copies of two cheques referred to in his statement.

By leave of the House, Mr. *Curtis* made a statement relating to the same matter.

By leave of the House, Mr. *Curtis* tabled a copy of the transcript of the radio broadcast in question.

By leave of the House, Mr. *D. A. Anderson* made a statement relating to the same matter.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *David Barrett* (Premier) made a statement relating to the same matter.

Mr. *L. A. Williams* rose on a point of order and asked Mr. Speaker to consider whether or not a breach of the privileges of the House had been committed by someone outside the House arising from the radio broadcast of March 13, 1975.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

On the motion of Mr. *L. A. Williams*, on behalf of Mr. *D. A. Anderson*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

Pursuant to Order, the Hon. *R. M. Strachan* presented the following report:

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

March 13, 1975

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Special Committee appointed February 18 to prepare and report lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of this House for the present Session begs to report and recommend that the personnel of the Select Standing Committees of the House for the present Session be as follows:

STANDING ORDERS AND PRIVATE BILLS—Messrs. *G. H. Anderson* (Convener), *Cummings*, *Dent*, *Gabelmann*, *Lockstead*, Mrs. *Webster*, the Hon. *Ernest Hall*, the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, Messrs. *Smith*, *Chabot*, and *Gardom*.

PUBLIC ACCOUNTS AND ECONOMIC AFFAIRS—Messrs. *Fraser* (Convener), *Cummings*, *Rolston*, *Gorst*, *Kelly*, *Skelly*, Mrs. *Webster*, the Hon. *Phyllis Young*, the Hon. *Gary Lauk*, the Hon. *A. A. Nunweiler*, Messrs. *Bennett*, *Morrison*, *Curtis*, and *McGeer*.

AGRICULTURE—Messrs. *G. H. Anderson* (Convener), *Cummings*, *Steves*, *Kelly*, *Lewis*, *Liden*, Ms. *Sanford*, the Hon. *David Stupich*, Mrs. *Jordan*, Messrs. *Curtis*, *L. A. Williams*, and *Wallace*.

MUNICIPAL AFFAIRS AND HOUSING—Ms. *Sanford* (Convener), Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *D'Arcy*, *Liden*, *Gorst*, *Rolston*, the Hon. *Lorne Nicolson*, the Hon. *James Lorimer*, the Hon. *A. A. Nunweiler*, Messrs. *Curtis*, *Phillips*, *L. A. Williams*, and *Wallace*.

LABOUR AND JUSTICE—Messrs. *G. H. Anderson* (Convener), *Barnes*, Ms. *Brown*, Messrs. *D'Arcy*, *Dent*, *Gabelmann*, the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, the Hon. *William King*, Messrs. *Smith*, *Fraser*, *D. A. Anderson*, and *Wallace*.

HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND HUMAN RESOURCES—Ms. *Brown* (Convener), Messrs. *Barnes*, *Calder*, *Gabelmann*, *Rolston*, *Lewis*, the Hon. *Eileen Dailly*, the Hon. *Dennis Cocke*, the Hon. *Norman Levi*, Messrs. *McClelland*, *Schroeder*, *Richter*, *Gibson*, and *Wallace*.

TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS—Messrs. *Steves* (Convener), *Calder*, *Gorst*, *Kelly*, *Barnes*, the Hon. *William Hartley*, the Hon. *Graham Lea*, the Hon. *R. M. Strachan*, the Hon. *A. A. Nunweiler*, Messrs. *Morrison*, *McClelland*, *Schroeder*, and *Gibson*.

ENVIRONMENT AND RESOURCES—Messrs. *D'Arcy* (Convener), *Lockstead*, *Liden*, *Lewis*, *Skelly*, *Steves*, the Hon. *Leo Nimsick*, the Hon. *Jack Radford*, the Hon. *Robert Williams*, Messrs. *Chabot*, *Richter*, *Fraser*, *Gibson*, and *Wallace*.

Respectfully submitted.

R. M. STRACHAN, *Acting Chairman*

By leave of the House, the report was taken as read and received.

By leave of the House, the Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

20 Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Labour the following question: With respect to the *Labour Research Bulletin* for the calendar year 1974, what were the circulated figures, by month, of man-days lost through strikes or lockouts and, if there were any adjustments made which in any way changed the published bulletin, what was the reason for the change?

The Hon. *W. S. King* replied as follows:

"The circulated figures, by month, of man-days lost through strikes or lockouts for the calendar year are: January, 43,950; February, 48,969; March, 78,061; April, 51,905; May, 765,915; June, 898,177; July, 148,554; August, 101,315; September, 116,102; October, 104,953; November, 16,254; December, 26,979.

"At the time of circulation, the figures were preliminary figures and were subsequently adjusted.

"The reason for such adjustment was that the preliminary figures were updated as more accurate information became available."

95 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Economic Development the following questions:

With respect to 16 resources studies announced in September 1974—

1. What is the target date for completion of each of the studies?
2. How many persons, not otherwise Provincial employees, have been engaged to perform each of these studies?
3. What is the estimated total cost of each of these studies?

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk* replied as follows:

"1. All studies are scheduled for completion by June 30, 1975.

"2. Twenty.

"3. The total cost to the Province of British Columbia will be approximately \$500,000."

And then the House adjourned at 5.30 p.m.

Friday, March 14, 1975

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

Prayers by Mr. *Karl Janzen*.

On the motion of Mr. *Bennett* 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. 37) intituled *The Resource Revenue Sharing Act*.

Bill (No. 38) intituled *The Municipal Consultation Act*.

Pursuant to Order, the House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Supply.

The debate continued.

The motion was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—31

<i>Liden</i>	<i>Cummings</i>	<i>Daily</i>	<i>Radford</i>
<i>Lewis</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Gorst</i>	<i>Young</i>
<i>Webster</i>	<i>Sanford</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Lea</i>
<i>Kelly</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>King</i>
<i>Steves</i>	<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Nunweiler</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>
<i>Anderson, G. H.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>	<i>Levi</i>
<i>Dent</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Lauk</i>	

NAYS—13

<i>Gibson</i>	<i>Curtis</i>	<i>Williams, L. A.</i>	<i>Bennett</i>
<i>Gardom</i>	<i>Richter</i>	<i>Anderson, D. A.</i>	<i>Smith</i>
<i>Schroeder</i>	<i>Wallace</i>	<i>Chabot</i>	<i>Jordan</i>
<i>Morrison</i>			

Order for Committee of Supply called.

(IN THE COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY)

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

By leave of the House, the Hon. *D. G. Cocke* (Minister of Health) made a statement advising that the Government had purchased the Aberdeen Private Hospital in the City of Victoria.

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

65 Mr. *Curtis* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With regard to the British Columbia ferry *Queen of Nanaimo*—

1. What was the total cost of lengthening and otherwise refurbishing this vessel during the winter of 1973/74?
2. How does this cost compare with similar work undertaken on other major ferries within the British Columbia ferry fleet?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

- "1. Cost of lengthening, \$2,952,653; hull and engine refit, \$146,492.
- "2. Cost of lengthening two major vessels the preceding year: *MV Queen of New Westminster*, \$2,685,623; hull and engine refit, \$92,940. *MV Queen of Burnaby*, \$2,701,145; hull and engine refit, \$137,102."

66 Mr. *Curtis* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to Gulf Islands ferry routes—

1. How many motor-vehicles were carried between Swartz Bay and Fulford Harbour in the calendar year 1974?
2. How many motor-vehicles were carried between Vesuvius and Crofton in the same year?
3. How many motor-vehicles were carried between Tsawwassen and Long Harbour (disregarding traffic between intermediate points on the last-mentioned route) in the same year?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

- "1. Vehicles carried (Swartz Bay to Fulford Harbour), 129,529.
- "2. Vehicles carried (Vesuvius to Crofton), 91,101.
- "3. Vehicles carried (Tsawwassen to Long Harbour), 96,183."

67 Mr. *Curtis* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

With respect to improvements to British Columbia Ferries' facilities at Tsawwassen—

1. What is the latest estimated total cost of the additional berthing and vehicle parking work currently being undertaken?
2. When is it expected that the improvements will be completed?

The Hon. *R. M. Strachan* replied as follows:

- "1. \$4,280,000.
- "2. End of December 1975."

And then the House adjourned at 12.13 p.m.

Monday, March 17, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. *John Williams*.

Mr. *McClelland* rose on a point of privilege relating to a letter referred to by him in the House on Thursday last and purporting to be from the Department of Housing.

Mr. Speaker tabled his written decision on the point of order raised by Mr. *L. A. Williams* on March 13 as follows:

Honourable Members,—The Honourable Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound raised the question of whether the statements tabled last Thursday in the House constitute a question of privilege for determination of the House, that is, whether a prima facie breach of parliamentary privilege arises from the publication of a broadcast by a radio commentator.

The question to be determined is whether, in this particular case, the broadcasted statement or the commentator offends the privileges of Parliament, or whether he interferes with the rights and immunities of individual members in the exercise of their parliamentary duties.

The privileges of the House are stated in general terms in May, 16th edition, pages 42 and 43, as follows:

Parliamentary privilege is the sum of the peculiar rights enjoyed by each House collectively as a constituent part of the High Court of Parliament, and by members of each House individually, without which they could not discharge their functions, and which exceed those possessed by other bodies or individuals. Thus privilege, though part of the law of the land, is to a certain extent an exemption from the ordinary law.

When any of these rights and 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. Each House also claims the right to punish actions, which, while not breaches of any specific privilege, are offences against its authority or dignity, such as disobedience to its legitimate commands or libels upon itself, its officers, or its members. Such actions, though often called "breaches of privilege" are more properly distinguished as "contempts".

Beauchesne's 4th edition has a number of citations which summarize the matter of newspaper and other public charges against members:

Citation 113 states: "An attack in a newspaper article is not a breach of privilege, unless it comes within the definition of privileges. . . ."

"Libels upon members and aspersions upon them in relation to Parliament and interference of any kind with their official duties, are breaches of the privileges of members."

In paragraph 3 of citation 108 Beauchesne states: ". . . but to constitute a breach of privilege they must concern the character or conduct of members in

that capacity, and the libel must be based on matters arising in the actual transaction of the business of the House.”

There are therefore two questions to be answered:

1. Does the broadcast concern the character or conduct of a member in his capacity as a member?

2. Does the matter constitute undue interference with the privilege of an honourable member to exercise his duties freely?

It is also acknowledged that complaints of alleged threats, imputations, or libels must be raised at the earliest opportunity for the House immediately to vindicate its powers and privileges.

It is the duty of the Speaker to determine if the matter is one calling for intervention before proceeding to the normal business of the House, i.e., a prima facie breach requiring immediate interposition. It is also his duty to determine if the matter has been raised at the earliest opportunity (*see* May, 17th edition, page 378: “A matter of privilege which claims precedence over other public business should be a subject which has recently arisen.” Priority was refused, for example, when the question was raised on Tuesday following its occurrence on Saturday).

Bourinot says in the 4th edition, page 306:

The Speakers of the English Commons have decided that “in order to entitle a question of privilege to precedence over the Orders of the Day, it should be some subject which has recently arisen, and which clearly involves the privileges of the House and calls for its immediate interposition”.

In the February 21, 1974, Journals of our House, in the matter of a libellous attack on the Honourable Member for Langley, I stated that on the basis of the parliamentary authorities “the key is that the reflections may tend to interfere with the member’s capacity to carry out his or her duties.” At a recent conference attended by over 20 Commonwealth Speakers this view was taken by those Speakers present in panel discussion.

In the same Journals at page 33, I quoted also from a Committee report of the 1963 British House:

Your Committee and the House are not concerned with setting standards for political controversy or for the propriety, accuracy, or taste of speeches made on public platforms outside Parliament. They are concerned only with the protection of the reputation, character, and the good name of the House itself. It is in that respect only and for that limited purpose that they are concerned with imputations against the conduct of individual members. (H.C. 246, 1963/64.)

It must be shown that the conduct impugned relates to a member whilst and only whilst he was a member of the House, since, as Beauchesne puts it, the “conduct of members in that capacity” is the sole concern of the House in matters of privilege when members are attacked publicly.

Looking at the imputations to determine if they satisfy that firm rule, that is, the member in his capacity as member, we find the following:

The Hon. Minister of Human Resources was not proclaimed elected under section 127 of the *Provincial Elections Act* until after September 12, 1972, nor was he sworn in and enrolled as a Member of the Legislative Assembly until the evening of September 15, 1972. Due return of his writ of election was September 29, 1972.

At the times referred to in the allegations of the commentator, there was no Legislative Assembly, it having been dissolved on July 24, 1972. The Thirtieth Legislature did not meet for the first time as a lawful body until October 17, 1972,

having been summoned on September 21, 1972. If one is precise, and in matters affecting the laws of Parliament precision is necessary, the matter of conduct and the allegations have to do with the honourable member before he was in fact either enrolled or summoned as a Member of the Legislative Assembly. Since privilege attaches from the date a Member of Parliament is first summoned (*see* May, 18th edition, page 96), attacks upon him for conduct before he was a member of the House are not therefore matters requiring the protection of the reputation of the House itself, in the words already quoted from the British Committee (H.C. 246, *op. cit.*).

Whether the operative date of his becoming a Member of the Legislative Assembly is the day of summons of the Thirtieth Parliament, the return date of his writ of election or the first meeting of the House need not be decided since all three significant dates occurred after the events in question here.*

Mr. Speaker Michener has put it aptly in House of Commons Votes and Proceedings, June 19, 1959, page 583:

“. . . the House is asked to direct its Committee on Privileges and Elections:

(1) To examine the actions and statements of the Honourable Member for Peel in connection with the evaluation and expropriation.

(2) To report generally on these matters.

(3) In particular, to consider and report whether the conduct of the honourable member was contrary to the usages of the House, derogatory to the dignity of the House and inconsistent with the standards which Parliament is entitled to expect from its members.

The House of Commons has concerned itself with the conduct of a member outside of the House from time to time for example where a member used his public office for private gain, has compromised his independence by taking money or has been found guilty of some scandalous crime. It is provided by law (the *Senate and House of Commons Act*, R.S., c. 147, s. 1) in the section dealing with the independence of Parliament, that no member shall hold any office of emolument under the Crown nor enter into any contract with the Government of Canada for which any public money of Canada is to be paid on pain of forfeiting his seat.

On the other hand, it is clear that many acts which might offend against the law or the moral sense of the community do not involve a member's capacity to serve the people who have chosen him as their representative nor are they contrary to the usage nor derogatory to the dignity of the House of Commons. Members of the House of Commons, like all other citizens, have the right to be regarded as innocent until they are found guilty, and like other citizens they must be charged before they are obliged to stand trial in the courts. Parliament is a court with respect to its own privileges and dignity and the privileges of its members. The question arises whether the House, in the exercise of its judicial functions with respect to the conduct of any of its members, should deprive such member

* *See* May, 18th edition, page 254: "‘A Parliament’ in the sense of a parliamentary period, is a period not exceeding five years which may be regarded as a cycle beginning and ending with a proclamation. Such a proclamation (which is made by the Queen on the advice of her Privy Council) on the one hand, dissolves an existing Parliament and on the other, orders the issue of writs for the election of a new Parliament and appoints the day and place for its meeting. This period, of course, contains an interregnum between the dissolution of a Parliament and the meeting of its successor during which there is no Parliament in existence." and at pages 254, 255:

"A new Parliament is summoned in pursuance of a proclamation issued by the Queen with the advice of the Privy Council. This proclamation which also dissolves the old Parliament. . . . appoints a day and place for the meeting of the new Parliament."

of any of the safeguards and privileges which every man enjoys in any court of the land.

The second question is whether there is a threat to the member or an imputation in the commentator's statements or conduct which "may tend to interfere with the member's capacity to carry out his or her duties".

Obviously the Hon. Minister of Human Resources is not under any threat of possible prosecution in the courts by the commentator or anyone else under either the *Provincial Elections Act*, R.S.B.C. 1960, or the *Canada Elections Act*, c. 14, R.S.C. 1970, as even a cursory glance indicates. The words in section 172 of the *Provincial Elections Act*: "No payment—or deposit—of or in respect of the election . . ." will thus never be sifted by a court to determine if moneys paid to a Provincial candidate and applied according to the Minister's evidence to a Federal constituency organization and to an intended Federal campaign organizer constitute a "payment or deposit" in respect of a Provincial election. Section 191 of the *Provincial Elections Act* bars such a judicial finding.

Also clearly, there is no threat to the Hon. Minister of a prosecution from the commentator or anyone else for any alleged violation of the *Canada Elections Act* as section 90 bars such a prosecution.

What threats are contained in the earlier communications? That if the Minister does not resign the commentator will broadcast his allegations? Not at all. That if the Minister did not clarify the matter of receiving a \$200 cheque into his personal joint account that the commentator would broadcast his information? If that is a threat, it was not regarded so by the Hon. Minister who could have disclosed any threat to the House on March 6 or 7. To the contrary it shows a desire to hear the Minister's answer. Not having been treated as a threat it would not conform at this late date to the requirement that alleged threats against members must be acted upon without delay. Any interference of any kind with their official duties is, according to Beauchesne's 4th edition, citation 113 (op. cit.), a breach of privilege but such matters cannot in such case obtain precedence before Orders of the Day if they are not brought before the House promptly. The communications of March 6 or 7, 1975, between the commentator and the Hon. Minister or his aide, do not in the Minister's own statement of last Thursday, show any undue interference with the honourable member with respect to his official duties, and even if it were so, I cannot rule that they are recent enough to come within the terms set out in Sir Erskine May, 17th edition, page 378.

Thus neither question can be answered in the affirmative. The privileges of the House have not been shown to be breached by any matter concerning the character or conduct of a member in his capacity as member. The article referred to has not been shown affirmatively to pose a threat of "undue interference" with the privilege of the member to exercise his duties freely. Finally, the earlier exchanges between the Minister and the commentator were not raised in any event at a time when they might qualify for examination and cannot be raised now except by Notice of Motion in the usual way on the Order Paper.

Another matter related to the events of last Thursday should be clarified for the records.

If a member seeks leave to make a statement, he cannot by virtue of the indulgence of the House utilize the occasion for statements that he could not otherwise deliver other than by a substantive motion. If anyone questions this assertion, I recommend study of Mr. Speaker Shantz's statement at pages 70 and 71 of the February 24, 1958, Journals of the House, in a similar case.

When a member has a matter of privilege to raise concerning another honourable member he does not do so by seeking leave. If it is on the basis of a breach of privilege, he must take responsibility for raising it and must be prepared personally to press his charge by suitable motion should the Speaker find it to constitute a *prima facie* case.

Last Thursday the Honourable Member for Saanich and the Islands seemed puzzled that I asked him whether he was making a charge and he suggested my question was out of order. To the contrary, no member is entitled to assume that obtaining leave to make a statement confers *carte blanche* to launch a personal attack on another member. After raising it in proper fashion he must be prepared to support his attack by a substantive motion. If the purpose of his making a statement were to call for a judicial inquiry (which it did) then it would have to be by Notice of Motion—not in the guise of a matter of privilege. The House vindicates its own dignity. Privileges of Parliament are not consigned to courts to determine, they are raised in the House by proper means and may, where valid, be settled by the House in a proper way, not by statements by way of leave.

For guidance of members, including the Member for Saanich and the Islands, I wish to quote from the decision of Mr. Speaker Michener on June 19, 1959, Votes and Proceedings, pages 582–586, House of Commons, Canada:

It has been strongly urged by some members that the House should not set in motion its power to try and to judge the conduct of a member unless such member is charged with a specific offence. It is urged further that not only must he be charged, but that he must be charged by a Member of the House of Commons standing in his place.

In my view, simple justice requires that no honourable member should have to submit to investigation of his conduct by the House or a Committee until he has been charged with an offence.

On the authorities it appears to be open to an honourable member to confront the House with charges against another member, implicit in documents in the possession of the House, but in my view the charge must be there.

In the case before us no honourable member has taken the responsibility of making a specific charge against the Honourable Member for Peel. At page 4829 of Hansard the Honourable Member for Essex East (Mr. Martin) says of the Leader of the Opposition in whose name the motion stands:

He made no charges, that is true. That is his continuous answer to the Prime Minister who repeats, "Make charges". The Leader of the Opposition said, "We have no charges to make".

If there is a charge then which the Honourable Member for Peel should be called upon to meet, it has to be implied from the reasons for judgment already referred to. Did the learned judge in commenting on the evidence say or imply that the Member for Peel had been guilty of a criminal offence, perjury for example? Certainly not, and if he had it would have been his responsibility to bring the matter to the attention of the Crown for prosecution. Did he intend or imply that the honourable member's conduct was an offence against the independence or dignity of the House of Commons, about which as a former member of that House he would be cognizant and alert? He does not say so. There is no direct charge of this kind in the judge's observations about the Honourable Member for Peel, nor has any member of this House taken the responsibility himself of saying that such a charge must be implied from such observations

or of saying what the charge is. Instead, the supporters of the motion say in effect, "Let the committee see if there is anything of this kind with which the member could be charged".

In considering the matter raised by the Honourable Member for West Vancouver-Howe Sound I quote also from Mr. Speaker Lamoureux in Votes and Proceedings of the same House of June 9, 1969:

The second procedural difficulty comes from the form of the motion proposed by the Honourable Member for St. John's East. In my view, the motion should follow the question of privilege as a logical sequence. Such a motion cannot merely ask that the committee investigate whether or not there has been a breach of privilege, it must allege a breach of privilege. It should not simply propose that a matter be investigated to determine if there is or is not a breach of privilege.

This proposed motion is in fact, a simple reference of a newspaper article to the committee, asking the committee to make a finding. That is not a motion of privilege but, in my view, an ordinary substantive motion, which, of course, can only be moved in the usual way with the appropriate notice.

In the result, nothing occurred on last Thursday which could set into motion the processes relating to breach of privilege, either by the actions of the radio commentator or the statements made in the House.

G. H. DOWDING, *Speaker*

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

During the question period, the Hon. *Norman Levi* (Minister of Human Resources) answered a question which had been asked earlier and, by leave of the House, tabled copy of a telex received by the Department of Human Resources on March 13, 1975, regarding social assistance payments to Mr. and Mrs. K. Mayea.

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.

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

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Tuesday, March 18, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *L. Vose*.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald* (Attorney-General) presented the First Annual Report of the Department of the Attorney-General for the year ended December 31, 1974.

On the motion of Mr. *Wallace*, Bill (No. 39) intituled *Election Expenses 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 called for "Oral Questions by Members."

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.

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8.30 o'clock p.m. today.

27 Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following question:
With respect to school construction: What was the total sum spent in the year ended December 31, 1974?

The Hon. *Eileen E. Dailly* replied as follows:

"The total sum spent on school construction in the year ended December 31, 1974, will not be known until audited financial statements from all school districts have been received and analysed. It is unlikely that this information will be available until late in May this year."

84 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

1. Since the *Land Commission Act* was given Royal Assent on April 18, 1973, how many acres of land have been purchased by the B.C. Land Commission?

2. What was the total price paid for the land purchased?

3. Of the total acreage purchased, how many acres have been subsequently rezoned for purposes other than agricultural use?

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk*, on behalf of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich*, replied as follows:

"1. As of February 28, 1975, 8,028 acres.

"2. \$10,874,400.

"3. If 'rezoned' refers to changed zoning under a by-law passed pursuant to the *Municipal Act*, the Land Commission is unaware of any such land having been 'rezoned'. If 'rezoned' refers to 'excluded' from the agricultural land reserve pursuant to the *Land Commission Act*, the answer is 'none'."

86 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

1. How many agriculture land reserve plans have been approved by the B.C. Land Commission?

2. Of the total acreage in these plans, how many acres are Crown owned?

3. How many applications have been made to regional districts to remove parcels from the agricultural land reserve?

4. How many unsuccessful applications have been submitted to the B.C. Land Commission to remove parcels from the agricultural land reserve?

5. How many unsuccessful appeals to the B.C. Land Commission have been submitted to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council?

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk*, on behalf of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich*, replied as follows:

"1. Twenty-six.

"2. This information has not been calculated.

"3. The Land Commission has no procedural way of knowing how many applications to remove parcels from the agricultural land reserve have been received by regional districts. However, up to February 28, 1975, of those applications received by the regional districts, 446 had been submitted to the Land Commission for consideration.

"4. The question of 'How many unsuccessful applications have been submitted to the B.C. Land Commission to remove parcels from the agricultural land reserve?' is complicated by the fact that many applicants requesting exclusion were accommodated within the reserve by some means short of full exclusion, e.g., by application of the regulations or by an order under section 11 (4) of the *Land Commission Act*.

"Of the first 243 applications for removal processed by the Land Commission, 95 were dealt with as requests under section 11 (4) without exclusion; 36 were held over for further information; seven were otherwise dealt with or withdrawn. Of the applications treated as requests for exclusion, 42 per cent were approved and 58 per cent were refused. These figures do not include several 'block' appeals by municipalities and regional districts under section 9 (1) of the *Land Commission Act*.

"Of the first 214 applications considered by the Land Commission under section 11 (4) of the Act, 82 per cent were approved in whole or in part without exclusion from the agricultural land reserve and 18 per cent were rejected.

"Up to February 28, 1975, 159 unsuccessful applications have been submitted to the B.C. Land Commission to remove parcels from the agricultural land reserves, if exclusion as such is considered the test. If accommodation of the applicant's plans is considered to be the test, 61 unsuccessful applications have been submitted. Not included in 'unsuccessful applications' are those in process, partly approved, or withdrawn.

"5. The appeal by a person who is dissatisfied with the decision of the Land Commission is to the Environment and Land Use Committee of Cabinet and not the Lieutenant-Governor in Council. Two requests for leave to appeal to the Environment and Land Use Committee have been received by the Land Commission and such leave to appeal was granted in one of the two instances."

101 Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

With respect to staff increases in the Department of Agriculture—

1. What new Department appointments have been made since September 30, 1972, to date?

2. What is the classification and the office location of these appointments?

With respect to Order in Council appointments by the Minister of Agriculture as they relate to departments, commissions, committees, consultants, etc.—

1. How many have been made since September 30, 1972, to date?

2. What are the names, capacity, remuneration, and expenses allowed for each?

3. How much has been paid out to each to date?

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk*, on behalf of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich*, replied as follows:

"With respect to staff increases in the Department of Agriculture—

"1. A total of 96 new established positions of a variety of responsibilities.

"2. As of February 28, 1975:

Appointment	Classification	Office Location
3	Agriculturist 3	2 Langley, 1 Okanagan, Property Management
1	Engineer 3	Abbotsford, Property Management
1	Clerk-Stenographer 3	Langley, Property Management
1	Clerk-Typist 1	Victoria, Property Management
1	Appraiser 1	Langley, Property Management
1	Agriculture Officer 3	Victoria, Horticulture Branch
1	Planning Officer 3	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Planning Officer 2	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Clerk-Typist 2	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Clerk-Stenographer 4	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Clerk 4	Vancouver, Land Commission
2	Engineering Aide 3	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Administrative Officer 4	Vancouver, Land Commission
1	Planning Officer 2	Vancouver, Land Commission
3	Agriculturist 8	Victoria
3	Clerk-Stenographer 3	Victoria
1	Veterinarian 2	Abbotsford, Veterinary Branch
1	Clerk 6	Kelowna, Crop Insurance Branch
1	Agriculture Inspector 3	Abbotsford, Veterinary Branch
4	Agriculture Inspector 3	Kelowna and Northern area, Crop Insurance Branch
5	Agriculture Inspector 3	Kelowna and Northern area, Crop Insurance Branch
2	Clerk 3	Kelowna and Fort St. John, Crop Insurance Branch
1	Clerk-Stenographer 2	Abbotsford, Veterinary Branch
1	Senior Officer 2	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
3	Agriculturist 5	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
1	Agriculturist 3	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
1	Administrative Officer 2	Victoria, Farm Income Assurance
2	Clerk 6	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
2	Clerk 3	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
3	Clerk-Stenographer 3	Victoria, Farm Finance Program
1	Agriculturist 3	Langley, Property Management
1	Draughtsman 3	Victoria, Property Management
1	Clerk 6	Victoria, Property Management
1	Clerk-Typist 1	Victoria, Property Management

Appointment	Classification	Office Location
1	Personnel Officer 3	Victoria
1	Clerk-Stenographer 3	Victoria
1	Clerk 1	Victoria
1	Agriculturist 3	Cloverdale, Apiary Branch
1	Agriculturist 3	Vernon, Farm Economics Branch
1	Agriculturist 3	Abbotsford, Farm Economics Branch
6	Agricultural Officer 3	2 Prince George, Oliver, Abbotsford, Summerland, Dawson Creek, Farm Economics Branch
3	Agriculturist 3	Prince George, Kelowna, Kamloops, Field Crops Branch
1	Agriculture Officer 3	Cloverdale, Field Crops Branch
2	Agriculturist 3	Oliver and Cloverdale, Horticulture Branch
2	Agriculture Officer 3	Cloverdale and Kelowna, Horticulture Branch
1	Agriculturist 3	Abbotsford, Livestock Branch
2	Agriculture Officer	Abbotsford, Poultry Branch
1	Agriculturist 3	Kelowna, Soils Branch
2	Agriculture Officer	Kelowna, Soils Branch
1	Laboratory Aide	Burnaby, Dairy Branch
4	Agriculturist 2	2 Prince George, Duncan, Cranbrook, Youth De- velopment Branch
1	Clerk-Typist	Victoria, Youth Development Branch
1	Veterinarian 2	Kamloops, Veterinary Branch
1	Agriculture Officer	Cloverdale, Veterinary Branch
1	Laboratory Scientist	Abbotsford, Veterinary Branch
1	Laboratory Technician 2	Abbotsford, Veterinary Branch
1	Engineer 3	Abbotsford, Engineering Branch
1	Technician 1	Abbotsford, Engineering Branch
1	Clerk-Stenographer 2	Abbotsford, Engineering Branch
1	Clerk 3	Victoria, ALDA
1	Agriculturist 3	Cloverdale, Entomology Branch

"With respect to Order in Council appointments by the Minister of Agriculture as they relate to departments, commissions, committees, consultants, etc.—

"1. Up to January 31, 1975, 10.

"2. As of January 31, 1975:

Name	Capacity	Remuneration \$
Miss J. Griffith	Secretary to Minister	13,600 (year)
S. B. Peterson	Deputy Minister	40,848 (year)
E. M. King	Associate Deputy Minister	32,004 (year)
A. McLellan	Executive Assistant	19,465 (year)
W. T. Lane	Chairman, Land Commission	38,640 (year)
V. C. Brink	Vice-Chairman, Land Commission	175 (day)
M. Rawson	Commissioner, Land Commission	30,910 (year)
A. E. Garrish	Commissioner, Land Commission	175 (day)
E. E. Barsby	Commissioner, Land Commission	175 (day)
G. G. Runka	General Manager, Land Commission	25,390 (year)

(NOTE—In regard to expenses, these are provided for in the Departmental estimates and are generally not a set amount.)

"3. As of January 31, 1975:

Name	Remuneration \$	Expenses \$
Miss J. Griffith	28,440.00	Nil
S. B. Peterson	90,206.00	11,920.50
E. M. King	70,524.00	10,309.27
A. McLellan	32,379.00	785.00
W. T. Lane	61,360.00	4,079.94
V. C. Brink	16,575.00	1,924.70

Name	Remuneration \$	Expenses \$
M. Rawson.....	49,116.75	2,688.38
A. E. Garrish.....	30,625.00	7,186.94
E. E. Barsby.....	25,550.00	3,663.11
G. G. Runka.....	55,275.00	7,995.56"

105 Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:

With respect to the B.C. Land Commission—

1. What lands, if any, has the B.C. Land Commission purchased between September 30, 1972, and February 16, 1975?
2. What price was paid for the acquisitions?
3. What are the legal descriptions of those lands and the acreage involved?
4. Who were the former owners?

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk*, on behalf of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich*, replied as follows:

"1. Between September 30, 1972, and February 28, 1975, the Land Commission has purchased the lands listed in the Return.

"2. \$10,874,400.

"3 and 4. That, in his opinion, the legal descriptions of lands purchased and names of former owners should be in the form of a Return and that he had no objection to laying such Return upon the table of the House, and thereupon presented such Return."

And then the House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.

Tuesday, March 18, 1975

HALF-PAST 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)

The Committee rose and reported progress.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

By leave of the House, Mr. *Curtis* tabled copy of a letter from J. E. Hargitt to Gary Bannerman, CKNW, Vancouver, B.C., dated March 7, 1975.

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

And then the House adjourned at 10.57 p.m.

Wednesday, March 19, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *R. A. McLaren*.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, Bill (No. 3) intitled *Public Trustee Amendment Act, 1975* 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.

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:

On the motion of the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, Bill (No. 4) intitled *Investment Contracts Amendment Act, 1975*.

On the motion of the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, Bill (No. 5) intitled *Administration Amendment Act, 1975*.

On the motion of the Hon. *A. B. Macdonald*, Bill (No. 20) intitled *Securities Amendment Act, 1975*.

On the motion of Ms. *Brown*, Bill (No. 40) intitled *Vancouver Charter Amendment Act, 1975*.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

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.

The Chairman further reported that on Mr. *McGeer's* motion that the Committee rise and report progress the Committee had divided, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Chabot*, the Rules were suspended and it was *Ordered* that the division be recorded as follows:

YEAS—16

Gibson
Gardom
Schroeder
Morrison

Curtis
McClelland
Richter
Wallace

Anderson, D. A.
McGeer
Fraser
Chabot

Phillips
Bennett
Smith
Jordan

NAYS—30

<i>Liden</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Radford</i>
<i>Lewis</i>	<i>Brown</i>	<i>Gorst</i>	<i>Young</i>
<i>Webster</i>	<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Lea</i>
<i>Kelly</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>King</i>
<i>Steves</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Dailly</i>	<i>Nunweiler</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>
<i>Rolston</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Lauk</i>	<i>Levi</i>
<i>Cummings</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>		

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.

Thursday, March 20, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *J. B. Hoave*.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

Order for Committee of Supply called.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Without the Committee rising, the Chairman reported that, during debate on Vote 2, the Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey had raised a matter not involved in the administrative responsibility of the Premier and Minister of Finance and was, accordingly, out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged.

The Chairman's ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS—30

<i>Liden</i>	<i>Cummings</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Nunweiler</i>
<i>Lewis</i>	<i>Brown</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>
<i>Webster</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Lauk</i>
<i>Kelly</i>	<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Gorst</i>	<i>Radford</i>
<i>Steves</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>King</i>
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>
<i>Anderson, G. H.</i>	<i>Strachan</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Lorimer</i>
<i>Rolston</i>	<i>Dailly</i>		

NAYS—16

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

Without the Committee rising, the Chairman reported that, during debate on Vote 2, the Member for North Vancouver-Capilano had raised a matter not involved

in the administrative responsibility of the Premier and Minister of Finance and was, accordingly, out of order.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged.

The Chairman's ruling was sustained on the following division:

YEAS—29

<i>Liden</i>	<i>D'Arcy</i>	<i>Barrett</i>	<i>Nunweiler</i>
<i>Lewis</i>	<i>Brown</i>	<i>Macdonald</i>	<i>Nicolson</i>
<i>Kelly</i>	<i>Calder</i>	<i>Hall</i>	<i>Radford</i>
<i>Steves</i>	<i>Hartley</i>	<i>Gorst</i>	<i>Cocke</i>
<i>Barnes</i>	<i>Stupich</i>	<i>Lockstead</i>	<i>Williams, R. A.</i>
<i>Anderson, G. H.</i>	<i>Nimsick</i>	<i>Gabelmann</i>	<i>Lorimer</i>
<i>Rolston</i>	<i>Dailly</i>	<i>Skelly</i>	<i>Levi</i>
<i>Cummings</i>			

NAYS—16

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

The Committee rose and reported progress.

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 8.30 o'clock p.m. today.

And then the House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.

Thursday, March 20, 1975

HALF-PAST 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)

The Committee rose and reported progress.

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 10 o'clock a.m. tomorrow.

And then the House adjourned at 10.52 p.m.

Friday, March 21, 1975

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *H. Bredesen*.

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.

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

19 Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:

1. Has the Provincial Government received any applications for subscriptions to *Hansard*?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what is the total number of applications received to February 18, 1975?

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* replied as follows:

"1. Yes.

"2. 1,997."

87 Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:

With regard to the publication of *B.C. Government News*—

1. What was the cost of production for the first two issues?

2. How many additional employees have been engaged to produce the publication?

3. What was the total number of copies printed for each of the first two issues?

4. How many requests have been received to be placed on the regular mailing list?

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* replied as follows:

"1. The cost of production for the first two issues was \$3,764.71.

"2. *Nil*.

"3. There were 50,000 copies of the first issue and 52,000 of the second.

"4. From the publication of the first issue, to March 3, 6,245 requests have been received to be placed on the regular mailing list. Over the past week, requests have averaged more than 200 per day.

"NOTE—Three or four person-days have been necessary between issues to keep the mailing list up to date. Approximately 10 people are employed for one day per issue to handle the distribution of names placed on the list but not yet punched into the addressograph, that is to label envelopes and stuff them (these are not in the production process)."

And then the House adjourned at 12.46 p.m.