

Tuesday, February 8, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *R. Young*.

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. *R. G. Williston*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

Pursuant to Order, the Hon. *L. R. Peterson* presented the following report:

REPORT

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

February 8, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

In accordance with the resolution that there be prepared a list of members to compose the Special Committee to review the policy governing the classification of motion-picture films prior to their display within the Province and to make recommendations to the House for any revision thereof deemed to be in the public interest, your Special Committee appointed on January 20 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 that Special Committee of the House be as follows:

Messrs. *B. Campbell* (Convener), *Merilees*, *Ney*, *Price*, *Wenman*, Mrs. *Kripps*, the Hon. *Isabel Dawson*, the Hon. *W. McT. Skillings*, Mrs. *Daily*, Messrs. *Cocke*, *Hall*, and *Brousson*.

Respectfully submitted.

L. R. PETERSON, *Chairman*.

The report was taken as read and received.

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

The Hon. *W. McT. Skillings* (Minister of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce) presented the Annual Report of the Department of Industrial Development, Trade, and Commerce for the year ended December 31, 1971.

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

1. Is the Department giving consideration to classifying Premier Lake Park as a Class A park?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what decision, if any, has been made?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. A firm decision has not been made, investigation and consideration are proceeding."

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

1. Does the Fish and Wildlife Branch of the Department of Recreation and Conservation hold title to any lands in Game Management Area 11?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what is the total acreage and (b) how many parcels of land are involved, who were the owners of each parcel, the acreage, and the price paid for each parcel?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) 920 acres and (b) five as follows:

"Portion of Lot 10278, KD (90 acres). Acquired in 1968 from Eric and Ida Neilson for \$27,000. Purpose: Supplement to Bull River Wildlife Management Project.

"Sublot 28 of Lot 4596, KD (480 acres). Acquired in 1970 from L. M. Wilder for \$103,996.96. Purpose: Supplement to wildlife management area on east side of Columbia Lake.

"Lot 6372 and Lot 10309, KD (160 acres). Acquired in 1970 from Wm. and Lidia Busch for \$35,001. Purpose: Wildlife management in Wolf Creek area.

"Sublot 30 of District Lot 4589 (160 acres). Acquired in 1962 from Percy Starr for \$5,000. Purpose: Supplement to wildlife management in Sheep Mountain area.

"Legal Subdivisions 1 and 2, Section 16, KD (30 acres). Acquired in 1971 from John and Caroline Berghenham for \$1. Purpose: Wildlife sanctuary near Moberley."

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

1. Is the Fish and Wildlife Branch considering the introduction of a permit system in harvesting big game?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what game animals will be harvested in this manner and (b) will the permits be available to both residents and nonresidents?

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

"1. Yes, in some areas.

"2. (a) Species in which there is need to more closely regulate the harvest and (b) yes, until resident demand sufficient to fully utilize population."

83 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following question:

What was the take of each of the following animals in Game Management Area 11 during the years 1970 and 1971 respectively; bull moose, antlerless moose, bull elk, antlerless elk, whitetail buck deer, antlerless whitetail deer, blacktail buck deer, caribou, goat, and sheep?

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

“The 1971 figures are not available. However, for 1970 the harvests were:

	Bulls	Antlerless
Moose (resident).....	435
Moose (nonresident).....	35
Elk (resident).....	972	398
Elk (nonresident).....	121	10
Whitetail.....	1,410	940
Blacktail.....	1,371	196
Caribou (resident).....
Caribou (nonresident).....	2
Goat (resident).....	110
Goat (nonresident).....	50
Sheep (resident).....	30
Sheep (nonresident).....	10

S4 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Recreation and Conservation the following questions:

In the matter of the application by the Kimberley Rod and Gun Club to have the area known as the “Top of the World” classified as a wilderness area—

1. Has the application been granted?
2. If not, at what stage is the application?

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

“1. No.

“2. The proposal has been referred to the Environment and Land Use Committee for study.”

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 8, 1972

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. *W. McT. Skillings*, 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 11.05 p.m.

Wednesday, February 9, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Pastor *John Baerg*.

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. R. Chabot*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The Hon. *L. R. Peterson* (Attorney-General) presented the following:

Law Reform Commission of British Columbia Annual Report for 1971.

Law Reform Commission of British Columbia Report on Expropriation.

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.35 p.m.

Thursday, February 10, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *A. Beaton*.

The Hon. *L. R. Peterson* presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:

JOHN R. NICHOLSON
Lieutenant-Governor

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled *An Act to Amend the Motor-vehicle Act*, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
February 9, 1972

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 26) intituled *An Act to Amend the Motor-vehicle Act*, a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.
Report adopted.
Bill introduced and read a first time.
Second reading at the next sitting after today.

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. *Gardom* moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. *Clark*—

That the motion "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 the Budget Speech of the Hon. the Minister of Finance fails to make adequate provision for the needs of the senior citizens of the Province."

The debate continued.

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

Thursday, February 10, 1972

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

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.

Mr. *Barrett* moved a subamendment, seconded by Mr. *Nimsick*—

That the amendment to the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair" be amended by adding, after the word "Province" in the fourth line, the following measures:

- "(1) The provision of a guaranteed minimum income of \$200 per month for senior citizens over 65 years and with five years' residence in the Province;
- "(2) The supply of medical drugs under the British Columbia Medical Plan free of charge for senior citizens;
- "(3) The elimination of all fees for coverage under the British Columbia Medical Plan for all British Columbia residents 65 years of age and over; and

“(4) The establishment of intermediate and chronic care under the British Columbia Hospital Insurance Service for all those senior citizens needing those services.”

The Hon. *L. R. Peterson* rose on a point of order, stating that, in his opinion, the subamendment was out of order for the reason that it involved the expenditure of public money without the recommendation of the Crown and thereby offended Standing Orders 66 and 67.

Mr. Speaker, quoting May, 17th edition at page 795, ruled that while the subamendment would involve expenditure of public money, it nevertheless was framed in sufficiently abstract terms that, if agreed to, the subamendment would have no operative effect involving public expenditure and therefore, in his opinion, did not offend the provisions of Standing Order 66.

Subamendment ruled to be in order.

The Speaker's ruling was challenged.

The Speaker's ruling was not sustained on the following division:

YEAS—16

Messieurs

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

NAYS—32

Messieurs

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

The debate was resumed on the amendment to the main motion.

On a point of order, the Chair ruled that a member having seconded the subamendment was precluded from again speaking on the amendment, and quoted May, 16th edition.

The debate continued.

On the motion of Mr. *L. A. Williams* that the debate be adjourned to the next sitting of the House, the House divided.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS—16

Messieurs

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

NAYS—33

Messieurs

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

The debate continued.

The House continued to sit after midnight.

FRIDAY, FEBRUARY 11

The amendment was negatived on the following division:

YEAS—17

Messieurs

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

NAYS—33

Messieurs

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

The debate was resumed on the main motion.

The debate continued.

On the motion of the Hon. *F. X. Richter*, 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. today.

And then the House adjourned at 1.09 a.m.

Friday, February 11, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *L. M. Carlson*.

On the motion of the Hon. *L. R. Peterson*, Bill (No. 28) intituled *An Act to Amend the Administration 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.

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. *W. N. Chant*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The House proceeded to the Order "Motions and Adjourned Debates on Motions."

On the motion of the Hon. *C. M. Shelford*, seconded by the Hon. *F. X. Richter*, it was *Ordered*—

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

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

On the motion of the Hon. *L. R. Peterson*, seconded by the Hon. *W. D. Black*, it was *Ordered*—

That a Special Committee be appointed to study the Report on Expropriation made by the Law Reform Commission of British Columbia and to report to the House the preferences, if any, of the Committee with respect to the recommendations contained therein.

That the Special Committee appointed under Standing Order 68 be instructed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, a list of members to compose the Special Committee appointed by this resolution.

On the motion of the Hon. *D. L. Brothers*, seconded by the Hon. *Grace McCarthy*, it was *Ordered*—

That this House authorize the Select Standing Committee on Social Welfare and Education to examine and report on the definition of the tenure of office of the members of the teaching staffs in the universities and on procedures followed by the universities relating to this matter, and to make such recommendations as the Committee considers necessary.

On the motion of the Hon. *Grace McCarthy*, seconded by Mr. *McGeer*, it was *Ordered*—

That this House recommends that the Government of Canada make available for acquisition by the Government of the Province of British Columbia at the price at which they were purchased by His Majesty the King in the right of Canada or the Crown in the right of the Dominion of Canada (as the case may be) from His Majesty the King in the right of the Province of British Columbia or the Crown in the right of the Province of British Columbia (as the case may be) those portions of the lands and premises commonly known as the Jericho Defence Lands and more particularly described as:

Lots 1, 2, and 3 of District Lot 538, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 13977;

Lot 4 of District Lots 448 and 538, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 13977;

Lot 5 of District Lots 448 and 538, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 13977;

Lot 6 of District Lot 538, Group 1, New Westminster District, Plan 13977;
on the understanding that the Government of British Columbia will not allow the property to be used for commercial, industrial, or residential purposes.

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

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

REPORT NO. 1

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
February 10, 1972

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 respective petitions for leave to introduce the following Private Bills:

An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter.

An Act to Amend the Trinity Junior College Act.

Your Committee recommends that the respective petitioners be allowed to proceed with the said Bills.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

B. PRICE, *Chairman*

The report was read and received.

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

The Hon. *W. D. Black* (Provincial Secretary) presented the Fifty-third Annual Report of the Civil Service Commission.

16 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources the following questions:

1. Have there been any prosecutions under the *Pollution Control Act, 1967*?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, how many prosecutions have been made under the *Pollution Control Act, 1967*?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. One."

55 Mr. *Nimsick* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources the following questions:

1. Has the Pollution Control Board made a survey of any of the lakes and streams in the East Kootenay relative to the degree of pollution?
2. If so, what lakes and streams are being monitored for pollution?
3. Has the water from any of these lakes and streams been found to be unfit for human consumption?
4. If so, what are the names of these lakes and streams?
5. Are the results of the monitoring of the lakes and streams in the East Kootenay available to the public?
6. If so, to whom does one apply for these results?

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

"1. No, as the undertaking of tests and surveys to determine the extent of pollution of water, land, and air is a function of the Director of the Pollution Control Branch.

"2. Not applicable.

"3. The determination of water quality for human consumption is not a function for which the Minister of Lands, Forests, and Water Resources is administratively responsible.

"4. Not applicable.

"5. Yes.

"6. The manager of the East Kootenay Pollution Control District at Cranbrook or alternatively to the Director of the Pollution Control Branch."

79 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

1. Were two engines for a new ferry to Denman Island purchased from Maritime Industries Limited?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what was the cost of the engines?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Total machinery cost \$119,518.35 (this includes all machinery and controls)."

80 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following question:

With reference to the ferry *Catherine Graham*, what was the cost of maintenance and (or) repairs to the *Catherine Graham*, her auxiliary barge, and the ferry landings in 1969/70 and 1970/71?

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

“Cost of repairs and maintenance of ferry *Catherine Graham*, ferry landings, and Departmental barge were: 1969/70, \$50,958.63; and 1970/71, \$39,684.36.”

99 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to roads in the Atlin constituency other than the Stewart–Watson Lake Highway—

1. Were any roads repaired in 1971/72?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what are the names of the roads and what was the total cost of repairs to each road?
3. Were any new roads constructed in 1971/72?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what are the names of the roads and what was the total cost of construction of each road?

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

“1. Yes.

“2. Atlin Highway (No. 2), \$7,388.16; Cassiar Mine Road (No. 10), \$16,465.29; Kitsault River Road, \$10,000; Premier Road, Salmon River Road, and Bear Lake Road, \$7,000.

“3. No.

“4. Not applicable.”

100 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to bridges in the Atlin constituency other than those located on the Stewart–Watson Lake Highway—

1. Were any bridges repaired in 1971/72?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what roads are they located, and what was the total cost of repairs to each bridge?
3. Were any bridges rebuilt in 1971/72?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what roads are they located, and what was the total cost of construction of each bridge?
5. Were any new bridges built in 1971/72?
6. If the answer to No. 5 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what roads are they located, and what was the total cost of construction of each bridge?

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

“1. Yes.

“2. Quartz Rock Creek Bridge (No. 127) on Cassiar Mine Road (No. 10), \$3,000; Loudecker Bridge (No. 153) on Telegraph Creek Road (No. 51), \$800.

“3. Yes.

“4. Esperanza Bridge eliminated by a culvert on Kitsault River Road, \$500.

“5. No.

“6. Not applicable.”

106 Mr. *Wolfe* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

In connection with the policy of our Province in self-insuring Government vehicles—

1. How many passenger and commercial vehicles are now owned and operated by the Province of British Columbia?
2. Of the above, how many vehicles are self-insured and how many are insured by private insurance companies?

3. During the past year (1971) what was the dollar amount of claims absorbed on Government vehicles?

4. What was the amount of claims paid by outside insurance companies?

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

(As at April 1, 1971).

"1. 6,448 vehicles.

"2. 6,324 self-insured, 124 insured by private company.

(For the calendar year ended December 31, 1971).

"3. \$88,125.97 (estimated). Estimated amount of damages to Government vehicles, for which no recovery has been made from outside insurance companies.

"4. \$39,942.74 (amount paid by outside insurance companies to Government for damages to Government vehicles).

107 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following question:

With reference to Bell-Irving Bridge No. 2 (Project 2233) on the Stewart-Watson Lake Highway, what are the complete engineering specifications of this bridge?

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

"A 600-foot permanent bridge consisting of two 300-foot through-truss spans of galvanized steel 'Callender Hamilton' construction supported by reinforced-concrete abutments and mid-stream pier, all founded on concrete-filled steel-pipe piles. Initially a single-lane timber deck is being constructed and the final deck will be of reinforced-concrete with a 26-foot roadway width. Overhead clearance is 19 feet. Live-load rating is HS25."

108 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following question:

With reference to Bell-Irvine Bridge No. 1 on the Stewart-Watson Lake Highway, is it the intention of the Department of Highways to complete construction of the bridge in 1972 and, if so, when does the Department contemplate calling tenders?

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

"It is not the intention to complete the deck of the Bell-Irvine Bridge No. 1 in 1972."

109 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to the Stewart-Watson Lake Highway, other than Projects 2233 and 2234—

1. Were any highway sections repaired in 1971/72?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what are the names, numbers, and mileage of the highway sections, and what was the total cost of repairs to each highway section?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Stewart Arterial (442-R), Mile 0-4, \$20,000; Mile 1 to 7 from Stewart, \$13,000; Mile 28 and 29 from Stewart, \$75,000; Mile 49 to 78 from Watson Lake (crushed gravel surfacing), \$200,000; Mile 29.4 to 35 from Watson Lake, \$100,000; and Mile 130 to 235 from Watson Lake, \$8,557.94."

110 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to the Stewart–Watson Lake Highway bridges, other than the Bell–Irving River Bridges Nos. 1 and 2—

1. Were any bridges repaired in 1971/72?
2. If the answers to No. 1 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what highway sections or mile point are they located, and what was the total cost of repairs to each bridge?
3. Were any bridges rebuilt in 1971/72?
4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what highway sections or mile point are they located, and what was the total cost of construction of each bridge?
5. Were any new bridges constructed in 1971/72?
6. If the answer to No. 5 is yes, what are the names of the bridges, upon what highway sections or mile point are they located, and what was the total cost of construction of each bridge?

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

“1. Yes.

“2. Bear River Bridge (No. 1), Mile 1 from Stewart, \$1,200; (no name), Mile 20 from Stewart, \$300; Rufus Bridge, Mile 21 from Stewart, \$200; Surprise Creek Bridge, Mile 34 from Stewart, \$300; Blue River Bridge (119), Mile 20.1 from Watson Lake, Tanzeilla Bridge (174), Mile 166.7 from Watson Lake, Willow River Bridge (156), Mile 241.7 from Watson Lake, Twin Lakes Bridge (160), Mile 86.1 from Watson Lake, total cost for these bridges, \$7,642.15.

“3. Yes.

“4. Bitter Creek, Mile 11 from Stewart, \$14,000; Dease River Bridge (173), Mile 111.6 from Watson Lake, \$25,142.79; Troutline Bridge (130), Mile 80.1 from Watson Lake, Blue River Bridge (119), Mile 20.1 from Watson Lake, French Creek Bridge (123), Mile 35 from Watson Lake, First North Fork Bridge (124), Mile 68.7 from Watson Lake, Third North Fork Bridge (125), Mile 73.5 from Watson Lake, total cost of these bridges, \$29,747.53.

“5. No.

“6. Not applicable.”

111 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to the maintenance of the Stewart–Watson Lake Highway—

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Highways to consider the advisability of establishing a Department of Highways camp in the vicinity of Meziadin Lake in 1972?
2. If so, at what mile point on the highway will the camp be located?

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

“1. During the summer of 1971 the Department of Highways investigated various possible sites for a maintenance depot in the vicinity of Meziadin Lake. It is expected that a site will be finalized in 1972 with the establishment of at least temporary maintenance facilities.

“2. Areas in the vicinity of Mile 37 (from Stewart) are being investigated.”

114 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following question:

With reference to snow removal on roads, highways, and bridges in the Atlin constituency, what was the total cost of removal in 1971/72?

The Hon. *W. D. Black* replied as follows:
“\$84,447.86.”

115 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:
With reference to the 12-mile road section on the Stewart–Terrace Highway that borders the north side of Meziadin Lake between Mile 39 on the Stewart–Watson Lake Highway and the new Nass River bridge—

1. Is it the intention of the Department of Highways to consider the advisability of bringing this road section up to a gravel highway standard?
2. If so, when does the Department contemplate calling tenders?

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

- “1. Yes, it is the intention to bring this road up to a gravel standard.
- “2. It is not contemplated to call tenders on this section, but some work will be done in 1972.”

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 5.15 p.m.

Monday, February 14, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *R. Holmes*.

The following Bills were introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* referred to the Select Standing Committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills:

On the motion of Mr. *Vogel*, on behalf of Mr. *Merilees*, Bill (No. 50) intituled *An Act to Amend the Vancouver Charter*.

On the motion of Mr. *Vogel*, Bill (No. 51) intituled *An Act to Amend the Trinity Junior College 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.

On the motion of the Hon. *P. A. Gaglardi*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

Pursuant to Order, the Hon. *L. R. Peterson* presented the following report:

REPORT
LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
February 11, 1972

MR. SPEAKER:

In accordance with the resolution that there be prepared a list of members to compose the Special Committee to study the Report on Expropriation made by the Law Reform Commission of British Columbia and to report to the House the preferences, if any, of the Committee with respect to the recommendations contained therein, your Special Committee appointed on January 20 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 that Special Committee of the House be as follows:

Messrs. *Fraser* (Convener), *Marshall*, *Mussallem*, *Price*, *Vogel*, *Wolfe*, the Hon. *W. D. Black*, the Hon. *Patricia J. Jordan*, the Hon. *W. K. Kiernan*, the Hon. *R. R. Loffmark*, Messrs. *Lorimer*, *Nimsick*, *R. A. Williams*, *Gardom*, and *Wallace*.

Respectfully submitted.

L. R. PETERSON, *Chairman*

The report was taken as read and received.

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

The Hon. *F. X. Richter* (Minister of Commercial Transport) presented the Annual Report of the Department of Commercial Transport for the year ended December 31, 1971. (In manuscript form.)

The Hon. *J. R. Chabot* (Minister of Labour) presented the Annual Report of the Department of Labour for the year ended December 31, 1971. (In manuscript form.)

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

1. How many tons of iron concentrates were produced in British Columbia in 1971?

2. What was (a) the total estimated value of these iron concentrates for the above year and (b) the royalty return to the Province from iron concentrates for the above year?

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

"1. 1,895,273 short tons of iron concentrates were shipped, we do not have figures for production but they would be similar.

"2. (a) The estimated value of these concentrates is \$16,800,000 and (b) \$253,047.57."

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

1. How many tons of copper concentrates were produced in British Columbia in 1971?

2. What was (a) the total estimated value of these copper concentrates for the above year and (b) the royalty return to the Province from the copper concentrates for the above year?

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

"1. Copper concentrates produced in 1971 contained 271,332,262 pounds of copper (i.e., 135,666 short tons).

"2. (a) \$132,900,000 and (b) *nil*."

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

With reference to payments under section 2 of the *Iron Bounty Act*—

1. Have any payments been made under this section to Cominco Limited since October 30, 1970?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, what are the amounts and dates of payment to date?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. \$45,534 by cheque No. 416629 dated November 6, 1970, covering \$26,229 for production in August 1970 and \$19,305 for production on which bounty was payable in September 1970. This constitutes final moneys payable under this agreement with Cominco."

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

1. How many coal mining licences were in good standing as at January 1, 1972?

2. How many of these licences were granted during 1971?

3. How many coal mines were operating in the Province as at January 1, 1971?

4. What are the names of these mines?

5. What was the production of each mine during 1971?

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

"1. 2,276.

"2. 840.

"3. Three producing coal mines were in operation at the beginning of 1971, all of which were under the management of Kaiser Resources Limited.

"4. Harmer Ridge open-pit operations, Balmer North underground mine, and Balmer Hydraulic underground mine.

"5. Official figures for the production of each individual mine are not kept. Total provisional production figures for 1971 for the Kaiser Resources Limited operations are 4,637,013 short tons, this figure being tonnage of raw coal put through the coal-preparation plants. Production figures reported for open-pit mining are 3,912,154 tons and for underground mining 724,858 tons."

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

1. Do Scurry Rainbow Coal Mines hold any coal licences in British Columbia?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what is the location of each licence, the date it was granted, and the number of acres involved, (b) in the case of each licence has the company concerned presented a plan of development and does this plan involve the diversion of the Elk River, and (c) if the answer to No. 2 (b) reveals any plan to divert the Elk River, has the plan been accepted by the Department?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) Coal licences held by Scurry-Rainbow Oil, Limited: 22 licences issued September 4, 1970, located in unsurveyed territory west of Chisholm Lake, Range 5, Coast Land District, comprising 12,160 acres. Coal licences held jointly by Scurry-Rainbow Oil, Limited and Emkay Canada Natural Resources Limited in Kootenay Land District: Two licences issued September 25, 1963, located near Aldridge Creek, a tributary of Elk River, comprising 960 acres; 14 licences issued December 5, 1967, located near Bleasdell Creek and Elk River, comprising 7,680 acres; nine licences issued July 16, 1968, located south of Cadorna Creek near Elk River, comprising 4,800 acres; one licence issued August 28, 1968, in vicinity of Cadorna Creek and Elk River, comprising 640 acres; nine licences issued October 30, 1969, in vicinity of Cadorna Creek and Elk River, comprising 2,880 acres; seven licences issued February 11, 1970, in vicinity of Aldridge Creek and Elk River, comprising 2,240 acres.

"(b) No plan to develop the coal in any licence has been filed with the Department, a reclamation permit covering exploration work only has been issued.

"(c) *See (b).*"

76 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources the following questions:

With reference to coal mined in 1970—

1. What was the total tonnage mined?
2. Was any of this coal exported and, if so, how many tons and what was its destination?
3. What was the total number of persons employed in coal mining?

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

"1. Gross production 3,483,062 tons, net production 3,163,695 tons.

"2. Yes; 11,083 tons to the U.S.A., 1,786,855 tons to Japan, and 128,785 tons other.

"3. 1,275."

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev *P. V. Atkinson*.

The Hon. *L. R. Peterson* presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:

JOHN R. NICHOLSON
Lieutenant-Governor

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled *Family Relations Act*, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
February 14, 1972

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 30) intituled *Family Relations Act*, a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.
Report adopted.
Bill introduced and read a first time.
Second reading at the next sitting after today.

On the motion of the Hon. *L. R. Peterson*, Bill (No. 29) intituled *An Act to Amend the Chartered Accountants 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.

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. *Bruch*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

The House proceeded to the Order "Motions and Adjourned Debates on Motions."

On the motion of the Hon. *R. G. Williston*, seconded by the Hon. *C. M. Shelford*, it was *Ordered*—

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

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

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

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

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

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

Bill (No. 9) intituled *British Columbia Railway Act* was read a second time and *Ordered* to be placed on the Orders of the Day for committal at the next sitting after today.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 10) intituled *British Columbia Railway Company Share Capital Purchase Act, 1972*, a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *McGeer*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 11) intituled *An Act to Amend the Pacific Great Eastern Construction Loan Act, 1954*, a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *McGeer*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

4 Mr. *Barrett* asked the Hon. the Premier and President of the Council the following questions:

1. Were any printed copies of the *Budget Speech* for 1971 distributed to other than elected members?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many were so distributed and (b) what was the total cost to the Government of the copies so distributed?

3. Did any source, other than the Government, pay for the printing and (or) distribution of the copies referred to in No. 2?

4. If the answer to No. 3 is yes, (a) who were the organizations and (or) persons concerned and (b) what was the total cost to them of printing and (or) distribution?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. (a) 71,500 and (b) \$30,307.
- "3. No.
- "4. Not applicable."

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

With reference to recipients of social assistance—

1. Were any recipients referred for vocational training or retraining during 1971?
2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many recipients were referred and (b) how many completed training or retraining?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. (a) 1,126 and (b) incomplete figures show approximately 450 completed."

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

With reference to funds received under the Canada Pension Plan—

1. What is the total amount received to date by British Columbia?
2. What are the detailed investments of the money?

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

- "1. \$647,242,000.
- "2. British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority:

Date	Maturity	Percentage Rate	Amount \$
March 1, 1967	February 1, 1987	5.46	80,396,000
May 1, 1968	February 1, 1988	5.71	95,001,000
May 1, 1969	February 3, 1989	6.68	65,862,000
May 1, 1970	September 2, 1989	7.32	68,396,000
May 1, 1971	March 2, 1991	7.77	110,949,000
April 7, 1971	April 7, 1991	6.90	10,000,000
April 8, 1971	April 8, 1991	6.90	5,074,000
May 6, 1971	May 6, 1991	6.83	10,000,000
May 10, 1971	May 10, 1991	6.83	6,098,000
June 1, 1971	June 1, 1991	7.08	7,879,000
June 1, 1971	June 1, 1991	7.08	188,000
June 10, 1971	June 10, 1991	7.08	10,000,000
July 2, 1971	July 2, 1991	7.26	10,000,000
July 5, 1971	July 5, 1991	7.26	2,664,000
August 3, 1971	August 3, 1991	7.41	10,000,000
August 4, 1971	August 4, 1991	7.41	1,150,000
September 9, 1971	September 9, 1991	7.54	10,000,000
September 10, 1971	September 10, 1991	7.54	792,000
October 7, 1971	October 7, 1991	7.25	5,206,000
October 7, 1971	October 7, 1991	7.25	2,733,000
December 9, 1971	December 9, 1991	6.93	6,114,000
January 4, 1972	January 4, 1992	6.76	4,391,000

“British Columbia School Districts Capital Financing Authority:

Date	Maturity	Percentage Rate	Amount \$
May 1, 1968	May 1, 1988	6.61	5,000,000
August 5, 1968	August 5, 1988	6.66	5,271,000
October 1, 1968	October 1, 1988	6.40	10,112,000
January 2, 1969	January 2, 1989	6.92	4,035,000
June 2, 1969	June 2, 1989	7.26	4,264,000
October 1, 1969	October 1, 1989	7.60	4,916,000
November 3, 1969	November 3, 1989	7.94	5,367,000
December 8, 1969	December 8, 1989	7.83	6,468,000
January 5, 1970	January 5, 1990	8.17	6,391,000
February 2, 1970	February 2, 1990	8.33	3,094,000
March 3, 1970	March 3, 1990	8.29	10,319,000
April 1, 1970	April 1, 1990	8.14	3,155,000
May 1, 1970	May 1, 1990	7.85	6,000,000
November 10, 1971	November 10, 1991	7.14	9,101,000

“British Columbia Regional Hospital Districts Financing Authority:

August 5, 1968	August 5, 1988	6.66	5,000,000
November 4, 1968	November 4, 1988	6.62	7,936,000
January 2, 1969	January 2, 1989	6.92	4,000,000
June 2, 1969	June 2, 1989	7.26	5,000,000
October 1, 1969	October 1, 1989	7.60	4,920,000
November 3, 1969	November 3, 1989	7.94	3,000,000
February 2, 1970	February 2, 1990	8.33	3,000,000
March 3, 1970	March 3, 1990	8.29	3,000,000
April 1, 1970	April 1, 1990	8.14	5,000,000”

9 Mr. *Strachan* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:

In each school district in the Province which has rural components, what were the total sums collectable under the *Public Schools Act* in each rural component for the school budget year of 1971?

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

“Total sums collectable under the *Public Schools Act* were as follows:

Unorganized Rural Component of School District	1971 School Requisition \$	Unorganized Rural Component of School District	1971 School Requisition \$
No. 1 Fernie	768,509	No. 27 Williams Lake	1,236,890
No. 2 Cranbrook	329,599	No. 28 Quesnel	976,597
No. 3 Kimberley	511,948	No. 29 Lillooet	916,655
No. 4 Windermere	407,454	No. 30 South Cariboo	594,184
No. 7 Nelson	960,146	No. 31 Merritt	421,265
No. 9 Castlegar	432,266	No. 32 Hope	459,154
No. 10 Arrow Lakes	184,844	No. 33 Chilliwack	263,833
No. 11 Trail	711,832	No. 34 Abbotsford	15,768
No. 12 Grand Forks	240,412	No. 36 Surrey	10,523
No. 13 Kettle Valley	176,848	No. 39 Vancouver	338,122
No. 14 Southern Okanagan	486,250	No. 42 Maple Ridge	25,975
No. 15 Penticton	256,415	No. 43 Coquitlam	1,975,361
No. 16 Keremeos	130,018	No. 44 North Vancouver	9,442
No. 17 Princeton	157,570	No. 45 West Vancouver	85,422
No. 18 Golden	187,827	No. 46 Sechelt	1,513,039
No. 19 Revelstoke	337,882	No. 47 Powell River	630,885
No. 22 Vernon	601,925	No. 48 Howe Sound	1,024,199
No. 23 Kelowna	2,689,604	No. 49 Ocean Falls	800,208
No. 24 Kamloops	2,828,794	No. 50 Queen Charlotte	588,715
No. 26 Birch Island	456,736	No. 52 Prince Rupert	258,509

Unorganized Rural Component of School District	1971 School Requisition \$	Unorganized Rural Component of School District	1971 School Requisition \$
No. 54 Smithers	173,798	No. 71 Courtenay	1,445,469
No. 55 Burns Lake	438,249	No. 72 Campbell River	1,192,972
No. 56 Vanderhoof	929,848	No. 75 Mission	204,868
No. 57 Prince George	3,452,770	No. 76 Agassiz	89,807
No. 59 Peace River South	1,143,145	No. 77 Summerland	22,054
No. 60 Peace River North	1,867,805	No. 80 Kitimat	58,700
No. 61 Greater Victoria	263,583	No. 81 Fort Nelson	598,841
No. 62 Sooke	1,512,656	No. 82 Chilcotin	43,422
No. 63 Saanich	55,679	No. 83 Portage Mountain	46,252
No. 64 Gulf Islands	667,451	No. 84 Vancouver Island West	111,850
No. 65 Cowichan	912,691	No. 85 Vancouver Island North	692,363
No. 66 Lake Cowichan	1,216,018	No. 86 Creston-Kaslo	597,072
No. 67 Ladysmith	245,452	No. 87 Stikine	199,727
No. 68 Nanaimo	3,547,176	No. 88 Skeena Cassiar	735,768
No. 69 Qualicum	654,274	No. 89 Shuswap	836,263
No. 70 Alberni	1,188,297		

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

1. Does the Province of British Columbia hold any shares in the Bank of British Columbia?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many such shares are owned by the Province and (b) when were such shares acquired?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) As at December 31, 1971, 38,100 nonvotable shares were held by the Minister of Finance as trustee for the Civil Service Superannuation Fund.

"(b) Fiscal year 1968/69, 17,780; fiscal year 1969/70, 11,120; fiscal year 1970/71, 7,300; April 1, 1971, to December 31, 1971, 1,900; total, 38,100."

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

1. Were any bond issues authorized by the Government in 1971 for school construction and, if so, in what total amount?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total amount of those bonds floated, (b) when were they issued, (c) what was the amount of each issue, and (d) what was the interest rate of each issue?

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

"1. Yes, \$51,000,000.

"2. (a), (b), (c), and (d):

Date Issued	Interest Rate	Amount \$
January 15, 1971	7.01%	10,000,000
March 1, 1971	6.79%	3,000,000
March 30, 1971	6.90%	6,000,000
June 15, 1971	7.08%	7,000,000
September 15, 1971	7.54%	10,000,000
November 1, 1971	7.14%	899,000
November 10, 1971	7.14%	9,101,000
December 30, 1971	6.93%	5,000,000
Total amount issued		<u>51,000,000"</u>

12 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:

With reference to the home-acquisition grant—

1. What is the total number of grants made under the Act since its coming into force?
2. How many of these grants were for \$1,000?
3. How many of these grants were for \$500?
4. What is the total amount of money granted under the Act since its inception?

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

- "1. 64,430 grants and 27,450 loans.
- "2. 18,430.
- "3. 46,000.
- "4. \$135,081,000 approved for grants and loans."

18 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following question:

What was the total number of recipients of Supplementary Social Allowances in Surrey as of December 1971?

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

"713."

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

With reference to boards of review under the social assistance regulations—

1. How many applications were received for boards (a) in each month of 1971 and (b) for the complete calendar year of 1971?
2. How many boards were set up in 1971?
3. How many cases were resolved in the applicant's favour during 1971?
4. From what areas of the Province were the applications received and how many cases were resolved in the applicant's favour in each area?

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

"1. (a) January, 3; February, 3; March, *nil*; April, 5; May, 5; June, 9; July, 2; August, 434; September, 6; October, 7; November, 46; December, 11; and (b) 531.

"2. 62.

"3. 50.

"4. Areas of the Province from which applications received are as follows:

	Number of Cases	Number of Cases Resolved in the Applicant's Favour
Abbotsford.....	2	2
Chilliwack.....	4	4
Dawson Creek.....	1	1
Duncan.....	6	6
Grand Forks.....	1	1
Haney.....	2	2
Kelowna.....	1	(1)
Langford.....	1	1
Langley.....	3	2
Mission.....	1	1
Murrayville.....	1	1
Nanaimo.....	1	1

¹ No decision, for further review.

	Number of Cases	Number of Cases Resolved in the Applicant's Favour
Nelson.....	1	1
Port Coquitlam.....	1	1
Prince George.....	8	7
Quesnel.....	2	1
Sechelt.....	1	1
Smithers.....	1	1
Surrey.....	1	1
Terrace.....	2	1
Trail.....	1	1
Vancouver.....	473 ²	1
Vancouver.....	---	2 ³
Vedder Crossing.....	1	---
Victoria.....	10	8
White Rock.....	2	1
White Rock.....	---	1 ⁴
Williams Lake.....	3	3

² Number of applications, August and November, Vancouver City, no further Boards held as appellant's awaiting decision *re* one specific case being appealed in the Courts.

³ Decision pending.

⁴ No decision.

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

Regarding the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement, Surrey—

1. During the year 1971 did any of the employees leave the Service in (a) field staff and (b) office staff?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) how many, (b) for what reasons, and (c) how many were replaced?

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

"1. (a) Yes and (b) not applicable, none employed by the Department.

"2. (a) One social worker, (b) leave of absence to attend university, and (c) one."

22 Mr. McGeer asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:

What were the detailed investments of the following Funds as at December 31, 1971: (a) The Municipal Superannuation Fund, (b) the Civil Service Superannuation Fund, (c) the Provincial Home-acquisition Fund, (d) the Queensborough Bridge Account, (e) the Burrard Inlet (Third Crossing) Fund, (f) the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Superannuation Fund, (g) the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Employees' Superannuation Fund, (h) the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Sinking Fund, (i) the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Sinking Fund, (j) the British Columbia Ferry Authority Sinking Fund, (k) the Teachers' Pensions Fund, (l) the Greater Vancouver Sewerage and Drainage District Sinking Fund, (m) the Centennial Cultural Fund, (n) the Workmen's Compensation Fund, (o) the British Columbia School Districts Capital Financing Authority Sinking Fund, and (p) the Drug, Alcohol, and Cigarette Education, Prevention, and Rehabilitation Fund?

The Hon. the Minister of Finance 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.

32 Mr. *Lorimer* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With reference to the social welfare 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 1970/71?

2. What was the total amount paid by the municipalities in the fiscal year 1970/71?

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

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

"1. 1970/71, \$97,374,696.64.

"2. 1970/71, \$25,109,110.84.

"3. See following table:

Municipality	(a) Amount Paid by the Government During the Fiscal Year 1970/71 \$	(b) Amount Paid by the Individual Municipalities in the Fiscal Year 1970/71 \$
Armstrong.....	94,344.16	24,327.56
Burnaby.....	7,410,515.44	1,910,873.54
Campbell River.....	546,547.76	140,932.66
Castlegar.....	229,178.24	59,095.84
Central Saanich.....	240,822.40	62,098.40
Chilliwack City.....	574,334.96	148,097.86
Chilliwack District.....	1,327,831.20	342,394.20
Comox.....	187,431.28	48,330.98
Coquitlam.....	2,707,002.56	698,026.96
Courtenay.....	387,763.76	99,988.66
Cranbrook.....	553,262.00	142,604.98
Creston.....	195,899.76	50,514.66
Dawson Creek.....	825,279.84	212,806.44
Delta.....	1,367,130.24	352,527.84
Duncan.....	284,421.84	73,340.94
Enderby.....	73,702.24	19,004.84
Esquimalt.....	871,988.80	224,850.80
Fernie.....	187,978.88	48,440.84
Fort St. John.....	511,946.08	132,010.28
Fraser Mills.....	10,850.24	2,797.84
Golden.....	171,354.40	44,185.40
Gold River.....	39,563.68	10,201.88
Grand Forks.....	181,479.84	46,739.64
Greenwood.....	60,271.76	15,541.66
Hope.....	195,039.68	50,292.88
Kamloops.....	1,467,230.32	378,339.62
Kelowna.....	1,125,290.00	290,167.18
Kimberley.....	511,482.96	131,890.86
Kinnaird.....	193,848.80	49,985.80
Kitimat.....	647,838.72	167,051.52
Ladysmith.....	225,605.60	58,174.60
Langley City.....	185,248.00	47,768.00
Langley District.....	1,043,144.72	268,985.02
Maple Ridge.....	1,276,027.92	329,036.22
Matsqui.....	1,069,211.76	275,706.66
Merritt.....	297,720.00	76,770.00
Mission.....	579,760.08	149,496.78
Nanaimo.....	1,004,838.08	259,107.28
Nelson.....	628,784.64	162,138.24
New Westminster.....	2,516,726.40	648,962.40
North Cowichan.....	687,005.44	177,151.04

Municipality	(a) Amount Paid by the Government During the Fiscal Year 1970/71	(b) Amount Paid by the Individual Municipalities in the Fiscal Year 1970/71
	\$	\$
North Saanich.....	191,268.56	49,320.46
North Vancouver City.....	1,776,462.16	458,078.06
North Vancouver District.....	3,183,883.84	820,995.44
Oak Bay.....	1,199,017.68	309,178.38
Penticton.....	1,014,563.60	261,615.10
Port Alberni.....	1,226,474.08	316,258.28
Port Alice.....	65,277.60	17,038.56
Port Coquitlam.....	735,765.36	189,724.26
Port Moody.....	464,509.36	119,778.26
Powell River.....	832,160.48	214,580.68
Prince George.....	1,698,117.52	437,980.22
Prince Rupert.....	971,030.32	250,389.62
Quesnel.....	397,055.84	102,331.96
Revelstoke.....	316,972.56	81,734.46
Richmond.....	3,338,433.60	860,847.60
Rossland.....	282,106.24	72,743.84
Saanich.....	3,893,185.20	1,003,895.70
Salmon Arm.....	317,945.20	81,987.30
Sidney.....	209,396.40	53,994.90
Smithers.....	208,800.96	53,841.36
Squamish.....	328,749.04	84,771.14
Sumas.....	360,241.20	92,891.70
Summerland.....	303,343.60	78,220.10
Surrey.....	5,413,608.16	1,395,951.56
Terrace.....	571,423.92	147,347.22
Trail.....	791,736.72	204,157.02
Vancouver.....	27,150,410.00	7,000,997.50
Vernon.....	765,207.36	197,314.08
Victoria.....	3,801,090.48	980,148.18
West Vancouver.....	2,116,259.92	545,698.22
White Rock.....	515,187.92	132,846.22
Williams Lake.....	239,307.28	61,694.66
	<u>97,374,696.64</u>	<u>25,109,110.84</u>

"NOTE—The total paid by municipalities, \$25,109,110.84, in the fiscal year 1970/71, includes an adjustment for the previous fiscal year."

88 Mr. *Hartley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:

1. Did any farmers in unorganized territory request a deferment until October 31 in the payment of their property taxes?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total number of farmers requesting such deferment and (b) what were the principal reasons stated in such requests for deferment?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. (a) 700 in 1971 and (b) awaiting returns from sales of grain, cattle, or other farm products."

91 Mrs. *Dailly* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following question:

With respect to grants of social assistance made between December 1970 and December 1971, what was the case load and total number of recipients on a monthly basis?

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

“Grants of social assistance, case load, and number of recipients were as follows:

	Social Allowance Case Load	Total Number of Recipients of Social Allowance
December, 1970.....	67,667	146,715
January, 1971.....	67,753	148,560
February.....	64,735	143,169
March.....	65,549	142,114
April.....	64,533	139,672
May.....	63,466	134,480
June.....	63,463	132,055
July.....	60,319	127,968
August.....	60,485	126,278
September.....	58,071	122,885
October.....	55,605	118,158
November.....	56,699	119,719
December.....	(Not yet available)”	

92 Mrs. *Daily* asked the Hon. the Minister of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement the following questions:

With respect to payments of supplementary social assistance—

1. How many persons are in receipt of this allowance?
2. How many persons receive the maximum allowance of \$38.59 and how many receive allowances of \$1 to \$10.99, of \$11 to \$20.99, of \$21 to \$25.99, of \$26 to \$29.99, and of \$30 to \$38.58?

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

“1. There are presently 16,645 persons (old-age security cases) receiving Supplementary Social Allowance.

“2. 1,283; 5,211 receive \$1 to \$10.99; 2,017 receive \$11 to \$20.99; 1,383 receive \$21 to \$25.99; 2,723 receive \$26 to \$29.99; 4,028 receive \$30 to \$38.59; and 1,283 receive \$38.60.”

95 Mr. *Cocke* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:

What were the investments of the Regional Hospital Districts Financing Authority Trust Account as at December 31, 1971?

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

“Nil.”

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

1. Were any persons formally charged in Court with defrauding the Department of Rehabilitation and Social Improvement of Social Allowance payments during 1970/71?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, (a) what was the total amount of money involved, (b) how many persons were charged, and (c) how many persons, if any, were convicted, and what was the total amount of money involved in these cases?

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

“1. Yes, for the calendar year 1971.

“2. (a) \$422,767.86, (b) 528, and (c) 288 and \$152,923.66.”

103 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:

With reference to the payments under the *Federal-Provincial Fiscal Arrangements Act, 1967*—

1. How much money was raised by the Provincial Government as a result of the transfer of tax revenue in the fiscal years 1970/71 and to date in 1971/72?

2. How much did the Federal Government pay to the Province for post-secondary education as a result of its undertaking to make adjustment payments in the fiscal years 1970/71 and to date in 1971/72?

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

“1. 1970/71, \$41,146,193; and 1971/72 (to January 31, 1972), \$38,352,942.

“2. 1970/71, \$15,464,004; and 1971/72 (to January 31, 1972), \$12,288,250.”

112 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to the Stewart-Watson Lake Highway construction contract, Project 2234—

1. When was the contract let?

2. What is the name of the highway construction company under contract?

3. What is the amount of the contract?

4. How many miles of highway are under contract?

5. How many miles of highway were constructed in 1971/72?

6. What was the total amount paid to the contractor for work done in 1971/72?

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

“1. Contract awarded March 18, 1971.

“2. Keen Industries Limited.

“3. \$2,057,505.80.

“4. 11.48 miles.

“5. Approximately 7½ miles.

“6. \$1,671,403.21.”

113 Mr. *Calder* asked the Hon. the Minister of Highways the following questions:

With reference to the Stewart-Watson Lake Highway construction contract, Project 2233—

1. When was the contract let?

2. What is the name of the highway construction company under contract?

3. What is the amount of the contract?

4. How many miles of highway are under contract?

5. How many miles of highway were constructed in 1971/72?

6. What was the total amount paid to the contractor for work done in 1971/72?

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

“1. Awarded May 18, 1971.

“2. Peter Kiewit Sons Company of Canada Limited.

“3. \$2,932,305.

"4. 16.33 miles.

"5. Approximately 5½ miles.

"6. \$1,537,437.50 (includes substructure and erection of the steel for the Bell-Irving Bridge No. 2)."

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 15, 1972

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. *D. L. Brothers*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

1. Is everyone applying for a licence to hunt or carry firearms required to take the hunter training course examination?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is negative, what class of person or persons are exempt from taking the course?

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

"1. No.

"2. All persons except first-time applicants for a hunting licence 14 years and older and first-time applicants for a firearms licence between ages 14 and 18, but this will not be Province-wide initially and will be phased in as sufficient instructors become available in the various regions of the Province."

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

And then the House adjourned at 9.50 p.m.

Wednesday, February 16, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *M. Henderson*.

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. *W. McT. Skillings*, on behalf of the Hon. *R. R. Loffmark*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

On the motion of the Hon. *W. A. C. Bennett*, the House proceeded to the Order "Public Bills in the Hands of Private Members."

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 2) intituled *An Act to Amend the Administration Act*, a debate arose.

By leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Macdonald*, Bill (No. 2) was withdrawn.

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

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 12) intituled *An Act to Amend the British Columbia Hydro and Power Authority Act, 1964*, a debate arose, which was, by leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *Nimsick*, 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 5.54 p.m.

Thursday, February 17, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *G. L. Braun*.

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. *W. K. Kiernan*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

65 Mr. *Hall* asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following questions:

With reference to the *Privacy Act*—

1. Since the coming into force of the *Privacy Act* have any actions been brought in the Courts of the Province founded on a right of action for a violation of privacy or the unauthorized use of the name or portrait of another?

2. If the answer to No. 1 is yes, how many such actions were brought and what was the result in each case?

The Hon. *L. R. Peterson* replied as follows:

“1. Yes.

“2. Three: In the Victoria Registry, No. 52/69, *Davis versus McArthur*, commenced January 31, 1969, in the Supreme Court the plaintiff was awarded damages in the amount of \$1,000, the judgment was appealed and the Court of Appeal allowed the appeal and the action was dismissed; in the Vancouver Registry, No. 1822/69, *Dora Allen versus Otto Remig*, commenced May 9, 1969, action was dismissed by consent on December 10, 1970; in the Chilliwack Registry, No. 6/72, *Edward George Yorke versus Robert J. Smith and Greenbay Exploration & Mining Co. Ltd.*, commenced January 13, 1972, action discontinued on February 4, 1972.

“NOTE—The answer for Vancouver may not be complete without checking each writ issued since the Act came into force.”

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

And then the House adjourned at 5.55 p.m.

Thursday, February 17, 1972

EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

On the motion of Mr. *Dowding*, Bill (No. 38) intituled *An Act to Amend the Rent-control 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.

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. *Brousson*, 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 11.16 p.m.

Friday, February 18, 1972

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by the Rev. *John Francis*.

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

JOHN R. NICHOLSON
Lieutenant-Governor

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled *Elderly Citizen Renters Grant Act*, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
February 18, 1972

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 39) intituled *Elderly Citizen Renters Grant Act*, a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.

Report adopted.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading at the next sitting after today.

On the motion of Mr. *Macdonald*, Bill (No. 41) intituled *An Act to Provide for Public Scrutiny* 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.

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 House divided.

Motion agreed to on the following division:

YEAS—35

Messieurs

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

NAYS—16

Messieurs

Brousson
Wallace
Cocke
Hartley

Lorimer
Hall
Williams, R. A.
Calder

Clark
McGeer
Macdonald
Strachan

Dowding
Nimsick
Barrett
Daily, Mrs.

PAIR:

*Messieurs**Chabot**Gardom*

(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.

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

On the motion for the second reading of Bill (No. 3) intituled *An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act* a debate arose, which was, on the motion of the Hon. *D. L. Brothers*, adjourned to the next sitting of the House.

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

JOHN R. NICHOLSON
Lieutenant-Governor

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled *An Act to Amend the Constitution Act*, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
February 18, 1972

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 37) intituled *An Act to Amend the Constitution Act*, a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.
Report adopted.
Bill introduced and read a first time.
Second reading at the next sitting after today.

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 5.45 p.m.