

## Monday, March 24, 1975

---

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *R. H. Dobson*.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *D. G. Cocke* (Minister of Health) made a statement relating to hospital residents and interns.

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 Honourable Leader of the Opposition 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—31

|                        |                 |                  |                        |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Liden</i>           | <i>D'Arcy</i>   | <i>Barrett</i>   | <i>Lauk</i>            |
| <i>Lewis</i>           | <i>Sanford</i>  | <i>Macdonald</i> | <i>Radford</i>         |
| <i>Webster</i>         | <i>Brown</i>    | <i>Hall</i>      | <i>Lea</i>             |
| <i>Kelly</i>           | <i>Calder</i>   | <i>Gorst</i>     | <i>King</i>            |
| <i>Steves</i>          | <i>Stupich</i>  | <i>Gabelmann</i> | <i>Cocke</i>           |
| <i>Anderson, G. H.</i> | <i>Nimsick</i>  | <i>Skelly</i>    | <i>Williams, R. A.</i> |
| <i>Rolston</i>         | <i>Strachan</i> | <i>Nunweiler</i> | <i>Levi</i>            |
| <i>Cummings</i>        | <i>Dailly</i>   | <i>Nicolson</i>  |                        |

NAYS—15

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

The Committee rose and reported progress.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The Committee reported that during consideration of Vote 2 the Committee had divided on a motion that the Chairman leave the chair, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

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

## YEAS—16

Gibson  
Gardom  
Schroeder  
Morrison

Curtis  
McClelland  
Richter  
Wallace

Williams, L. A.  
Anderson, D. A.  
McGeer  
Fraser

Chabot  
Phillips  
Bennett  
Smith

## NAYS—31

Lewis  
Webster  
Kelly  
Steves  
Anderson, G. H.  
Rolston  
Dent  
Cummings

D'Arcy  
Sanford  
Brown  
Calder  
Hartley  
Stupich  
Nimsick  
Strachan

Dailly  
Barrett  
Macdonald  
Hall  
Gorst  
Gabelmann  
Skelly  
Nunweiler

Nicolson  
Lauk  
Lea  
King  
Cocke  
Williams, R. A.  
Levi

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.

## Tuesday, March 25, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. G. R. Cook.

On the motion of the Hon. A. B. 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. 6) intituled *Co-operative Associations Amendment Act, 1975*.

Bill (No. 9) intituled *Real Estate Amendment Act, 1975*.

Bill (No. 2) intituled *Patients' Estates Amendment Act, 1975*.

By leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. A. B. Macdonald, Bill (No. 8) intituled *Limitations 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.

The Hon. W. S. King (Minister of Labour) presented the Fifty-eighth Annual Report of the Workers' Compensation Board for the year ended December 31, 1974.

**109** Mr. Bennett asked the Hon. the Minister of Labour the following questions:

With respect to the Workers' Compensation Board—

1. Are there any class or subclass fund balances showing a deficit for the year 1974 and, if so, how much of a deficit is shown in each class and subclass and what is the amount in total of such deficits in all classes and subclasses?

2. Were any assessment rates increased during the year 1974 and, if so, in which classes of industry and by how much?

3. What was the over-all cost of administration in 1974 compared to 1973?

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

"1, 2, and 3. The annual accounts of the Workers' Compensation Board are included in the Annual Report which is due to be received in my office by March 25, and will then be laid before the House. I am sure that the Board would be pleased to respond to any request for any information that is not contained in the Annual Report."

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)

2. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$286,290 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Premier's Office to 31st March 1976.

52. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$34,710 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Minister's Office, to 31st March 1976.

53. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$645,580 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, General Administration, to 31st March 1976.

54. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,901,232 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Controlling and Audit Branch, to 31st March 1976.

55. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$970,716 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Purchasing Commission, to 31st March 1976.

56. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,555,324 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Taxation Administration, to 31st March 1976.

57. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,539,314 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Data Processing Branch, to 31st March 1976.

58. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$4,032,778 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Government Agencies, to 31st March 1976.

59. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$100,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Assessment Appeal Board, to 31st March 1976.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The Committee reported that during consideration of Vote 2 the Committee had divided on a motion that the Committee rise and report progress, 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 said division be recorded as follows:

## YEAS—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>   |

## NAYS—33

|                 |                |                  |                        |
|-----------------|----------------|------------------|------------------------|
| <i>Liden</i>    | <i>D'Arcy</i>  | <i>Macdonald</i> | <i>Lauk</i>            |
| <i>Lewis</i>    | <i>Sanford</i> | <i>Hall</i>      | <i>Radford</i>         |
| <i>Webster</i>  | <i>Brown</i>   | <i>Gorst</i>     | <i>Lea</i>             |
| <i>Kelly</i>    | <i>Calder</i>  | <i>Lockstead</i> | <i>King</i>            |
| <i>Steves</i>   | <i>Stupich</i> | <i>Gabelmann</i> | <i>Cocke</i>           |
| <i>Barnes</i>   | <i>Nimsick</i> | <i>Skelly</i>    | <i>Williams, R. A.</i> |
| <i>Rolston</i>  | <i>Dailly</i>  | <i>Nunweiler</i> | <i>Lorimer</i>         |
| <i>Dent</i>     | <i>Barrett</i> | <i>Nicolson</i>  | <i>Levi</i>            |
| <i>Cummings</i> |                |                  |                        |

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

The Hon. *D. G. Cocke* (Minister of Health) presented the Seventy-eighth Annual Report of the Public Health Services for the year ended December 31, 1974.

**54** Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Human Resources the following questions:

1. What was the total number of social workers employed in the Public Service as of December 31, 1973?
2. What was the total number of social workers employed in the Public Service as of December 31, 1974?

The Hon. *Norman Levi* replied as follows:

- "1. Four hundred and sixty-three (Department of Human Resources only).
- "2. Five hundred and two (Department of Human Resources only)."

**93** Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Human Resources the following questions:

With respect to instances of child abuse in the Province during the most recent 12-month period for which information is available—

1. How many children have been reported victims of abuse?
2. In how many instances has child abuse resulted in (a) death, (b) serious physical injury, or (c) serious psychological injury?
3. In how many instances has the Department of Human Resources (a) recommended the laying of criminal charges or (b) taken other remedial measures to prevent recurrence of child abuse?
4. How many instances of child abuse have been discovered and reported to the Department of Human Resources by (a) Departmental employees, (b) employees of other Provincial Government departments, (c) members of the medical profession, and (d) the general public?

The Hon. *Norman Levi* replied as follows:

- "1. During the calendar year 1974, 141 reports received involved abuse of children.
- "2. (a) Four, (b) 21 children were admitted to hospital, and (c) unknown.

"3. (a) It is not the policy of the Department to recommend the laying of criminal charges; however, police investigation of the suspect occurred in 24 cases; and (b) in 11 cases the Department of Human Resources did not open a case but allowed another professional (psychiatrist, doctor, or school counsellor) to assume major responsibility for assisting the child and family, in the remaining cases the Department has assumed directly the responsibility for assisting the family to prevent further incidents.

"4. (a) All; (b) 14; (c) 26 by doctors, 18 by nurses, 7 by medical social workers; and (d) 23 by school personnel, 53 by other members of the community."

**94** Mr. *Wallace* asked the Hon. the Minister of Human Resources the following questions:

With respect to Departmental financial assistance for students in post-secondary institutions—

1. Is the Department of Human Resources providing financial assistance to persons who attend universities, vocational schools, or colleges in the Province?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many students are attending universities, vocational schools, or colleges with financial assistance provided by the Department of Human Resources, (b) what criteria are used when authorizing such students to receive financial assistance from the Department of Human Resources, and (c) what costs are paid by the Department for such students, e.g., books, tuition, living expenses, etc.?

The Hon. *Norman Levi* replied as follows:

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) Approximately 500; (b) help with educational expenses is available only to a social assistance recipient and then only if it is not available through another source such as the Canada Manpower Commission or Department of Labour; for employable recipients, educational assistance is conditional on the plan being a practical one that will lead to employment; for a nonemployable person, such as a single mother with small children, aid may be provided as a preparation for future employment or as a help in coping with problems of a personal or family nature; help is not provided with university costs because these are available through the Student Assistance Programme, Department of Education; social assistance may be continued for a mother with children or a handicapped person attending university if the plan is a practical one that will lead to employment; and (c) costs of books and fees, a training allowance of \$15 per month for a single person and \$25 per month for a family head to help with travel costs when necessary and regular social assistance entitlement."

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

---

**Tuesday, March 25, 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)

60. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$4,119,076 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Incidentals, to 31st March 1976.

61. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$2,500,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Interest on Trust Funds and Deposits, to 31st March 1976.

62. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,000,000 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Rural Power Subsidy, to 31st March 1976.

63. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$31,457,010 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Statutory Appropriations, to 31st March 1976.

3. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$116,894 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Minister's Office, to 31st March 1976.

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

The Committee reported that during consideration of Vote 62 the Committee had divided on a motion that the Committee rise and report progress, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

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

YEAS—15

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

NAYS—35

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

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

And then the House adjourned at 10.56 p.m.

Wednesday, March 26, 1975

---

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. P. D. Ross.

By leave of the House, the Hon. A. B. Macdonald (Attorney-General) presented the *Protection of Privacy Act* Annual Report.

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. D. G. Cocke, on behalf of the Hon. Phyllis F. Young, Bill (No. 10) intituled *Fair Sales Practices Amendment Act, 1975*.

On the motion of Mr. Gardom, Bill (No. 41) intituled *An Act for the Restriction of the Use of Spring Traps*.

On the motion of Mrs. Jordan, Bill (No. 42) intituled *Senior Citizens Home Repair Assistance Act*.

On the motion of Mrs. Jordan, Bill (No. 43) intituled *Home Buyers' Protection Act*.

On the motion of Mr. McClelland, Bill (No. 44) intituled *An Act to Amend the Public Bodies Information Act*.

Order called for "Oral Questions by Members."

During the question period, by leave, the Hon. Lorne Nicolson (Minister of Housing) tabled an affidavit of Ramzanali Shivji Gangji in the matter of the sale of Casa Loma Motel Ltd. complex, Burnaby, to the Crown.

During the question period, by leave, Mr. Phillips tabled copies of two mortgage agreements relating to the Casa Loma Motel Ltd.

By leave of the House, Mr. D. A. Anderson tabled portions of a transcript from proceedings at trial in the Supreme Court of British Columbia between British Columbia Egg Marketing Board and Veeken's Poultry Farm Ltd. *et al*.

Order for Committee of Supply called.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

On the motion of the Hon. David Barrett it was *Resolved*—

That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund there may be paid and applied in such manner and at such times as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may determine a sum not exceeding in the whole five hundred and thirty-seven million dollars toward defraying the several charges and expenses of the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March 1976, not otherwise provided for, and being substantially one-sixth of the Main Estimates

for the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March 1976, as laid before the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia at the present Session.

The Committee reported the Resolution.  
Report to be considered forthwith.

The Committee reported that during consideration of the Resolution the Committee had divided on a motion that the Chairman leave the chair, and recommended that the division be recorded in the Journals of the House.

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

## 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—32

|                        |                 |                  |                 |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Lewis</i>           | <i>D'Arcy</i>   | <i>Barrett</i>   | <i>Nicolson</i> |
| <i>Webster</i>         | <i>Sanford</i>  | <i>Macdonald</i> | <i>Lauk</i>     |
| <i>Kelly</i>           | <i>Brown</i>    | <i>Hall</i>      | <i>Radford</i>  |
| <i>Steves</i>          | <i>Calder</i>   | <i>Gorst</i>     | <i>Lea</i>      |
| <i>Barnes</i>          | <i>Hartley</i>  | <i>Lockstead</i> | <i>King</i>     |
| <i>Anderson, G. H.</i> | <i>Stupich</i>  | <i>Gabelmann</i> | <i>Cocke</i>    |
| <i>Rolston</i>         | <i>Strachan</i> | <i>Skelly</i>    | <i>Lorimer</i>  |
| <i>Cummings</i>        | <i>Dailly</i>   | <i>Nunweiler</i> | <i>Levi</i>     |

On the motion of the Hon. *David Barrett*, the report of Resolution from the Committee of Supply was taken as read and received, read a second time, and agreed to.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Order for Committee of Ways and Means called.

## (IN THE COMMITTEE)

On the motion of the Hon. *David Barrett* it was *Ordered* "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" for the House to go into Committee of Ways and Means.

On the motion of the Hon. *David Barrett* it was *Resolved*—

That from and out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund there may be paid and applied in such manner and at such times as the Lieutenant-Governor in Council may determine a sum not exceeding in the whole five hundred and thirty-seven million dollars toward defraying the several charges and expenses of the Public Service of the Province for the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March 1976, not otherwise provided for, and being substantially one-sixth of the Main Estimates for the fiscal year ending the thirty-first day of March 1976, as laid before the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia at the present Session.

The Committee rose and reported the Resolution.  
Resolution considered forthwith and adopted.  
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.



The Hon. *David Barrett* presented Bill (No. 11) intituled *Supply Act, No. 1, 1975*.

*Ordered*, That the Bill be referred to a Committee of the Whole House forthwith.

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

*Resolved*, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of the Bill.

Resolution reported.

Report considered forthwith and adopted.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

By leave of the House, the Rules were suspended and the Bill read a second time.

By leave of the House, the Rules were suspended and the Bill referred to a Committee of the Whole House to be considered forthwith.

The Bill was committed, reported complete without amendment, and, by leave of the House, the Rules were suspended and the Bill *Ordered* to be read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor having entered the House, and being seated in the chair—

*Ian M. Horne*, Q.C., Clerk of the House, read the title to the following Bill: (No. 11) *Supply Act, No. 1, 1975*.

His Honour was pleased in Her Majesty's name to give assent to the said Bill.

The said assent was announced by the Clerk of the House in the following words:

"In Her Majesty's name, His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor doth assent to this Bill."

His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor was then pleased to retire.

*Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2 o'clock p.m. on Monday, April 7th next.

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

With respect to the vessel *Queen of Surrey*—

1. What was the total cost of the vessel?
2. Specifically, what was the (a) basic purchase price, (b) cost of exchange, and (c) cost of conversion, if any?

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

"1. \$17,793,468.

"2. (a) Basic purchase price, \$13,875,000; import duty, \$3,468,750 (application has been made for remittance of this amount in accordance with established Federal Government practice, as yet no decision has been forthcoming from the

Federal Treasury Board); delivery charges, \$425,000; miscellaneous items, \$24,718; (b) payment was made in Canadian funds; and (c) conversion and inspection costs, \$820,721.”

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

1. Did the Minister of Transport and Communications travel to Europe during 1974 for the purpose of investigating ferry design and operations?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, who were the persons in the party and which of those persons travelled at public expense?

3. What was the total cost to the Provincial Government of the trip referred to above?

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

“1. Yes; in addition to examination of ferry design and operations the group also examined newly developed internal ferry ramps, ship-building yards, marine research facilities, several maritime training colleges, and computerized reservation developments.

“2. The Hon. *R. M. Strachan*, Mr. C. M. Dalfen, Mr. P. Loudon, Dr. J. F. Newberry, Mr. C. Gallagher, Mr. W. B. Weston, Capt. A. Heater, all travelled at public expense.

“3. \$17,177.69.”

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

With regard to the British Columbia ferry fleet—

1. Does it appear than any major reconditioning or major repair (other than the usual annual maintenance or refit) is required for any vessel in the fleet during the next 12 months?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what is the name of the vessel or vessels and what is the nature of the work to be undertaken?

3. Is it intended to retire or otherwise dispose of any vessel presently in the ferry fleet during the same period?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what is the name of the vessel or vessels to be disposed of?

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

“1 and 2. Consideration is being given to major reconditioning of main engines of *Queen of Vancouver*, *Queen of Victoria*, and *Sunshine Coast Queen*.

“3 and 4. Consideration is being given to retiring *Langdale Queen* during 1976.”

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

With respect to a possible new major ferry terminal on or near Gabriola Island—

1. Is this proposal still under review by the Minister’s Department and (or) British Columbia Ferries?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, at what stage is preliminary or basic design for the facility and where is it to be located?

3. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, will the Minister make public such basic design before detailed working plans are authorized?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. No preliminary or basic design has been undertaken; study is continuing of the viability of existing and future routes between the Lower Mainland and Vancouver Island.

"3. Only after discussions with responsible local officials."

And then the House adjourned at 4.36 p.m.

## Monday, April 7, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

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

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. 47) intituled *Restraint on Speculation Act*.

On the motion of the Hon. *D. D. Stupich*, Bill (No. 7) intituled *Farmers' and Women's Institutes 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)

4. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$864,208 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Deputy Minister's Office, to 31st March 1976.

5. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,104,648 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, General Administration, to 31st March 1976.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

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

**81** Mr. *Curtis* asked the Hon. the Minister of Municipal Affairs the following questions:

With respect to the amalgamations in the following British Columbia municipalities, (a) Kelowna, (b) Kamloops, (c) Prince George, and (d) Nanaimo—

1. Were special financial grants extended to each of the amalgamated municipalities stated above?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what were the amounts of each grant authorized to the municipalities mentioned above, by individual municipality?

3. Has any portion of each grant been paid?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what is the amount which has been paid to each municipality concerned and for what designated purpose in each case?

5. Are any further grants committed but not yet paid to each of the municipalities concerned?

6. If the answer to No. 6 is yes, what is the amount of each grant and the purpose for which it is to be used by the recipient municipality?

The Hon. *J. G. Lorimer* replied as follows:

"1. Yes.

"2. Kelowna, \$4,315,000; Kamloops, \$5,515,000; Prince George, \$5,174,684; Nanaimo, \$4,698,953; and in addition in each case an ongoing streets and roads program and an ongoing policing assistance program as follows:

"*Kelowna and Kamloops*—Major streets, roads, and bridge construction program and a streets and roads maintenance program together with a policing assistance program under which the Province assumes full responsibility for streets and roads maintenance and for policing in the formerly nonmunicipal areas of these two municipalities for a period of three years, followed by an ongoing joint Provincial/municipal streets and roads maintenance program and a policing assistance program based on an urban/rural division of the municipality for sharing purposes.

"*Prince George and Nanaimo*—A streets and roads maintenance program together with a policing assistance program under which the Province assumes full responsibility for these services in the formerly nonmunicipal areas of the municipality for a period of five years.

"3. Yes.

"4. *Kelowna*—\$1,000,000, fire protection assistance; \$271,000, adjustment of *per capita* grant, retroactively to January 1, 1973; \$29,000, tax transfer; \$193,249, public works; \$15,000, grant to defray expenses of advisory committee on restructuring; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Kamloops*—\$200,000, waterworks assistance; \$247,000, adjustment of *per capita* grant, retroactively to January 1, 1973; \$53,000, tax transfer; \$15,000, grant to defray expenses of advisory committee on restructuring; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Prince George*—\$600,000, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Nanaimo*—\$600,000, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"5. Yes.

"6. *Kelowna*—\$2,806,751, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Kamloops*—\$5,000,000, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Prince George*—\$4,574,685, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above.

"*Nanaimo*—\$4,098,953, restructure grant; together with the ongoing streets and roads program and the ongoing policing assistance program referred to above."

And then the House adjourned at 5.54 p.m.

**Tuesday, April 8, 1975**

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *George Doubroff*.

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 consideration of Vote 31 he had ruled that the Honourable Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey was debating matters not within the administrative responsibility of the Minister of Consumer Services.

The Chairman's ruling was challenged.

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

YEAS—25

|                        |                 |                  |                |
|------------------------|-----------------|------------------|----------------|
| <i>Lewis</i>           | <i>Sanford</i>  | <i>Lockstead</i> | <i>Young</i>   |
| <i>Webster</i>         | <i>Brown</i>    | <i>Gabelmann</i> | <i>Lea</i>     |
| <i>Steves</i>          | <i>Hartley</i>  | <i>Skelly</i>    | <i>King</i>    |
| <i>Anderson, G. H.</i> | <i>Nimsick</i>  | <i>Nicolson</i>  | <i>Cocke</i>   |
| <i>Rolston</i>         | <i>Strachan</i> | <i>Lauk</i>      | <i>Lorimer</i> |
| <i>Cummings</i>        | <i>Dailly</i>   | <i>Radford</i>   | <i>Levi</i>    |
| <i>D'Arcy</i>          |                 |                  |                |

NAYS—11

|                  |                        |                        |                 |
|------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>Gibson</i>    | <i>Morrison</i>        | <i>Anderson, D. A.</i> | <i>Phillips</i> |
| <i>Gardom</i>    | <i>Curtis</i>          | <i>Fraser</i>          | <i>Smith</i>    |
| <i>Schroeder</i> | <i>Williams, L. A.</i> | <i>Chabot</i>          |                 |

31. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$88,796 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Consumer Services, Minister's Office, to 31st March 1976.

The Committee reported the Resolution.  
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.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *Eileen E. Dailly* (Minister of Education) presented the Universities Council of British Columbia recommendations for operating and capital grants for the public universities of British Columbia, 1975/76.

And then the House adjourned at 5.56 p.m.

**Tuesday, April 8, 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)

32. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,798,344 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Consumer Services, General Administration, to 31st March 1976.

The Committee reported the Resolution.  
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.

**22** Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Human Resources the following questions:

With reference to the social assistance cost-sharing formula between the Government and the municipalities—

1. What was the total amount paid by the Government under this formula in the fiscal year 1973/74?

2. What was the total amount paid by the municipalities in the fiscal year 1973/74?

3. In the case of each individual municipality, what was the amount paid by (a) the Government and (b) the municipality?

The Hon. *Norman Levi* replied as follows:

"1. 1973/74, \$144,704,519.20.

"2. 1973/74, \$24,825,193.80.

"3. See following table:

| Municipality             | (a) Amount Paid by<br>the Government<br>During the Fiscal<br>Year 1973/74<br>\$ | (b) Amount Paid by<br>the Individual<br>Municipalities<br>in the Fiscal<br>Year 1973/74<br>\$ |
|--------------------------|---|---|
| Abbotsford.....          | 620,857.28  | 107,640.00  |
| Burnaby.....             | 10,437,046.92   | 1,809,504.00  |
| Campbell River.....      | 830,578.30  | 144,000.00  |
| Castlegar.....           | 491,536.24  | 85,219.20   |
| Central Saanich.....     | 426,585.01  | 73,958.40   |
| Chilliwack City.....     | 758,733.28  | 131,544.00  |
| Chilliwack District..... | 1,972,706.52  | 342,014.40  |
| Comox.....               | 330,570.16  | 57,312.00   |
| Coquitlam.....           | 4,421,168.29  | 766,512.00  |
| Courtenay.....           | 594,611.00  | 103,032.00  |
| Cranbrook.....           | 996,693.96  | 172,800.00  |
| Creston.....             | 266,117.29  | 46,137.60   |
| Dawson Creek.....        | 987,142.31  | 171,144.00  |
| Delta.....               | 3,809,032.08  | 660,384.00  |
| Duncan.....              | 364,457.76  | 63,180.60   |

\*1 Excluded is the \$444,049.24 rebate granted April 1973 for overbillings to municipalities in 1972/73.

| Municipality  | (a) Amount Paid by<br>the Government<br>During the Fiscal<br>Year 1973/74 | (b) Amount Paid by<br>the Individual<br>Municipalities<br>in the Fiscal<br>Year 1973/74 |
|---|---|---|
|   | \$  | \$  |
| Esquimalt   | 1,073,273.28  | 186,076.80  |
| Fernie  | 367,281.72  | 63,676.80   |
| Fort St. John   | 691,871.72  | 119,952.00  |
| Golden  | 250,004.07  | 43,344.00   |
| Grand Forks   | 263,542.49  | 45,691.20   |
| Hope  | 261,881.34  | 45,403.20   |
| Kamloops  | 4,575,655.85  | 678,096.00  |
| Kelowna   | 3,747,320.12  | 495,454.80  |
| Kimberley   | 634,810.99  | 110,059.20  |
| Kitimat   | 980,331.57  | 169,963.20  |
| Ladysmith   | 305,154.47  | 52,905.60   |
| Langley City  | 389,042.88  | 67,449.60   |
| Langley District  | 1,821,956.56  | 315,878.40  |
| Maple Ridge   | 2,032,923.45  | 352,454.40  |
| Matsqui   | 1,956,344.13  | 339,177.60  |
| Merritt   | 439,292.86  | 76,161.60   |
| Mission   | 848,851.02  | 147,168.00  |
| Nanaimo   | 1,241,548.44  | 215,251.20  |
| Nelson  | 780,743.60  | 135,360.00  |
| New Westminster   | 3,557,782.15  | 616,824.00  |
| North Cowichan  | 1,010,813.79  | 175,248.00  |
| North Saanich   | 299,091.25  | 51,854.40   |
| North Vancouver City                                    | 2,645,142.71  | 458,596.80  |
| North Vancouver District                                | 4,805,809.10  | 833,198.40  |
| Oak Bay   | 1,530,423.58  | 265,334.40  |
| Penticton   | 1,507,167.38  | 261,302.40  |
| Port Alberni  | 1,666,389.24  | 288,907.20  |
| Port Coquitlam  | 1,624,611.16  | 281,664.00  |
| Port Moody  | 895,197.29  | 155,203.20  |
| Powell River  | 1,140,051.77  | 197,654.40  |
| Prince George   | 2,755,775.74  | 477,777.60  |
| Prince Rupert   | 1,307,911.65  | 226,756.80  |
| Quesnel   | 519,775.90  | 90,115.20   |
| Revelstoke  | 404,242.46  | 70,084.80   |
| Richmond  | 5,159,635.46  | 894,542.40  |
| Rossland  | 323,593.31  | 56,102.40   |
| Saanich   | 5,402,081.26  | 936,576.00  |
| Salmon Arm  | 647,269.67  | 112,219.20  |
| Sidney  | 404,325.52  | 70,099.20   |
| Smithers  | 320,935.46  | 55,641.60   |
| Squamish  | 508,396.98  | 88,142.40   |
| Summerland  | 461,054.01  | 79,934.40   |
| Surrey  | 8,189,585.09  | 1,419,854.40  |
| Terrace   | 829,830.78  | 143,870.40  |
| Trail   | 926,011.75  | 160,545.60  |
| Vancouver   | 35,403,898.38   | 6,138,086.40  |
| Vernon  | 1,133,905.50  | 194,522.40  |
| Victoria  | 5,129,734.64  | 889,358.40  |
| West Vancouver  | 3,026,627.33  | 524,736.00  |
| White Rock  | 859,565.48  | 149,025.60  |
| Williams Lake   | 338,216.45  | 58,636.80   |
| Municipalities exempted as of June 1, 1972 <sup>2</sup> | not applicable  | 8,872.80  |
|   | <u>144,704,519.20</u>   | <u>24,825,193.80</u>  |

<sup>1</sup> Excluded is the \$444,049.24 rebate granted April 1973 for overbillings to municipalities in 1972/73.

<sup>2</sup> The municipalities of Armstrong, Enderby, and Greenwood were exempted from responsibility for Social Allowance costs as of June 1, 1973, as their respective populations were under 2,500."

**32** Mr. *Bennett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Transport and Communications the following questions:

1. Have the British Columbia Ferries issued passes to any individuals in British Columbia for passage between Vancouver Island and the Mainland?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what persons have been issued passes on the ferries?

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

"Please see answer to Question 241, Sessional Journals, April 11, 1973."

And then the House adjourned at 10.59 p.m.

### Wednesday, April 9, 1975

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *William H. Bulloch*.

On the motion of Mr. *Gibson*, Bill (No. 49) intituled *An Act to Repeal the Mineral Royalties 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.

The Hon. *Norman Levi* presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Administrator, which read as follows:

JOHN L. FARRIS  
*Administrator*

The Administrator transmits herewith Bill (No. 19) intituled *Pacific North Coast Native Co-operative Loan Amendment Act, 1975*, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*  
*March 10, 1975*

By leave of the House, Bill introduced and read a first time.

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)

33. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$673,863 be granted to Her Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Consumer Services, Salary Contingencies, to 31st March 1976.

The Committee reported the Resolution.  
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.

The Hon. *R. A. Williams* (Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources) presented the following:

Ocean Falls Corporation financial statements for the year ended December 31, 1974.

Annual Report of the British Columbia Cellulose Company for the year ended December 31, 1974.

Annual Report of the British Columbia Water Resources Service for the year ended December 31, 1974.

The Hon. *G. V. Lauk* (Minister of Economic Development) presented the Annual Report of the Department of Economic Development for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1975.

The House proceeded to "Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees."

Mr. *Lockstead* presented the First Report of the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills, as follows:

REPORT NO. 1

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

April 9, 1975

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills begs leave to report as follows:

That the Standing Orders have been complied with relating to the petition for leave to introduce the following Private Bill:

*An Act to Incorporate The Institute of Accredited Public Accountants of British Columbia.*

Your Committee recommends that the petitioner be allowed to proceed with the said Bill.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

DONALD F. LOCKSTEAD, *Chairman*

The report was read and received.

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

**119** Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:

With respect to extra Departmental committees, commissions, task forces, and the like—

1. Have any special extra Departmental studies been established to date?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) for what purpose was each such structure established and who are the members and (b) what, if any, were their total expense allowances to the latest available date?

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

"1. There have been six studies undertaken and completed within the last few months: (1) Advisory Committee for a Northeastern Community College; (2) Advisory Committee for an East Kootenay Community College; (3) Advisory Committee for a Northwestern Community College; (4) Advisory Committee for Post-secondary Education Services in the Powell River-Northern Vancouver Island Region; (5) Survey Report of Department of Education Library; and (6) Lower Mainland Community College Survey Committee.

"2. (a) Purposes:

"*Studies (1), (2), (3), and (4)*—To study post-secondary educational needs, assess resources and facilities, and to make recommendations on programs, staffing, facilities, and distribution of services in the four regions.

"*Study (5)*—To study present Department Library, and to make recommendations on space, staffing, and direction.

"*Study (6)*—To study population distribution, transportation systems, existing needs and resources relevant to colleges, and to make recommendations on size and administrative structure for Lower Mainland colleges.

"2. (a) Membership:

"*Study (1)*—Dr. B. Brown, Dawson Creek; Mrs. B. Gregory, Fort Nelson; Mr. M. Calliou, Chetwynd; Mr. R. Dutka, Fort St. John; Mr. W. Keunzel, Toms-lake; Mr. A. Schuck, Fort Nelson; Mrs. E. Lucas, Baldonnel; Mr. A. Krassnick, Fort St. John; Mrs. D. Jeannotte, Rolla; Mr. F. Davies, Fort St. John; Mr. T. McEwan, Dawson Creek; Miss D. Pomeroy, Fort St. John; and Mr. Joe Weingart, Sunset Prairie.

"*Study (2)*—Mr. J. Pidgeon, Fernie; Dr. N. Fahmi, Fernie; Mrs. E. Madson, Invermere; Mrs. M. Engstrom, Canal Flats; Mr. J. Ratcliffe, Kimberley; Mr. J. Patterson, Kimberley; Mrs. D. MacKay, Cranbrook; Mr. D. Waurynchuk, Cranbrook; Mrs. L. Staples, Creston; Mr. P. Haines, Creston; Ms. J. Beaulac, Golden; Mr. O. Pecora, Golden; Mr. B. Swaney, Sparwood; Mrs. B. Taplin, Elkford; and Mr. P. Sims, Cranbrook.

"*Study (3)*—Mrs. H. Cap, Prince Rupert; Mr. G. Viereck, Prince Rupert; Mr. S. Simpson, Masset; Mr. B. McKay, New Aiyansh; Mr. L. Kozier, Terrace; Mr. W. Hutchison, Terrace; Dr. C. Ling, Kitimat; Mr. K. Muldo, Hazelton; and Mr. E. Redmond, Terrace.

"*Study (4)*—Ms. R. Taylor, Alert Bay; Mr. N. Sieffert, Comox; Mr. P. Glemitz, Port Hardy; Capt. R. Griffiths, Comox; Mr. M. Henderson, Campbell River; Mrs. O. Rousseau, Heriot Bay; Mrs. R. Barnett, Campbell River; Ms. J. Fanning, Cumberland; Mr. T. Ryan, Courtenay; Mrs. M. McRae, Powell River; Mrs. S. Cole, Powell River; Mr. R. Donovan, Gold River; Mr. M. Nagy, Holberg; and Mr. G. McGillivray, Nanaimo.

"These four committees are assisted and co-ordinated by: Ms. C. Miller, Dawson Creek; Mr. D. Shergill, Campbell River; Mr. P. Sims, Cranbrook; Mr. L. Minsky, Terrace; Ms. H. L'Estrange, Burnaby; and Mr. L. O'Neill, Salmon Arm.

"*Study (5)*—Mr. I. Kemlo, Victoria.

"*Study (6)*—Dr. L. Marsh, Vancouver; Ms. H. Symonds, Vancouver; and Dr. G. Dickinson, Vancouver.

"2. (b) Total expense allowances as of March 13, 1975, for the six studies, \$32,245."

And then the House adjourned at 5.52 p.m.

**Thursday, April 10, 1975**

---

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *A. Calder*.

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.

By leave of the House, the Hon. *Ernest Hall* (Provincial Secretary) presented the Sixth Report of the Royal Commission on Family and Children's Law—Report on Matrimonial Property.

The House proceeded to the Order "Presenting Reports by Standing and Special Committees."

Mr. *Gabelmann* presented the Report of the Select Standing Committee on Labour and Justice as follows:

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

April 10, 1975

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Labour and Justice begs leave to report as follows:

The Select Standing Committee on Labour and Justice was instructed by the Legislature to consider the status of farm and domestic workers with respect to their inclusion under labour standards legislation. For this purpose, the Committee toured the Province between October 9, 1974, and October 31, 1974, in order to solicit submissions from interested parties on the issue. The meetings were designed to be of an informal nature in order to encourage submissions from persons who might normally be reluctant to appear before such a committee. The response to these hearings was considerable in several of the centres visited with representations being made by most of the directly concerned parties, as well as by numerous individuals and organizations not directly affected. The agricultural industry was well represented at most hearings, as were trade unions and political organizations. Submissions from farmworkers were received at approximately half of the sittings, and briefs regarding domestic help were submitted at about one-third of the meetings.

The Labour and Justice Committee hearings revealed a wide range of labour standards legislation from whose provisions farmworkers and domestics were excluded. A number of pertinent questions regarding this body of legislation were raised at the hearings. These can be classified roughly under two headings:

- (1) Philosophical issues; and
- (2) Administrative fears and problems.

The philosophical arguments can be summarily dealt with since administrative problems seem to constitute the main impediment to a comprehensive inclusion of these workers under labour standards legislation. Briefly, the argument for legislative inclusion of farm and domestic employees considers the problem as one of the community's social and moral responsibility. Its inherent logic is one of equity for all citizens, as one submission clearly points out:

" . . . all this legislation has been enacted through the years because governments have felt it necessary to establish certain minimum limits beyond which men and women in British Columbia should not be expected to work. Now, if these governments have set these standards for the vast majority of British Columbians and if these minimum standards are fair and just, what possible justification can there be for excluding a small group of employees from these benefits?" (Submission of B.C. Federation of Labour, October 9, 1974, page 1.)

In other words, if the present standards of legislation are considered consistent with the objectives of a just labour policy, then their application should be universal.

The main arguments *against* legislative action are based on more purely economic considerations. These can be formulated in a number of ways:

- (i) *Higher wages would force many producers out of business and merely produce more unemployment*

The purely theoretic position underlying the statement cannot be sustained even by a careful consideration of the assumptions underlying that position. It should also be noted a recent Department of Labour study on the impact of a minimum wage revision showed little, if any, employment repercussions from raising the minimum wage.

On a more practical level, many producers complained bitterly about labour shortages, although it seems very likely that these are largely the result of the poor wage and working conditions prevalent in the industry. It would also seem likely that the recently introduced Income Assurance Plan would mitigate the effect of increased costs to affected farmers during poor years. Much evidence was heard about the cost/price squeeze to which most small operators are subject. It is true that these producers have little market power and, as a result, bear most of the burden of cost increases.

- (ii) *The workers are being paid what they are worth*

Several submissions pointed out that this position was tantamount to exploitation of the affected workers by the rest of society. The over-riding philosophy of the argument is that relatively cheap food prices for the consuming public at large are socially more important than the welfare of those producing it. In addition, it also implies that there may be some justification for obliging a class of workers in our society to subsidize producers who may be inefficient or whose operations may not be otherwise economically viable. Thus, those people engaged in food production must continue to be content with poor wages and working conditions.

The Committee considers this position unacceptable. Exploitation of a pool of low-skilled workers should not be required at a time when numerous modern

technologies and management methods are available to accomplish the tasks of production and distribution. The large disparities between prices paid by the consumer and those received by the producer are a major cause of concern as they severely affect the ability of the farmer to provide socially acceptable wages and working conditions.

(iii) *Piece rates are a necessary part of agricultural production*

This consideration does not preclude the setting of guaranteed hourly minimums. The Labour Standards Branch of the Department of Labour has pointed out that similar situations already exist in other British Columbia industries. Industry reasons for desiring maintenance of piece rates seem to depend heavily on their use of a secondary labour force, especially the aged and the very young whose individual production capabilities may be considerably below average. Piece rates therefore enable the farmer to maintain a constant labour cost of each unit produced, an important factor considering the wide fluctuations inherent in their revenues. This Committee sees no objection to the maintenance of piece rates as an incentive system *above and beyond* the minimum standards which should be guaranteed to all workers.

These arguments revolve around the idea of added costs that may in fact be illusory, as benefits associated with the relevant legislation are not generally considered in the employer's calculations. These include such intangibles as increased employee satisfaction, higher productivity, and increased labour force stability. A number of other arguments have been classified as "administrative issues" and will be considered with the individual pieces of legislation.

As numerous, very different pieces of legislation were considered by this Committee at its hearings, the public reaction to each will be summarized individually.

1. *Annual and General Holidays Act*

This is viewed as an "unnecessary" added cost by most farmers. They seem opposed to holiday pay of any kind for seasonal employees, whether their employees work one day or for the whole season. Furthermore, holidays often clash with harvest schedules and necessary chores, and would therefore necessitate the paying of overtime rates. Current practice among ranchers seems to be to give an annual holiday during the winter months. Regular, "full-time" orchard workers are unemployed during the winter and generally receive UIC benefits as "holiday pay".

2. *Control of Employment of Children Act*

Children are used extensively to harvest the berry and tree-fruit crops. The consensus of farmers seems to be that this practice is necessary because of a shortage of other types of labour. The relevant question here is whether generally higher wages would attract more workers—most farmers feel not. Actual abuse of child labour does not seem to be an important issue in British Columbia, although questions relating to the use of agricultural chemicals were not pursued at the hearings. A definition of "domestics" requires a decision as to whether to include temporary babysitters or not. Inclusion of this category of worker under its auspices would then make this Act very wide-ranging in its application.

3. *Hours of Work Act*

In its present form, this would seem to be a very contentious piece of legislation among farmers. Complaints were similar to those against paid holidays—that harvest and necessary chores must be undertaken without delay. Overtime pay for this work would drastically increase costs, according to most operators. Regular employees are often subject to an "hours-averaging" arrangement, with extra time

off being allowed in winter months in lieu of overtime pay. Similar problems occur with "live-in" housekeepers, where indeterminate hours of work could lead to administrative problems in relating rates of pay and hours actually worked.

#### 4. *Labour Code of British Columbia*

While most farmers do not favour trade unions, there are no valid reasons why agricultural or domestic workers should not be covered by the Code. Opposition voiced to this Act was largely on the basis of "personal" employee/employer relationships traditionally prevalent in agriculture, and a "gut feeling" that unions would destroy these relationships.

#### 5. *Minimum Wage Act*

This was perhaps the second most controversial piece of legislation discussed at the hearings. As mentioned above, many witnesses considered low wage rates, especially low piece rates, tantamount to worker exploitation. The B.C. Federation of Agriculture has made a strong appeal for the maintenance of piece rates. This appeal is based on farmers' extensive use of a secondary labour force, and their feeling that harvest wages should be tied to individual worker ability and effort. On a holding of any size this tends to remove the onus of supervision from the farmer and allows him to contribute necessary labour himself. Guarantee provisions of this Act were also seen as a burden to the farmer, who could be at the mercy of poor weather conditions. It should also be noted that, in most sectors, wage rates for *full-time workers* seem well above the presently established minimum. In addition, apparently low rates of pay are often bolstered by payments-in-kind, but these arrangements are often vague and would seem to easily lend themselves to dispute. Some witnesses also found difficulty in accepting that babysitting or household work, as distinct from personal care services, should require payment of even current minimum wage rates. It should be noted that administrative problems are common to both the Hours of Work and Minimum Wage Acts and, seem to be a major impediment to their immediate implementation.

#### 6. *Maternity Protection Act*

The impact of applying this Act would seem to be negligible for both these categories of workers. Full-time, female hired hands are almost nonexistent in British Columbia agriculture, and the employment duration of seasonal workers is generally so short that the Act would have little practical effect. Domestic workers, being predominantly female, would seem to be more in need of the benefits of this Act. There was no opposition voiced about the amendment to this Act to include agricultural and domestic workers.

#### 7. *Payment of Wages Act*

There was no opposition to this Act recorded at any of the hearings, and organizations such as the B.C. Federation of Agriculture have voiced their approval of it.

#### 8. *Truck Act*

There was no evidence presented at the hearings regarding this Act and, to a large extent, its power seems to have been subsumed by the *Payment of Wages Act*. However, the Committee feels that there are no valid grounds for continued exclusion of farm and domestic labourers from the *Truck Act*, if it is to be retained in some form.

### 9. *Employment Agencies Act*

It was recommended by witnesses at Lower Mainland hearings that this Act should be modified in order to eliminate abuses by both domestic and farm labour contractors. Evidence was heard relating to shocking "rip-offs" perpetrated by certain unprincipled operators. The most common of these was the use of patently unsafe forms of transportation for their workers. In addition, deceptive or completely false promises by contractors, especially concerning wages and pay-cheque deductions, were seen to be a major problem. On the other hand, a few growers stated that, due to inadequate supplies of other types of labour, these contractors were in fact a necessary evil. Evidence was also heard that some growers had been let down by contractors, thus creating considerable hardships for the affected farmers.

The view of the Committee, and apparently shared by most witnesses, was that the consequences of unscrupulous contractors operating within certain ethnic communities are potentially socially catastrophic and, for that reason, completely unacceptable. The problems related to vehicular travel could conceivably be countered by a strict application of the *Motor Carrier Act*. Other unacceptable practices could be countered by amending the *Employment Agencies Act* to cover the situation. This would provide a situation analogous to that of the United States where farm labour contractors must meet strict requirements in order to be licensed, and must be licensed to carry on business or face severe penalties.

### 10. *Workers' Compensation Act*

Much evidence was heard regarding the application of the compulsory provisions of this Act. Opposition was generally based on fears of additional paper work, additional costs, and "snooping" inspectors. Direct evidence was heard at the Pentiction and Merritt meetings that paper work and inspector fears were totally unfounded. This evidence was given by farmers who had already voluntarily availed themselves of WCB coverage. It also seems likely that the cost factor could be decreased if more farmers were to belong to the scheme. In any case, it was pointed out by the Minister of Labour that the somewhat higher (than private insurance) costs of coverage were more than balanced by additional worker benefits, especially with respect to wage loss coverage, and the levels of permanent disability benefits and rehabilitative assistance available. It was pointed out by different witnesses that agriculture has been found to be the third most dangerous British Columbia industry in which to work. The high incidence of accidents in the home was also presented as a valid reason for inclusion of domestic employment under the Act, although some opposition was voiced to the possible presence of WCB safety inspectors on private premises.

### 11. *Factories Act*

Complaints were voiced, especially at Lower Mainland hearings, that poor working conditions not directly referable to safety (and hence not governed by the *Workers' Compensation Act*) were prevalent in agriculture. Evidence was presented that new immigrants were the ones most often subject to poor field conditions, and that these people urgently require some form of protection. Suggestions were that this Act could be used as a vehicle to set minimum standards for provision of toilets, clean drinking water, and accommodation when supplied by the farmer.

## RECOMMENDATIONS

There would seem to be little, if any, difficulty in making the provisions of the *Labour Code of British Columbia*, the *Maternity Protection Act*, the *Payment of Wages Act*, and the *Truck Act* applicable to farm and domestic employment. Few

administrative problems are anticipated due to the straightforward nature of these Acts.

Application of the *Employment Agencies Act* is recommended as an immediate and valuable tool in controlling excesses perpetrated by unscrupulous labour contractors. Specific provisions are required in order to fully cover this class of agency.

The *Control of Employment of Children Act* should also be amended to cover domestic and agricultural situations. Problems both administrative and philosophical, concerning babysitters and children working on family farms must be considered. Obviously, it is not the Committee's intention to limit the ability of children to work as babysitters or as casual helpers on family farms. It is, however, our intention to ensure that the Department of Labour has the statutory authority to control unscrupulous practices relating to child labour.

The *Workers' Compensation Act* should have its compulsory coverage extended to cover domestic and agricultural employees. Additional worker benefits available under this Act far outweigh any possible employer cost involved, and are deemed necessary given the high-risk nature of both fields of employment. Family members must be allowed coverage and in fact every encouragement should be made to make it easy for entire farm families to be included.

The *Annual and General Holidays Act* should be amended to include farm and domestic workers. Provisions of this legislation need not interfere with the farmers' need to have an uninterrupted supply of labour during the peak months. Holidays can be provided either by time off in the winter or by a cash payment of a percentage of earned income.

The *Hours of Work Act* should also be amended to include farm and domestic workers. Clearly, administrative problems will arise under this legislation. The Department of Labour should conduct thorough research into the effect of this Statute on the farm industry. A great deal of flexibility must be built into the administration of this Statute to ensure that the farmer is not hamstrung in meeting his work needs and that the rights of his workers are not violated.

The *Minimum Wage Act* should cover farm and domestic workers. Implementation of this Act should follow extensive research which takes into account "in kind" payments as well as the complexities of the piece rate system.

It should be noted that British Columbia, and indeed most Canadian jurisdictions are presently at variance with International Labour Organization Conventions regarding agricultural workers. These include Convention II: Right of Association (Agriculture); Convention 99: Minimum Wage-fixing Machinery (Agriculture). Coverage of agricultural workers in other jurisdictions is minimal; Newfoundland and Ontario providing the only coverage that is at all extensive. The legislative action proposed in this report should put British Columbia well ahead of other Canadian jurisdictions in providing labour standards coverage for agricultural and domestic workers. In addition, this proposed action should put the Province in compliance with all present International Labour Organization Conventions regarding these categories of workers.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

COLIN GABELMANN, *Chairperson*

The report was taken as read and received.

On the motion of Mr. *Gabelmann* that the Rules be suspended and the report adopted, leave to suspend the Rules was not granted.



**103** Mrs. *Jordan* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:

With respect to the Public Service—

1. How many public servants have been hired to serve the North Okanagan constituency between September 30, 1972, to date?
2. What are their current classifications?
3. What are their current salaries?

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* replied as follows:

“Record of public employees not maintained on a geographic or electoral boundary basis, consequently the answer is unavailable.”

**106** Mr. *Curtis* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:

With respect to persons employed by the Provincial Government and appointed by Order in Council, on the latest date for which information is available—

1. How many persons so appointed are citizens of the United States of America?
2. What is the name and present assignment of each United States citizen so appointed?
3. Are any persons currently under contract with the Provincial Government or any of its agencies, Crown corporations, or enterprises, citizens of the United States of America?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what is the name of each person under contract and what are the particulars of each assignment?

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* replied as follows:

“To this question and subsequent questions pertaining to No. 106, this information has not been recorded and is unavailable.”

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

In the leased premises of the Public Service Commission located at 26 Bastion Square in Victoria—

1. How much rent or other financial consideration has been received from the B.C. Government Employees' Union Victoria Regional Office for the use of the meeting-room during the past two years?
2. Is there a contractual arrangement between the Union and the Public Service Commission regarding the interchange of information relating to public servants?

The Hon. *Ernest Hall* replied as follows:

“1. Union pays its own rent for offices in the building at 26 Bastion Square and does not have access to the Public Service Commission meeting-room except for meetings with the Commission, for which no rent is charged.

“2. Under Article 4 of the Master Agreement, the Public Service Commission is to provide a list of names and components of those employees whose salaries are subject to union dues deductions together with the amount so deducted. Article 11.02 of the Master Agreement requires that the employer submit a seniority list of all employees to the union prior to the expiry date of the agreement.”

And then the House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.

## Thursday, April 10, 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 10.54 p.m.

---

## Friday, April 11, 1975

---

TEN O'CLOCK A.M.

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

The Clerk informed the House of the unavoidable absence of Mr. Speaker, whereupon Mr. *Dent*, Deputy Speaker, took the chair pursuant to Standing Order 12 and section 46 (2) of the *Constitution Act*.

Mr. *L. A. Williams* rose on a matter of privilege relating to the receipt by him of a publication containing allegations which might constitute a breach of privilege, and tabled the publication in question.

Mr. Speaker stated that the matter would be taken under advisement.

On the motion of Mr. *Wallace*, Bill (No. 60) intituled *The Drug Addiction Rehabilitation 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.

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.

And then the House adjourned at 12.58 p.m.