

The following electronic version is for informational purposes only.
The printed version remains the official version.

Official Report of
DEBATES OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
(Hansard)

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1974

Night Sitting

[[Page 4945](#)]

CONTENTS

Night sitting

Routine proceedings

Statute Law Amendment Act (1974) No. 2 (Bill 178) Second reading.

Amendment to section 1.

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [4945](#)
Mr. Smith — [4945](#)
Mr. L.A. Williams — [4947](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [4950](#)
Mr. Gardom — [4952](#)
Mr. D.A. Anderson — [4954](#)

Timber Products Stabilization Act (Bill 171). Committee stage.

Amendment to section 1.

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [4957](#)
Mr. Bennett — [4957](#)
Hon. R.A. Williams — [4958](#)
Mr. L.A. Williams — [4958](#)
Mr. Smith — [4959](#)
Mr. Wallace — [4960](#)
Mr. Gibson — [4962](#)
Mr. Phillips — [4962](#)
Mr. Gardom — [4964](#)
Mrs. Jordan — [4965](#)
Mr. Chabot — [4966](#)
Hon. R.A. Williams — [4967](#)
Mr. Bennett — [4967](#)

On section 1.

Mr. Bennett — [4967](#)
Mr. Gibson — [4968](#)

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 21, 1974

The House met at 8 p.m.

Mr. Speaker: Hon. Members, at the close, prior to 6 p.m., we had a little difficulty over the question of amendments by message to a bill which was a message bill. I just want to say that the confusion really developed because of the practice of the past of matters that were first introduced by message going to a Committee of the Whole House at the time of the first reading.

When it comes to amendments, there really is no need for leave to be asked or sought, although that practice has, by a courtesy, been used for many years. Actually the matter simply moved into the charge of the committee having in charge the bill by the Minister concerned moving that the message and the amendments accompanying the same be referred to the committee of the House having in charge the bill. So all of this contretemps might have been avoided if we had all taken a look at the original practice.

In any event — I will certainly advise the other Ministers. I see that the Hon. Member for Boundary-Similkameen (Mr. Richter) agrees with me on that point, for which I thank him.

Mr. L.A. Williams (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Speaker, on that very point, I'm pleased that your Honour has recalled what the practice of this House is. I think it is important that we recognize from time to time just what our usages are, and anything that can be done to remind us of that matter must be a step in the right direction. I know that your Honour would wish to ensure that all of the practices of this House be carried on in accordance with traditions of parliament, which you will always sustain.

Mr. Speaker: Thank you for the words. I hope I can remember that, but I sometimes suffer from amnesia. (Laughter.)

Orders of the day.

Hon. E.E. Dailly (Minister of Education): Public bills and orders. Committee on Bill 178, Mr. Speaker.

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT ACT (1974) NO. 2

(continued)

The House in committee on Bill 178; Mr. Dent in the chair.

On section 1 *(continued)*.

Hon. R.M. Strachan (Minister of Transport and Communications): When we were discussing this previously, Members of the opposition were urging me to accept a specific amendment suggested by them. Inherent in their suggestions were that perhaps this section would not be implemented. I think we would not have introduced this legislation had we not had the fullest intention of implementing it. If we haven't moved by the next session to implement this legislation certainly....

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Hon. Mr. Strachan: ...the government, and I personally, would be in a position where I could be roundly

hammered by the opposition. But we would not have introduced it had we not intended to implement it.

Interjections.

An. Hon. Member: People of little faith!

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order!

Hon. Mr. Strachan: I repeat what I have already said: we are accepting responsibility for every just claim. We will not put the claimants through the courts. We will move immediately we are given the authority to settle these claims. As I have already pointed out, until we have this authority — despite the fact it's not our responsibility but that of the private companies — we can't move.

I gave these suggestions a lot of thought. I gave them a lot of thought. I know, and my legal friends across the way know, that every word has weight in legislation when that legislation gets before the courts.

I think it was the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) who said: "Don't leave these people suffering while the government is fighting with the private insurance companies." That's why we're bringing this legislation in — so that people will not be left to suffer while we try to get the insurance companies to accept their responsibility. I know the weight of every word. I don't want to accept this amendment, because it might jeopardize our ability to follow through on that section which allows us to collect from the responsible insurance company.

Mr. D.E. Smith (North Peace River): We listened to a very, very weak speech by the Minister. It was touching. It got right to us; it grabbed us right by the heart, but there was no commitment. No commitment. What is wrong or what is offensive about the word that would involve or infuse into this

[[Page 4946](#)]

particular section "shall?" What is wrong with a word that would put a requirement on behalf of the government rather than an election on their part? What is wrong with that, Mr. Minister? What's wrong with that?

If you have listened to the debate this afternoon, you will realize that the people who are involved in this are the ones who are caught in between. They're caught in between by this particular section of the bill, because they don't know whether they're fish or fowl; they don't know whether you're going to deal fairly with them or not. If you are as concerned as you say you are, then you'll write it into the statute before us tonight. You'll write in into the statute.

For too long we've listened to the NDP and their platitudes on how they cared about people. Then we saw the type of legislation you've brought into this House since you've become government. You know, it's nice to say: "We believe in protecting the little people; we really care." But until such time as you're forced to it, you say it out of one side of your mouth and you turn around and direct your legislation in the opposite direction. That's why we want a guarantee written into this. We want a guarantee, Ever since this Minister has been appointed to the office he now holds we've listened to platitudes; we've listened to promises; we've listened to the Minister waffle on issues that were vital to the public of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to keep his remarks strictly relevant to the section before us.

Mr. Smith: Perhaps it would be well if the Chairman listened to the debate that has taken place. The debate up to this point on this particular subject has been one of accepting an amendment from the opposition. Now if they don't want to accept an amendment, if the Minister is a little embarrassed to accept an amendment from the opposition, all he has to do is put in his own amendment. Put it in then. Write it into the statute that's before us tonight. Let the little people who are involved and who are caught in a crunch in this situation know that if they have a legitimate cause, if they have a legitimate claim, they'll be looked after.

Hon. Mr. Strachan: You just want to get the private insurance companies off the hook; that's all you're after.

Mr. Smith: I'll tell you this: the private insurance companies in this particular instance have kept faith far more than the Minister has kept faith with the people of this province, because they have been prepared to accept legitimate claims, even though they were forced out of business by the NDP in this province. They've kept their faith. Now we suggest to the Minister that he try to keep his.

Now we suggest to the Minister that he try to keep his faith by inserting two little words which say that you can believe in the small people in the Province of British Columbia, and are prepared to examine any claim put before you on a legitimate basis and see that these small people will not be hurt. That's all that's been asked.

Interjection.

Mr. Smith: I don't intend to ask a question 67 times this evening, Mr. Minister.

Mr. D.A. Anderson (Victoria): Don't tempt him.

Mr. Smith: Is that a challenge?

Interjection.

Mr. Smith: I didn't even expect to see you in the House tonight....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Smith: ...after that 180-degree turn earlier this evening.

Mr. Chairman: Order, Please. Would the Hon. Member please address himself to the section before us?

Mr. Smith: Thank you.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Smith: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The Minister's responsible for the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, all he has to do is say...but he has to do more than say; he has to write into this particular section....

Hon. Mr. Strachan: I've already said it.

Mr. Smith: The fact of the matter, Mr. Minister, is that because of past experience those people who may be involved in this particular situation do not believe you. They've seen too many things happen as a result of Ministers saying one thing and doing another since the NDP came to office.

If you are really concerned about the 100-odd people who will be involved in this particular situation, all you have to do is write two little words into this section of the bill, or accept an amendment,

[[Page 4947](#)]

or propose it yourself. It's not difficult; it's not copping out. All it's doing is fulfilling an obligation that you now have to the people of British Columbia.

Believe me, that obligation became yours the day you legislated all other insurance companies out of the auto insurance business in the Province of British Columbia. Even though they carry on a commitment beyond that point in good faith, you now have an obligation. And if you are prepared to do the same thing that the private insurance

companies did in the past, you will devote 3 per cent of the funds that are presently paid into ICBC into a fund that can pay for these sort of things.

Hon. Mr. Strachan: We do.

Mr. Smith: Then go ahead and recognize the legitimate claims. After all, they've paid far beyond the time they were in business in British Columbia, and now you pick up the tab.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Interjections.

Mr. Smith: That's right. Do a fleet-foot, Mr. Minister, and get lost.

Mr. Chairman: Order! Would the Hon. Member address himself to the section, please?

Mr. Smith: Thank you. I'm trying, Mr. Chairman.

There is nothing quite as revealing as to the true policy of this government as this particular section. It's very obvious now, and it must be obvious to all of the people of British Columbia, that what the NDP says and what they are prepared to do are two different things. All you have to do is accept a very small amendment.

You know, if the Minister of Mines and Petroleum Resources (Hon. Mr. Nimsick) was on this side of the House tonight, he'd be up screaming his head off for exactly the same things I'm asking for, Mr. Chairman.

An. Hon. Member: You'd say that about W.C.B. — the same argument with W.C.B.

Mr. Smith: You'd be up making a very forceful case for exactly the same thing that I'm asking for this evening on behalf of people who are caught in a crunch — not because of their fault, but because of a transition that took place in the Province of British Columbia, orchestrated by the NDP. Now let's see the NDP prove to the people of British Columbia that they really do care for the individuals, for the little people.

In short, Mr. Chairman, it's time the government put their money where their mouth is, and did something for the...

An. Hon. Member: Our money where their mouth is.

Mr. Smith: Their money? That's incorrect; it's our money — the taxpayers' money.

Mr. D.M. Phillips (South Peace River): What about their false advertising?

Mr. Smith: If this corporation, which was a monopoly in the Province of British Columbia, can spend millions of dollars on computers which do not work, which they have to discard, then they can put up a little bit of the money of the people of the Province of British Columbia, which they have taken from them in premiums, to guarantee that the people who are caught in this crunch will not be hurt by the fact that the government can chose as to whether they accept a claim, or whether they do not. Write it into this section of the bill, and let people know once and for all where you stand.

Mr. L.A. Williams (West Vancouver–Howe Sound): Mr. Chairman, I think the Members of the committee should very carefully consider what it is that we are doing here this evening. We are sitting as a committee of the Legislature of this Province; we are not in a cabinet meeting to decide what government Ministers may or may not deem as appropriate, but what the Legislature of British Columbia should pass in the way of its laws.

The Hon. Minister of Transportation and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan), earlier this afternoon gave a

clear and accurate dissertation on what the situation was that led up to the debate we are having tonight with regard to the establishment of the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund, the consequences of the enactment of the automobile insurance legislation and the commencement of the operations of the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. I would hope that we could continue this debate in a manner that would cast more light upon the subject than heat, as the case has been too often heretofore.

If I have been involved in the heat, then I apologize to the committee for that.

Mr. Chairman, we have here a case where by reason of legislation passed by this House — not introduced by this government but by the previous government, but nonetheless legislation passed by this House — the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund has been brought into being; and under the laws of the Motor-Vehicle Act, the Traffic Victims Indemnity

[[Page 4948](#)]

Fund has disappeared, as of November 10, 1973.

As a consequence of the legislation in this province, we have 125, or so, individuals who find themselves at the moment without a clear right to relief which the legislation passed by the House was intended to provide for them. These are people who have sustained injuries in motor vehicle accidents resulting either from hit-and-run accidents, or from accidents caused by people who were uninsured. The legislation, going back from 1957 in this province, has provided that those individuals who suffer loss as a result of incidents of that nature should be entitled to compensation.

There are 125-odd individuals, as I say, who find themselves by reason, perhaps, of the inadequacy of the legislation unable to obtain prompt redress for their loss. That is what we are talking about.

I'm not concerned with what the rights of the private insurers might be in this matter. It may be that the position they take is a proper one in law. I'm not concerned with what the position of what ICBC may be — at the moment its position is unquestionably right in law. It has no responsibility, and these injured people can make no proper claim on that corporation at this time.

It may be because of a hiatus in our legislation, it may be because of inadequacies in the agreements, which over the years were entered into between the Attorney-General on the part of the Province of British Columbia and the private insurers, that these people had been left out. If that is the case, then I think it is the responsibility of the people of British Columbia to ensure that those 125 to 130 individuals do not suffer loss because of the failure of the Legislature or of Members of the government to deal properly with their responsibility.

If indeed, Mr. Chairman, it is truly the responsibility of the private insurers who were members of the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund to contribute the moneys which are required to compensate these individuals, then, by all means, this Legislature and this government should support any action required to ensure that those private insurers properly pay the amount which is due from them. There's no question about that at all.

But what we have before us is an amendment to legislation which would authorize but not direct, to make it permissive but not mandatory that the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia carry out this responsibility to these individuals.

Earlier in the past week, the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) posed a question to the Attorney-General as to whether or not he would give his assurance that, because the responsibility fell within the jurisdiction of his department, these individuals would be compensated. The Hon. Attorney-General in response to that question said that he could not give such assurance, and I think the Members of this House can recognize why he could not.

But, Mr. Chairman, equally the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan), who has the responsibility of administering the affairs of ICBC so far as this House is concerned, cannot give that assurance to

this House. He cannot control the destiny of ICBC. It is a corporation; it must act in accordance with the decisions of its board of directors. The Hon. Minister cannot give us the assurance, and, indeed, it is inappropriate for this House and this committee to demand of that Minister assurances which he cannot give.

But we as the Legislature of British Columbia are entitled to tell our Crown corporation what its position should be in this matter. And that's what we're asking tonight.

Now, are we asking so much? When we passed the automobile insurance legislation, which is the law in this province today, and when the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia was incorporated by this Legislature....

An. Hon. Member: Did you vote for it?

Mr. L.A. Williams: No, I didn't vote for it. I don't know why the Minister raises that question. It is the law. When we passed that legislation, it became the law of the Province of British Columbia.

From March 1, 1974, any individual in this province who suffered injury as the result of a hit-and-run accident or who suffered injuries as a result of the operation of a motor vehicle by a person who was uninsured would be compensated, without question, for the amount of his claim by the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia. It was mandatory on the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia that they compensate that individual for that loss.

Now, all we are saying at this particular time from the opposition side — because it is out of order under the rules of this House that an amendment from us be debated on the floor of this House — is that the Minister whose responsibility it is should place before this committee an amendment which will give these 125 or 130 individuals the same right which this Legislature has given to everyone else in this province — that they shall be compensated for their loss as the result of injuries sustained in accidents with a hit-and-run driver or with an operator of a motor vehicle who is uninsured.

It is suggested by the Minister of Transport and Communications in his remarks earlier today that there is a question as to whether or not these claims are appropriate or not. We don't quarrel with that part of the amendment which is before us, because all that they are giving to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia is the obligation and the right to

[[Page 4949](#)]

carry out the responsibilities which heretofore were undertaken by the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund.

Now I urge all Members, if they haven't taken the time up until now, to look at the responsibilities of the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund. Those responsibilities are two in number.

First of all, it is the responsibility of the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund to pay any judgment obtained in the courts of British Columbia. So all we're saying to ICBC, then, is: "Please assume the responsibility to pay a judgment which has been rendered in the courts of this province."

Interjections.

Mr. L.A. Williams: That's all that we're asking the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia to do — undertake as an obligation the payment of a judgment obtained in the courts of this province by a person struck down by a hit-and-run driver or by an uninsured motorist.

The second obligation of the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund, which we're asking ICBC to assume, is to pay any settlement properly arrived at in respect of the injuries of a person who has been struck down by a hit-and-run driver or an uninsured motorist.

You might say that in that settlement provision there is a possibility for great abuse. But, Mr. Chairman, if you look at the legislation which governs settlements under Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund, no such settlement was

a proper charge against that fund unless the settlement was concluded with the knowledge and approval of the Attorney-General of this province. So the other thing we're asking ICBC to do, with respect to these 125 individuals, is: "Please pay any settlements of claims they have for personal injuries sustained in an accident with a hit-and-run driver or an uninsured motorist if that settlement has been approved by the Attorney-General or a member of his staff."

Now, are we asking ICBC to do so much? Indeed, all we are asking ICBC to do is to extend to these 125 to 130 individuals the same rights that are extended under the laws passed here which established ICBC and the automobile insurance plan.

In addition, with this bill which is before us, we are saying to ICBC: "If any amount of money paid by you as a result of the obligations which we are casting upon you with this legislation is recoverable from those private insurers who formerly made up the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund, then you have the full authority to proceed against those companies and recoup those moneys." If, on the other hand, the legislation of this province was ineffective for that purpose, then it is the responsibility of the province to share whatever the loss might be.

What I would like to say to the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) who seems to find this debate so amusing, and to the Hon. Member for Comox (Ms. Sanford) who appears to find this debate so amusing, is that all we are trying to do is to say to these 125 or 130 people, who through no fault of their own find themselves without relief, that they be given that relief by the Legislature of the Province of British Columbia as a matter of right in the same way as if they had suffered such injuries after March 1, 1974. We are saying at the same time to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia: "You have the full authority of this Legislature to pursue those private insurers and to recover from them any amount which they were obliged to pay."

We are therefore saying to these unfortunate people: "We will ensure that you suffer no loss, and we will also remove from you the burden of chasing the private insurers or ICBC or anybody else."

There is one very important matter to recall, Mr. Chairman. It just may be that the private insurers are right. It just may be that there is no obligation on them to pay any claim of which they did not have notice on or after November 11, 1973.

Now, if that is the case, then the people who fall into that category are suffering loss which is beyond recovery as a result of a failure of this Legislature and the Government of British Columbia to take certain circumstances into account. We're only asking that that situation be settled in such a way so that result can never occur.

If indeed it is the fact that the insurance companies are right and that they have no obligation to pay, if indeed it is not the responsibility of ICBC to pay this money because it didn't come into existence until March 1, 1974, then I suggest that the failure of the government and of this Legislature to take these circumstances into account is such that the people of the Province of British Columbia should make up out of consolidated revenue whatever fund is required to ensure that these people suffer no loss. No question about that.

The Hon. Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan), as I expected he would, has indicated by his nod and comment that he agrees with what I say. But I ask the Minister also to agree that we as a Legislature should place this obligation as a mandatory obligation on ICBC.

An. Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. L.A. Williams: It then removes from that Minister any obligation to go to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia and say to them: "You've now got the authority; please do this" — interfere with their business. Since we as a Legislature may have been responsible for inadequacy in legislation, then we as a Legislature should speak positively to the people of British Columbia and to

ICBC and say: "This is what we want you to do. You must do it. There's no decision for you to make; we're taking that decision off your shoulders."

And I say to you, Mr. Chairman, that if the settlement or payment of these claims comes to a figure of \$5 million, as has been suggested, this should not be a claim against ICBC and its normal sources of revenue; it should be a claim against the consolidated revenue fund of this province. It should not figure in any profit or loss of ICBC.

If they can't recover from the private insurers following proper proceedings in court, if the TVIF is truly excused from making this payment, then the consolidated revenue of this province should make up the fund necessary to pay these moneys. It has been the fault of this Legislature — not of the Members who sit here today but of Members who have sat in past parliaments — which has brought this about.

We should remove this particular problem — the solution of the difficulties of these 125 or 130 people — from the shoulders of this government, from the shoulders of this Legislature, from the shoulders of that Minister, from the shoulders of the Attorney-General (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), from the shoulders of the directors of ICBC, and say to these people: "We will pay your claims out of judgments that you have recovered in the courts of this province and of settlements which you have made which have been approved by the Attorney-General. We will cast no obligation on anyone if these moneys cannot be recovered from the insurance companies who form part of TVIF."

It should not be left to that Minister of Transport and Communications to walk out of this House and go to the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia to interfere with decisions which it should make. We should remove that burden from that Minister. There has been too much criticism of him and of ICBC for matters which are not within their responsibility. Those matters rest squarely within the responsibility of this Legislature and it is up to each Member of this House to assume that burden and to encourage the government to make this obligation on ICBC mandatory. If any criticism is to be levied for that Act, then this Legislature should assume that criticism and all other individuals should be excused.

The consequence of this, Mr. Chairman, I suggest to you, is that these unfortunate people injured as a result of no fault of their own will receive their proper compensation. The people who should properly provide the funded money, be it the private insurers or the people of British Columbia, will have paid that fund and will have fulfilled that obligation. There will be no room for any Member of this opposition, of this Legislature or any person in this Province of British Columbia to point the finger at the government, at ICBC or at the Minister for having carried out that responsibility.

We are in this position because of the laws of, this province, and it is through the laws of the province that we should extricate ourselves.

Mrs. P.J. Jordan (North Okanagan): Mr. Chairman, I appreciate this opportunity to speak. I would like to leave it to the lawyers who speak in the legalistic terms that they do so well. But I would like to comment on some, what seem to me, very obvious points in this whole debate and, in particular, in relation to the plight of these 125-odd people, and maybe some more, whom we're talking about.

The first thing that's impressive is that the Minister comes into the House and, after he listens to the debate for a while, comes on strong and calm, and almost has everyone reduced to tears about what he is going to do in processing each of these particular cases.

And the former speaker has spoken very eloquently on the improper position the Minister places himself in that regard.

But one would almost have been inclined to believe the Minister and to have been able to have confidence in him when he wound up with his usual, "Trust us." It's not in legislation, but "trust us". This is just another "trust us" attitude that we see repeated day after day, legislation after legislation, as discussion goes on in this House.

The fortunate thing is that most people, once bitten, are twice shy. This Minister among all the Ministers is probably the last one who should be standing up in this House and saying "Don't read what's in the legislation; listen

to what I say I'm going to do. And trust us." One might almost have been inclined to take him at his word if, in his presentations on three occasions now in this debate, he hadn't spent so much time protecting his own hide by sly digs here at this company and sly digs there, slowly waxing the whole problem in which these people find themselves and the whole problem of ICBC, around those much-discredited companies that he likes to talk about.

After all, Mr. Chairman, it was this Minister and this government that pulled the table out from under these people.

Some Hon. Members: Come on!

Mrs. Jordan: They're the ones that left them sandwiched between big government and big law and big companies. It's this government that has left them in a position where they don't know and can't really prove what their rights are, not only in terms of the law and the cost of trying to do this through the law, and the remoteness of trying to act through the courts on such an issue, but the fact that they themselves in many instances are physically handicapped and suffering long-term complications

[[Page 4951](#)]

from their accidents.

The Minister got up and said: "Those companies — they didn't even tell me what they were going to do." All I have to say about that, Mr. Chairman, is that that makes two of them sitting down at the table and playing games.

It shouldn't really be our concern here as to who's right and who's wrong. We could argue on all night. The important thing is that a vacuum has been created by this government and repercussions have been created by companies because of actions of this government.

It's people who are caught in that vacuum. But I would say that this government created the monopoly situation in British Columbia. It was this government that legislated a sector of the private enterprise system in which these people were involved out of this province. If the government chooses that as its way of operating for the people's benefit, then it must assume the responsibilities that go with that monopoly. One of the responsibilities is the legal and insured protection of the people who are hurt by that legislation.

This, Mr. Minister, is what we're concerned about. Your word is not good enough on the basis of your performance. The word of this government is not good enough on the basis of its performance. Just in this whole issue, it was the Minister of Public Works (Hon. Mr. Hartley) who convinced the people of British Columbia that they would have \$25 auto insurance, and they voted for it and they were stung. It was not true. And in the same way in this section the people of British Columbia and the Members of this Legislature know that this Minister is not performing on the basis of his history since being a Minister, and his words cannot be accepted as fact.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Member that we're not considering the Minister's conduct or his Ministry, but rather we're considering this section under the Act.

Mrs. Jordan: I am making reference to his comments in the debate.

I really wish that the Premier of this Province, that great champion of the little man in British Columbia, were here. I'm sure, on the basis of a presentation and a speech that he made in the community our family lives in, in Vernon, less than a month ago, that he would know what we are talking about on this side of the House, and he would accept or bring in the two little words that we need.

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to tell you about this because it pertains to this section of the Act. The Premier was in Vernon for the opening of what we call Howard House. As the Chairman knows, this is a group of people who work for the benefit of people who have alcoholic problems, who have been in jail and are getting out, and need help in their rehabilitation. At that presentation some of the discussion went around the fact that this Howard House he was opening was an old nurses' residence that had been moved down in pieces to this site. They discussed the problems

of putting that building on the foundation.

Everyone came to the conclusion that no matter how useful the home, it just didn't quite fit. The Premier got up and said how appropriate for Howard House that the building just didn't quite fit, and how it was to serve some very unfortunate people who in life just didn't quite fit. He was right, Mr. Chairman.

The point here is that we're talking about approximately 125 people who just don't quite fit. They don't fit into the plans of this government, and they don't fit into the actions of the insurance company. Surely if tenants and the people who are going to live in Howard House don't quite fit, because of circumstances of nature and human character — and they deserve the money that has been put into this Howard House, and I believe they do, and they deserve the consideration that the Premier gave them on that day, and I hope will in the future, and they do — then surely these people, who just don't quite fit into the machinations of this government and private enterprise and the legislation in this province, deserve equal consideration.

They're not the victims of nature. They're not the victims of their own mismanagement or their own weaknesses. They are victims of man-made problems in terms of mechanical devices, and they are the victims, as I mentioned, of the machinations of this government.

Surely, Mr. Minister, before you leave the House you must recognize their rights, and you must recognize the need for your commitment to protect their rights every bit as much as we would protect any other citizen's rights in this province.

Interjection.

An. Hon. Member: Flippant!

Mrs. Jordan: The Minister has just walked out making a flippant remark, and that's very disappointing, although I must say that it is certainly not unexpected from this Minister.

Interjection.

An. Hon. Member: Typical.

Mrs. Jordan: Extremely typical.

I would recall, Mr. Chairman, in his debate, in his concern for these people and his attacks on the companies....

[[Page 4952](#)]

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. R.T. Cummings (Vancouver–Little Mountain): A point of order.

Mrs. Jordan: I'll have two chocolate and one banana, please.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Cummings: Just make her vaguely touch the subject once every five minutes, please, This is going to drive the Hon. Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) clear out of the House if somebody doesn't bear with him.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

There is no point of order. Would the Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) continue, please?

Mrs. Jordan: I appreciate the Hon. Member's comment. I just hope that one day that Member doesn't find that he just doesn't quite fit.

Interjections.

Mrs. Jordan: Mr. Chairman, as the Minister was talking about his concern for these people, and his attacks on the company, he also between his tears brought out the figure that it might cost \$6 million to meet the commitment the opposition is asking him to. Really, one must ask, what is \$6 million to this government? They're spreading nearly that much in gold filigree around these buildings.

I'm advised that it is only \$1.5 million. That's nothing but coffee money for the welfare and the woods programmes, and that overrun.

Surely for these people who don't quite fit we can afford that amount of money.

Interjection.

Mrs. Jordan: The Hon. Minister for Consumer Services (Hon. Ms. Young) says, "What more do you want? He's giving you his commitment." I find that extraordinary, because that Minister of Consumer Services has been one Minister who has been completely blocked in her Ministerial function by ICBC. She should be championing the rights of these consumers...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mrs. Jordan: ...who would receive the benefit of this amendment. So I would urge you, Mr. Minister...and it now seems confusing who the Minister is we are addressing. It was the Provincial Secretary (Hon. Mr. Hall) who opened the legislation and now it is the Minister of Transport and Communications (Hon. Mr. Strachan) who is carrying it.

I would ask you again: let's get out of the confusion, the red-tape; let's get out of the legality; let's get out of the commas and the dots and the i's and the t's and get down to where it is really at, Mr. Chairman. That is these few people who just don't quite fit. Let's enshrine with two words in this Act nothing more than what they deserve: fair play and fair consideration for fair claims.

Mr. G.B. Gardom (Vancouver–Point Grey): Mr. Chairman, where we're parting company with the Hon. Minister.... In one sense I'm glad that he is out of the room because I feel that several Members of the government side are sympathetic and understanding to the points that are being made by the opposition. What we wish to absolutely ensure in this debate, is to the fact that a person who doesn't have the use of his arms or the use of his legs is not going to have to be put in the position of bringing an action against the insurance corporation and/or an action against the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund for just compensation. We say that those people should be paid as of right, Mr. Chairman, and anything less is heinous treatment for them.

I would like to pay a little regard to some chronology here. This is an article from *The Vancouver Sun* on November 10.

Interjection.

Mr. Gardom: I might have mispronounced a word, Mr. Minister, but that doesn't help their situation one bit. You've the power to do that tonight, Mr. Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King). I'd like to hear you on the point of this rather serious....

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Gardom: We won the point. We said of this rather spurious chit-chat across the floor....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member address the Chair?

Mr. Gardom: November 10, 1973, there's an article in *The Vancouver Sun*:

"The B.C. cabinet has created a fund to cover claims arising from motor vehicle accident where no insurance policy exists. The cabinet order released Friday announced that a previously unproclaimed 25-year-old section of the Motor-Vehicle Act has been brought into effect setting up an unsatisfied judgment fund."

[[Page 4953](#)]

So this is November of 1973: at that point there was a remark from the Hon. Minister complaining about the companies. He stated in this debate that:

"The companies already have collected the money they needed to keep the fund going until March 1, from every vehicle owner who's purchased an insurance policy this year."

Strachan said:

"Every private auto insurance premium includes an additional loading to support the TVIF programme."

The article continues at the end:

"Motor vehicle licence revenues" — speaking under ICBC — "will be tapped to finance the emergency fund to cover the claims for death, injuries and car damage resulting from hit-and-run and other cases not covered by insurance, Strachan's announcement said."

So, Mr. Chairman, let's understand one thing absolutely clearly. In November, 1973, the Minister was 100 per cent and fully aware of the problem that was presenting itself.

Next, a very interesting advertisement. Full-page. *The Vancouver Sun*, March 20, 1974:

" 'You tell us,' says Mr. Norman Bortnick. 'The whole concept behind public auto insurance is the fact that we are responsible to you the public, and in order to do the best job for you we have to know what you are thinking, and in order for us to know what you are thinking, you have to tell us.

'We have very qualified people here to answer your letters, complaints, suggestions and praises. They are the heart of our organization because they tell us what you tell them, and that's when we go into action.' "

And so far the "action" of ICBC on this particular point has been nil.

Carrying on with this advertisement:

"Changing, modifying, adjusting, responding to the needs of British Columbians, that's what public insurance is all about. Public responsibility and responsiveness".

So let us have it. Let us have it.

These people, one of whom is paralyzed totally, another one partially, they read these kind of advertisements, and what are they receiving?

Interjections.

Mr. Gardom: One Member says: "Zilch"; another says: "The back of a hand". They've received so far nothing more than evasion. Here's a letter from Mr. Bortnick in the Insurance Corporation of British Columbia, July 2, 1974, to Mr. K.V. Malthouse of Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund. He says:

"Thank you for your letter of June 13, 1974. I have been unsuccessful in reaching you by telephone, so I thought I should inform you that I have noted your comments in your letter and will be in touch with you further on the matter shortly."

July of 1974 — "shortly". We're debating this today in November 1974. Four months later.

Next, here's a very interesting bit of correspondence from Robert M. Strachan, dated October 8, 1974, to a solicitor who's representing a person who's badly injured. He says:

"Further to our letter of September 26, 1974, I have now had an opportunity to obtain information necessary to reply to your letter of September 19."

This is just a couple of months back.

"It is most unfortunate that the position adopted by the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund has created the situation which you describe. However, I can assure you that discussions are presently in progress between TVIF, its counsel and the department of the Attorney-General.

"It is hoped that some resolution of the present difficulties will soon be achieved, and in the event that there is some assumption of liabilities by the Attorney-General's department, then it may well be that the ICBC will act as agents for the purpose of dealing with claims, such as the one which is the subject matter of this correspondence."

So there's an attempt or indication by the Hon. Robert M. Strachan, Minister of Transport and Communications, to fob off responsibility onto the Attorney-General's Department on October 8, 1974.

Here happens to be a letter to me from a person who's claiming. This is dated November 15, 1974:

"I have been corresponding for some considerable length of time with both TVIF and ICBC, and more recently with the Attorney-General's office in an effort to make some progress."

They couldn't make any progress, Mr. Chairman. The ball was just tossed from one court to the other, meanwhile the people who are entitled to the recoveries are not getting them. They are not getting them.

Now, November 8, 1974, *The Province*: "Crash funds liable, not B.C." that's what Strachan said, November 8. Strachan said: "The private insurance companies, which have bank-rolled the fund, collected premiums until March 1, 1974." They obviously didn't collect...well, maybe they did, I don't know.

This is what he said:

"... collected premiums until March 1, 1974, and part of those premiums should have gone as usual to the fund. This means the fund should

[[Page 4954](#)]

have money in reserve to pay the claims of all persons injured before the November cutoff date."

Mr. Chairman, I wish you to listen very carefully, and particularly all government Members, to this next statement — this is your Minister whom you are supporting in this thing.

" 'The fund has a clear legal responsibility to pay all claims arising out of accidents that occurred before November 10, 1973,' said Strachan.

"He suggested that persons caught in the situation should consult a lawyer to see what action could be taken to recover claims legally due them. The government is not considering any direct action against the fund to try to force it to pay the claims."

That's what he said on November 8 of this year.

Then he comes in the House this afternoon — and you people heard this debate, heard your Minister stand up on his feet and say to the people in this House that we can't pay carte blanche.... These are my words, not his, but this is the impression I received from his remarks, and if anyone else in this House received a different impression from his remarks I'd like you to raise your hand. He said that they can't carte blanche pay everyone that they're asked.

Then I stood up and I made the point: "Mr. Minister," I said, "no one is asking you to do that at all." I said:

"Under your bill as it is phrased, you only have to pay those which you have an obligation to pay" — meaning a legal obligation. And as the Member for West Vancouver–Howe Sound (Mr. L.A. Williams) most eloquently stated tonight, and made it crystal clear to everyone in this chamber, "the injured individual has to prove his claim." But the Minister didn't say that this afternoon. How many times is he going to shift his ground?

If anyone in the House denies, that I said what he said this afternoon, just put your hand up.

An. Hon. Member: Stop the legislation.

Mr. Gardom: Okay, well, that's fine and dandy.

So this is what we're asking and I have appealed to individual Members of the government side who understand the point, but they have stubbornness on the part of the Minister, or something or other. It's preposterous that you cannot bring in this amendment which we're requesting.

For goodness' sake, don't let it continue on a permissive basis. You have a Minister here who has switched ground more than once. Where is he now?

I'll tell you one thing, Mr. Chairman. The Premier of this province would not be out of this House in this kind of a debate — make no mistake of that fact — when there are injured people suffering in this province.

What the devil's going on here? We're just trying to do the fair thing; this never had to be a heated debate!

The amendments were suggested to the government side by side. They could have brought it in. I asked them this afternoon would they hoist it. I'll ask them again tonight: will you please hoist this if you were to caucus on it tomorrow? Hoist this section of this bill; take a look at it tomorrow morning at caucus, and put the word "shall" here. Put the word "shall"...that these people "shall be paid". Let them have that kind of a confidence tonight that you've done the right thing by them. Let right be done. Let right be done.

Mr. Phillips: What about the left?

Mr. Gardom: Well, Mr. Member, your remarks are interesting and you're entitled to them, but they're no help to the injured people.

This isn't a political matter. It's a matter of health; it's a matter of doing the right thing for people. It's a matter of doing the correct and the right thing for injured people. Let them know tomorrow that they can have their judgments and their legal claims paid by the insurance corporation.

Let the insurance corporation, if it chooses and if it has the grounds to do it, take proceedings against Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund. Let that be settled by the tribunal in front of whom it should be properly settled, and those are the courts of this land. But for goodness' sake, let right be done.

It is no use to this debate, if this Minister's carrying the conduct of it, if he's not here.

An. Hon. Member: Where is he?

Mr. Gardom: If the Provincial Secretary is prepared to pull this section tonight and bring in the amendment, he will receive the accolade of the people who are injured. He's not interested whether the opposition supports or doesn't support it. He's a politician. It's not a political issue; it's a blood-and-guts issue. You are doing the wrong thing. You are really doing the wrong thing.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Mr. Chairman, I had hoped that we would not call a vote on this section until the Minister does return, because it would make great sense. I would just like to refer, while we wait for the Minister to return — then I will move an adjournment which I'm sure it will be accepted — to what is really at issue here.

We've had the government time after time, Mr. Chairman, say, "Well, we might do it. Our hearts are

sympathetic. It's possible that we'll help them out. But don't give them a right; let it all be discretionary.

[[Page 4955](#)]

Let it all be the Minister; let it all be the department. Let it all be us telling them what we're going to give them. Let it all be us telling them what we're going to give them. Let it all be them coming to us on bended knee for what we think they should receive by right."

That is the real issue that we have tonight. It's not a question, we feel, for government discretion.

Mr. H.W. Schroeder (Chilliwack): Vote adjournment.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: I will move adjournment, you just hold on.

The question is one of right. I'd like to refer just for a few moments to a parallel which has been raised before. I think it's important because essentially what we are dealing with here is the same as that dealt with on March 5, 1971: it's the willful pride of a Minister refusing to let right be done. It's a very similar case.

Back in 1971, we had the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Barrett) admitting that the case he was bringing up was one where a widow, one Donna Taylor, did not have a legal right, but he felt on grounds of natural justice that she had a right at least to have her case heard. He pointed out at the time — and it's similar in this respect — to the then Attorney-General (Mr. Peterson) that had the Premier been in the House (the Premier of those days being one Bennett) — and I'll quote from the newspapers of the day:

"He was sure, said Barrett, that Premier Bennett would have shown in the same circumstances some compassion in the case."

Now here we have much the same situation. The Premier is away. We have a headstrong, proud Minister who has taken the wrong position, we feel, in this instance.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I think it's improper under the rules of the House to speak personally about a Minister. We're addressing this section of the bill; we're not considering the Minister's estimates or the Minister's....

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Mr. Chairman, I accept your admonition, but we're considering the statements made by the Minister with reference to the attitude he takes towards section 1.

I welcome the Minister back to the House.

We're considering his attitude, because that's the crux of the issue here. We are recommending that rights be given to individuals. We have pointed out that if we accept the Minister's word, as we do, there will be no cost to the Crown, because, of course, any legal recovery that can be made from the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund will be made, as the Minister indicated. There can be no extra cost to the Crown of an amendment putting in the word "shall" in this instance, if we accept, as I said, his word as to what he intends to do.

Now, given that, we have to consider the attitude of the Minister and we have to consider the attitude of the government. We think the attitude is that of a legalistic group who are relying upon details of the law rather than the intent of the law, and who are relying upon discretion of the Minister instead of the right that should be granted to the individuals concerned.

Mr. D.E. Lewis (Shuswap): Who introduced the legislation?

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Who introduced the legislation?

Interjection.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Now you had better check, Mr. Member for Shuswap. You were out of the House for

days on end and you wouldn't vote. That Member there kept raising the issue, the Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom). But you didn't have the guts to come here and vote on the other bill so you didn't hear him.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member address the Chair, please!

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Oh, my apologies, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that this was raised in this House by the Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

An. Hon. Member: He was hiding in the chicken house.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: The Minister introduced an amendment to this bill that we are discussing at the present time.

But the problem we face is this: no rights are given to the individuals concerned, no rights whatsoever, and total discretionary power is kept in the hands of the Minister concerned.

I would like to refer you, Mr. Chairman, to the debate that I mentioned earlier and that has been mentioned a number of times earlier, back in March of 1971. At that time, what was essentially at issue, because there was no legal right involved, was the headstrong attitude and the unfeeling attitude of the Minister (Mr. Peterson) when faced with a case which needed a little compassion and understanding. At that time and in that instance that was the fact which was worked upon and put forth time after time by the then Leader of the Opposition (Hon. Mr. Barrett). We feel he was right to do so and we naturally voted with the opposition at that time.

[[Page 4956](#)]

An. Hon. Member: You weren't here.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: When I say we, I refer to the members of the Liberal Party present that evening.
Interjections.

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Liberals do, Mr. Member, and I refer you again....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member address the Chair, please?

Mr. D.A. Anderson: Mr. Chairman, I refer you again to the reason for this legislation being here. It's here because of the concern expressed by the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey (Mr. Gardom). That's why the legislation is here.

What we ask for is this: we ask that in this instance, the individuals concerned — many of whom are bedridden, others of whom are in wheelchairs — be given a right. If we take the Minister's words at face value, there is no way that to give them that right could cost the Crown a single dollar. It could not happen because, on the one hand, if the Minister's interpretation is right, then the insurance companies involved in the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund will be forced to pay out. The government will have a claim against them and they will be forced to pay out.

But if, on the other hand, the Minister's interpretation of the law is wrong — and it's always conceivable (we know that because of the number of amendments that have been brought in this session in bills which modify other bills passed so far; we know that because of the number of corrections that are incorporated in this omnibus bill that we're discussing tonight) — as it well might be, then the individuals do not have to go to the courts to recover. They can recover by way of right from ICBC.

Everybody in this room knows that we are dealing with essentially a technicality dealing with the time at which an application was put in. It's a question of a date upon which a claim was filed. For people to be denied rights because of a technicality of that nature is simply appalling in my view.

Mr. Chairman, we could go on, as we probably will, unless the government sees the reason and virtue of an amendment such as we have suggested. We could go on for many hours. We may well go on until early in the morning as was the case on March 5, 1971.

But the problem that we have raised is a very straightforward one. We do not deny that the Minister's interpretation of the history may well be correct. No one in the opposition, at least in this party, is denying that. We are simply saying that in a situation such as this, dealing with about 125 to 130 injured individuals who are in the position of having no rights whatsoever because of a technicality, the government — any government with a certain amount of compassion and heart — would grant them the right so that they need not continue as they are at the present time with simply the discretion of the Minister.

Why should they come cap in hand to the Minister when they have been injured through no fault of their own, where the situation has arisen through no fault of the Ministers but because of the introduction of a new scheme of insurance in B.C., tied in with the decision of the previous insurance companies to back out of the TVIF? Had there been no new insurance scheme, we know full well there would have been a substitute to the TVIF. We know full well that one plan would have merged in with the other. But it didn't happen that way, and it's understandable because of the confusion that surrounded the introduction of a new scheme. There is this problem, this hiatus here, this period in which we have these people who did not put in claims by a certain date, who are not covered by the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund or indeed, apparently, by ICBC.

Now what we suggest to the Minister and Hon. Provincial Secretary is to do the just and honourable thing. Don't make these people rely on the largesse of the government or supplicants to the government. Give them the right to have the type of compensation to which they would have been entitled to had the Traffic Victims Indemnity Fund continued or had there been a successive plan introduced.

We could go along at great length upon the parallel of 1971, but essentially the same point was there. The government was taking a legalistic approach which refuses to show compassion. Indeed, in this case, there's a great deal more reason for it than there was in the case in 1971 where there was obviously, as admitted by the former Leader of the Opposition, (Hon. Mr. Barrett) no legal right involved under the law.

We feel that the same compassionate approach should be adopted as was put forward by the Leader of the Opposition at that time. There are not many people.

I would suggest, in the interests of the government sleeping on the problem, examining the difficulties, considering the many quotations that are present from 1971 which well might come back to haunt them if this debate continues, that they reconsider section 1. I would therefore move adjournment of this debate.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

[[Page 4957](#)]

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: Order, please.

Mr. Speaker rises.

Mr. Speaker: If the House does not come to order I have to name somebody for all this noise. I called for order and the Speaker is on his feet. I'm looking at both of you. Very difficult.

Interjections.

Mr. Speaker: I don't need any more suggestions now. Let's get on with the business.

Mr. Speaker resumes his seat.

Mr. Chairman: Mr. Speaker, the committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly: Committee on Bill 171, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections.

TIMBER PRODUCTS STABILIZATION ACT

Hon. Mrs. Dailly: I want to inform the House that the Minister is available. If you are ready to start off your debate on the clauses, he will be here.

The House in committee on Bill 171; Mr. Dent in the chair.

On section 1.

Hon. Mr. Strachan: I move the amendment to section 1 standing in the name of the Minister on the order paper.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. W.R. Bennett (Leader of the Opposition): Mr. Chairman, I wondered if I was less recognized, or did you recognize the Minister of Transport a moment ago? He made a motion.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: The Hon. Minister of Transport and Communications moved the amendment on behalf of the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources (Hon. R.A. Williams).

An. Hon. Member: Fumble — bumble!

Mr. Bennett: Now that the Minister has returned and wishes to speak to his amendment.

Mr. Phillips: What utter chaos!

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Chairman, here we have an amendment that deals with a principle that we brought out and which we said was the government attempting to take over the forest industry. They've taken powers far beyond the true intent of what the Minister said this Act was all about.

He talked about this being a simple little wood chip bill. We pointed out quite strongly in second reading that indeed the powers he'd taken, through the definitions of this Act, of forest products, the definitions he'd taken in the type of powers and products he can control, were completely at odds and completely foreign to the simple little chip bill that he represented to this House. Indeed Mr. Chairman, they are powers far beyond the necessities of a simple chip bill — far beyond the powers needed to bring stabilization to the chip industry.

The fact that the Minister brings in this amendment at this particular time gives some credence and credibility to the opposition, who suggested that perhaps the true intent of this bill was....

Interjections.

Mr. Bennett: We pointed out to the Minister in second reading that the powers they'd taken in the broad

definition were excessive to the intent he had expressed. Again, I would suggest that it gives credence to the argument that really this government dragged their feet for nine months to allow the industry to fall into economic chaos, to allow unemployment to develop....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Leader of the Opposition standing order 61, part 2, which requires strict relevance to the section under consideration.

Mr. Bennett: I'm talking about the definition. That definition and these arguments relate to the arguments we gave in second reading of this definition being too broad, and the fact that the Minister's made an adjustment. I think we should have the opportunity to restate those arguments that brought about the back-up from the flip-flop Minister, the back-up that this Minister has done, the fact that this Minister has been forced to back off from the true intent. That is that he waited nine months and let the industry decline and let unemployment develop in this province to try to

[[Page 4958](#)]

create an excuse to bring in a bill that was excessive to his needs, to grant power excessive to his needs.

The fact that this Minister failed should not go unnoticed in this committee, in this Legislature and by the people of B.C. The fact that the unemployment these people have gone through for nine months — and it's very real to them, to the Minister of Labour (Hon. Mr. King), who smirks and laughs.... The fact that people have become unemployed in this industry because of lack of action, the fact that this Minister and his government have not acted before to bring some stability to the forest industry in British Columbia....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Again I draw to the attention of the Hon. Leader of the Opposition standing order 61, part 2, which requires strict relevance to the matter before the committee — and that is the amendment to this section.

Mr. Bennett: The amendment deals with the change of definition from forest products, the change of definition. Because of the fact that we advanced this argument in second reading, I think the Chairman should be aware that we're well aware of the intent of what that definition section meant. That's why we've called for an amendment, and that's why this Minister has backed up.

I think we have the opportunity of dealing with the definition and the change the Minister has made, because many people have suffered in this province through unemployment. They've suffered while the government sat and did nothing about stabilizing the forest industry in the interior, and the fact that the Minister's got his back-up lights on now, the fact that the Minister has withdrawn from his earlier position and the fact that he now is not going to take over the whole forest industry with the broad power that he asked for.

Interjection.

Mr. Bennett: Well, if he wasn't, why would he back up if he wasn't embarrassed? Why would he back up and change the definition? Why would he change the definition if in reality the arguments of the opposition hadn't fallen around him, and a cry from the people of the province and from the industry, and the people that would be hurt should he create this lack of confidence in the industry by taking these powers? Why wouldn't this Legislature be prepared to discuss a change? A very dramatic turnabout, a very dramatic change from this Minister, Mr. Chairman.

We're dealing with section 1 and the amendment. I think it shouldn't pass unnoticed that this definition has been changed. This Minister has backed up and this Minister has had to listen to the opposition. We might pause and remember that if there hadn't been an attack, and if this Legislature hadn't had the type of opposition it has, this Minister would be proceeding with this bill in its original form. Let us remember now that this amendment is brought in grudgingly by that government. The shame of the unemployment of the last nine months, though, is still with this Minister.

Hon. R.A. Williams (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Really, it was the Member for

North Peace (Mr. Smith)...it was a most impressive speech that he gave. I pondered it overnight and it just made all the difference in the world. The Leader of the Opposition is certainly making points this evening. The other thoughtful speeches from the Member for Chilliwack (Mr. Schroeder) and the long speech from the Member for South Peace (Mr. Phillips) were profound indeed and certainly made all the difference.

I'd just like to say, Mr. Chairman, that this is a government that says what it means and means what it says. (Laughter.)

The purpose of this bill is to see to it that the independents in the interior survive and do well under this government. The purpose of this bill is to see to it that the independents once more flourish on the south coast of British Columbia, and these changes will see that they do.

Mr. L.A. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I've heard it said in the past that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources is a man without a sense of humour. I didn't really believe this, and certainly following his performance tonight I never will believe it again. I think the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources has got to be the greatest humorist this province has ever produced.

He said a minute ago that we had to understand that this was a government that says what it means and means what it says.

An. Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. L.A. Williams: Mr. Chairman, we are prepared to use the great majority that the people have given us to change the words so that came true at any time of the day or night. If you don't believe it, just look what he's done to this legislation.

He's dropped into the middle of section 1 to change the definition of forest products, to limit it to logs and wood chips, and he's removed piles — there's a trick that I didn't think even this Minister could do. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

Mr. L.A. Williams: Poles, ties, crib timber,

[[Page 4959](#)]

shingle bolts, pulpwood, lumber, veneer, plywood, pulp, paper and newsprint — all those things have come out, and this bill is no longer going to deal with all those momentous things that are going to save the indigenous independent operator in the Province of British Columbia. I'm surprised he didn't have a definition for "indigenous independent operator" in this bill.

As a matter of fact, concerning the amendment, which we are now debating and which I think we can all support, I don't see why the Minister doesn't withdraw this entire bill if they are going to make this amendment.

An. Hon. Member: Hear, hear!

Mr. L.A. Williams: If the Members will take a care to read the other sections of the bill, considering this particular amendment, why do we need to have this forest...what's it going to be called? — oh, yes, Forest Products Board of British Columbia. This is the other amendment.

The Minister is so precise to change British Columbia Forest Products Board to Forest Products Board of British Columbia. Isn't that a momentous change? The industry, I am sure, will be delighted, and the people of British Columbia will stand in their places and shout hosanna, that the Minister has made that change.

Interjection.

Mr. L.A. Williams: Well, I'm glad to see that the Minister indicates that he's made this change at the specific

request of the British Columbia Forest Products. At least he's listening to some segment of the forest industry in British Columbia.

But, Mr. Chairman, why do we need the rest of this bill if we are just going to deal with logs and wood chips? Why do we need to have a board? There is another section which isn't being changed; the board is still going to deal with the improvement of performance of markets for forest products, and the encouragement and utilization of timber. Why do we need timber in there if we are only dealing with logs and wood chips now?

This is just gobbledygook, this amendment. This makes the whole bill nonsensical. Why do we need to have a board which has vast borrowing power? Why does it need authority to throw away the Revenue Act of the Province of British Columbia, if we are just going to deal with logs and wood chips? The Minister hasn't explained this.

I'm just surprised that he didn't support this amendment by again reciting the number of sawmills we had in 1952 and what we've got in 1974 — although it is not important to recite that now because we are only dealing with logs, and sawmills don't produce logs. We all know that. But maybe they produce wood chips, so I suppose they are still of some consequence, except that the mills in 1952, 1953, 1954, 1955, 1956 and up to about 1967 didn't produce any wood chips at all, just sawdust, so that, really, the numbers which are important for this bill starting 1967 and 1968.

I think the Minister should really come clean with us and tell us, as a result of the debate of the last couple of days and the reaction that there has been in the community generally, that he's decided he can't proceed with his manifesto of 1971 at this particular time and that he should withdraw the entire bill.

Mr. Smith: We're on an amendment to change certain definitions within the first section of this bill.

You know, for a Minister who recycles the same speech that he's made every year in this House for the last seven or eight years, about the forest industry, and adds a little here and takes a little there, you're not really doing that well, Mr. Minister. As a matter of fact, it was interesting to note that during the supper-hour adjournment one of the Minister's colleagues, the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce...Commerce, or whatever....

An. Hon. Member: Economic Development.

Mr. Smith: Industrial development?

Mr. Bennett: No development.

Mr. Smith: No development? Yes, that's about the size of his contribution to the total programme of development in the Province of British Columbia — no development.

[Mr. Gabelmann in the chair.]

But it was interesting to note that the Minister happened to be on "Hourglass" this evening. Obviously, the programme must have been taped a little prior to the time the Minister introduced his amendments at 6 o'clock, because the Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) went to great lengths to explain the situation as to how closely the cabinet works, that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources was not really the kingpin in cabinet, that there was tremendous continuity and that tremendous discussion took place between the cabinet Ministers.

Then this same Minister went on to defend, in total, the original bill that was put before this House, and said what a tremendous thing it was for the Province of British Columbia. He was 100 percent in favour of it; he'd back it to the hilt. Where is he right now? Obviously, he's got so much egg on his face that he won't appear in this House this evening.

It would seem, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister, that certain Members of cabinet are not aware of what other Members of cabinet may be proposing...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Smith: ...even an hour or two before that proposal hit the press and was given to the Members of this House — the old flip-flop.

Mr. Chairman: Order! I would ask the Hon. Member to attempt to aim his remarks at the amendment specifically. Nothing else is allowed in this debate.

Mr. Smith: I am trying, Mr. Chairman...

Mr. Chairman: You haven't succeeded as yet.

Mr. Smith: ...to relate my remarks to the amendment.

Well, if I could refer to the section, without being out of order, I'd suggest that the original interpretation and the original intent of the Minister, and what we now have before us, are 180 degrees apart. And thank God that has happened, because the industry in the Province of British Columbia has been so concerned about the direction that this Minister was trying to proceed on, that we would have no industry in British Columbia in a few months if the original words in this bill were to be followed verbatim. The Minister well knows that. While this may be his desire, and this is his wish as expressed in the original bill, he knows that there would be no industry left in the Province of British Columbia if he followed that particular path.

Interjection.

Mr. Smith: "You all get your water wings on," the Minister says. What a remark from a Minister who knows that the industry he is responsible for produces 50 cents out of every dollar generated and spent in the Province of British Columbia. What a remark from that Minister. No wonder he redefines the term "forest products" so that now it only means logs and wood chips.

I think that the point is well taken, then, Mr. Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that if that is the original intent of the bill, why didn't it say so? What were the other 19 or 20 sections in the bill required for if your whole intent and purpose was contained, really, in a definition of forest products and section 2, which deals with chips in the Province of British Columbia?

I suggest that the Minister had intentions far beyond anything he's saying tonight, and he still does. It's a matter that he has to back off, but I believe that the industry itself would be foolish to think that the Minister does not still have his mind on the same goal that he had when this bill was produced. It's just a matter of a diversion temporarily to get yourselves over a particularly crucial problem at this particular time.

I would hope that the industry....

Interjection.

Mr. Smith: It's not deceit.

Certainly there was a need for improvement in the price of chips, but the Minister realizes as much as everyone else does that this could have been accomplished; that the main stumbling block in renegotiation of price of chips in the north happened to be because of the corporation, which is 79 per cent controlled by the government, who refused to renegotiate any prices.

The second main stumbling block was the fact that any price beyond and above \$10 would result in the Crown taking 80 per cent of that additional revenue. It was not until last Friday — not until last Friday, Mr. Minister — that an announcement was made by yourself which would indicate a temporary abatement of that particular levy

against the industry.

Certainly, the industry in the Province of British Columbia requested a definition of "forest products," if you really intended what is said in the original draft of this bill. I suggest to the Minister, through you, Mr. Chairman, that the intent is still here; that it is merely a matter of drawing back and away from the original intent because of the fact that it would be a great embarrassment to proceed with the bill that was originally drafted.

Who drafted it? Who drafted it — the Minister? Do you mean to say that the people responsible for drafting this legislation did not follow the Minister's instructions? It's quite a diversionary tactic to say, "Well, the legal clerks who are responsible for helping us draught these bills took excessive measures beyond what I had intended. I really didn't intend that at all."

I would suggest that the only reason the terms are originally included in this bill as they are is because the Minister had full intentions, and knew full well, what it was he wished to accomplish. Thank goodness — at least for the time being — the industry can sleep a little better because of the fact that forest products now mean logs and wood chips. But they can't become complacent. They can't become complacent and they can't believe what the Minister says, because it's been proven not only by this Minister, but other Members of the cabinet, that what you say and what you do — given the opportunity — are poles apart.

Mr. G.S. Wallace (Oak Bay): I welcome the

[[Page 4961](#)]

amendment to make a more precise definition of what this bill means by "forest products." I would assume that part of the reason, at least, for the amendment is the meeting which the Minister had with the Council of Forest Industries yesterday — or whatever day it was the meeting took place. If this is the case, it would certainly lead to some measure of reassurance that the Minister is willing to consult with the industry — a very important industry, as has been mentioned many times.

That would be my first point: if this amendment is the outcome of discussions with the industry, then I think this is a point of reassurance to the people of British Columbia and to the people in the industry.

On the other hand, and it may be — the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett) may be perfectly correct — that it's also a reaction to the opinions expressed by the opposition. I suppose if we could get just a little bit objective for one minute in this House we would probably agree that it was 50-50, and perhaps both these influences have had their effect.

On the other hand, we will be debating other sections and I really feel that one of the major obstacles to this bill, as we see it on this side of the House — namely, the tremendous power which is delegated to a board of as small as three people with the objects expressed in section 8 — that just by changing the definition of "forest products" does the amendment go far enough to reassure us about many of the other concerns which we have in this bill.

Already, we have had the Minister's strong emphasis on the fact that it is logs and chips that the bill is concerned with. Even at that point, I understand the independents to whom this bill is largely dedicated have already expressed apprehension to other members of the industry in the last 48 hours about receiving government assistance. In reading this bill, they now see that in receiving assistance they have lost the very independence on which they place such value. The degree of authority of this bill, and the lack of amendments in other sections, only makes the amendments to section 1 rather minimal in regard to our overall appraisal of this bill.

I wonder if the Minister would care to comment also...does he feel that in this amendment he has restored confidence in the minds of investors in the forest industry — the people who put their money into the forest industry; the pension plans which buy shares in the forest industry?

As was mentioned in this debate earlier on this week, any fear that the industry was to be taken over through the vehicle of this bill was likely to lead to a decrease in share values. I wonder if the Minister, in his discussions

with the forest industry, would care to tell us whether, in fact, the amendment is likely to produce some restoration of confidence in the financial community in this province — and others who invest in the province.

One of the earlier speakers mentioned that this government has shown in some of its legislation that it cannot be trusted. I quoted this afternoon the rent stabilization Act which promised a rent review as an interim measure which would be carried on in a new bill. The new bill came along and the rent review is a farce.

Now we have this Minister telling us that forest products only involve logs and chips. Certainly I wouldn't profess to be any expert in the forest industry, but it seems to me that everything that's made from wood starts with logs. That may be a very simple layman's appraisal of the wood industry, but it seems to me that you can't make plywood or boats or shingles, or all these other fancy things defined in the original bill, unless you start with a log.

So whether this is just a rather subtle device to enable the original intent of the bill — the scope of the bill — to be accomplished while at the same time pouting oil on the troubled waters of the forest industry, I don't know. I prefer to give the Minister the benefit of the doubt. But the fact is that other legislation — not by this Minister, to be fair — but legislation by other Ministers has not been followed through in good faith. I think the most despicable example is the whole area of rent control where we had one bill which promised a certain principle which, within a few months, was completely and blatantly contradicted and betrayed.

We have here another change of direction which appears to go in the direction requested by the industry, requested by the opposition parties and, I think, the wish of the people of this province, by and large.

I just mention these points to say that I would like to believe that it is completely as open and full of the Minister's intent as he says it is. But on the other hand, I do feel that you can play with words to the degree that this amendment, without amendments to some of the other sections limiting the power of the board and the purposes of the board, still leaves me in some apprehension that this bill in total still goes too far. I do hope time will prove me wrong and that, in fact, all this bill is intended to do is to control the price of chips in the interior and logs on the coast, which is what I think I heard the Minister say in the press interview this evening.

But on the other hand, in the light of other government actions with other legislation, I don't think that we can be criticized for being rather apprehensive, and I wonder whether, in fact, there may be a great deal more to the bill than meets the eye, even with the change of definition in regard to forest products.

I do hope the Minister may comment on the degree to which he expects this change to restore confidence in the investor in B.C.

[[Page 4962](#)]

Mr. G.F. Gibson (North Vancouver–Capilano): Mr. Chairman, I don't know whether to be chagrined or delighted that no Member of my party was mentioned in the august company cited by the Minister in his opening remarks.

Mr. Chairman, you weren't in the chair this afternoon, but under the ground rules that were established this afternoon, I almost wonder if this amendment would have been found in order. I hasten to say that I hope it is in order. But it has — you should know, Mr. Chairman — effectively emasculated three-quarters of this bill. I think that's a very good thing; were it four-quarters I would think it even better.

But it has ruled out lumber and pulp and newsprint, and a great many important forest products. Mr. Chairman, this is clear confirmation that the opposition has been doing its job in this Legislature, and it's a vindication of the stand we've taken over the last couple of days.

There are still very wide powers left in this bill, and the public should not be deceived on that. As the Hon. Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) just pointed out, logs are the fundamental of any forest product, and the power to control logs remains the power to control the forest industry. The power remains in this bill to have a log marketing board to control the log market in its entirety, and the power to squeeze the profits of any company as

much as the Minister wants, and the power to buy them out. It's all in there still, in spite of this redefinition.

I'd like the Minister to say in this House, Mr. Chairman, what he said earlier on in an interview tonight that I participated in. I asked him the question there as to whether he saw the intervention of this board in the log market as being one that was coercive or one that was voluntary. In other words, would this board establish itself as a marketing board and say: "These are the prices that you must fix," or would it simply intervene in the market as a buyer and seller on its own account on a strictly voluntary basis? I don't want to put words in the Minister's mouth, but I think he said earlier on that the latter condition was the one he had in mind. I wish he would repeat that statement in this House.

I wish, Mr. Chairman, that he would do something more than this amendment about unemployment in the forest industry, which this amendment doesn't do and which this bill doesn't do.

[Mr. Dent in the chair.]

You know, Mr. Chairman, in justifying this amendment, the Minister spoke of the independents he is looking after, who can have reason to, rest easier because of this amendment. You may remember in his earlier remarks the Minister spoke of the chickens and the elephant, and the elephant dancing in the midst of the chickens saying: "Every man for himself." Mr. Chairman, who's the elephant? I suggest that the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources is the elephant in the forest industry — the rest are chickens. It doesn't matter how big those chickens are.

He reminds me of another poem. Remember: "The walrus and the carpenter were walking hand-in-hand," and they went down to the beach and they came upon some other little creatures — not chickens, but oysters?

Oysters, come and play with us, the walrus did beseech, A pleasant walk, a pleasant talk, along the briny beach....

The independents are the oysters, the Minister is the walrus, and the oysters end up eaten.

The independents had better watch out, and they'd better keep watching this Minister.

I ask this Minister to speak again on this amendment and to make a very clear statement about the voluntary, as opposed to coercive, nature of the board that he is setting up — whether on this section or whether on the section setting up the board.

Mr. Phillips: Mr. Chairman, although we've seen another snow-job — flip-flop — carried on by the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources, tonight he's going to ease the pain by defining forest products. He's going out and he's going to tell all the people of British Columbia that he didn't really wish to control the entire forest industry in British Columbia.

Hon. R.A. Williams: That's right.

Mr. Phillips: "That's right," the Minister says. Well, that is entirely true.

It's another snow-job whereby the Minister brings in a legislative measure whereby he interprets in his explanation of certain definitions exactly what they mean.

But let's be realistic: all the Minister has done here is prove to us that by "forest products," he means "logs and wood chips." Big deal! It doesn't mean a thing, because the first two sections of the bill only deal with wood chips.

Let's look at the objects of the board.

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: Let's look at the objectives of the board.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

[[Page 4963](#)]

Mr. Phillips: The Minister made.... No, let's look at it later — it has a very important bearing on the intent of this bill.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to discuss this section only and relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Phillips: I happen to be discussing the definitions. My point, Mr. Chairman, is, if you'll bear with me for just a moment: what are the objects of the entire bill? The objects of the entire bill are: "Without limiting the generality of section 6(1) the objects of the board" — which this bill established — "...has the power to improve the performance of markets for forest products," which we've — big deal! — defined as wood chips and logs, "and to encourage the utilization of timber in the province." What is the definition of timber? What is the definition of timber?

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: Not even in the forest Act is there any pure definition of the word "timber."

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: The title doesn't really relate to the Act — absolutely not.

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: Good title. Yes, but a title ought to be what it is. You can change the title, but the object of this board and the rest of the entire bill and the purpose of the bill is to encourage the utilization of timber — nice words. The public will probably buy it, but "to encourage...."

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: Let me tell you, Mr. Chairman, let's look at where it's at: "to encourage the utilization of timber...."

We have a bill which sets up the board with the powers — and we've gone all through the powers — to sit on boards, able to take over, able to cancel contracts, able to do the same things that this bill did before this Minister brought in the amendments. That's where it's at. There is really no change in this bill...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Phillips: ...except a small snow-job at the very beginning.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. We're dealing only with the amendment before us and I would ask the Hon. Member to confine his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Phillips: What I want to know, Mr. Chairman, is why the Minister didn't bring in the definition of timber. This is the definition section....

Let's look at the Natural Products Marketing Act. We have another bill brought in which is at cross purposes — definitely at cross purposes — with two other legislative measures we have in this Legislature.

It is at cross purposes with the Natural Products Marketing Act, which really doesn't define timber products; it's at cross purposes with the forestry Act, because it really doesn't define timber.

Now, I want to tell you, Mr. Chairman — and this has to do with the definition section....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

We're not dealing with the section as a whole, Hon. Member, we're dealing with the amendment alone.

Mr. Phillips: No, we're dealing strictly with definitions; we're dealing with the amendment.

Mr. Chairman: Order. This particular amendment deals with certain words in the section, not with the whole section.

Hon. G.R. Lea (Minister of Highways): So I can understand what's going on here, I wonder if the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) would define "timber" for me, so I know what he means.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. There's no point of order.

Mr. Phillips: No, absolutely, there's no point of order.

Now, my point is...

Hon. Mr. Lea: Put a hat on it. (Laughter.)

Mr. Phillips: ...Mr. Chairman, we have a definition of forest products which, in my humble opinion...

An. Hon. Member: Humble?

Mr. Phillips: ...and certainly I don't carry any degrees in forestry, but in my humble opinion,

[[Page 4964](#)]

we have defined forest products but it doesn't include timber. Now can you rationalize why forest products would not include timber when, in section 7, the objects of the board are to encourage the utilization of timber, which is not explained in the definition section?

Now you go ahead and make your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman. Make your ruling on that, Mr. Chairman.

Where are we at? This is another snow-job, another cosmetic section — cosmetic politics — and that's exactly where it's at. Sure, it's okay for the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources to come out and say, "Oh, no. We really didn't want to have any jurisdiction over poles, ties, crib timber, shingle bolt, pulpwood, lumber, wood chips, veneer, plywood, pulp, paper and newsprint. Oh, no. We don't want to do that, not at all." But he's misleading this Legislature and he's misleading the people of this province.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

I'd ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the imputation that the Minister is misleading the province.

Mr. Phillips: Yes, I'll withdraw it. He's trying to do this.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the imputation that he is either "trying," or is in any way,

misleading the House. It is unparliamentary to make that accusation.

I would ask the Hon. Member to withdraw the imputation.

Mr. Phillips: Yes, yes, I'll withdraw (laughter), but I won't give that Minister that much intelligence. I won't give him that much intelligence. He's using his usual tactics — tactics that have been used in this Legislature by several other bills.

Now, when the Minister speaks again on this amendment, I would like him to explain what timber products are and why there is no definition in the interpretation section of this bill of timber products, specifically when it is used in the Act and it's used in other Acts, to encourage and utilize the utilization of timber. The whole bill refers to it. That's why he has these other powers.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

I want to draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that in the amendment we are considering the definition of two words, namely "board" and "forest products," and therefore he must confine his remarks to these words.

Mr. Phillips: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think I've made my point, and we'll discuss this point further under section 7.

Mr. Gardom: I can't for the life of me understand some of these sort of semi-saccharin sentiments that have been expressed on the part of some of the Members tonight to this which I would call a two-bit act of appeasement on the part of this Minister of the government. He came in threatening the whole of the industry and the industry became alarmed — and I think justly so — but one has to indeed question, Mr. Chairman, where was the alarm of these "peace-in-our-time" forestry industry people, when they sat idly by and they noted the insurance industry in the Province of British Columbia completely confiscated without compensation; when they saw the mining industry, with the abuse of the discriminatory taxing policies of this government, almost put under; and they've also seen the most restrictive powers and controls against the farmer anywhere to be found in the free world.

It's a very curious thing to me, Mr. Chairman, where the concern and the alarm and the public statement of help came from the forestry industry — the attitude of assistance towards their neighbour. No, indeed, they sat by and they watched the insurance industry drown; they've watched the mining industry sink; and they've watched the farming community being told to tread water according to the government's wishes or go completely down the drain.

But some Members have found a degree of succour in the fact that the Hon. Minister has removed the pack of wolves from the door and just left one wolf outside. But I can assure the Hon. Members, and the people in the forestry industry, that with one wolf at the door, there are others pretty darned close behind. I'd assure you that to become satisfied tonight with creeping socialism, as opposed to galloping socialism, is pretty shallow kind of succour.

It seems to me, Mr. Chairman, that there's no question of a doubt that this Minister and this government are following almost to the letter the Waffle Manifesto, which is supported by their Members and which supports this amendment, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Speak to the amendment.

Mr. Gardom: Yes, indeed, speaking to the amendment, and I quote the Waffle Manifesto talking about an independent socialist Canada:

"This includes extensive public control over investment and nationalization of the commanding heights of the economy, such as the key resource industries, finance and credit,

[[Page 4965](#)]

and industries strategic to planning our economy."

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Gardom: This amendment is just another step down the line of the Waffle Manifesto. Make no mistake of that fact.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mr. Chairman rises.

Mr. Gardom: Yes, Mr. Chairman, what have you got in mind?

Mr. Chairman resumes his seat.

Mr. Chairman: I would ask the Hon. Member, at some point, to relate his remarks to the amendment.

Mr. Gardom: You know I'm related to it, Mr. Chairman. The fact is that the Minister has come in with an exceptionally sloppy bill. I must say he's come into this House with much better humour as a Minister of the Crown than he ever had as a Member of the opposition.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Once again I would appeal to the Hon. Member to observe Standing Order 16....

Mr. Gardom: From an opposition Member to a good government guy. This is his public face today — very pleasant.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Order!

An. Hon. Member: Naughty, naughty, Garde. (Laughter.) Naughty, naughty.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Hon. Member remain seated until I've made my point?

Standing Order 61 is very clear and I'll just read it to you, Hon. Members:

"Speeches in Committee of the Whole House must be strictly relevant to the item or clause consideration."

I would ask the Hon. Member to use his common sense, in this respect, to try to keep his remarks concerned directly with the points in the amendment, Would the Hon. Member continue?

Mr. Gardom: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. The point is, without question, that this is just one step along the line. The Hon. Minister had the complete opportunity to bring in a proper kind of a bill.

Surely to goodness, Mr. Chairman, you bring in an amendment - and I gather from discussions tonight that this session is coming close to its end — bring in an amendment in the dying stages of this session with the industry that most completely affects this province. Is this an indication, Mr. Chairman, of effective government? Is this an indication of effective government, or is it just another classic example of backfill, of piecemeal efforts on the part of the NDP to go ahead and tamper with an economy and to bring more and more control against the people in this province? Once again I say, Mr. Chairman, they're following this Waffle Manifesto right to the letter.

Mrs. P.J. Jordan (North Okanagan): Well, Mr. Chairman, speaking to the amendment, I would certainly say that the Leader of the Opposition is absolutely right.

When we read the papers on Friday we found that the Minister had very carefully couched what he wanted to say in very comfortable words for the media, and the media bought it. They're not to be blamed for this; they have to try and be objective on the basis of what the Minister said.

But this opposition came down in this House with all four feet (laughter) and pointed out to this Minister —

sorry, all 20 feet — all 20 feet, and pointed out to this Minister, and to the public, and to the media, exactly what the Minister was trying to do. The Minister found that he had got his fingers burned, and burned very badly. So he has backed up, but let us not be deceived, Mr. Chairman.

While the Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) talked about elephants and oysters, and things eating things, I don't know who's gobbling up the oysters, but I'll tell you we know who's still trying to gobble up the forest industry in this province: it's this Minister and it's this bill. We have rolled him back, and in this amendment we've rolled him back on the title, from "British Columbia Forest Products Board" to "Forest Products Board of British Columbia." But I would ask him why he needs to change the title in this amendment?

Why, when he's defining forest product, doesn't he define the word "timber," because, Mr. Chairman, that's where the essence of this bill is?

The Minister is known as a fellow who gets what he wants, by hook or by crook, and this Minister wants the forest industry of British Columbia.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would point out to the Hon. Member that it would be more appropriate to discuss and to make her point under the general discussion of the section rather than under this amendment. I would ask her to keep her remarks....

[[Page 4966](#)]

Mrs. Jordan: In reference to what, Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Chairman: Well, she's proposing a new definition, and this is really not relevant to the amendment. It's more relevant to the section as a whole, and I would ask her, if this is the point she wants to make, to wait until we pass the amendment.

Mrs. Jordan: Well, I appreciate the Chairman's comments. I was not trying to define a new definition. I was just asking why the definition was omitted. But I'll certainly accede to your request and discuss the matter under the general section of section 1.

I listened very carefully, Mr. Chairman, to the Minister's reply to the Leader of the Opposition (Mr. Bennett). It was unbelievable in terms of its superior attitude and in terms of what he was asking this House to believe. He didn't dare admit that in fact the opposition had burned his fingers. He didn't dare admit that suddenly the people in the industry of this province were becoming electrified by the whole fact of what he was trying to do, and he didn't dare admit that the socialists are afraid of open legislation and open confrontation — that they would rather chip away and steal this way and slither that way to meet their ultimate ends, rather than lay it squarely on the table.

If we listened to what the Minister said tonight, which was a shilly-shally between poorly drafted legislation and his own inefficiency, perhaps the fact of the matter is that what this Minister wants he's going to get. There were no comforts in his words, if we were to accept them. If, as the Minister sort of indicated to try and save face, it was an error in the drafting, and that those people who worked for him didn't really know what they were doing and didn't follow his orders, it certainly wouldn't be the first time that the Minister has tried to pin his errors on someone else. The last time it was a postal clerk, and the time before that it was a member of his department who hadn't consulted with the Fish and Wildlife Branch in lifting a wildfowl reserve.

If we accept the fact that it is indeed, as he said, an error, then what comfort is there in this? What this Minister in his own words, if they are to be accepted as the explanation, is saying is that he suddenly made another instant decision without any facts, without any major discussion and without any real consideration. Now this Minister, Mr. Chairman, is in a position where he is making vital decisions in this province every single day, decisions which....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member to confine her remarks to these two points that are in the amendment: namely the definition of the word "board" and the definition of the words "forest products."

Mrs. Jordan: Yes, I am, Mr. Chairman. I'm relating my remarks to the Minister's remarks about this amendment, and that relates directly to the amendment. These are the words that the Minister said. He was giving us what he wanted us to believe were his reasons for bringing in these two amendments.

I'm just saying that if we accept the first reason he slithered around with, then we must accept the fact that the Minister is incompetent, and that in his day-to-day work he's making vital decisions about the future of the trees, the land and the water in this province. He's making vital decisions which will affect the jobs of thousands of people in this province. He's making vital decisions about 50 cents of every dollar in this province — on an instant basis, on a basis of incompetence. That hardly inspires confidence as to why he would change the name of the board.

Or is it just another example of this Minister retrenching, having burned his fingers, and looking for another avenue through which he can bring into operation his grand design for the forest industry in the Province of British Columbia? Either alternative, based on what the Minister said in this debate in speaking to this amendment, is hardly palatable to 90 per cent of the people in British Columbia. These statements are hardly designed to look after the Minister's new-found friends, the independent operators of this province. And they are hardly designed to inspire confidence in the opposition, that while we have burned the Minister's fingers, and we have rolled him back and there are amendments to this bill, that he isn't slyly trying to again, through the back door, achieve his ultimate objective.

These two amendments certainly don't make the bill really any more palatable in its long-term design.

Mr. J.R. Chabot (Columbia River): There have been very significant questions posed, questions of substance, to the Minister regarding the definition they figure the Minister is not willing to answer — of the inclusion of the word "timber" in the definition.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I've pointed out to other Hon. Members that it would be more appropriate to bring up this matter under a general discussion of the section rather than under the particular amendment.

Mr. Chabot: Well, Mr. Chairman, if we're going throughout the Act, if we're going to refer to the matter of timber throughout the Act, it's quite appropriate, I think, that it should be included in the definition, which the amendment we are presently debating....

[[Page 4967](#)]

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. The amendments are to two words in the definition section.

Mr. Chabot: Well, Mr. Chairman, I think we have the right to question the advisability — or inadvisability — of whether this should be included in the definition. And you know that.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Chabot: I'm not here to question whether we're going to restrict our comments to wood chips or to logs. I want to know why timber isn't included in the definition. Isn't that a fair comment, Mr. Chairman? Or is the right of questioning going to be restricted on the advisability of including the word "timber?"

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. In the judgment of the Chair, what the Hon. Member is proposing.... He is suggesting the definition of the word "timber" in the definition section. We are dealing with only two words contained in the definition section, namely "forest products" and "board."

Mr. Chabot: Mr. Chairman, really we are dealing with a substantial number of words in the definition. If you will read the section it says: "forest products includes logs, piles, poles, ties, crib-timber, shingle-bolts, pulpwood, lumber, wood-chips, veneer, plywood, pulp, paper, and newsprint." They might as well put an "et cetera" behind that. These are the matters I believe we have the right to debate...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. If the Hon. Member....

Mr. Chabot: ...the possibility of whether these should continue to be included or should be excluded from the definition. I think that they Minister should stand in his place and tell us whether he is going to remove the other references to timber in the Act, or whether he is going to include in the definition of the Act the word "timber." It's a very simple question to a very simple Minister, and I think he should be able to answer such a simple question, Mr. Chairman.

Hon. R.A. Williams: The matter was gone into thoroughly with our counsel, and the conclusion was that this was the best form.

Mr. Bennett: Since that Minister is on his feet he can give us, then, all the advice he got when they went into it so thoroughly, and what the definition of "timber" is.

Mr. Phillips: Let's hear it from the Minister. You don't know what the definition of "timber" is.

Interjections.

Mr. Phillips: I'll bet you the Minister of Consumer Affairs (Hon. Ms. Young) knows what "timber" is.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Phillips: Sure, it's the big stick that she wields. (Laughter.)

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, has it been decided whether we are talking about "timber" now or later?

Mr. Chairman: The ruling I am making from the chair is this: if the Hon. Member is proposing a new definition in the section, which is not included in the amendment, and does not apply to the amendment, then we should dispose of the amendment first and then deal with the possible new definition of "timber." However, if the Hon. Member is considering adding this to the definition of "forest products," that is a different matter.

Shall the amendment pass.

Amendment approved.

On section 1.

Mr. Bennett: Mr. Chairman, I wonder, now that we are in the definition section — and the idea of the definition section is to relate to terminology used later in the Act — why the word "timber," which is utilized in section 7 in a very positive way and a very definite way and indeed carries with it utilization of powers, isn't defined. Is that definition left out to further fuzzy up and muddy up the Act? Under the terms of using the word "timber" later on, the definition section, in restricting forest products to just "logs" and "wood-chips" becomes impossible to understand. Why isn't "timber" defined?

In the dictionary the definition is, "Standing trees attached to the land." And from these trees come all the forest products that the Minister is trying to pretend that he's taken out of the Act with the amendment.

I ask again: would the Minister get up, now that we're in the definition section and the fact that timber is used prominently in the Act, and give us his definition of timber? Why isn't timber in the

definition section? After we've received the definition, we will add it to another amendment if we allow him enough time to help clean up his Act.

Mr. Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I think this question of timber is very important. If the Act were to be brought before a court of law for interpretation, in the absence of a definition in this Act, one of the things that a judge would no doubt do would be to turn to the Forest Act. And if a judge turned to a Forest Act, he would find that timber means trees, whether standing, felled, or cut, and primary forest products, and includes saw logs, spars, piles, poles, railway ties, shingle bolts, pulp wood and Christmas trees. Mr. Chairman, a lot of these things are the things that we've just taken out of the definition of forest products by the Minister's very amendment.

So I'm not going to suggest — obviously, with the way I feel about this bill — that the definition of timber be put into this definition section. Rather, I'm going to ask the Minister at this point if he would earnestly consider in section 7, when we get to it, taking timber out of that section and replacing it with forest products, given this definition.

Mr. Phillips: We've definitely got a conflict of interest here, Mr. Chairman. Because we have in this bill with reference to timber in section 7, which is not defined here, a conflict of interest with the Forest Act. We also have a conflict of interest with the Natural Products Marketing (British Columbia) Act which we've just recently, by the great crushing majority of the government in this Legislature, passed. In that, natural product means any product of the forest. And here we have a legislature measure passed recently in this Legislature which can control and oversee the marketing of any product of the forest.

We are passing another Act which doesn't properly have the definition and where the Minister can oversee and control all of the timber, which is all standing trees or by products of the trees in the forest. We have the Forest Act which controls basically the utilization of our forest products. So, Mr. Chairman, not by defining the word "timber" in the definition section of this Act, we definitely run into a conflict of interest between three Acts that we have on the statutes of British Columbia.

I would like to know, if this Minister goes ahead with the awesome powers that he has in this Act and does something in conflict with what the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Stupich) might want to do under the Natural Products Marketing (British Columbia) Act.... Or he might even be in conflict with himself because he administers the Forest Act.

It seems to me that the Minister is getting himself into a great deal of problems with the actual law of British Columbia. He will find himself hiring one lawyer to look after his right hand and another lawyer to protect him on the left hand because he's got two lawyers protecting himself from two Acts that he controls.

That's why it is very important that the definition of timber be included. I plead with the Minister here tonight, since section 7 is really the nuts and bolts of this whole bill. The whole rest of the bill other than the first two sections deals at giving the Minister the power to have the best utilization of timber.

But there is no definition of the word timber. What is timber? In the Forest Act, timber means trees, whether standing, felled or cut, and primary forest products that include saw logs, spars, piles, poles, railway ties, shingle bolts, pulpwood and Christmas trees.

An. Hon. Member: Oh, oh!

Mr. Phillips: The whole thrust of this bill is to better utilize timber products — timber products as defined in the Natural Products Marketing (British Columbia) Act or timber products as defined in the Forest Act. And before we can approve the definition section of this bill, we must have the Minister spell out in black and white what he means by timber. The whole thrust of the bill is for him to do whatever he feels with any and all powers that he has in this bill.

They're all laid out specifically and we've mentioned them all before in second reading. I don't propose to be repetitive but I do want the Minister to explain to this Legislature before we pass section 1 in his own words as the Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources what his definition of the word timber is. What is his interpretation? It's his bill; he relates it to this bill.

I think that this Legislature is certainly entitled to know. Why did he leave it out? We don't want to build into this any sinister powers which the Minister might want to take unto himself. We don't want to build into this Act the fact that the Minister wants to have any great awesome powers. But if he doesn't spell out to this Legislature tonight what the meaning of timber in his own words, we're going to have to ask him again and again. Let the Minister speak; let him advise this Legislature.

Mrs. Jordan: Is the Minister going to answer the question?

Mr. Chairman: I would point out to the Hon. Member that no Member can insist upon an answer. If the Minister wishes to comment, he may.

Mrs. Jordan: It's going to be a long evening. I'm sure this Minister, in spite of his absence in the past and the concerns about this bill, will want to do his very best to explain his altruistic motives in this

[[Page 4969](#)]

bill. And I suggest to you, Mr. Chairman, that I'm certainly confused.

I don't profess to be the brightest person in the world. But I live in....

Interjections.

Mrs. Jordan: Thank you, thank you. But I live in the lumber area. I am very confused about what the Minister means. It's interesting that the backbenchers of the NDP would insult the independent operators, just as they did, because they're confused.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member please address the Chair and speak to the section?

Interjections.

An. Hon. Member: Old thumper didn't have enough nerve to come into the House and vote on a bill.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mrs. Jordan: The chicken farmer who's so tame when it comes to knuckling under the government.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member please address the Chair?

Mrs. Jordan: And has not just insulted the independent operators in his area. I've talked to the operators in his area...

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mrs. Jordan: ...and they are confused about this term "timber."

The loggers are confused. They don't understand what the Minister means. The truck loggers have said that they don't understand what the Minister means by the word "timber." The Minister of Economic Development (Hon. Mr. Lauk) didn't understand on the television tonight. The Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Lea) several times during this short debate this evening has said, "What's timber?" Your own colleagues, Mr. Minister, don't understand what is meant by the word "timber."

Mr. Smith: They didn't even know the amendments were coming in.

Mrs. Jordan: No. They didn't even know the amendments were coming in.

But it's very interesting that in the amendment that has just been rammed through the House, the Minister amended the definition...

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please!

Mrs. Jordan: ...of the term "boards" and "forest products." But we see this word "timber" scattered through this Act in very significant places — we see it in the title and we see it again in section 7 — not very often, but in very significant areas. I decided, with all these questions coming in, and seeing that when I called various members of the forestry department, they couldn't give me a definition of the word "timber," I looked it up in a number of dictionaries and got various definitions.

An. Hon. Member: They've torn out all the pages.

Mr. Bennett: They don't want anyone to know.

Mrs. Jordan: They were hard to find, Mr. Member. But we use a dictionary in our caucus because we want to be accurate. But, you know, we're going to need your help more, Mr. Minister, after looking up the terms in the dictionary.

I will quote from *Webster's New International Dictionary*, and I would draw your attention to the comments by the Member for North Vancouver–Capilano (Mr. Gibson) who said that because there was no firm definition in this Act, a judge, were there a court case, would have to refer to the Forest Act. But we have no guarantee of that, Mr. Member.

It's quite possible that a judge, in his wisdom, might want to look at every avenue in order that he could draw in a proper definition. If he decided to look at the dictionary, this is what he would find, and perhaps the Minister would define for us just which of these definitions will apply. It says "timber"... and in Anglo-Saxon times, in their attitude, it was wood and buildings. Then they go on to say: "originally a building structure"; later the word "timber" moved to mean material for construction. It has a figurative meaning in many parts of the country; and the figurative meaning is: "such disposition are the very errors of human nature, and yet they are the hottest timber to make politics of." There's an interesting definition.

Hon. R.A. Williams: That will look great in *Hansard*.

[[Page 4970](#)]

Mrs. Jordan: Well, you may be concerned about your *Hansard* image, Mr. Minister, but we're concerned about this province, the people in this province and your interference and political playing with a very fundamental industry in this industry in this province.

Mr. Bennett: Right on.

Mrs. Jordan: Stop worrying about your image and your Bond Street suits and get on with your responsibilities.

Mr. Bennett: The Minister of unemployment.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would ask the Hon. Member....

Mrs. Jordan: Obviously, the Minister doesn't know what it's like to have to work for a living.

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Interjection.

Mr. Chairman rises.

Mr. Chairman: Would the Hon. Member be seated, please. Again I would request that any Hon. Member speaking on this section keep the remarks relevant to the section. I would just refer to section 43 where it says that Members should avoid irrelevance. I think it's very important to keep the remarks serious and strictly relevant to this section which we are considering. Would the Hon. Member continue?

Mr. Chairman resumes his seat.

Mrs. Jordan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your ruling. I suggest that the Minister's attitude is very relevant to this debate. I suggest that this, Mr. Chairman, is a legal document, or will be a legal document, in British Columbia and there are some holes of power in this Act that you could drive a logging truck through — and the definition of the word "timber" is one of them.

An. Hon. Member: The logging trucks will be confiscated.

Mrs. Jordan: Yes, by the time this Minister gets through, the logging trucks will all belong to the Province of British Columbia, and not to their rightful owners.

It's absolutely imperative, Mr. Chairman, that the definition of "timber", which appears so sparsely but so significantly in this bill, is made very clear to this Legislature, because the legal acceptance of the word "timber" is very varied indeed.

I would continue...that the word "timber" can mean a squared or dressed piece of wood. It can mean a piece of sawed lumber more than 4 1/2 inches thick and more than 6 inches wide. Mr. Chairman, that could include almost every piece of wood that is produced in the Province of British Columbia, every piece of wood from which materials that include wood fibre in their composition are made. I'm glad the Minister admits it, because certainly the people in this province know that it's another plot, Mr. Minister.

Another legally accepted use for the word "timber" is land covered by trees from which timber is produced. Land covered by trees from which timber is produced — and unless the Minister clarifies his definition of timber, he leaves himself and his government suspect to another avenue of their committed land grab in this province. I'd ask the Minister: if these definitions cannot be applied, then define for us the word "timber" and embody in this Act a true definition as you want it, as you intend to administer this Act.

Isn't it interesting? Something made of wood, as in the wooden part of an implement or weapon. A wooden leg.

Mr. Minister, whether you're aware of it or not, the extent of the powers of the word "timber" touch in every home in this province.

It goes on to define timber, under law, to mean trees which as part of the freehold may not be cut by the tenants. That's a very interesting definition and perhaps the Minister would comment on that.

One would hope, with one of the most sweeping pieces of legislation brought in, and the Minister now having had his fingers severely burnt, that the least he could do is pay attention in the debate.

It might interest you, Mr. Chairman, to know that the word "timber" is a legally accepted term for a certain number of fur skins. We have trappers in this province. We have people wholesaling and retailing furs. Is this something the Minister's going to include in his definition of "timber"? If it isn't, then we'll accept the Minister's words, providing he defines the word "timber" in this Act.

It can mean high forest, Mr. Minister. Is that to be included in your definition?

Interjection.

Mrs. Jordan: You know, Mr. Minister, one wonders if the legal application and the broad terms of the word "timber" are applied in British Columbia, and if the Minister is intending to utilize the scope of that word by not defining it, if he's going to invade the realm of the naturalists and impose upon them a tax for such timber accompanying words of nature —

[[Page 4971](#)]

the timber words.

Another definition, Mr. Chairman, is "timber rattlesnake", and that's a banded rattlesnake.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please.

Mrs. Jordan: Is the Minister again intending to invade the preserve of the naturalists?

Mr. Chairman: Order!

Mr. Chairman rises.

Mr. Chairman: I think it's very clear to the Chair that the Hon. Member is persisting in irrelevance, and I would ask her either to return to the seriousness of this debate on the definition on a serious basis, or else discontinue her speech. Would the Hon. Member continue, please?

Mr. Chairman resumes his seat.

Mrs. Jordan: If in your opinion, what could well be used by a judge, if there's a court case on this legal document, in terms of definition, due to the faulty drafting of an Act, or the deceitful drafting of an Act, is irrelevant to the debate, then I would suggest that the Chairman needs to go back to parliamentary school and find out what we're all here for. However, Mr. Chairman....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! Before the Hon. Member continues, I would ask her to withdraw the word "deceitful" as applying to the preparing of this Act, as it does impute a motive to the Member, under Standing Order 40, section 2 — that no Member shall use offensive words against any other Member of the House. I ask you to withdraw the word....

Mrs. Jordan: Mr. Chairman, I withdraw. I wouldn't wish to accuse the Minister of intentionally being deceitful.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please! I just asked the Hon. Member to withdraw....

Mrs. Jordan: And I do. I withdraw, Mr. Chairman, I'd just like to sum up this part by suggesting that the Minister knows full well what he's doing. He knows full well, unless he will answer these questions, that by leaving timber in the two significant places that it is in this Act, and not defining it, he is leaving in his hands the very powers that he's pretending to remove from the Act. If he does that, Mr. Chairman, then it's very much as the second Member for Vancouver-Burrard (Ms. Brown) said about life — it's a race between the forest industry in British Columbia and the ambitions of the Minister to take over that forest industry, and the Minister has the inside track.

Mr. D.E. Lewis (Shuswap): Mr. Chairman, if I may I'd like to define the term "timber," I spent 10 years in the logging business, and I think I'm perfectly familiar with what timber means.

Timber is a product about which John Purdue, a Social Credit president in their league in 1953, said: "If you need any of it, get in touch with your local Socred. They'll get in touch with the head office; they'll get in touch with the Minister, and you'll get your timber."

Timber was also a product that got our friend Mr. Sommers in jail. He was also a Socred cabinet Minister.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would also draw the attention of this Member to ask him not to indulge in irrelevance.

Mr. Lewis: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'll define it a little closer.

Timber was a product of which in 1955 B.C. Forest Products received 270,000 acres for nothing by that party at that end of the House. Timber was also a product which MacMillan Bloedel screamed and cried about paying 10 per cent tax on; and right after that they received a grant of 204,000 acres of it in the Tofino area.

At that time Mr. MacMillan apologized.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would draw to the attention of the Hon. Member that... Order, please! I would ask the Hon. Member to relate his remarks more seriously to the section we're considering.

Mr. Lewis: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to relate my remarks to the portion of the bill we're speaking about right now.

In 1953 Mr. Carney, who was a forest ranger, came out and said at that time that the small forester was going out of the business; the small company didn't have a chance. He said, "Of companies that owned 20,000 acres or less...there was only two-thirds of the timber in that category." But there was a gradual change.

Mr. Phillips: How about the big chicken producers? How big is your quota?

Mr. Lewis: My quota is just about as big as your head. (Laughter.)

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Once again I would appeal to the Hon. Member for Shuswap to

[[Page 4972](#)]

relate his remarks more directly to this section in a serious manner.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman....

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. I would also ask the Hon. Member to withdraw any personal remarks against another Member that can be considered offensive.

Mr. Lewis: I'm sorry.

Interjections.

Mr. Chairman: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member withdraw the unfortunate remark, which is obviously unparliamentary?

Mr. Lewis: I'll withdraw the remark, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman: Will the Hon. Member continue please?

Mr. Lewis: This is a serious matter, because in 1954 there was 68 per cent of the timber in B.C. held by nine corporations or persons. I say, Mr. Chairman, that it's through the giveaway policies of that party at that far end of the House, the Socreds, that we're having to bring this bill before this House tonight.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Mr. Chairman: The committee reports progress and asks leave to sit again.

Leave granted.

Hon. Mrs. Dailly moves adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 10:59 p.m.

[Return to [Legislative Assembly Home Page](#)]

Copyright © 1974, 2001, 2013: Queen's Printer, Victoria, B.C., Canada