

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)**

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1973

Night Sitting

[[Page 2981](#)]

CONTENTS

Routine proceedings

Development Corporation of British Columbia Act (Bill No. 102).

Report stage.

Mrs. Jordan — [2981](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [2981](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [2982](#)

Mr. Smith — [2984](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [2985](#)

Mr. Wallace — [2985](#)

Mr. McGeer — [2986](#)

Mr. Schroeder — [2988](#)

Mr. Gardom — [2988](#)

Hon. Mr. Barrett — [2988](#)

Mr. McClelland — [2989](#)

Hon. Mr. Strachan — [2989](#)

Mr. Cummings — [2990](#)

Division on motion to postpone-third reading — [2990](#)

Division on third reading — [2990](#)

An Act to Amend the Medical Act (Bill No. 110).

Report and third reading — [2990](#)

Energy Act (Bill No. 148). Report stage.

Mr. Smith — [2990](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [2992](#)

Mr. Wallace — [2992](#)

Division on adjournment of debate — [2993](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [2994](#)

Mr. Richter — [2994](#)

Mr. McGeer — [2995](#)

Hon. Mr. Bennett — [2995](#)

Hon. Mr. Williams — [2996](#)

Mr. Phillips — [2996](#)

Division on motion to postpone-third reading — [2998](#)

Division on third reading — [2998](#)

An Act to Amend the Public Schools Act (Bill No. 156).

Report and third reading — [2998](#)

An Act to Amend the Municipal Act (Bill No. 175).

Report and third reading — [2998](#)

Mobile Home Tax Act (Bill No. 18 1). Committee stage.

Mr. Smith — [2999](#)

Hon. Mr. Lorimer — [2999](#)

Report and third reading — [2999](#)

Statute Law Amendment Act, 1973 (Bill No. 183). Committee stage.

Mr. Gardom — [3000](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3001](#)

Mr. Gardom — [3001](#)

Mr. Morrison — [3002](#)

Hon. Mr. Macdonald — [3002](#)

Mr. Phillips — [3002](#)

Mr. D.A. Anderson — [3003](#)

Mr. McGeer — [3003](#)

Mr. Phillips — [3004](#)

Hon. Mr. Cocke — [3004](#)

Mr. Phillips — [3004](#)

Mrs. Jordan — [3005](#)

Division on section 1 — [3005](#)

TUESDAY, APRIL 17, 1973

The House met at 8:30 p.m.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Public Works.

HON. W.L. HARTLEY (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I ask leave to file documents relative to the Glenshiel Hotel.

Leave granted.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Why don't you call a public inquiry instead? What have you got to hide?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Mr. Speaker, just so there will be no further aspersions cast, I'd ask that I read the document. It's addressed to myself...

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MR. SPEAKER: One minute please.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I remind the Hon. Member that this is the highest court in the land. In terms of the conduct of the Members, in order that it be absolutely clear, this is the highest court in the land so far as the conduct of the Members are concerned. You have to judge each other in this particular place right now.

I ask the Members do they wish to give leave for the Minister to make a statement?

AN HON. MEMBER: No, no!

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Minister sit down?

HON. MR. HARTLEY: Yes. I have leave to file the...

MR. SPEAKER: You've already filed the documents.

Orders of the day.

HON.

MR. BARRETT (Premier): Mr. Speaker, I move we proceed to report on bills.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Report on Bill No. 102, Mr. Speaker.

DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION OF BRITISH COLUMBIA ACT

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Speaker, we have made our views on this Act known.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): Both of them, for and against.

MRS. JORDAN: The Hon. Attorney General says both of them, and I think that this probably typifies more than any other comment in this House why it's necessary for this opposition to bring this bill to the attention of this House and to the public of British Columbia.

It's a bill which by nature should be a bill to stimulate secondary industry in British Columbia. It should be a bill by which we should see the advancement of many new and exciting technological industries in British Columbia. It's a bill by which we should be able to see a much more advanced balance in the economy of British Columbia...

MR. SPEAKER: One moment please. What is your point of order?

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): You can't debate the bill again, the principle of the bill, on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: It's true that you can't debate the principle of the bill. It's very narrow debate. I'd point out to the Hon. Member that, although a motion is debatable under standing order No. 45, and that the procedure on third reading is similar in relation to that described in the second reading, the debate is more restricted at the later stage, being limited to matters contained in the bill. That means that it must strictly be within the matters that are in the bill and not what you think should have been in the bill or what is not in the bill — but strictly those that are. I hope that we will not be going through repetition of any debate that was in second reading.

MRS. JORDAN: No, I wouldn't want to offend your ruling, Mr. Speaker. It is the *Development Corporation of British Columbia Act*; it is up for third reading, and I would like to move that this bill be hoisted and laid over for six months before final reading in order that the people of British Columbia will have an opportunity to study its content. I'll present you with the motion for study, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What I take it you are doing... I'm sorry, the Hon. Attorney General.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Mr. Speaker, it seems to be that the official opposition moved exactly the same motion on second reading.

MR. G.B. GARDOM: (Vancouver–Point Grey):

[[Page 2982](#)]

That was after they spoke for it. (Laughter).

HON. MR. MACDONALD: ...and the House made the decision that the British Columbia Development Corporation should be instituted forthwith.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The House has made a decision upon this question.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please.

MR. GARDOM: On a point of order, the Hon. the opposition are allowed to flip and to flop. Tonight I think they should be permitted to flap.

MR. SPEAKER: Order please. Before we get embroiled in another debate...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order! Would the Hon. Member please send the amendment out.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I would like to move that the *Development Corporation of British Columbia Act*, Bill 102, be read a third time this day six months hence.

MR. SPEAKER: The amendment is correctly worded, the way it is indicated in May. The other point about it is that it is quite in order to move the same motion or amendment in third reading, even though it has been moved in second reading because things have happened in between.

MRS. JORDAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. You did say that things have happened in between and in many ways they have, but one of the problems is that nothing has happened to this bill in between, Mr. Speaker. There's been no...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order. Would the Hon. Member be seated a minute? The Hon. Premier, your point of order?

HON. MR. BARRETT: I'd like to refer you to May, 531, debates on third reading. "When a motion has been made for the third reading of a bill, the question is put without debate unless at least six members have given notice of an amendment to the question." There's not notice, as I understand it, on the order paper, and I request that you follow May.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's not in our rules and orders.

MR. SPEAKER: What edition is that, the eighteenth?

HON. MR. BARRETT: That is the eighteenth edition, page 531, debate on third reading.

MR. SPEAKER: I had better check this. There will be a short delay while we examine it because if it's under British standing orders, it would not apply in May.

MRS. JORDAN: Would you like a recess, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Would the Hon. Member be seated for a moment? Hon. Members, in examining that

edition of May, which is a little different to the one I was looking at, the standing orders of the British House are different than ours. When it refers to that rule and that requirement, it's referring to a rule that has been set out in British standing orders, which does not therefore apply to this House, in our usual procedure in regard to debate in third reading.

I take it that the Hon. Member is in order unless I can find some authority other than what we have. I also point out to the Hon. Member that under our rules the Speaker is entitled, if he feels the debate is not necessary at this stage, to curtail the debate. I haven't done so when this happened on second reading, but I have to consider that it has already been decided by the House. There may be something different, I don't know. Therefore, I have to consider whether I should exercise that discretion that I have to curtail the debate on the advisability of a hoist for six months on your amendment.

MRS. JORDAN: Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your point and I will sincerely try to stay in order.

The need for this amendment to hoist the bill for six months has arisen because there has been so much by way of telephone calls, by way of personal visits and by way of correspondence, Mr. Speaker, regarding this bill, There is indeed a great public concern which we have been asked to bring to your attention in this House in third reading regarding this bill. It gives the Minister of Finance and through him, the Minister of Industrial Development, unparalleled powers to invest the taxpayers' money in any number of private concerns in British Columbia.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member is debating the general principles of the bill and the only question that is before the House is your amendment that this should be read six months hence.

[[Page 2983](#)]

MRS. JORDAN: Well what they have asked for, Mr. Speaker, is that this bill be held over in order that greater study can be given to this matter; in order that accountants and investment counselors and, in fact, Mr. Speaker, the taxpayers themselves, the small business people themselves, can study this bill and its ramifications.

In asking to have it held over they are expressing the concern that their tax dollars will be used to invest against them. They must have the opportunity to examine fully how this is going to affect their own particular situation.

They also feel, Mr. Speaker, that these unparalleled powers given to the Minister and the Minister of Finance need further study from the point of view of whether or not this is in fact something that the people of British Columbia wish to accept. They feel that study is needed to ascertain where this complete change of direction is going to take British Columbia in its economic future as well as its philosophical future. In this six months they want an opportunity to study how this radical change, this move by government into the private sector of investment, and elbowing in and controlling little companies is going to affect these individual people in British Columbia.

They feel that in this six months period of time there would be an opportunity to make suggestions to the government that could be incorporated in this bill, as to how the government might better assume its responsibility in creating a climate which would stimulate much-needed secondary industry, and that they would be a part of this in this study. The need for hoisting this bill for six months is based in part, Mr. Speaker, on the international monetary situation which is at a peak of concern at this time.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: No, it isn't.

MRS. JORDAN: Oh, the Minister of Highways...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, the need to study this sort of massive investment into the economic...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please! Would the Hon. Member be seated?

HON. MR. STRACHAN: The Member is talking about the international monetary situation and all sorts of... That is not in the bill.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, that shows why we need this six months to study it. The Minister of Highways, who may well be investing thousands or millions of dollars on his say, doesn't even know there's an international monetary situation and matter of concern.

The six-month period that we are asking for would give the government itself, Mr. Speaker, the opportunity that it must have if it's to follow out the Minister of Finance's statement that they will handle our tax dollars prudently and wisely.

The Minister of Finance, who is a social welfare worker, who's merely held this portfolio for six months, is not a financial authority. There is no one in that cabinet, Mr. Speaker, who really has any general knowledge, let alone specialized knowledge, in financing of industry, in the problems of industry or the need and the problems that this industry is going to face in British Columbia when it tries to compete on the international market and be competitive.

If there was no other reason, Mr. Speaker, for a need for six months' study, it is because the Minister of Finance and the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce (Hon. Mr. Macdonald), whose bill this is, needs the opportunity to learn a good deal more about business and how business responds and the risks involved in business when they are using taxpayers' money to buy shares or create industries in which they are full partners.

During that six months the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, if indeed it is going to be the same Minister who is piloting the bill through the House now, needs the opportunity to sit down, not to elbow his way into the private industrial sector, but to listen to them put forth their views.

This government so far has shown a need for study by its own investments to date which have done nothing to inspire the confidence of the public about the use of their money in industries in British Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I would ask that you give every consideration to what we feel is nothing more dramatic than a plea to hold this bill over for six months to give the public, the taxpayer who's putting up this money which is going to be in competition with him, which is going to be used at great risk, the opportunity to have his input in this bill. And to give the Minister of Industrial Development — if indeed, as I mentioned, it is the same Minister who is piloting this bill — the opportunity to gain more experience in how to create a climate in which secondary industry can expand and how to properly go about stimulating secondary industry without in fact cutting into the private sector and pursuing a bill much too rapidly which is philosophical in its rejection rather than philosophically acceptable in its ability to stimulate where it's needed.

The Premier of this province has said that he's going to be a Premier of "second looks." We have yet to see a demonstration of this. But we would like to

[[Page 2984](#)]

accept his word, Mr. Speaker, that this is what he intends to do. So here is an excellent opportunity to pause for six months, to learn more, to examine this bill and to bring this bill in as it should be brought in. I support this amendment, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In speaking to the amendment, which is to read this bill a third time six months hence, I support the amendment on the basis that the position of the economic climate of British Columbia will be affected either positively or negatively by this particular corporation.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: It certainly will be.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: You people are unreal.

MR. SMITH: This particular bill puts the government in the position of becoming an equity shareholder in any and every corporation they desire, in any and every corporation that they allow to become financed under the requirements and the rules and regulations of this bill. Regardless of what the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce would like to try to say, this is just another way of forcing your way into the private sector into the economy of the province. That's all it is.

That is why we suggest that while a development corporation may be needed, this bill should be hoisted for six months. There's no reason for the Province of British Columbia to take an equity position. By the very introduction of this bill you have suggested to the people in this province that if they wish to come before this development corporation, if they wish financing to be provided to them by this development corporation, they must take the government in as "big brother."

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: I'm not debating the principle of the bill again, Mr. Minister. I'm suggesting to the Hon. Speaker why this bill should be hoisted and read six months hence.

In speaking to that principle, the Minister himself realizes that there is strong resentment to the idea of the provincial government becoming equity partners in each and every endeavour of a financial nature in this province.

The bill gives the government the power to enter into the equity position with any corporation that they finance. It suggests, Mr. Speaker, that while it may not be written into the bill, if the government...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. If it isn't written in the bill you know you cannot debate it. It's precisely what is in the bill that you can debate when you are debating the main motion. This is not the main motion; this is strictly confined to one thing only: whether it should be adjourned for six months.

AN HON. MEMBER: Right on!

MR. SMITH: There's an indirect pressure on people who would avail themselves of the provisions of this bill to let the government be an equity partner before their loan will be approved. That is why we suggest to the government of this province and to the Minister who's in charge of this bill that it be hoisted for six months. Take a look at it. Listen to the people of the province who would like to avail themselves of capital through a development corporation in this province, who would like to know more about what the government has in mind with this type of development corporation, who would like to know more for instance about the type of interest the government is going to charge.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: You can tell me that, yes. The Minister has made this point repeatedly that he would like to hold a gun to the head of the Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith) and the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips) to suggest no one ever asked this government to go into an equity position in any financial endeavour in the north-east or the south-east. All they asked for was the position of the government backing a loan, a low-interest loan, and you know that.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SMITH: I'm not blocking anything, Mr. Speaker. What you have suggested tonight is that if you cannot become an equity partner, there will be no funds available for an alfalfa cubing plant. That is not the position that we took when we presented a bill to the House. That is not a position that we will support in this House.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: Certainly people are interested in finance for development in the province. Certainly, the financial...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

[[Page 2985](#)]

MRS. JORDAN: Don't distract the Member.

MR. SMITH: ...means are available in the Province of British Columbia — built up through a sound financial system over the last 20 years. But, when the government says they must dictate and they must be equity partners, we do not support it, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Point of order.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The point of order is three times in a row the Hon. Member has said that the government, in order to use this Act, must have an equity position in each and every business in the province that it helps. It is not in the bill. The bill provides for loans — industrial...at the sites — and/or equity, but doesn't say "each and every." So this Member has been consistently misrepresenting this bill. He is out of order.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. I draw the attention of the Hon. Member for North Peace to an even more irregular part — that is that he is debating what he says is in the bill. But that is not the purpose of this debate; it is to confine itself strictly to why this should be six months delayed.

MR. SMITH: I am trying, Mr. Speaker, to debate, if I might, the reason for the motion to read the bill six months hence.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MRS. JORDAN: Oh, go back to your ice cream machine before it's taken over by the government.

MR. SMITH: The reason I suggest that we should read this bill six months hence is very simple. It would give the government ample opportunity to look at the sections that we feel are not the type of legislation we should have before this province. We are certainly opposed to the type of bill in its present form. We feel that the people of this province should have more input, that they should be asked what they think of it. And on that basis, I suggest it should be hoisted for six months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. G.S. WALLACE (Oak Bay): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand to oppose the amendment. There are various reasons why I oppose the amendment, and I am neither extreme right nor extreme left; I try to be reasonable, and that is what we are all supposed to be. Even more important than being reasonable is to be logical. For the official opposition, with Bill 6 on the order paper — section 6(c), which is exactly what the government bill says...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please, Would the Hon. Member confine himself to the six months delay that is proposed in this amendment?

MR. WALLACE: Yes, Mr. Speaker. Point number one why the six-month proposal is so preposterous and ludicrous is that it is proposed by people who, in the first instance, tabled a bill in this House that says the same thing...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: "... acquire shares, stocks, bonds, debentures, debenture stocks..." What's the difference between that and the bill we are debating?

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Oh, they're uneasy, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I would say that several Members have already spoken, going far beyond the amendment they propose. Now I am asked to curtail this Member, and the ones who permitted it to happen without any cries of "order" are suddenly becoming virtuous.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: Well, Mr. Speaker, with respect of the Chair, I will very quickly get to the point. I would say that whether this opposition of the official opposition approves or disapproves of the bill, it is the clear policy of this government that as an alternative method of stimulating the economy and the development of secondary industry, it has chosen quite clearly a policy to encourage the participation of government in private corporations.

Now, whether or not the opposition approves — certainly the official opposition has the right to disagree — but, whether or not it agrees or disagrees, it is very clearly the stated policy of this government to follow that concept. Therefore, in my opinion, nothing would be gained by waiting six months to implement a policy which they are absolutely dedicated to following tonight.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. WALLACE: It isn't, Mr. Speaker, a question of fight or no fight. It is our interpretation of the

[[Page 2986](#)]

British Columbia Development Corporation Act that the government has the alternative, one of many alternatives, as a means of stimulating the economy and creating non-polluting secondary industry in the province. I feel that the reasons are very clear as to why nothing would be gained...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. WALLACE: It is my feeling, Mr. Speaker, that the policy of this government is clearcut. In our opinion, the development corporation fund is a good idea, and we do not accept the thesis or the concept put forward by the official opposition that the only way in which new industry will be created will be by the government compelling the new industry to accept government investment as partners.

We feel that there are various alternatives explained in the bill and this type of amendment — we can't discuss it in detail and quote the sections, but the facts are quite clear. This is the policy of the government. It will be the policy of the government six months from now, and it will probably be the policy of the government six years from now.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Order! Would the Hon. Member proceed and would the Hon. Members of the official opposition be more quiet, please — and me too. (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, my!

MR. WALLACE: Well, Mr. Speaker, I am very keen to...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order.

MR. WALLACE: I am more than willing, Mr. Speaker, to continue, but the opposition is making it a little difficult to be heard. The little chickadee from North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) seems to think that I am...(Laughter). Oh, there's the chickadee...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, I think when I said "little" I was being rather generous. (Laughter). But it is always a common experience in this Legislature that when a person gets up and gets pretty close to the bone with some of the things he says, one or other side of the House erupts. I'm rather interested to hear all the flak and the noise from the flip-flop party down the way.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Awwh!

MR. WALLACE: Aw! They just don't like it.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): You haven't walked a straight line since you went into politics. (Laughter).

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

AN HON. MEMBER: Shocking, absolutely shocking! (Laughter).

MR. WALLACE: Mr. Speaker, the very essential issue in this amendment is that if this bill were held over for six months, there would likely be a different outcome. As a result of events in the next six months the government might choose to change the bill we have before us tonight.

That's the evidence for the opposition. If we go by the pattern of legislation that has been presented this session and not by this individual bill per se, it is clear, since it has been stated innumerable times in the House and outside the House by the Premier, that this government believes in a measure of participation by government in the private sector of the economy.

Whether the opposition agrees or disagrees with some of the content of this bill, it is a remarkable example of short-sightedness for anyone to think that by holding it over for six months there will be any change in the basic philosophy or policy of this government.

For this reason I oppose the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's with a twinge of regret that I say I can't support the Hon. Member for North Peace River (Mr. Smith), much as I would like to do so. He made eminent common sense last evening. But I'm afraid on this particular occasion, he hasn't done so.

For many years the Members of our party have spoken on the need to develop a completely new industrial strategy based not on natural resources, but on manufacturing. Recognizing the inherent handicaps of B.C., namely the tariffs that we face in other countries and the transportation costs we face in serving the Canadian common market, it's been recognized that British Columbia has to offer particular incentives to manufacturing industries to

[[Page 2987](#)]

get them established.

That being the case, Mr. Speaker, we were disappointed that appropriate legislation was delayed one year by Social Credit in 1953; was delayed four years by Social Credit in 1956; was delayed 8 years by Social Credit in 1960; was delayed 11 years by Social Credit in 1963; was delayed 14 years by Social Credit in 1966; was delayed 17 years by Social Credit in 1969. At this point I want to pause, Mr. Speaker, to remind the Member for Oak Bay (Mr. Wallace) — who has left — and all the Members for the Legislative Assembly that the Member for Oak Bay had no difficulty in 1969 in ignoring this particular difficulty, running for Social Credit for the opportunity of becoming elected to this Legislative Assembly. His stance tonight in sound defence of the principle of supportive secondary industry represents quite a departure from the position in 1969 when it was convenient to run for Social Credit in order to get elected to this assembly.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I wonder if the Member would deal strictly with six-month delay.

MR. McGEER: Well, Mr. Speaker, some of these things need to be placed on the record. I've been in this Legislative Assembly for 11 years now speaking on the need for this kind of incentive to be developed in the province so that we could get manufacturing going. I can remember the Second Member for Vancouver—Point Grey (Mr. Gardom) and myself saying that the thing we look forward to most in coming to a special session of the Legislative Assembly — which was promised by Social Credit and by the NDP and by the Liberal Party, should they form a government — was to embark upon a new programme of industrial incentives to industry.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. Would the Member deal with the amendment which is a six-month delay, not the merits of the bill or the general principles of the bill or anything of the sort?

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to make a very fundamental point here. I believe all parties now agree with the position that we've taken for many years that incentives are essential for us to develop a new industrial strategy in British Columbia.

The NDP has the belief that an equity position should be an integral part of the programme, whereas Social Credit has rejected that particular aspect of the bill.

MR. SPEAKER: This is not the subject of the debate in this amendment...

MR. McGEER: But, Mr. Speaker, if I may just take a moment to develop this point.

MR. SPEAKER: Your moments extend all the time.

MR. McGEER: No, Mr. Speaker, they don't. They extend only because of the interruptions from this side of the House, from the other side of the House and yourself, Sir. (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: We haven't interrupted you at all.

MR. McGEER: But the Speaker has on occasion.

MR. SPEAKER: Now, now, we must win against you if all of us are interrupting you.

MR. McGEER: Can I not be a peacemaker in this assembly, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Only if you sit down. (Laughter).

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, I regret the remarks of the Leader of the Opposition and former Premier that I've not attempted in all these years to be a peacemaker.

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

MR. McGEER: What I'm trying to say, Mr. Speaker, is, really, the difference between the NDP, the Social Credit and the Liberal Party is not all that great. We all want to see secondary industry enhanced in this province. Is that not correct?

The former Premier says "only by private enterprise"; the present Premier says "by buying an equity position." The Liberal Party would agree to it being done either way, so long as...(Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: Sure, they'll go any way you want.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to be brief. (Laughter). Why should this province limit itself to only a left arm or only a right arm when it could have both arms to develop jobs and industry in this province? Really, the whole point of the Liberal Party and why we, on this occasion, support the government is because we feel we have to have both arms in British Columbia to provide jobs and a better industrial future for all our people.

I regret the dispute that has developed between the government and the official opposition because I don't think it is in the best interests of the province. What we need to do is to get on with some kind of a

[[Page 2988](#)]

development corporation. That's why we support the government in this particular instance.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Chilliwack.

MR. H.W. SCHROEDER (Chilliwack): Mr. Speaker, I'd like to speak in favour of the amendment because I believe it's going to take the people of British Columbia at least six months to recuperate from the facts that they have just learned this evening; that we now have a socialist Conservative Party in British Columbia. (Laughter).

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SCHROEDER: "Bless your socks." Mr. Premier, thank you.

Seriously, can we listen to just a little bit of reason? I think that I would be within the bounds of reason if I suggested that the people of British Columbia have been just a little bit apprehensive about a piece of legislation that allows the government to move in as an equity factor into any segment of business. Now, why don't we do this: the government has already moved into two different corporations, Colcel and Ocean Falls...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. You are not allowed to debate other bills before this House in debating this very narrow ground of this six-month delay.

MR. SCHROEDER: I appreciate that, Mr. Speaker, but I just wanted the government to remember which two it was they had already invested in.

Why don't you take six months' time and develop some kind of a track record? Prove to the public that you can invest in a corporation and make it a viable thing; prove to the people of British Columbia that they have nothing to be afraid of. In that way you can read the bill the third time six months from now and at least you'll lay the people of British Columbia to rest. I hope not in an economic sense, but at least as far as their fears are concerned.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Vancouver-Point Grey.

MR. GARDOM: Well, Mr. Speaker, I don't wish to make any reference to octopi attitudes in the House that might have been expressed a little bit earlier this evening.

Dealing with the equity factor and the equity quotient that seems to be the distinction between the official opposition and the New Democratic Party, I cannot find it between either of their two bills.

As I said a little bit earlier in this debate last week or the week before — time is getting a little long — there was a gross similarity between the positions which was a total DBR, I would say with every respect to the official opposition that they had the highest DBR rating in Canada when they came out with their suggestion that they would provide incentives to industry.

DBR is the Death Bed Repentance quotient, and this emanated from the Kelowna Charter. And you know the funniest thing about the Kelowna Charter? That poor child was killed in infancy on the floor of this House.

For a moment we had a tiny bit of revival from the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) who tried to pump a little bit of blood into this poor child; but then, by golly, Okanagan South (Hon. Mr. Bennett) came in and that was the end; notwithstanding that we really and truly had a twin insofar as the two bills are concerned.

Now I said a tiny bit earlier tonight that perhaps we could base it upon the lateness of the session; but, Mr. Speaker, I can't really and truly buy a six-month amendment for this.

I am not questioning the motivations nor the sincerity of the position of the Social Credit Party.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. GARDOM: I may for a moment. I may indeed. Strike me down with a bolt from Heaven if I would do that.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

HON. MR. BARRETT: You've gone too far. (Laughter).

MR. GARDOM: Howsoever, we find, Mr. Speaker, that for the 10 long years since I've been more actively interested in provincial politics they fled this thing like the devil did the holy water. For all of the time that this was proposed in the Legislature for the next 10 years — which means 20 years of proposition — they said, "No, no, no. Never again!" But suddenly the Kelowna Charter...and now again, now it's 20 years and six months "No." If the same bill were brought up 20 years and six months from today it would be another 20 years and six months plus. I don't think they're ever able to make up their mind about this thing. I think the question should be put.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I must have an answer to a question before I can make up my mind on this amendment. I want to know from the Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) if they really mean it this time or if they are only fooling.

[[Page 2989](#)]

(Laughter).

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Langley.

MR. R.H. McCLELLAND (Langley): Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's a pleasure to be in this House tonight and hear the Liberal manifesto finally. They'll vote any way as long as they don't fall off the fence.

Mr. Speaker, I understand the Liberal problem because they've been trying for many years to promote this kind of legislation. I appreciate that. I think everyone believes in helping industry and particularly small business and

agricultural concerns.

But I think that the Liberals believe so strongly in this that they've allowed themselves to become blinded to this legislation, because this legislation is just another example of where we're going and one of the reasons that we should delay this for six months.

The government, Mr. Speaker, and particularly the Attorney General, must stop its threats and blackmail and stop it right now. Mr. Speaker, the government has proved that it doesn't need this bill right now; yet it stands and attempts to blackmail the Members from the northern part of this province by saying that this bill must be passed...

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. You do not use the word "blackmail" against any other Member of this House. Would you kindly withdraw it?

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, I said "the government." But I'll withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: I think it's obvious that the government is in the House.

MR. McCLELLAND: I'll withdraw it.

MR. SPEAKER: Thank you.

MR. McCLELLAND: Mr. Speaker, the government has proven that it does not need this bill right now. It can wait for six months because it has moved into private enterprise on at least two occasions and it didn't need an industrial development bill to do it. It did it with special measures before this Legislature and it could do exactly the same thing.

Mr. Speaker, we agree that the people in this province are anxious for some kind of measure by which we can help secondary industry and by which we can help the agricultural community develop manufacturing processes. The people are anxious for it and so is the official opposition. But the people and the official opposition are very uncertain about the methods that this government has chosen to follow. They need time to look at these provisions in relation to the rest of the bill and decide whether or not they want to go this far. All they are asking for is six months time in which to do that.

Where are the promises, Mr. Speaker, that were made so piously by the Members opposite that they would take important legislation and send it to committee of the House so that the legislation could be studied over-a six-month period?

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Hon. Member, I have outlined to the Members that you first of all have to deal only with the six months, you cannot refer to other matters or other bills that are in the records or in the order paper. You must strictly deal with the six-month delay that is proposed in the amendment, either for or against.

MR. McCLELLAND: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I haven't mentioned any other bills. I have suggested that the government has said that it would give us six months, or whatever time we needed, for important legislation to be discussed and considered and worked over by all of the people who are Members of this Legislature. That's what we are asking for now.

We want six months so that we can provide the kind of input that this government said that they would allow us to provide. Mr. Speaker, this government pledged to make the role of the individual MLA more meaningful, and by this kind of action you are reneging on that pledge. You are reneging on that pledge, Mr. Speaker. That kind of promise that this government makes to the individual MLA, particularly in opposition, is hollow and meaningless, Mr. Speaker. Because that's what we are asking for now; we are asking for that six months so that all of us can have some input into this kind of bill.

Mr. Speaker, this government has taken this particular piece of legislation, taken many good ideas and surrounded them with such offensive measures that they have allowed their philosophical outlook once again to

cloud their good judgment. All we're asking, Mr. Speaker, is that they take six months to take another look at their philosophy, and see if it can't be amended.

Mr. Speaker, one of the Members on the other side of the House alluded to a wrecking crew. Well, Mr. Speaker, it's our opinion that we know where the wrecking crew is, and it is on the other side of the House, certainly not on this side of the House. Mr. Speaker, this government should be ashamed of their actions. They are gambling the livelihood of the people of British Columbia against an obsession to get into the stock market and take a flyer, and play the market with the taxpayers' money. You won't even wait for six months to see if there isn't a better way to do it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Highways.

[[Page 2990](#)]

HON. MR. STRACHAN: Well, Mr. Speaker, this is probably the most pitiful display that I have ever seen in this House. They talk about input; they talk about a six-months hoist...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. STRACHAN: They talk about a six-months hoist so they could have some input. We got their input, and their input demanded that a corporation be set up with the right to acquire what? They are objecting to this bill which allows a corporation to have equity. How do you get equity in a corporation? By buying shares of stock.

Their input demanded that this government bring in legislation immediately to set up a corporation with the right to buy equity shares and stock. Well, what does shares and stock mean? It means equity. But you were only fooling, and we will let the people of British Columbia know that you are still fooling; that you are deliberately holding up the work of this House so that the government can't get on with the job of developing this province that should be developed and providing the jobs that you were shedding the crocodile tears about.

It's obvious you didn't mean a word you said all session, otherwise you'd make this bill pass now, unanimously, by the support of every Member of the House.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Vancouver—Little Mountain.

MR. R.T. CUMMINGS (Vancouver—Little Mountain): Mr. Speaker, I wish to rise to oppose this amendment. The Social Credit mentioned the need. I would like to mention that there are 75,000 people out of work. Six months. Have you ever been out of work for six months? This bill is very important to stimulate business and provide jobs for the people. I don't know your motives, and I don't know what makes you oppose the people like this. They need these jobs. We have to move on; we can't waste time.

Motion negatived on the flowing division:

YEAS — 10

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland Morrison	
Schroeder		

NAYS — 39

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford

Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Calder	Hartley	Skelly
Gabelmann	Lauk	Lea
Young	Lockstead	Gorst
Rolston	Anderson, G.H.	Barnes
Steves	Kelly	Webster
Lewis	Liden	Wallace
Curtis	Gardom	McGeer

Bill No. 102 read a third time and passed on the following division:

YEAS — 39

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Calder	Hartley	Skelly
Gabelmann	Lauk	Lea
Young	Lockstead	Gorst
Rolston	Anderson, G.H.	Barnes
Steves	Kelly	Webster
Lewis	Liden	Curtis
Wallace	Gardom	McGeer

NAYS — 10

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder		

PAIRED

Williams, L.A.	Stupich
Nimsick	Brousson

HON. MR. BARRETT: Report on Bill No. 110, Mr. Speaker.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MEDICAL ACT

Bill No. 110 read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Report on Bill No. 148, Mr. Speaker.

ENERGY ACT

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. SMITH: I move that Bill No. 148, intituled *Energy Act* be read a third time this day six months hence.

In speaking to the amendment, Mr. Speaker, this is an Act that ostensibly when it was introduced it was suggested that it was required to regulate and control the petroleum industry in the Province of British Columbia. But the Act covers every type of energy

[[Page 2991](#)]

source in the province.

Mr. Speaker, it's a known fact that many organizations tried to get copies of the Act after it had been printed and they were unavailable. It's a known fact that the dealers' associations which represent the petroleum industry were not able to get copies of the Act as they would have liked. It's a known fact that because of these things, the dealers' associations, the petroleum companies and in fact anyone who is directly or indirectly affected by this Act, have suggested that they want more time to study it.

The provisions of the Act seemed to have dawned upon the public generally only within the last week or 10 days when they realized the full ramifications of what this Act would do in the Province of British Columbia. That is one of the reasons that we ask that the government delay reading this bill for six months.

It's the type of Act which, when passed, will control not only the petroleum industry but everyone or every type of business in the manufacture or distribution of energy in the Province of British Columbia. It's the feeling of this party that through the failure of the government to properly advise people of the ramifications of this Act, in the interests of everyone it should be delayed for six months.

It is only in the last week or 10 days that the petroleum industry itself, which is affected by the whole Act — but one section deals specifically with it — has really found out in a general way the ramifications of the bill. Still, not all of the people affected by the Act are aware of its ramifications simply because for some reason they have not been able to obtain copies of that Act. Mr. Speaker, perhaps it was not intentional on the part of the government, but the copies of the Act that were available to the public were certainly limited in number. For that reason, people who applied to the offices here to receive copies could not get them. They were just not available. I don't know what the run was, Mr. Attorney General...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: It seems that the Hon. Attorney General, in his capacity as Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, would suggest that because Imperial Oil received one copy of the Act, everyone who is an Imperial Oil dealer in the Province of British Columbia should know what was in it. Yet they would each, individually and separately, be involved in the actual implementation of the Act.

Mr. Speaker, I would suggest that while the ARA (Automotive Retailers Association) may have received a copy of the bill, their secretary-manager is in direct conflict with the members of that association with the statement that he has made to the Press. They don't support what he said and they've said so loud and clear. For the Attorney General to suggest that just because Mr. Kinneard has received a copy of the Act and has made a statement on behalf of the association without properly contacting the members of that association — complete nonsense. One man, while he may operate in the capacity of secretary-manager, cannot speak for the dealers and they have said so.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SMITH: Well, it's unfortunate that many, many people who have an interest in this Act found it impossible to receive or obtain a copy of the Act from the government.

I believe that in the best interests of the public generally the government would be well-advised to accept our amendment to read this bill six months hence. It has certainly been said often enough by this new government that they intend to hold two sessions a year, Mr. Speaker; that one of the purposes of the spring session would be to bring before the House those matters of finance, particularly with regard to the budget; and that many of the matters referring to legislation would be brought before the House for first and second reading or taken to committees and then laid over until the fall session so that every Member of this House and the public generally would have ample opportunity to study the ramifications of the legislation.

If we were proceeding on the basis of a minor amendment to a bill in which the principles had long been known and understood by the people of the province, it would be one thing. But on this bill and many others, we're proceeding to put into effect new legislation completely different from anything that we presently have on the statute books. True, it is an indication of new policy by the government. That is all the more reason why the government should be particularly careful in providing as much information as possible to those who will be directly affected by the legislation.

Give them an opportunity to study the legislation, Mr. Minister of Industrial Development. Point out to them the position that they have with relation to the new legislation, because many will be affected. Some of them feel that they will be affected detrimentally. Give them time between now and the fall session to look into the *Energy Act* because it is a very complicated and long Act bringing up many new principles.

I would hope, Mr. Attorney General, that the Hon. Minister of Industrial Development would accept the plea of the opposition in the House that the bill be read this day six months hence. Open up the government to the scrutiny of the public. Let the sun

[[Page 2992](#)]

shine in, as the Minister so often likes to say. Indicate to the people who will be affected the implications of this bill as it relates to their own individual business enterprise. Listen to the petroleum industry as it relates to their field of commercial enterprise in the Province of British Columbia. Listen to the dealers who have a direct interest in the retail end of the business. Listen to the people in the refining end and the exploration end of the business who are affected by this.

In other words, make good the promises of pre-election days when you and Members of the NDP said that they would be an open party, they wished to conduct an open government, they wished to let a little sun shine in, they wanted public participation. This Act is certainly one which enters into a field not previously covered by legislation in this province.

Mr. Speaker, I would hope that the Minister would consider that point of view and accept our amendment to hoist the bill for six months.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, it's a curious position for me to be in, to be speaking in agreement with — and indeed on behalf of — the oil industry in this province because I've spent a good deal of the last three years opposing them.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Like Alice, he's getting curiouser and curiouser.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Well, it's a question of applying a consistent principle. In this instance it's the principle of open government and fair play, Mr. Attorney General.

We have a situation where the industry, perhaps to a degree through its own failure to be a little faster off the blocks and out on the track a little quicker, but nevertheless, where it has not had the opportunity to make representations which it feels, and we feel as well, it should have made. The fact is that Bill 148 was called for second reading out of order by the Premier. It was not expected to be on the floor at the time it was. You will agree, Mr. Attorney General, this was the case if you will cast your mind back. Or were you listening to a hotline at the time?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: I was in the House.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: You were in the House? Anyway, it was called out of order and in actual fact we have not had the representations — either representations to the government or to the opposition on this bill which we feel there should have been.

Apart from that, there are aspects to this bill which I will not go into again, but which I outlined on behalf of this party during the second reading debate, and which other Members of my party emphasized as well — aspects dealing with the complete control which this particular bill gives over industry and, in particular, the service-station operators of the province.

We feel that a six-month hoist would give an opportunity for discussion which has not, let's face it, taken place on this bill up to now. It would give an opportunity for a true evaluation of what the effects of what this particular bill would be, and we feel it would allow the bill to be improved.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I would simply like to say that we in this party will be supporting the proposal of the Hon. Member for Peace River.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Oak Bay.

MR. WALLACE: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This party opposed the *Energy Act*, Bill 148, in second reading and more particularly in committee reading because, as I said, in several sections we are concerned that the power the Attorney General is seeking exceeds that which is reasonable and necessary to carry out the essential purpose of the bill. Again, we have a philosophical difference in that the government feels that this kind of power is necessary while we feel that it is not necessary.

Furthermore, we would also repeat that the degree of control of the petroleum industry, in our opinion, has not been adequately studied. We disagree that the petroleum industry has a monopoly, as claimed by the government. We feel that there is competition and that those people in the petroleum industry who are competing in the private sector have been sadly neglected in the preparing of this bill.

We feel also, from representations which have been made to us as a party in this House by various people in the petroleum industry, that a better bill could have been and could be produced by giving them a chance to discuss the bill with government in greater detail than has been allowed, despite the Premier's protest that he did, in fact, meet with the oil industry.

Mr. Speaker, I am not disputing that he did meet with them. I am simply saying that the scope of this bill, the ramifications of the bill, particularly in regard to the petroleum industry, are such that much more detailed consideration should have been given to the people most affected by this bill.

We consider it to be one of the fundamentals of our democratic process that any party — whatever government, yours or ours or any other government — must consult fairly and in depth, and listen to the opinions of the people most affected by the legislation. We feel that this has not been done, and

[[Page 2993](#)]

we feel that a six-month period would indeed afford the government this opportunity and provide justice to the individuals who are most concerned by the bill. Therefore we support the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. JORDAN: Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

MR. SPEAKER: The motion is incorrect.

MRS. JORDAN: What would you make it?

MR. SPEAKER: Well, before you can move the adjournment of the House you have to first adjourn the debate.

MRS. JORDAN: No, no.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. J.R. CHABOT (Columbia River): Mr. Speaker, I move adjournment of this debate until the next sitting of the House.

Motion negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 10

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder		

NAYS — 40

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Hartley	Skelly	Gabelmann
Lauk	Lea	Young
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves
Kelly	Webster	Lewis
Liden	Wallace	Curtis
Gardom	Williams, L.A.	Anderson, D.A.
McGeer		

PAIRED

Brousson Nimsick

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan (Mrs. Jordan) has moved the adjournment of the debate, she is therefore not permitted to speak.

MRS. JORDAN: No, I didn't. No. No.

MR. SPEAKER: Oh, I'm sorry. Pardon me. She got up and spoke, then took her seat and the Hon. Member for Columbia River (Mr. Chabot) stood up, took the floor and moved the adjournment of the debate.

AN HON. MEMBER: That's right, and he lost his place.

MR. SPEAKER: Yes, but I would take it that the Hon. Member for North Okanagan lost her place because she stood up, spoke, and sat down.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

AN HON. MEMBER: You ruled her out of order.

MR. SPEAKER: She did not get up on a point of order, and she did not retake the floor after I ruled on that point. Consequently, she lost her place in the debate.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. SPEAKER: No, Hon. Member, I am awfully sorry but that is the only way that you can... Order, please. The only way that the Hon. Member could speak again is with leave of the House. Is leave granted?

Leave not granted.

MRS. JORDAN: A point of order.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order. Order, please. Would the Hon. Member be seated?

MRS. JORDAN: Yes, but may I speak on a point of order, please?

MR. SPEAKER: I don't think so because you are out of order.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Do you have a new point of order? Order, please. When I've made a ruling, you can't speak on the point of order. You speak on the point of order before the ruling; that is in standing orders. Do you have a new point of order on

[[Page 2994](#)]

something else?

MRS. JORDAN: I would just like to ask to have an opportunity to ask you for clarification. Everybody else has been discussing the issue. I'm the Member who's involved, and I'm sure that you wish to give me this.

I understood, when I got up and moved that the House do now adjourn and was ruled out of order, that I did not lose my place in this debate. I said nothing, quite admittedly, so afterward sat down. Then the Hon. Member for Columbia River got up and moved adjournment of this debate.

MR. SPEAKER: It didn't matter if you related *Alice in Wonderland*, it still wouldn't make any difference.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please!

MRS. JORDAN: I just bet that will be in *Hansard* tomorrow, Mr. Speaker.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: She's just made the best speech she's made all this session.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. The point is, when you stand up and you speak, you are only entitled to speak once. And that is the point.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Member for Boundary-Similkameen is recognized.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. F.X. RICHTER (Boundary-Similkameen): Mr. Speaker, on that basis there wouldn't be anybody left to speak in the House.

AN HON. MEMBER: Alice in "Blunderland."

MR. RICHTER: Mr. Speaker, speaking in support of the amendment to delay the third reading of this bill for six months, it's obvious because of the nature of the bill that it is not clearly understood. It's a conglomerate. It doesn't only deal with the matter of the petroleum industry — and the energy industry — it deals with a great number of other areas of jurisdiction which were previously administered through the Public Utilities Commission.

This is going to be a brand new operation, a brand new organization with far-reaching powers. The representations that we are getting each and every day indicate quite clearly that the petroleum industry did approach the government to be heard, and at that time the Premier was not able to hear them.

They did submit in writing a submission at a later date. It has not been given any particular recognition. Only the other day a group met with the Attorney General, and he had very little time to give them, so they are all very confused in the public sector as to just what the impact of this legislation is going to be.

So, even if you just laid it over as you did another bill, which I must commend you for — the Attorney General laid another bill over to another time. Even if you just laid this bill over until the next session, that would certainly give people an opportunity to make representations, to study it and to be able to really recognize the impact of it.

I don't think there will be any particular harm done by delaying it for that short period of time. I would commend this to the government very highly. I'm sure it would stand them in excellent stead in the eyes of the public if they would take this recommendation.

I must support the amendment because, to be quite frank, I have studied the bill and I find some new impact in it each time. That's good. Yes, it's good that I find some new impact. It just shows you that someone who is used to reading legislation, if they can do this, what of the person on the street?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: There are great hidden benefits in this bill.

MR. RICHTER: Yes, they're certainly well hidden.

HON. W.A.C. BENNETT (Leader of the Opposition): If they are hidden, they certainly should be studied for six months.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. RICHTER: Well, there's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, there's no question with the admission of the Attorney

General, the Minister piloting the bill, that the public should have more opportunity. I can't go along with this hurried effort of shoving so much legislation, so much important legislation, so much legislation that has a completely different approach to public affairs.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: That's right. And it's a sorry day that that...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. RICHTER: And I know that's not in the bill, Mr. Speaker. That part, the fact that the socialists won

[[Page 2995](#)]

election, isn't in the bill and I don't want to talk about it. But it certainly is not in the interest of the public if they don't have an opportunity to have a full explanation. I think the idea of committees working out in the country with this sort of legislation is an excellent one. I commend the government for that approach. I hope they would take it in this particular case.

Mr. Speaker, I must support the motion and the amending motion, and hope that the government will see fit to show their strength in taking a second look and laying this over even until the fall session.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver—Point Grey.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Speaker, this isn't the A.B. Macdonald bill. I think this is the M.A. Macdonald bill. And the M.A. Macdonald bill was delayed some 35 years, while this particular motion only delays it six months. It seems to me there would be a certain appropriateness in delaying it another 35 years.

HON. MR. BARRETT: His daddy told him to get on with it. (Laughter).

MR. McGEER: Well, I don't think we should be trying to pursue ancestor worship in this Legislative Assembly, Mr. Speaker, and...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. McGEER: Well, maybe, but I'm not trying to pursue ancestor worship, and the Premier knows that, Mr. Speaker.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please.

MR. McGEER: Well, Mr. Speaker, I'm not going to go into a lecture on monetary theory; I think the ex-Premier is being just a bit extravagant there.

But nevertheless, this energy bill... Mr. Speaker, may I say that the Attorney General was not a bit embarrassed, indeed he was proud to have lifted sections holus-bolus out of the former Act, which was discredited in this province, and reintroduce it after we had this surcease for some 20 years. The former Act was found to be repugnant and unworkable. I'm talking about a former government of which the Hon. Attorney General's respected ancestor was at one time a Member.

AN HON. MEMBER: A Liberal.

MR. McGEER: It was a Liberal government. I would be the last one to decry legislation that was brought in by a former government, but Mr. Speaker, we did have a good try at this kind of legislation some 30 years ago, and it was found not to be particularly beneficial for the Province of British Columbia, even in war time.

I think that it was an act of wisdom on the part of the former Social Credit government to remove this legislation from the books. It didn't do the Province of British Columbia any particular harm to have that legislation lifted. In the years when it was on the books of British Columbia, as I said before, it proved not to be terribly beneficial and therefore it's hard for me to grasp how our province is going to be advanced, particularly by reintroducing the M.A. Macdonald legislation.

Mr. Speaker, though we support the six-months hoist, I would have thought it would be in better tradition of the rebellious new generation, of which the Attorney General is a faded example, not to have delayed it by six months but to have delayed it by a further 35 years.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. BENNETT: I too think that this amendment should be supported tonight. It would have been well if certain legislation and certain actions of a former Liberal government had been postponed for further study. I refer to my great friend, the late Mr. Pattullo, who too was interested in getting the state involved in energy development in drilling for oil. They drilled for oil and they drilled for gas.

I want to say this: when Mr. Hart became Prime Minister or Premier of this province — which means exactly the same thing — he had a study made. He found that under the government operation, they were drilling for oil in Commotion Creek in the Peace River but the pipe started to come back up the other way. The government didn't dare stop the operation because if they did it was said that they would be selling out to the oil interests, because if they had gone just a little bit further they would have struck oil. I want to tell you that had they gone on further, they would have struck the moon and the Americans wouldn't have to go there at all.

That's the experience of government operations in energy development in this province. It was a total failure. It cost the province thousands and thousands of dollars. That's the reason why this bill should be delayed for six months before it is read. We're entering policies under this energy bill which are not going to be in the best interests of the province and are going to cost the Treasury and the taxpayers a lot of money. A lot of money is going to be wasted in this energy bill.

Then a Social Credit government came into office,

[[Page 2996](#)]

Mr. Speaker. Then we got oil and natural gas by drilling for it for the first time and got it piped into the markets. I want to say this: that's the way to get it, with private enterprise. That's the reason why this energy bill should be given a six-months hoist tonight.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources.

HON. R.A. WILLIAMS (Minister of Lands, Forests and Water Resources): Knowing all those things, all that history of this great province, the former Premier decided to expropriate the B.C. Electric. (Laughter).

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I recognize the Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Speaker, I certainly rise to support this amendment to this motion to have this bill hoisted for six months. I think the amendment should have read "for six years" or "for 66 years."

The government is jumpy about this bill, Mr. Speaker. That's one reason that it should be hoisted. The government is jumpy. The Premier is jumpy. The Attorney General is jumpy and all the Members of his backbench are jumpy about this bill, Mr. Speaker. That's one reason and one good reason why this bill should be hoisted for six months.

When the bill was discussed in second reading, it was discussed on a Saturday — a rare Saturday meeting in

this Legislature. His own government benches were so jumpy that half of them weren't even in the House. That's why this bill should be hoisted, Mr. Speaker.

Another reason is that this bill is just too much. It's too much for the Members of the government and it's too much for all the Members in this Legislature to swallow. Mr. Speaker, this bill was brought down too fast. That's another reason it should be hoisted for six months or six years. We've had too much of this kind of legislation during this sitting of the Legislature.

AN HON. MEMBER: You're a six-month party.

MR. PHILLIPS: "Six-month party"? Mr. Speaker, you take this bill along with the other one that we tried to hoist for six months. Put them together and study the two of them for six months and you'd know exactly what's going on in this province. That's why we need a little time — to let the people know.

Mr. Speaker, this government did not get the right on August 30 to shove all of the stuff down our throats so fast. Mr. Speaker, it is too much for the people of this province to swallow. We need six months to take a look at it. The people in the Province of British Columbia and the people in the industries that are going to be affected by this bill need an opportunity to get their breaths, Mr. Speaker.

Trying to swallow this bill is like trying to swallow a whole steer in one gulp. That's impossible, isn't it, Mr. Speaker? Even at six months, that's a lot of meat. But at least we'd have the opportunity to cut out some of the bone and gristle that's in this bill, Mr. Speaker. That's why we need to hoist it for six months.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Don't give us a bum steer.

MR. PHILLIPS: We're getting a lot of bull from the other side when they're trying to ram this down our throats, Mr. Speaker.

What we want is just the opportunity to slowly digest it. Mr. Speaker, even the government's own backbench has not been able to digest this bill. The Attorney General himself hasn't digested it. On Saturday when we pointed out some of the ramifications of this bill, the Attorney General could hardly believe his own eyes, Mr. Speaker. That's why we need six months.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: Who said that? That's why we need six months, Mr. Speaker.

By some of the legislation that we have created this year, Mr. Speaker, the people of this province will be paying out \$1 million in salaries for the bureaucracies that this government has created. The new bureaucracies, the new commissions that this government has created in this Legislature, Mr. Speaker, will cost the people of this province \$1 million.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I've already told the Hon. Members that you're not to discuss other matters but the simple question of six months delay on this bill. You are embarking upon a discussion of all the commissions of British Columbia, past, present and future.

MR. PHILLIPS: What I'm saying is that we need this six months to relate this bill to the other bills. I think that relates very much, Mr. Speaker. However, I'll give you another reason.

This bill should be broken down into three pieces of legislation.

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance): It would take you six months to read one part of it.

MR. PHILLIPS: Well, the Minister of Health

doesn't know what's going on over there or he would certainly never support this piece of legislation.

In this energy bill — which by the way has taken all of the energy out of the Minister of Industrial Development...look — he's exhausted. He's laying back. This bill has taken all his energy, Mr. Speaker. He needs six months to recuperate and he needs six months to realize what he has actually done in this bill. He's put so many things in this bill and tossed a few roses on top of it to try to sell it to the people of this province. But as I pointed out, Mr. Speaker, this bill has wide-ranging ramifications. A lot of the motherhood that this government has tried to write into this bill has been sold to them by one man in the ARA and maybe a few unsuccessful service station operators, Mr. Speaker.

The good, profitable, business-like service station operators in this province do not yet realize what is in this bill. They need time to digest it. What little bit they have seen has seared them, Mr. Speaker, but they have had no opportunity whatsoever to give this government any input.

This is a bill that affects every service station operator in this province, a bill that affects the employees of every service station operator in this province, and a bill that affects every oil company in this province, whether it's involved in the producing end of it or whether it's involved in the merchandising end of it. It affects every employee of all of the oil companies in both the production and service divisions.

Mr. Speaker, I have pointed out just a few of the reasons why this bill should be laid over to give the people of this province — the people whose lives this bill directly affects — the opportunity to digest this bill so that they can come back to this government and at least have the opportunity to lay it on the line with the government. Then if the government wants to bulldoze it through after that, Mr. Speaker, that's fine.

But at the present time, the way this legislation is being crammed down our throats, nobody has had the opportunity to fully study it. The Attorney General knows that; the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce knows that. I plead with him, in all sincerity, and I plead with all the government, the government that was going to listen to the people of this province.

I plead with them here tonight, Mr. Speaker, to lay this bill over and let people have the opportunity to find out what it's going to do, how it's going to affect their lives, how it's going to affect the lives of their children and their children's children.

Mr. Speaker, this Energy Act changes the entire outlook of energy in this province — not only of energy, Mr. Speaker, but of every gallon of gasoline and every person who has an automobile. That, combined with the previous bill that we tried to have hoisted for six months, is going to force the people of this province into buying into companies that we will be digging out for the next 10 years.

That's why I plead with the government — and you can talk about your Frank McMahons and the Attorney General can bring in all those rip-off artists that he says are ripping off the people. He knows, Mr. Speaker, that this legislation affects the ordinary man in the street — every service station operator, every employee of every service station operator and every employee of every oil company. He knows that, yet he tries that old ruse of bringing in something that really doesn't have any bearing on this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the true intent of this legislation has to be studied by the people of this province. This is what concerns me. As I said before, Mr. Speaker, it's too much. It's too much socialism and it's too much and it's too fast and the people of this province can't stand it. They're concerned, Mr. Speaker. If the Attorney General and the Premier and, indeed, the entire cabinet would just allow a six-month breathing spell, get away from this Legislature, go out into their constituencies and talk to the ordinary people of British Columbia, then they would know.

Then they would listen, Mr. Speaker, because they would know the concern of the ordinary people in the Province of British Columbia. They would know how upset the ordinary person in British Columbia is tonight. Then, Mr. Speaker, after this six-month delay and after they've found out the true feelings of the ordinary people in

British Columbia, I'm sure that they would have a great change of heart. They would truly have a great change of heart, Mr. Speaker.

I realize that when you're in this Legislature and you're working 12 or 14 hours a day, with no chance to go home on the weekends, as the government has pushed us to do, they become insulated, Mr. Speaker. They become insulated from the feelings of the people in this province. That is what has happened in this, the longest session of the Legislature since the turn of the century. The government has become insulated. They've begun to think that whatever they do is right and they haven't allowed people to give them feedback. They haven't taken the time.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I plead with them here tonight. I plead with the Premier and with the Attorney General and with the Minister of Industrial Development, Trade and Commerce, to use some common sense. Six months' worth of common sense, Mr. Speaker — that's all I ask for.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. PHILLIPS: And the Liberals want six months of common sense too. They'll support this amendment, Mr. Speaker. Given a free vote, the Members of the government backbench would support this amendment, Mr. Speaker. They don't

[[Page 2998](#)]

understand the legislation, Mr. Speaker. They know their constituents don't understand the legislation. They want a breathing spell. They're overworked.

That's why I'm pleading here tonight for just a little recess, Mr. Speaker. Just six months, so that everybody in this province can have a chance to study this legislation and to come back to the government and tell exactly what's happening in this province. The Premier is turning — he's so tired himself, Mr. Speaker. He knows what's happening. He wants the opportunity to leave this Legislature. He wants the opportunity to go to his constituency and find out what his constituents are thinking about this legislation.

I plead just one more time. Just a breathing spell is all we ask for, Mr. Speaker, so that everybody can do a little studying. I've made my plea, Mr. Speaker. I know that the government backbench is going to support this amendment. They want a six-month delay. They want some time to study the legislation, Mr. Speaker.

When you call the vote, if the Premier will stand on the floor of this Legislature and say that it's a free vote, the backbench of that government will support it, Mr. Speaker. Call a free vote and they'll support it.

MR. SPEAKER: The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: No charge on this vote. It's absolutely free. Let's call the question.

Amendment negatived on the following division:

YEAS — 16

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

NAYS — 35

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

PAIRED

Brousson Nimsick

MR. SPEAKER: The question has been called that Bill 148 be read a third time now.

Motion approved on the following division:

YEAS — 35

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

NAYS — 16

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

PAIRED

Brousson Nimsick

Bill No. 148, Energy Act, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Report on Bill No. 156, Mr. Speaker.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS ACT

Bill No. 156 read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Report on Bill No. 175, Mr. Speaker.

AN ACT TO AMEND THE MUNICIPAL ACT

Bill No. 175 read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill No. 181, Mr. Speaker.

MOBILE HOME TAX ACT

House in committee on Bill No. 181; Mr. Dent in the chair.

[[Page 2999](#)]

Sections 1 to 3 inclusive approved.

On section 4.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Member for North Peace River.

MR. D.E. SMITH (North Peace River): One of the provisions of this particular section of the Act is that mobile homes owned by the Crown or by a municipality and occupied on behalf of the Crown or the municipality are not subject to this Act.

When the Crown owns mobile homes in a municipality, is it the Crown's intention to make any type of grant in lieu of taxes to that municipality? Will there be just a straight write-off or will the government consider some form of revenue to the municipality for anything that they might lose? I'm not suggesting that that they will lose anything, but if there is a loss.

The other point concerns mobile homes which are held in storage or which form part of the inventory of a manufacturer or dealer. I would presume that this section of the Act would cover any mobile home on a licensed dealer's lot. There are also cases where people who deal in mobile homes lease out units on their premises. They have them hooked up to water and sewer on location and they lease them out. Some of these mobile homes may be leased out and taken to other parts of the country, but basically they are leased out on the premises.

Would they be considered as a mobile home park under the particular section of the Act? I'd like the Minister to comment on that if he would.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Minister of Municipal Affairs.

HON. J.G. LORIMER (Minister of Municipal Affairs): With respect to mobile homes owned by municipalities that are parked in mobile home parks, I don't think there's much problem there. They themselves would be receiving the money.

MR. SMITH: Other Crown agencies, though.

HON. MR. LORIMER: As far as the province is concerned, at the moment under the Act they would be exempt as well. However, it's hoped that the mobile homes will be used to a substantial degree in the form of subsidized rental housing. Where that occurs in any quantity in any municipality, then certainly I would say that changes would have to be made in the event that the province does own mobile homes for housing purposes within a municipality. I think changes would have to be made at that time.

As far as the dealers are concerned, if a dealer has his mobile home parked in a mobile home park, then it will be taxable in the same way and no homeowner grant will be given. If it's in his own garage that is not used as a park, then it will not be taxable under this section.

MR. SMITH: Mr. Chairman, is the Minister aware that there are a number of agencies which sell mobile homes and are not classified or registered now as a mobile home park, and which do lease out some of their units on location right in their sales yard? Would they be classed as a mobile home park under the purposes of this Act?

HON. MR. LORIMER: Yes, that's correct.

MR. SMITH: And there is a possibility that there will be a provision for municipal authorities or the provincial government to go into the business of leasing or renting out units within mobile home parks within the province in a short period of time? Is this contemplated?

HON. MR. LORIMER: Yes, this is contemplated. I expect that this will be a fact within a year. This section that you've mentioned will have to be looked at again as far as the provincial government is concerned, as to payment of taxes on their mobile homes.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Shall section 4 pass?

Sections 4 to 10 inclusive approved.

Title approved.

HON. MR. LORIMER: Mr. Chairman, I move the committee rise and report the bill complete without amendment.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

Bill No. 181, *Mobile Home Tax Act*, reported complete without amendment, read a third time and passed.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Committee on Bill No. 183, Mr. Speaker.

STATUTE LAW AMENDMENT

[[Page 3000](#)]

House in committee on Bill No. 183; Mr. Dent in the chair.

On section 1.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. Second Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. G.B. GARDOM (Vancouver–Point Grey): I just hope that the Hon. Attorney General will explain each of the sections on the way through. It was agreed in the earlier stages that this would be handled totally within committee. I think we should have a statement from the Attorney General concerning the proposed amendments.

HON. A.B. MACDONALD (Attorney General): In the case of Hydro, section 1 is simply for expropriations. The Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council will no longer have to designate a judge to hear the appeal; it will be an appeal to the county court judge of the county wherein the expropriated land is situated.

MR. GARDOM: Now come on, it goes a little bit further than that, doesn't it? Among other things, it brings B.C. Hydro, which heretofore it has never, ever been, within the provisions of your new *Automobile Insurance Act*. From a strict position, you should really not be passing this bill until you've got your *Automobile Insurance Act* into being because you could run into a nullity situation over a few days which you can cure, I know. But howsoever, B.C. Hydro was a self-insurer as you well know, Mr. Attorney General.

You've got a very, very different principle under this bill because you are bringing B.C. Hydro under the provisions of the *Automobile Insurance Act*. Conceivably, you're making... You're getting advice from the Minister of Highways or you're giving advice? It's going one way or the other in any event, with the hope that we will get an answer from one of you. I suppose you are going to make B.C. Hydro insure within the provisions of the insurance Act.

B.C. Hydro, from a dollars and cents point of view, found it much more economic to be a self insurer as opposed to paying premiums and buying insurance on its multitude of operations, as the Attorney General is aware perhaps more than many other Members in the House. I believe they had one or two very high deductible situations. I don't know what they are and perhaps you could help me in this. A half-a-million or \$1 million deductible — some of those enormous losses — are the only things they insured for.

Apart from that they assumed that themselves as an expense of operation. As a result of them being many years in business and inheriting that financial wisdom from B.C. Electric, they found it cheaper to self-insure than to purchase insurance premiums.

So there is a little more to the amendment than the Attorney General mentioned. I'd like to hear his views on that point.

Secondly, I also see that B.C. Hydro is now brought within the *Public Works Fair Employment Act*, although we tried to have the word "Fair" deleted a little bit earlier today. This will mean B.C. Hydro will only be able to have any contracts with any individual, person or group of people in concert, be they a company or partnership, who happen to have members with a collective agreement in the Province of B.C.

This is a great departure from the heretofore practices of B.C. Hydro. I don't think it is really enough, with respect to the Attorney General, for him to just say that this deals with an appeal procedure. You've really got into the dollars and cents of the operation of B.C. Hydro with this amendment.

This just isn't a little, two-bit, innocuous amendment; this is an amendment that could well affect several millions of dollars of operational costs to B.C. Hydro. I would ask the Attorney General or his colleague, who is dying to get to his feet, to inform the House as to whether or not there have been any projections taken of costs...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

MR. GARDOM: It's bad when it happens in front of you, isn't it?

...any projections of costs taken for the new expense of insurance as opposed to this authority taking care of that itself out of its own revenues. If there have not been, you should not be bringing in this amendment.

Secondly, I would ask the Attorney General if the government has had — I loathe the word "input" but someone beside me said it — any input as to increased costs to B.C. Hydro as a result of you making it now subject

to the *Public Works Fair Employment Act*! What is the difference going to be in dollars and cents? The dollars and cents are only going to come out of one person's pocket. It is out of the fellow's pocket who pays for his light and his gas.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And whose pocket does it go into? The working people of B.C.

MR. GARDOM: No, no. But it comes out of their pocket too. What do you mean?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Yes, but it goes right back in.

MR. GARDOM: O.K., then. You say it comes out of their pocket and it goes right back in. You tell the working people of B.C. how much is going to go out of their pocket and how much is going to go back in.

[[Page 3001](#)]

HON. MR. MACDONALD: All right.

MR. GARDOM: None of this open-ended, woolly, economic, socialism when you start to talk about a few million dollars here. You're saying its just an appeal procedure. That's a bunch of hokum. Tell people what this Act means.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: O.K. Mr. Chairman, the government believes B.C. Hydro should be subject to the regular laws of the province. This is a step in that direction.

MR. GARDOM: How much?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: All of them.

MR. GARDOM: What about the costs?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: In respect to automobile insurance, this is a plan with not only costs attached to it but benefits to the users of the service. Hydro users of their transportation should be entitled to the benefit of my friend's automobile insurance plan.

Now you say it will increase costs...

MR. GARDOM: Do you know?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: It will be a public plan...

MR. GARDOM: You don't know.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Probably not. I think you'll need a year of actuarial experience on a thing like that because on the one hand you're improving benefits and on the other hand you may be increasing costs. Let's look at it.

Now in terms of the *Public Works Fair Employment Act* applying to Hydro, we on this side of the House believe that work should be performed by employees who have formed unions of their own choice and bargain collectively for their wages and conditions. In fact we are putting it right in the Act — that Hydro will use union labour.

If that little group wants to go through this province and say they are against the use of union labour as they have been saying in this session of the Legislature, let them do it. But we'll be right behind them and tell them that those people ought to have the right.

MR. GARDOM: Oh, baloney!

HON. MR. MACDONALD: They ought to have union rates and conditions of work. We're not ashamed of that. It's about time forgotten people of the province who haven't had the benefits of a union contract had that protection. We're not ashamed of that position one bit.

MR. GARDOM: O.K., now look. When the Attorney General frankly — and I give him great credit for his frankness — says that we don't know whether it's going to cost more to Hydro or not, I agree with him. But I'll tell him one thing: B.C. Hydro and B.C. Electric did know and they've had a history of many, many years experience in this province. I might be wrong within a year but I'll be awfully close to it; I think B.C. Electric went out of buying insurance policies around 1940. They've got a great track record from B.C. Electric through B.C. Hydro of knowing that it was cheaper for them to self-insure.

You're just plunking them holus-bolus into the B.C. automobile insurance plan, saying you don't know if it is going to cost them any more money. Well, that's dumb. It is just plain simple stupidity. If you don't know, don't put them in it. If you do know, and you think it is going to be cheaper for them, put them in it. Maybe you've got an argument there that you can present to anybody. But when you say you don't know if it is going to cost any more — and in they go when they've got a track record of showing that it is far less expensive for that organization to self-insure than buy premiums — that's goofy.

This is one of the greatest weaknesses that the government over there has — its economic attitude. It really is. This is the thing that is worrying the people of B.C. quite sick. They think that you people are a bunch of economic inadequates. You're proving them to be right.

Interjections by some Hon. Members

HON. D. BARRETT (Premier): Take that back.

MR. GARDOM: That is fair. I'm not going to take that back; that is absolutely correct. I say it in the greatest of good spirits and total humility, Mr. Premier.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. GARDOM: No way, it's true.

Now, dealing with the other aspects, let's not go over that clouded argument again. I'm not going to recite the thing. We're just saying people are entitled to the freedom of choice. This is where you differ and this is perhaps the one fundamental difference. I don't necessarily agree with the statements that have come forth from all sides of our opposition.

To me this is one of the greatest fundamental differences between the socialist posture and the posture that I subscribe to. I believe in the freedom

[[Page 3002](#)]

of choice. And you've denied freedom of choice in the *Public Works Fair Employment Act*, you're denying freedom of choice in the *Automobile Insurance Act*, in the *Mineral Act*, in the *Energy Act*. Have I missed any?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order.

MR. GARDOM: Under the *Revenue Act*, under the finance Act — any more? Did I miss any, Mr. Premier?

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. Would the Hon. Member refer to this section?

MR. GARDOM: But this is the point of the thing. You can't just simplistically go ahead and shoot the thing in here and say, "Well, we don't know if it's going to be cheap or not," when you've had a history of experience. We assume that the accounts of the B.C. Hydro are not in the morass that the accounts that the B.C. Rail are in.

You've had a history of experience here that it has been less expensive for this organization to self insure. Now you're making them be insured. And under the insurance Act you think there are going to be profits. Ho, ho, ho — that's the biggest joke since St. Nick.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I recognize the Hon. First Member for Victoria.

MR. N.R. MORRISON (Victoria): Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask, through you to the Minister...he says that they are going to get additional benefits. I'd like to have the word "benefits" defined, because they are certainly going to have additional costs.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Well, Mr. Chairman, you don't know... Don't be so conservative on that side of the House, You know, when B.C. Electric or B.C. Hydro went into self-insurance and cut themselves out of the private insurance industry...

MR. GARDOM: Twenty-three years ago — oh, 33 years ago.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: ...in that first year they were daring. They didn't know what the costs were going to be — they had an estimate of it. But they weren't so conservative that they said "oh, there's a change, we'll shrink from it."

MR. GARDOM: How do you know so much?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Oh, don't be so conservative. Try it, you'll like it! (Laughter).

AN HON. MEMBER: I'm not going to argue against that.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: The Hon. Member asks what are the increased benefits? Well, under the new auto insurance plan there will be increased no-fault benefits that will be available to the strap-hangers of the B.C. Hydro.

AN HON. MEMBER: They have that now.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: And when you discuss that bill...

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. MACDONALD: Discuss that under the other bill. We believe it's a good insurance bill and it should be applied to the Crown agencies.

AN HON. MEMBER: Oh, baloney.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Hon. First Member for Vancouver–Point Grey.

MR. P.L. McGEER (Vancouver–Point Grey): Is this a way of using the Crown agencies to support otherwise money-losing propositions?

HON. MR. MACDONALD: No. The answer is no.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for South Peace River on section 1.

MR. D.M. PHILLIPS (South Peace River): Mr. Speaker, Section 1 under this Act is a way of bringing this new government insurance corporation insurance which it might otherwise not obtain under a free enterprise system. For the government to stand there this evening and say that this is not a way of obtaining additional insurance for the British Columbia government insurance Act it is a way. This is the way they went in Saskatchewan. No competition. Nobody in the free world is going to be able to compete for the British Columbia Hydro insurance. Nobody is going to be able to compete now.

A few years from now, if anyone is ever able to untangle all this bureaucracy that's being set up — this government umbrella that takes everything under its little scope — if anybody ever has the opportunity to unwind this, then we will have to go back to find how much the additional premiums have cost the people of British Columbia. It will be a sorry day because it will be a great revelation and the people will know how much this bill, this section of this bill, has cost them in the period of time between its enactment and when we're able to unwind it in a few

[[Page 3003](#)]

years hence.

HON. R.M. STRACHAN (Minister of Highways): That's more than the kind of revelation the people of this province got today.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. PHILLIPS: There's the new general manager of the insurance company who doesn't want anybody touching his pet. He doesn't want anybody touching his little pet project at all.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order. Will the Hon. Member address the Chair?

MR. PHILLIPS: What next, Mr. Chairman? What next? B.C. Hydro? Is the B.C. Railway in here? Or did we miss it? Is there going to be an Act for that, Mr. Chairman? Another Act to bring the railway in.

No, the true intent of this is to bring in insurance for this new insurance corporation that it would not be able to get under a competitive system. That is the purpose of this section, very loud and clear. The Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) can twist it all he wants to, but that is the true intention of this Act. Make no mistake about it.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Second Member for Victoria.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON (Victoria): Could there be some explanation for the fact that at present, B.C. Hydro...

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. D.A. ANDERSON: Look, B.C. Hydro at present does not go, out...it is self-insured. It does not go out and engage in trying to get insurance or trying to get the cheapest rate from companies. So there is the situation here where the lowest possible administrative costs are the B.C. Hydro costs, which are virtually zero because they don't bother to go out in the market.

Now if we put it under the Act, as has been mentioned earlier, we quickly and automatically get into the whole bureaucratic structure and we get into administrative costs which are currently not being paid by the people of British Columbia because they don't have to pay them, because it is a self-insuree.

So we are in a situation where if we pass this for absolutely no benefit to the people of British Columbia, we're going to create bookkeeping and administrative costs.

Surely there's an explanation for that from the government. Or perhaps they haven't thought about it. If they haven't thought about it, they should delete the reference to this particular Act, because by deletion of those words what they will be doing is saving the people of British Columbia money.

You know, it is a simple proposition. The self insurer, if he's big enough, is obviously the cheapest insurance going. If you swing it under a government scheme or a private scheme or any scheme at all, you are going to involve yourself in administrative costs which you don't now have, and the people who will lose will be the people who own B.C. Hydro and the insurance company. The people of B.C. will lose. They have to lose because we are creating bureaucracy — administrative costs — which produce absolutely no benefit or return. Now why on earth are we

doing that? What is the point of doing that?

AN HON. MEMBER: We have 21 floors of administrators.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. First Member for Vancouver—Point Grey.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. McGEER: Mr. Chairman, I don't think we're tipping any hands. On the contrary, Mr. Chairman, the Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance (Hon. Mr. Cocke) is revealing that the government is tipping its hand. What the government is using is the Crown corporations and the money in these Crown corporations to subsidize what otherwise might be a losing proposition. It is using a Crown corporation as a captive customer of a newly-created and questionable creation of the Minister of Highways.

Now, Mr. Chairman, first of all the Attorney General stands up and he says, "No, that isn't so," when it is just as plain as the print on this particular page that it is precisely so. And then the Minister of Highways (Hon. Mr. Strachan) engages in a little snicker because he knows it is a con job on the people of British Columbia, and the Minister of Health Insurance suggests that the Members on this side of the House are tipping their hands.

Mr. Chairman, the reason why we are standing up and engaging in debate on this particular section is to reveal, we hope, to the people of British Columbia just exactly what the bureaucratic tendencies of a socialist government are. It is to take what was a perfectly efficient Crown corporation, to force it right into the mold of money-losing corporations; to take captive Crown corporations and the public's money and use this to subsidize bureaucracy and inefficiency.

We're seeing bureaucracy mounted on bureaucracy during this session. We are seeing boards and commissions, and boards and commissions; and all of it, all of it Mr. Chairman, results in a wastage of money

[[Page 3004](#)]

for the benefit of appointing defeated candidates and friends of the NDP to bureaucratic jobs.

We condemn the whole lot of it. We say that section 1 is in the disinterest of the people of British Columbia. We say that the Ministers of the Crown, who have stood up to defend it, have perpetrated a falsity on the people of the province.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Order, please. The Hon. Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: Mr. Chairman, what this section is in essence doing — and the Member for Point Grey just about hit it...

MR. McGEER: Just about?

MR. PHILLIPS: But even before this new insurance corporation is formed, every user of electricity in the province is already obligated to subsidize it. Every user of electricity in the Province of British Columbia will be subsidizing the new insurance corporation of British Columbia before it is even born. That's what this is all about. Every gas customer — every customer of B.C. Hydro will be subsidizing this new insurance corporation. And in three or four years, the Minister of Highways will stand in this Legislature and point out, Mr. Chairman — he'll say, "Look at the money. Look at the money. Look how successful this insurance corporation has been. Look at the profit it has made. Look at the profit it has made."

And all the time all the little housewives who have been told to turn off their ovens and who have been told to turn off their lights will be subsidizing this huge bureaucracy which the government is forming under this new insurance Act.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Are you going to attack Santa Claus too?

MR. PHILLIPS: No, but you are attacking every citizen in this province.

And the light will shine. And as the light shines in on this type of legislation. Mr. Chairman, the people who pay for that light are going to be subsidizing this new insurance corporation. That's what's happening, and the people will never know. The people of this province will never know.

When the light bill goes up, and when the power bill goes up, I will tell the people of this province that one of the reasons the power bill is going up is that they are subsidizing this bureaucratic insurance company, this monopolistic insurance company that this government is setting up — I'll tell the people of this province!

HON. D.G. COCKE (Minister of Health Services and Hospital Insurance) We're going to cook your goose.

MR. GARDOM: Just wait till he gets to section 2. (Laughter).

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Minister of Health.

HON. MR. COCKE: Mr. Chairman, have a little patience. I recognize the fact that reason isn't in this debate up until now and it seems to me that it should be.

Now, I didn't expect anything more from the Member for South Peace River (Mr. Phillips). But I expected a great deal more from the Liberals in this House, Mr. Chairman.

Interjections by some Hon. Members.

HON. MR. COCKE: We anticipate, Mr. Chairman, insurance administration in this province. Why in the blazes should we duplicate it in all the Crown corporations? Don't give us that stuff! The fact of the matter is that it's going to be better administered by one administration.

Interjection by an Hon. Member.

HON. MR. COCKE: You don't like reason, do you? Not at this time. Mr. Chairman, the fact is that they know that this is the way to do it. And all of that "let the light shine in" over there is just a bunch of malarkey.

What you're trying to do is hurt the whole Hydro Insurance Corporation and everything else. Hydro right now are doing their own administration themselves. They're doing their own administration. Why should this Minister be charged with the administration of self insurance when we do have a Crown agency?

That's all it is, simple reason — not bureaucracy. All it is is simplification. If you can't understand that you can't understand anything — and I'm not surprised.

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Member for South Peace River.

MR. PHILLIPS: He says he didn't expect any more from the Member for South Peace River because he knows the Member for South Peace can see through his legislation! He thought maybe the Liberals would miss it. But he knew the Member for South Peace wouldn't miss it. He knows that he can see through this legislation. And when he calls it malarkey he knows it's the truth and he tries to cover it up with big adjectives. (Laughter). That's the

[[Page 3005](#)]

reason ...

MR. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Member for North Okanagan.

MRS. P.J. JORDAN (North Okanagan): Mr. Chairman, I've said before in this House: the longer the bill by this government, the shorter the explanation and the shorter the bill, the longer the explanation. And that's the case here.

But what we are concerned about is not only the warp and woof that's going on with Hydro and the other funds that are involved. But, as I've said before, this government intends to marry the Insurance Company of British Columbia with the insurance companies of other provinces, particularly Manitoba and Saskatchewan, so the gas payers in British Columbia will not only be subsidizing the insurance company in B.C. but they will be subsidizing the insurance company in Manitoba.

The light user in British Columbia who's had a postage stamp rate across British Columbia will be subsidizing the insurance company of Saskatchewan. That user in British Columbia will be subsidizing the marriage that is explained in section 1 and which we know is going to be expanded by this government in this illicit marriage.

HON. MR. COCKE: Order! Just for once.

MRS. JORDAN: They will be subsidizing this. It's a massive weaving — and almost deceiving the people of British Columbia. It's no more letting in the light to the funds of this province or the actions of this government than any of the other bills that we've been debating before this House.

[Ms. Young in the chair.]

MS. CHAIRMAN: Shall section 1 pass?

Section 1 approved on the following division:

YEAS — 34

Hall	Macdonald	Barrett
Dailly	Strachan	Nunweiler
Nicolson	Brown	Radford
Sanford	D'Arcy	Cummings
Dent	Levi	Lorimer
Williams, R.A.	Cocke	King
Calder	Hartley	Skelly
Gabelman	Lauk	Lea
Lockstead	Gorst	Rolston
Anderson, G.H.	Barnes	Steves
Kelly	Webster	Lewis
Liden		

NAYS — 16

Richter	Bennett	Chabot
Jordan	Smith	Fraser
Phillips	McClelland	Morrison
Schroeder	McGeer	Anderson, D.A.
Williams, L.A.	Gardom	Wallace

Nimsick Brousson

MS. CHAIRMAN: The Hon. Premier.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Madam Chairman, I move the committee rise, report progress and ask leave to sit again.

Motion approved.

The House resumed; Mr. Speaker in the chair.

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

Leave granted.

HON. MR. BARRETT: Mr. Speaker, I move the House at its rising do stand adjourned until 10:00 a.m. tomorrow.

MRS. JORDAN: On a point of order, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: What's your point of order?

MRS. JORDAN: I wonder, Mr. Speaker, through you, if we might mention to the Hon. Premier that there is a pre-ordained, pre-arranged committee meeting which is to discuss the final report of that committee. While I am sure it would only take about an hour perhaps he would give the Members the opportunity...

MR. SPEAKER: I am sorry, Hon. Member. It isn't a point of order because already the House has ruled on the question of committees sitting while the House is also sitting.

MRS. JORDAN: Could I change it to a point of privilege?

SOME HON. MEMBERS: Order, order.

MRS. JORDAN: I just feel that the Premier is probably not aware of this. With leave of the House, Mr. Speaker?

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I don't think it is

[[Page 3006](#)]

either a matter of order or a matter of privilege. In the circumstances the House has already ruled on that question and you would be setting yourself against the House.

MRS. JORDAN: The Premier could give us leave, Mr. Speaker.

MR. SPEAKER: Order, please. I have a motion before the House that the House do adjourn until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning.

Motion approved.

The House adjourned at 11:30 p.m.

