



Fourth Session, 38th Parliament

OFFICIAL REPORT OF
**DEBATES OF THE
LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY**
(HANSARD)

Tuesday, November 25, 2008

Morning Sitting

Volume 36, Number 1

THE HONOURABLE BILL BARISOFF, SPEAKER

ISSN 0709-1281

PROVINCE OF BRITISH COLUMBIA
(Entered Confederation July 20, 1871)

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR
His Honour the Honourable Steven L. Point, OBC

FOURTH SESSION, 38TH PARLIAMENT

SPEAKER OF THE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY
Honourable Bill Barisoff

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

Premier and President of the Executive Council	Hon. Gordon Campbell
Minister of State for Intergovernmental Relations.....	Hon. Joan McIntyre
Deputy Premier and Minister of Education and Minister Responsible for Early Learning and Literacy	Hon. Shirley Bond
Minister of Aboriginal Relations and Reconciliation	Hon. Michael de Jong
Minister of Advanced Education and Labour Market Development	Hon. Murray Coell
Minister of Agriculture and Lands.....	Hon. Stan Hagen
Attorney General and Minister Responsible for Multiculturalism	Hon. Wally Oppal, QC
Minister of Children and Family Development	Hon. Tom Christensen
Minister of State for Childcare.....	Hon. Linda Reid
Minister of Community Development	Hon. Blair Lekstrom
Minister of Energy, Mines and Petroleum Resources.....	Hon. Richard Neufeld
Minister of State for Mining.....	Hon. Gordon Hogg
Minister of Environment.....	Hon. Barry Penner
Minister of Finance and Minister Responsible for the Olympics	Hon. Colin Hansen
Minister of Forests and Range	Hon. Pat Bell
Minister of Health Services.....	Hon. George Abbott
Minister of Healthy Living and Sport	Hon. Mary Polak
Minister of Housing and Social Development	Hon. Rich Coleman
Minister of Labour and Citizens' Services.....	Hon. Iain Black
Minister of Public Safety and Solicitor General	Hon. John van Dongen
Minister of Small Business and Revenue and Minister Responsible for Regulatory Reform	Hon. Kevin Krueger
Minister of Technology, Trade and Economic Development and Minister Responsible for the Asia-Pacific Initiative.....	Hon. Ida Chong
Minister of Tourism, Culture and the Arts	Hon. Bill Bennett
Minister of Transportation and Infrastructure.....	Hon. Kevin Falcon

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY

Leader of the Official Opposition.....	Carole James
Deputy Speaker.....	Sindi Hawkins
Deputy Speaker.....	Katherine Whittred
Assistant Deputy Speaker	Sue Hammell
Deputy Chair, Committee of the Whole	Harry Bloy
Clerk of the Legislative Assembly.....	E. George MacMinn, OBC, QC
Clerk Assistant	Robert Vaive
Clerk Assistant and Law Clerk.....	Ian D. Izard, QC
Clerk Assistant and Clerk of Committees.....	Craig H. James
Clerk Assistant and Committee Clerk.....	Kate Ryan-Lloyd
Sergeant-at-Arms	Vacant
Director, Hansard Services.....	Jo-Anne Kern
Legislative Librarian.....	Jane Taylor
Legislative Comptroller	Dan Arbic

ALPHABETICAL LIST OF MEMBERS

Abbott, Hon. George (L)..... Shuswap
Austin, Robin (NDP)..... Skeena
Bains, Harry (NDP)..... Surrey-Newton
Barisoff, Hon. Bill (L)..... Penticton-Okanagan Valley
Bell, Hon. Pat (L)..... Prince George North
Bennett, Hon. Bill (L)..... East Kootenay
Black, Hon. Iain (L)..... Port Moody-Westwood
Bloy, Harry (L)..... Burquitlam
Bond, Hon. Shirley (L)..... Prince George-Mount Robson
Brar, Jagrup (NDP)..... Surrey-Panorama Ridge
Campbell, Hon. Gordon (L)..... Vancouver-Point Grey
Cantelon, Ron (L)..... Nanaimo-Parksville
Chong, Hon. Ida (L)..... Oak Bay-Gordon Head
Chouhan, Raj (NDP)..... Burnaby-Edmonds
Christensen, Hon. Tom (L)..... Okanagan-Vernon
Chudnovsky, Dave (NDP)..... Vancouver-Kensington
Coell, Hon. Murray (L)..... Saanich North and the Islands
Coleman, Hon. Rich (L)..... Fort Langley-Aldergrove
Conroy, Katrine (NDP)..... West Kootenay-Boundary
Coons, Gary (NDP)..... North Coast
Cubberley, David (NDP)..... Saanich South
de Jong, Hon. Michael (L)..... Abbotsford-Mount Lehman
Dix, Adrian (NDP)..... Vancouver-Kingsway
Evans, Corky (NDP)..... Nelson-Creston
Falcon, Hon. Kevin (L)..... Surrey-Cloverdale
Farnworth, Mike (NDP)..... Port Coquitlam-Burke Mountain
Fleming, Rob (NDP)..... Victoria-Hillside
Fraser, Scott (NDP)..... Alberni-Qualicum
Gentner, Guy (NDP)..... Delta North
Hagen, Hon. Stan (L)..... Comox Valley
Hammell, Sue (NDP)..... Surrey-Green Timbers
Hansen, Hon. Colin (L)..... Vancouver-Quilchena
Hawes, Randy (L)..... Maple Ridge-Mission
Hawkins, Sindi (L)..... Kelowna-Mission
Hayer, Dave S. (L)..... Surrey-Tynehead
Herbert, Spencer (NDP)..... Vancouver-Burrard
Hogg, Hon. Gordon (L)..... Surrey-White Rock
Horgan, John (NDP)..... Malahat-Juan de Fuca
Horning, Al (L)..... Kelowna-Lake Country
Ilich, Olga (L)..... Richmond Centre
James, Carole (NDP)..... Victoria-Beacon Hill
Jarvis, Daniel (L)..... North Vancouver-Seymour
Karagianis, Maurine (NDP)..... Esquimalt-Metchosin
Krog, Leonard (NDP)..... Nanaimo
Krueger, Hon. Kevin (L)..... Kamloops-North Thompson
Kwan, Jenny Wai Ching (NDP)..... Vancouver-Mount Pleasant
Lali, Harry (NDP)..... Yale-Lillooet
Lee, Richard T. (L)..... Burnaby North
Lekstrom, Hon. Blair (L)..... Peace River South
Les, John (L)..... Chilliwack-Sumas
Macdonald, Norm (NDP)..... Columbia River-Revelstoke
McGinn, Jenn (NDP)..... Vancouver-Fairview
McIntyre, Hon. Joan (L)..... West Vancouver-Garibaldi
MacKay, Dennis (L)..... Bulkley Valley-Stikine
Neufeld, Hon. Richard (L)..... Peace River North
Nuraney, John (L)..... Burnaby-Willingdon
Oppal, Hon. Wally, QC (L)..... Vancouver-Fraserview
Penner, Hon. Barry (L)..... Chilliwack-Kent
Polak, Hon. Mary (L)..... Langley
Puchmayr, Chuck (NDP)..... New Westminster
Ralston, Bruce (NDP)..... Surrey-Whalley
Reid, Hon. Linda (L)..... Richmond East
Richmond, Claude (L)..... Kamloops
Roddick, Valerie (L)..... Delta South
Routley, Doug (NDP)..... Cowichan-Ladysmith
Rustad, John (L)..... Prince George-Omineca
Sather, Michael (NDP)..... Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows
Simons, Nicholas (NDP)..... Powell River-Sunshine Coast
Simpson, Bob (NDP)..... Cariboo North
Simpson, Shane (NDP)..... Vancouver-Hastings
Sultan, Ralph (L)..... West Vancouver-Capilano
Taylor, Carole (L)..... Vancouver-Langara
Thorne, Diane (NDP)..... Coquitlam-Maillardville
Thorpe, Rick (L)..... Okanagan-Westside
Trevena, Claire (NDP)..... North Island
van Dongen, Hon. John (L)..... Abbotsford-Clayburn
Whittred, Katherine (L)..... North Vancouver-Lonsdale
Wyse, Charlie (NDP)..... Cariboo South
Yap, John (L)..... Richmond-Steveston

LIST OF MEMBERS BY RIDING

Abbotsford-Clayburn..... Hon. John van Dongen
Abbotsford-Mount Lehman..... Hon. Michael de Jong
Alberni-Qualicum..... Scott Fraser
Bulkley Valley-Stikine..... Dennis MacKay
Burnaby North..... Richard T. Lee
Burnaby-Edmonds..... Raj Chouhan
Burnaby-Willingdon..... John Nuraney
Burquitlam..... Harry Bloy
Cariboo North..... Bob Simpson
Cariboo South..... Charlie Wyse
Chilliwack-Kent..... Hon. Barry Penner
Chilliwack-Sumas..... John Les
Columbia River-Revelstoke..... Norm Macdonald
Comox Valley..... Hon. Stan Hagen
Coquitlam-Maillardville..... Diane Thorpe
Cowichan-Ladysmith..... Doug Routley
Delta North..... Guy Gentner
Delta South..... Valerie Roddick
East Kootenay..... Hon. Bill Bennett
Esquimalt-Metchosin..... Maurine Karagianis
Fort Langley-Aldergrove..... Hon. Rich Coleman
Kamloops..... Claude Richmond
Kamloops-North Thompson..... Hon. Kevin Krueger
Kelowna-Lake Country..... Al Horning
Kelowna-Mission..... Sindi Hawkins
Langley..... Hon. Mary Polak
Malahat-Juan de Fuca..... John Horgan
Maple Ridge-Mission..... Randy Hawes
Maple Ridge-Pitt Meadows..... Michael Sather
Nanaimo..... Leonard Krog
Nanaimo-Parksville..... Ron Cantelon
Nelson-Creston..... Corky Evans
New Westminster..... Chuck Puchmayr
North Coast..... Gary Coons
North Island..... Claire Trevena
North Vancouver-Lonsdale..... Katherine Whittred
North Vancouver-Seymour..... Daniel Jarvis
Oak Bay-Gordon Head..... Hon. Ida Chong
Okanagan-Vernon..... Hon. Tom Christensen
Okanagan-Westside..... Rick Thorpe
Peace River North..... Hon. Richard Neufeld
Peace River South..... Hon. Blair Lekstrom
Penticton-Okanagan Valley..... Hon. Bill Barisoff
Port Coquitlam-Burke Mountain..... Mike Farnworth
Port Moody-Westwood..... Hon. Iain Black
Powell River-Sunshine Coast..... Nicholas Simons
Prince George North..... Hon. Pat Bell
Prince George-Mount Robson..... Hon. Shirley Bond
Prince George-Omineca..... John Rustad
Richmond Centre..... Olga Ilich
Richmond East..... Hon. Linda Reid
Richmond-Steveston..... John Yap
Saanich North and the Islands..... Hon. Murray Coell
Saanich South..... David Cubberley
Shuswap..... Hon. George Abbott
Skeena..... Robin Austin
Surrey-Cloverdale..... Hon. Kevin Falcon
Surrey-Green Timbers..... Sue Hammell
Surrey-Newton..... Harry Bains
Surrey-Panorama Ridge..... Jagrup Brar
Surrey-Tynehead..... Dave S. Hayer
Surrey-Whalley..... Bruce Ralston
Surrey-White Rock..... Hon. Gordon Hogg
Vancouver-Burrard..... Spencer Herbert
Vancouver-Fairview..... Jenn McGinn
Vancouver-Fraserview..... Hon. Wally Oppal, QC
Vancouver-Hastings..... Shane Simpson
Vancouver-Kensington..... David Chudnovsky
Vancouver-Kingsway..... Adrian Dix
Vancouver-Langara..... Carole Taylor
Vancouver-Mount Pleasant..... Jenny Wai Ching Kwan
Vancouver-Point Grey..... Hon. Gordon Campbell
Vancouver-Quilchena..... Hon. Colin Hansen
Victoria-Beacon Hill..... Carole James
Victoria-Hillside..... Rob Fleming
West Kootenay-Boundary..... Katrine Conroy
West Vancouver-Capilano..... Ralph Sultan
West Vancouver-Garibaldi..... Hon. Joan McIntyre
Yale-Lillooet..... Harry Lali

CONTENTS

Tuesday, November 25, 2008
Morning Sitting

Routine Proceedings

	Page
Introductions by Members.....	13253
Second Reading of Bills	13253
Economic Incentive and Stabilization Statutes Amendment Act, 2008 (Bill 45) (<i>continued</i>)	
N. Simons	
G. Gentner	
S. Herbert	
C. Trevena	
C. Wyse	

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 25, 2008

The House met at 10:03 a.m.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair.]

Prayers.

Introductions by Members

M. Karagianis: Again, I have the pleasure today of having one of my school classes attending the Legislature this morning. Division 11 from Rockheights School is in the precinct. I don't think they've quite made it into the chambers yet this morning. They are accompanied by Mrs. Huxtable, Ms. Kay, Don Dashney and Marianne Duffus. I would hope that we would all make them very welcome.

Orders of the Day

Hon. M. de Jong: I call in this chamber second reading of Bill 45.

Second Reading of Bills

ECONOMIC INCENTIVE AND STABILIZATION STATUTES AMENDMENT ACT, 2008

(continued)

N. Simons: So in conclusion, Mr. Speaker...

What we have before us today is Bill 45, which implies that it will stimulate and stabilize the economy by providing incentives to residents of the province. But what it really is, is an assortment of initiatives — some that are re-announcements of previously promised feel-good initiatives, like tax cuts; some that have nothing to do with stimulating anything, like the property assessment freeze; and some that make good sense, like protecting RRSPs from creditors.

There are parts of the bill that are helpful, others less so, but we're being delivered the whole thing in one piece of legislation. We agree with some of it; we disagree with parts of it. But it seems to me, listening to the catcalls yesterday from the government back benches, that this could be simply part of the government's cynical re-election plan.

[1005]

You see, this is how the government works. They put a bunch of ideas into a budget, which is traditionally opposed by — you guessed it — the opposition. So far, so good.

In those budgets there are a number of initiatives — some good, like less red tape for small business; others not so good, like \$20 million for a friend to build a pet project. Some are good, like protecting parkland,

and some are not so good, like cuts to programs that would address homelessness, that would address issues for people with developmental disabilities and cuts to programs for people on social assistance and cuts to environmental protections.

Well, put all in one package, we can either vote for it all or vote against it all. Those sneaky tricksters, who think that this is clever, come back to the House and say: "You voted against tax cuts. Oh, the horror."

Yesterday one former minister kept saying things like: "You're against employment. You're against jobs. You're against people having money. You're against money being protected." To me, that's a bit of an embarrassment, and it should be embarrassing to his own colleagues.

Let me set him straight and maybe set his colleagues straight as well. The Premier realized that B.C. can't sail through the economic storms of this time and this world without putting on a life jacket. Unfortunately, the life jacket doesn't fit everyone.

We are in a time of economic uncertainty, extremely noticeable after a period of high commodity prices and what appeared to be a relatively healthy economy. But just as Squirrel Nutkin found out, you can spend a lot of time having fun and playing around, but unless you put something away, we'll be in very difficult times. He was enjoying himself too much when he should have been collecting nuts. Now we find ourselves hungry when there should have been food in our storage.

Poverty is more of a reality to children here than anywhere else in Canada. We find ourselves cold on the first day of winter. Homelessness has increased in cities and in the rural parts of our province at an unprecedented rate, in a manner that impacts all of us, whether we live in the cities or we live in the country. We find ourselves sick when our hospitals are already overcrowded with seniors who long for a place where their needs will be better served, and we find our families are overstressed when respite and other family support programs have disappeared.

In conclusion, I would like to ask: how can it be that here in B.C., which the government boastfully and embarrassingly calls the best place on earth...? How is it that we enter troubled economic times now, when our citizens and our communities are already facing steep challenges?

It's my hope that British Columbians look at all the circumstances that they see in their communities and ask: if this is the best we can do when we were living in good times, how are we going to care for each other in difficult times? And I'll say this. It won't be under this government.

G. Gentner: It is indeed a pleasure to be here again this fall to return to all the bright, shining faces, particularly those opposite. I know we've got musical chairs that have occurred across the way.

I have to tell you that I know that the Minister of Community Development is enthused with these types of congratulatory remarks. I have to warn you, hon. Speaker, that there's an uncanny resemblance to the former minister who sat in that chair, albeit there's a few years difference there. But let's not be fooled. This is still the same big-headed government — the same arrogant, haughty group that certainly hasn't learned anything through a little cabinet shuffle.

[S. Hawkins in the chair.]

I want to address Bill 45. It is certainly resemblant of what has occurred here with this government, or what hasn't occurred. It is certainly a government that is out of touch, and it still is pursuing a reckless approach to how it's going to manage this province. It really is out of step with reality. It's not in touch at all with what's really going on in the real world.

[1010]

I want to begin by expressing to you what the real world is all about — the view of the fact that this was supposed to be a bill of stabilization and recovery. I'm going to start off by reading a quote that was in yesterday's *Vancouver Sun*, a letter to the editor. It's a letter that says:

The Homeless Need Help, Not Rhetoric.

If you allow a visitor to comment, I would say that Vancouver is a beautiful city, obviously, and public transport is fantastic. The number of parks brings a welcome relief from the high-rise vistas. However, I was shocked by the number of emaciated homeless men. I expected to see homeless people, as one does in any city, but it was the poor physical state of these men that shocked me. They are starving. There is no other explanation for such emaciation.

I also saw men and women in wheelchairs begging. I believe that any society should be judged by how it treats its weakest members. These people surely deserve urgent help, but instead I saw them being ignored. I did not see one other person offer alms in my two-week visit. Instead I found people generally rude and unfriendly.

Sadly, these images are the ones that will stay with me rather than the beauty of Vancouver.

Joan Daly
Bettystown
County Meath, Ireland

Here is an international visitor to our city, to our province, gearing up with visions of how this Olympics is going to occur, and this is what she's taking home with her: the sad reality of what is needed — a real Bill 45 that will address stabilization and recovery, recovery for those who need it most. A society that is deemed to be compassionate, but yet a government turns its back on those who need aid most.

I have to bring to attention something that was quoted by the likes of a former President, John F.K., who said: "Tax reduction never cleared a slum." Here we're going into a strategy that....

Yes, there are probably some tax reductions that are necessary, but it is not taking full view, full force on how

to change our social net and how to deal with a growing problem that's almost becoming institutionalized. It's entrenched on the streets of Vancouver. It's entrenched in all the communities of our province.

It's something that's before us, and this is a bill of denial. This is a bill that completely ignores reality. We are looking at a promise of 5,000 long-term care beds that is being ignored. It's not at all addressed in Bill 45 — the 5,000 long-term care.

The solution from this government was to change the goalposts, and they've created something they're calling units now. They're even throwing in supportive housing as part of the new equation. It's called Liberal math, and you can certainly see what Liberal math is hidden under Bill 45.

The serious thing about Bill 45 is what is not being addressed, and that's why I'm coming forward here today. I think it's shocking what's happening in the streets of Vancouver. It's shocking what's happened to our seniors, the negligence that's occurring throughout.

Here we are now moving into a period of uncertainty where seniors and those who are retired on fixed incomes have to worry about not only their pensions but their RRSPs. We're seeing utility fees continue to go up and up. We're seeing pocketbook costs hitting them hard. And I have to ask the question: where is the tax break for them? Where is the tax break for them?

We're seeing children with the highest poverty level in this country. Some 24 percent of the children have been earmarked as poverty-stricken.

I will graciously surrender to the Chair with the ability to readdress.

Hon. K. Falcon: Thank you to the member for Delta North.

I seek leave to make an introduction.

[1015]

Leave granted.

Introductions by Members

Hon. K. Falcon: We're joined today in the galleries by the mayor of Sooke, Janet Evans, and she has brought along a couple of very bright, intelligent students, Ethan and Tiffany. I had the pleasure of meeting with them this morning to talk about a signalized crossing that would help create a safer environment for their students. I would ask the fellow members of the House to please make Mayor Evans and Ethan and Tiffany, welcome today.

D. Routley: Madam Speaker, I seek leave to make an introduction.

Leave granted.

D. Routley: I would like the House to help me welcome young Forest Johnstone, a student from Island Oak High School in Duncan. He's with me on a job-shadow today, and he's come to see how our parliamentary democracy thrives in the city of Victoria. Help me welcome Forest.

Debate Continued

Deputy Speaker: Thank you, Delta North. Please continue.

G. Gentner: Hon. Speaker, the homeless need help, not rhetoric, and there's nothing in this bill that addresses this real bane, this scar that is before us that we have created as a society — our negligence to address what is so blatantly obvious to those who visit this city, this province.

We have poverty with children, we have student tuitions going up and up and up over these years, and we're going into a recessionary period. Those are times when we put money in and invest in education, invest in our young people — who will be able to put back rich capital, their own resources, to help build this province.

Of course, we have working people who have uncertainty in their lives right now, not knowing where the province is going, certainly knowing by Bill 45 — when we untangle the web, the smoke-and-mirrors particularly, that is being created with the assessments — that this government is trying to push or download responsibility onto local government.

In my community this bill does not address the selling of my schools that's happening in Delta. It's completely turned its back on what's happening on the educational front. You know, this is reflective....

Here we are now in November, when we could have been dealing with this way back in October when we should have. We're now looking at tax rebates, tax potential there, in light of the fact that we're already a month too late. Taxes are supposed to be reductions, there for recovery, but we're well along the road now.

You know, hon. Speaker, this started with what was known as the credit crunch, the by-product of what happened in the United States relative to housing and the fact that there was no equity in people putting towards down payments. That was a philosophy evolved many years ago with the notion of deregulation.

We didn't need regulation to look at the movement of money and investments. That was the way created under the Milton Friedman school. It's what the Thatcherites endorsed years ago, and it certainly was endorsed by this government when it comes down to deregulation. It's deregulation that's helped create this financial mess in this global world, and that's the purpose of government. Government is to regulate, to find fairness, and there's no fairness in Bill 45.

It's quite interesting. We have all the free-enterprisers lining up at the front gates demanding bailouts. God, it sounds like they're a bunch of socialists. They're at the gates begging for money. Here we have all this group away, talking about their free enterprise economy and how wonderful it is, and who's going to be out their doors very soon looking for money.

I know the media is getting lots of money. It's through a windfall of advertisement. That's the bailout. That's one of many. But you know, that's the ideology that's been driving the bus across the way, and even a guy like Eugene Debs would be applauding all this government intervention south of the line, what we're now going to see here. Even the federal Conservatives support the economy through somewhat public spending and perhaps even borrowing money.

[1020]

You know, this is an arrogant bunch across the way. They are certainly out of touch, because they've always seemed to find money for their pet projects, their mega-projects, but not for things everybody needs every day — everything that people need. Whether it be a long-term care facility in Cloverdale...

Interjections.

Deputy Speaker: Order, Members.

G. Gentner: ...or whether it be proper schooling for those in Delta, this government is totally out of touch with the real needs of the people of British Columbia.

Time after time the Liberal government has squandered billions of dollars on their pet projects and handouts to their friends. Funny, that could have been put towards lowering child poverty and combatting homelessness, the crises.

Let's look at this recklessness, this mismanagement, that certainly is being ignored in Bill 45. Well over \$400 million in cost overruns to the Vancouver Convention Centre, and it's still not even complete. Here's the deal. This government got into hedging with that one. They could have paid for all the resources and all the materials and stored them. But no, they didn't. They were warned about that by experts. They didn't, and the costs went up — spiralled upward and upward.

Here we have a position now where we're looking at draining a surplus because of the mismanagement and the arrogant, big-headed, condescending nature of this government.

Then, of course, another example of mismanagement was B.C. Place. The roof came down on that one, didn't it? It certainly came down. It was mismanaged, and now it's going to cost us more and more money while people outside of B.C. Place are poverty-stricken, are looking for a meal, are lining up day after day for a lunch or a dinner, and they can't find it because the money has

been misallocated towards mismanagement through B.C. Place.

This Bill 45 never addresses the \$220 million in tax breaks to the banks — \$220 million. Talk about withering away a surplus. Here's an opportunity. The banks in the States are looking for handouts, and here we're giving it to them. Let's not forget about the \$327 million—plus this year alone in subsidies to big oil and gas companies.

We're looking at hundreds of millions in benefits for forest corporations after the Liberal government gave away more than 120,000 hectares of forest land on Vancouver Island and the coast, with no benefits to local communities. None.

So we're talking about stabilization and recovery in Bill 45. How is it addressing this? It's not. It's turned its back. It's turned its back on local communities.

Of course, we can talk about the \$63 million the next three years for unaccountable advertising. We can look at the climate change action secretariat with \$9 million in that budget for 2008 and the \$30 million to \$40 million per year for the Premier's public affairs bureau for spin-doctoring. That's lost economies. That's lost money that could have been used for real stabilization in this province to try and fix what they broke through Bill 29 — fix the hospitals, fix our social net and, above all, maintain our infrastructure. But no, they've turned their back on that as well.

It is a snooty group across the way — aren't they, hon. Speaker? Snooty. They're arrogant, they're egotistical, and they turn their back on the real people of this province.

Deputy Speaker: Member, I would ask members to temper their language when they are speaking in debate.

G. Gentner: Thank you, hon. Speaker.

Interjections.

Deputy Speaker: Order, Member. Members, order. Continue, Member.

G. Gentner: Let's just say they're not.... I take back "snooty." Let's stick to the word "big-headed." I think that is probably more apropos.

We've seen millions and millions of dollars spent to the Premier's top advisers. Now, that certainly is haughty. That certainly is somewhat beyond a class of a bureaucratic system that is so far removed from reality that they turn around and give a 60 percent pay raise to Liberal-linked B.C. Ferries board of directors; \$460,000 a year for the 500 percent wage hike for the TransLink board of directors. A new board — this plutocracy that's being created at the whim of the Minister of Transportation.

[1025]

We talk about the pet projects. I'm glad the Minister of Transportation is here, because we can talk about

some of those megaprojects. We can talk about the wasted money that's gone on and on. Now they're going to talk about a South Fraser perimeter road. Where is the financing? Where is the financing for that?

I know the Premier is out back east getting accolades about P3s. I mean, isn't that a wonderful thing when the same financial institutions that are sponsoring P3s in North America are the very ones, cap in hand, going to Washington asking for money. They've squandered it. Lehman Brothers — it goes on and on.

Now we're looking for a billion-dollar project, including special land deals, for P3s that were supposed to transfer risk onto the private sector. But there's no funding. If there's any risk, the Minister of Transportation is trying to take that away from the private sector and do all the preloading on marshlands in Surrey. That's what's happening. The risk is going to be borne by the taxpayer, not by the consortium.

I have residents who are going to be wondering about this new assessment deal that's being created by this government. They're being expropriated by this government. They're being lowballed by this government. They won't have a choice what assessment best fits them. They have no choice at all.

So where, with these land deals that are beneficial to the insiders who have been able to purchase land...? We saw it on 80th Street and over by River Road. Where is the equity and fairness to the residents who are being expropriated? But that certainly isn't addressed in Bill 45 — the need for fairness.

Now we hear, yesterday, about this need for administrative savings. That's a new curveball. That has all the under-pinnings, all the wording, for something called restraint. Here we go. Massive slash-and-burn project that's going to happen on May 13 if that side is so successful as they think they could be.

Meanwhile we have waste and more waste, and I won't get into the Visa card waste — the Minister of Transportation knows all about that one — or the country club attitude....

Interjection.

G. Gentner: There you go, hon. Speaker. It's called fraud. I'm glad the government has finally admitted what's actually happening in the front bench. Fraud. He's admitted there's fraud. If there's fraud, there should be a police investigation, and there has never been a police investigation. What the minister is alleging is called fraud. That's mismanagement of the public purse, and they should be ashamed of themselves.

Times are tough, but we want to build a decent society on this side, not one that turns its back on ordinary people. We believe....

Interjection.

G. Gentner: It's a broke society. It is a broke society indeed. It is broken. The back is broken by this government. The back has been broken long ago. There are lineups on the food lines in this province, and you have the audacity to say it's a sunshine 45 bill. Nonsense, hon. Speaker. Total nonsense.

We need a decent society. We believe in each other. We believe in equality, a society that also believes in equity and that we look after our brothers and sisters. We believe in a compassionate society. That's something that the bottom line — those who believe in it and that run this government — doesn't fully understand, because in the end there's no conscience on that side of the House.

You know, Bill 45 really misses the boat. In fact, Bill 45 should be rescinding the \$220 million tax break to banks. It should be seriously reining in its subsidy to the oil and gas companies — \$372 million.

[H. Bloy in the chair.]

But let's address the recession. That is what this bill is supposed to be dealing with. There are many who live in recession with a wholly secure livelihood and with a lessened fear of price increases. Those are the ultra-rich. They're not going to be hit too hard with this recession. They are in no real danger of loss of income.

[1030]

Across from me represents the more secure parts of the modern corporate bureaucracy. CEOs — they're going to do well in this recession. The example is certainly seen with the automakers flying their jets to Washington for handouts, and it's not going to change here.

We know the insiders. We know that through the so-called lobbyists registry, or lack of, there are people who are still going to benefit from this government. But this bill doesn't certainly address that waste.

You know, the corporate elite is never fired or sacked in the interests of efficiency. However, those who are truly influential have no fear. They always, in the interest of efficiency, are the ones who do all the crying for the people, the disadvantaged, those who will be in servitude to hard times. But they do nothing for them.

We'll have compelling arguments from government members, but their jobs are secure until at least May. Similarly secure are many in the professions — professors; needless to say, some public servants; lawyers; doctors; media stars. Yes, media stars — where are you? They're not here today, but they'll be looked after.

Also very important is the modern large property class, which is another break through Bill 45. We have something called the property tax credit. For all these, recessions mean stable or even falling prices and no serious reduction of income. These are happy days indeed for those in the upper echelons protected by this government.

Also, in an economy where services are increasingly important, a recession means a more willing and pliant labour supply, an underclass more available for the unpleasant toil that makes life for the rest of us more agreeable. A recession in modern times is also, for many, far more attractive than remedial action against it.

The possible positive lines of action against recession are threefold. Taxes can be reduced to enhance the flow of consumer and investment spending, or so it is hoped. The government can undertake direct, forthright job creation by addressing what they broke — the health care system and services — and fixing and maintaining infrastructure.

Tax reduction has its proponents, notably among those who pay the taxes. There is a difficult question as to whether revenues released will be spent or invested. How will all this tax relief help British Columbia? Where was the consultation with the UBCM?

Tax credits could go to be held as cash or unused bank balances by offshore landholders. What guarantee do we have that the breaks out of Bill 45 will find their way into the pockets of ordinary British Columbians? There's none. There's this idea that it's all going to filter downward. It's all going to come down to the poor bloke on the street.

We know there are going to be people grabbing the money offshore. It's not going to reach the people who need it most. This is trickle-down economics.

Tax reduction has its proponents, normally those who pay the taxes. But you know, hon. Speaker, there is direct government expenditure and employment that will be questioned in May. There will be more unemployment. Then we will have the test of how this government brought us back here for a couple of days to address a growing international global situation, ignored it, and we'll see in the spring the increased unemployment and the greater amount of disparity for those who need it most.

We could be looking at a progressive taxation system, a higher tax rate in proportion to that of the working guy and the poor. A great Canadian — yes, he was a Canadian — John Kenneth Galbraith, once stated — and this is totally against the philosophy across the House, which is steeped in the likes of Milton Friedman and others: "I have a lesser plea. It concerns our awkward secret, our forbidden truth. Let us now face the fact that for many, a recession is a tolerable, even pleasant thing. Let us say so. This will not be popular. There could be indignant denial. That is often the response to unwelcome truth."

[1035]

Galbraith said that in the '60s, and here we have today happy days from the government across — total denial of what's happening, because it's their rich friends that will survive a recession. But Bill 45 does not address it. I remember quite well, in the '80s, the situation, the restraint program, the cut-and-slash-burn tactics.

I know my time is coming to an end very shortly, to the applause of members opposite, I'm sure.

Specific to the bill, I want to talk about the assessments very quickly. We talked about the chaos, the disorder, the confusion that's going to be created through their changing of the goalposts at the B.C. Assessment Authority and what it all means.

The municipal alarm is off and running, but I want to talk about it — where this idea came from. It came from a napkin. It was written on a napkin. It's called Liberal politics. It was written on a napkin, and some Liberal government think-tank put it all together. It was a last-minute, cheap bit of politics.

Mae West — I have a lot of respect for Mae — once said: "I've been on more laps than a napkin." I have a lot of respect for old Mae, because we're talking about a Liberal napkin here. It's sullied, and it's soiled. It's ragged. It's been crumpled up. It's been passed around, stained with coffee, with real consultation. It's policy formation on a paper napkin. That's what Bill 45 is all about. It was whipped together at the last minute. This is how the government formulates its policies: on a napkin.

I believe that is how it came to dealing with assessment. Assessment is a confusing option that this government is creating. You know, it's changed the goalpost. The mill rate is still derived by the local government. But what this really is, is shifting deliberately shifting the blame from tax hard times onto local government, because it's going to be the local government that's going to have to find the difference.

My biggest fear is that this is not progressive. You're going to have homeowners in this province, some of which have not had a major increase or fluctuation on their assessment from '07 to '08.... Meanwhile, others have had a huge increase. Those who had the huge increase, usually the higher end, will be able to claim the lowest assessment. So who makes up the difference on the mill rate? It'll be downloaded onto the moderate- and low-income homeowner, who'll be making up the difference.

The assessment part of this bill does not at all address progressive taxation. It's counter. That is something we will certainly have to deal with in third reading, because I can't see how anybody — including local government members, members of this Legislature, the Assessment Authority Board, appraisers, realtors — can possibly fully understand.... The confusion at the appeal process is going to be paramount. There's going to be paranoia created — the amount of work that's going to be created.

Let's just not forget, for one parting shot here.... When we look at the mission statement of the B.C. Assessment Authority, it says: "We produce uniform property assessments that form the basis for local and provincial taxation while providing information to assist people when making real estate decisions." Uniform property assessment — that's been thrown out. That's thrown out by this government, by this bill.

We had probably one of the best assessment authorities in the world. It had nothing but accolades everywhere else. It was the pinnacle of a wonderful example that other jurisdictions followed. This government, through its politics and its interference, has ripped up that tradition, those credentials, and it should be ashamed of itself. By golly, we're all going to do our bit to bring a redress on that horrible part of Bill 45 relative to changing the B.C. Assessment Authority.

S. Herbert: I rise today to talk about the economic stabilization, economic incentive bill that we're discussing today. But I want to remind everybody here about how we got here. It was by-election season. We had the by-elections in Vancouver-Burrard and Vancouver-Fairview.

[1040]

I remember, after months of calling for Mr. Premier, the hon. member from Point Grey, to bring the House back to session, he decided to step up and actually talk to the voters who he's supposed to represent and lead. We had a speech about the economy — ten points designed on the back of a napkin as an attempt to skew the results of our by-elections. I take it as a great honour that he was so afraid of us that he decided he had to commandeer the airwaves to give his message in the hope of swaying the voters.

Thank you for the compliment, Mr. Premier, and I'd like to thank the residents of Vancouver-Burrard for their support.

I hope that just as we were able to be catalysts to get the government to actually start to listen to our concerns with these by-elections, we can continue to do so for the months — and years, hopefully — to come.

Now, I think we need the government to do its job, and that's to lead. When I talk about leading, I talk about the economy. Right now in our province we have two economies. There's an economy made up of the Premier, his friends and insiders, and there's an economy made up of the rest of us — an economy that is struggling, an economy that for many of us has been struggling for years. Only now, as we get close to an election, do we hear the Premier say: "Maybe we need to look at this issue."

I look at the homelessness crisis in my community. We've seen it go up over the last seven years 373 percent. That's thousands of people on the streets. I look to Stanley Park, where I had the great honour but great sadness to tour the park with one of the Vancouver park board staff members to talk to the people living in that park, to talk to them about: "Can you get shelter? Can we get you out of the park, because this shouldn't be your home?"

Many of them have gone to shelters again and again, only to be turned away because the shelter beds are full. The statistics back this up. That's wrong. How did we get to this place in a province that is said to be as prosperous as ours?

That we've allowed this to continue.... Not only is it a crime in terms of morality, but it's also bad economic policy to keep these people on the streets. It costs way more to have people living on the streets. We've seen the studies to prove it — from SFU, from the police, from health authorities — which show that it costs more to have to deal with somebody living on the streets than it would if you got them into treatment.

I talked to the people. I talked to one gentleman who sleeps out on Beach Avenue — 73 years old. He wants to get housed. He's gone to the shelters, to be turned away. He doesn't get the support he needs to get off the street and to be taken care of in his old age. He has given to our province. He's been a productive member of our society, but no, no help for him and continuing to waste the money of our province through cruel means.

We look at child poverty. This statement does nothing for child poverty. We look at 24 percent, I'm told. Now, child poverty is not just about the children. It's also about the families, because if the families cannot support their children.... That's why child poverty happens. Whether that's minimum wage, which hasn't gone up in seven years, whether or not that's the fact that these parents are not getting the support they need to get into the jobs they need, whether that's because of day care or training.... The list goes on.

Again, how did the government let it get this bad in the good years? I'm very worried about what it will take to get the government to act, because we haven't seen the action, and I'm very worried what will happen as the economy gets more and more unstable.

I talk about my community. We need to provide stable homes for people so they can have their jobs, so they can build a productive community, look out for each other, care for one another. Stable homes are a key portion of how that happens.

Again, it wouldn't take much to get the government to change its bills, to change the Residential Tenancy Act, to keep people in their homes. That, again, would help us with the economy.

[1045]

Instead, there's a real push on to transfer money to those that don't need it right now, that don't need all the wealth that they've got, because they already have the wealth. They don't need to be pushing people out of their homes. The government continues to make it easy to hit those with the least. This is not good for the economy.

Now, my background is in the arts, and my background is working with small companies managing on tiny budgets. So I know the value of a dollar. I talk to artists out there today. They say: "You know, we've been in tight times before. We'll continue to be in tight times, but we just wish the government would actually take some leadership. We wish the government would step up and deal with these problems — deal with homelessness, deal

with these evictions — so that our money is not going to waste, so that we can build a stable community."

But we don't see that. Five days in the House in a time we should have been working full out this fall. There a lot of work to be done in this province to make it better, to be the best place on earth, but again, we get five days. Five days with two bills — that's it.

I look at how the government has treated the average person in B.C. They talk about tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts. What we don't hear about are fee increases, fee increases, fee increases. We look at the MSP increases. We look at tuition fee increases.

I talk to students today who want to get support. They want to be able to graduate so that they can do their job in the province, whether that's becoming nurses, whether that's becoming doctors. They're getting crippled by massive student loans with interest rates that are higher than those that you could get for buying a car. Do we really believe that buying a car should be supported more than educating our young, educating our students? That's the way that this government seems to think.

Other provinces have taken action. Our province continues to be one of the worst in terms of actually supporting students to get the education they need. We could be taking action on that this fall, but we're not, because the government seems to believe that these two bills are all that the province needs. Everything else is fine. I wish it were so.

The people of B.C. want change. They want to see real leadership that listens to them, that works on their behalf, but instead, we have members opposite laughing, not paying attention. Well, that may be the way it is here in the House, but when we leave this House, people want real action. Unfortunately, they can't see the rest of the members here today and what's going on in here.

Deputy Speaker: Member, would you please direct your comments through the Chair, and there are to be no comment about members, whether they are or are not in the House. All comments come directly through the Chair.

S. Herbert: Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I hear you.

I really want to talk about.... Is this place representative of the province I know and love? We hear day in, day out the chest beating, the ego pumping, when we've got an economic situation that needs real action now.

When we go out of this House, people talk to me about, "So you're in there doing work," and I say: "Well, yes, we are working, but we're not taking all the action that's required to get us out of this economic turmoil, to build the greatest province that we need to be."

We seem to be arguing about power over principles, when we really need to be talking about principles — principles of fairness, of supporting each other, of uniting our province, not dividing. It seems to be about

partisanship over people, when we've got an economic situation that needs real action and real leadership now.

I have some real concerns about this bill, and I'd like to read into the record some comments made by Don Cayo from *The Vancouver Sun*, who I think really crystallizes some of this. He writes:

[1050]

"The nub of the just-tabled bill to legalize the property assessment freeze announced weeks ago by the Premier means just what the provincial cabinet chooses it to mean, neither more nor less. In one fell swoop, it eviscerates the ten-year-old legislation that gives B.C. one of the world's best property assessment systems. It endows cabinet with jaw-dropping powers to aid or hammer any individual property owner or any class of property owner it wishes, and it opens up 2009 property tax collection to potential chaos."

Then he goes on to say that the bill gives the cabinet the power to add anything left out, make the legislation more effective or not, ease transitional difficulties — do anything cabinet considers to be in the public interest. And as you guessed, public interest isn't defined.

Then he goes on to write: "If all that is not scary enough, cabinet can also make its rulings retroactive and use different methods and standards to determine the value of properties in the same class, and despite specific provisions in the old Assessment Act, no one can appeal these cabinet decisions."

We've seen here that a real intervention in this market-based mechanism, which leaves it... Rather than up to the old way that we did things, where you actually could understand how it happened, it's going to put this in terms of what the cabinet chooses to do. So if you've got a problem with your property assessment, where do you go? You go to the cabinet. This puts politics into what should be a non-partisan discussion, and that, I believe, is wrong and shouldn't stand.

Here we go again. It talks about business owners. I'm concerned about small business owners in my community who, despite some massive increases in the office towers in terms of value... The small business owners on Davie, Denman Street and Robson Street have not seen as massive an increase. So what comes when we go back to the old rates for some and the new rates for others? We see, potentially, a massive shift of property taxes from the big businesses, the big banks, the head offices onto the small business owner in my community, when they're already paying high taxes which can be challenging.

The bill, in one sense, says that we're going to do small business tax relief, which I support, but in the other, puts a real potential for tax increases on these small businesses. I don't believe that is fair.

I want to talk about the NDP plan that the NDP leader, the opposition leader, laid out in response to Mr. Premier's back-of-the-napkin response to the economic crisis. The NDP leader supports putting more money in the pockets of middle-class families and small business, and that's a good idea.

The NDP leader also believes in building for the future by investing in education and skills training. That includes training our young people and supporting them so that they don't get some of the highest debt loads in the country. We need to cut the student loan interest rates by 50 percent. That's something that's easy to do. We need to expedite critical community and green infrastructure.

I spoke earlier about the homelessness crisis. We can deal with that right now. We can spend a chunk of money right now that's sitting in a bank account, not really gaining much interest anymore because of this turmoil, and build 2,400 housing units in our first year and 1,200 in the subsequent years to add to the small number of units the current government is building.

We need to end homelessness, because again, it's costing us more money to leave these people on the street suffering. It's costing our communities their viability. It's scaring people. It's making our communities not the best places that they could be, and it's unfair to those who are homeless, who are dealing with mental illness, drug addiction and who sometimes just need a little hand up to get off the streets and get back to life.

I don't know if you know, Mr. Speaker, but it's very challenging to get a job when you're living on the street with nothing. When you don't have anyplace to write your resumé, to have a shower, it's a real challenge. This has gotten worse and worse.

[1055]

We talk about accelerating school seismic upgrades, because we've seen a government that is focused on doing seismic upgrades for liquor stores and prisons. Meanwhile, children in our schools are threatened. As they say, a big one could come any day now, and we need to take strong action and faster action now to deal with this issue.

Three schools in Vancouver-Burrard are on the list. Three schools have seen no action. I speak of King George Secondary School, Lord Roberts and Lord Roberts Annex. All need support. All need action on school seismic upgrades. Unfortunately, the government is focused on putting money towards liquor stores and prisons for their seismic upgrades.

I believe we need to focus on community health clinics and accelerate transportation infrastructure — whether or not it's green transit. Focusing on transportation, my community is very blessed in that most of us can walk to work. Most of us can walk to the grocery store. That's the kind of model that we could be focused on across the province.

One big piece that's missing from this plan is a revitalized forestry sector and the rural economy. Now, I come from a constituency that's about as urban as you can get. The only forest that we've got in our community is Stanley Park. But even in Vancouver-Burrard we know that we can't survive when a forestry sector is taking a

nosedive. We can't survive when a government refuses to take action for forest communities.

I believe we also need to focus on getting rid of government waste, whether or not that's the massive advertising budgets we see on the news every day, in our newspapers every day, talking about what a great place it is. It is a great place for many of us, but for many of us, it's very challenging, and it's getting worse.

I wonder why we keep telling ourselves what a great place it is when we could be spending that money elsewhere — on key, important initiatives in our community that make things better, that save us money in the long run.

I think about hospitals and about emergency room lineups and how those increase and how challenging that is for many, many patients, when what we need to be doing is working to get seniors into long-term care beds so that they don't have to be stuck in hospitals.

D. Routley: I think they have an ad for that.

S. Herbert: I believe there's probably an ad, I hear a fellow member say, saying what a great job they're doing on hospitals.

Well, I'd like to say that we can be doing much better than we are doing currently. We could be building those long-term care beds, which will be saving us money because they will be creating more room in the emergency rooms so we can deal with life-threatening illnesses, life-threatening emergencies faster.

But we don't see anything in that. We see talk of two bills — two bills only — in a province with as many issues and challenges and opportunities as we have.

I'd like to speak about the future, about the children growing up in poverty. It seems too often that this government is about managing up to the election rather than managing the economy. When we have child poverty as bad as it is, we know that there are effects down the road. We know how challenging it is to continue to support children who can't get the schooling they need because they're living in poverty. They can't get the support they need to do the jobs that they need, to get to the bright future that they all want to lead.

We need to be supporting children to get the food that they need, to get them out of the mouldy houses that a number of them are living in, whether that's on the reserves across B.C. or right downtown, which we've seen in some cases.

We need to be talking about the homelessness crisis, how it's getting worse and about how residents in my area — a number — have been thrown out of their apartments because of what's happened with the Residential Tenancy Act and ended up on the street, which costs us more and more and more.

This is not right. The province doesn't need to be this way. We could be looking out for our future. Instead,

we're here partisan-bickering and not focusing on the real issues, the real things that unite us about building a great province together.

[K. Whittred in the chair.]

Instead, we hear about the '90s, when I was in elementary school — a government that was elected when I was in elementary school — rather than on the focus of today: the future, our children's future, my generation's future.

[1100]

We seem to have a lack of vision — a lack of the vision that needs to unite us to build a strong province together. Instead, we get calling the Legislature back for two bills, for five days, when there are issues that go on and on and on. They don't seem to be getting better. People in my community say: "Well, why should I vote? Nothing is done to support people like me." Sometimes I understand their concerns, because too often it seems to be about insiders and not the people of B.C.

I thank you, Madam Speaker, for giving me the opportunity to speak today on the economic crisis facing our province, the real action that we need to take. There are real concerns in my area. There are real concerns in communities across B.C. that need more than lip service, need more than chest beating. They need this Legislature to come together to develop real solutions — real solutions that build our economy for all of us; real solutions that pull people out of poverty, not push them into it.

C. Trevena: Like many of my colleagues who've had the opportunity to stand here in the last few hours to talk about Bill 45 in its second reading, we're very pleased to be back, because I think that everybody realizes that there is a crisis. There's a crisis in our economy, and we've been trying to get the government to acknowledge that with a crisis in the forest sector for many, many months. The government, I still don't believe, has recognized that, but it's a crisis not just in B.C. I think we're all very well aware that this is a crisis that is having effect across Canada and across the world, that it's having a huge impact.

We have heard the word "recession" mentioned. We've heard the thoughts that this is going to have the impact that we saw in the Great Depression. So it's really important that we came back to discuss this. I think that what we have seen on this side of the House is really... What we have is a sense of disappointment that we come back... The Premier writes down his notes of his ten-point plan of what are going to be the solutions for the province and then waits a month to call us back. So we've known for some time that we have a crisis.

We've been wanting to come back to work to discuss this, to work bilaterally, to work in a bipartisan way for the people of B.C. I think that's what people want us to

be doing. They don't want us to be standing here at two sword-lengths — or now less than two sword-lengths, with the reconfiguration of the House — bickering at each other, taking swipes at each other, taking jabs at each other. They want us to come up with solutions — solutions that will really help them, their families, their children and their communities.

Sadly, what we have is two bills — one which is an omnibus of small measures that are not going to do the structural changes that we really need that we could have been seeing, and another bill, which is obviously very important, on the Vancouver Foundation.

But this bill, Bill 45, is a strange sort of omnibus financial package with tax cuts and nods to the municipal authorities and so on, and it really does have that essence of a policy written on the back of a napkin and a bill written maybe just on the sticky part of an envelope. It could have been so much more, and the people of B.C. have every right to be disappointed in Bill 45 and what it offers.

It offers some things, and I think the Leader of the Opposition has said very clearly that there are parts of it that we support. There are parts of it we are very concerned about. We will stand up and say that yes, these are the tax cuts that we already said we were going to support many months ago, and yes, they're accelerating them. But this was a chance, an opportunity, to look at things in a bigger picture.

I've got to say that I represent the North Island. I represent a community that has been hurting for many months — in fact, for many years — with this government's policies, and I had hoped that in coming back to address an economic crisis, the needs of my community would be addressed. Instead, we have Bill 45, which, as I say, looks at some small items but doesn't look at the bigger picture.

[1105]

We have no opportunity here really to discuss the bigger picture. The government has said: "Okay. You're coming back. You're coming back for five days. We'll play a few political games in those five days, and we're just going to put these two bills on the table."

My community has been hurting for many months, many years. It's a forest-based community, and it's a resource-based community. It has been seeing the crisis in the forest industry and wondering when the government will actually acknowledge that there is a crisis in the forest industry and act on that crisis and say: "We are here; we are going to help. We're going to make sure that changes happen, that you have jobs, that your kids have jobs and that we have a forest industry in the future."

I mean, the fact that B.C. could be in this very strange position with no forest industry, or with such a diminished forest industry, because of this government's complete inactions and the lack of opportunity, the lack of taking a hold of the opportunity and acting on it....

We're talking about the possibility of a recession. I've got to say, in my community we've already got people who have not been working for months and months. People have not been working because this government's forest policy allows the major companies.... In my community there are two major companies — TimberWest, which looks after private lands, and Western Forest Products, which looks largely over the public lands — who can basically play such games with their annual allowable cut and their staffing that we have people who don't work.

I have had one guy who's been working for maybe 20 weeks this year. Can you imagine trying to support a family on 20 weeks? It's ridiculous. We have people who have to leave the community to try and get enough work so they can at least claim EI, because the majors aren't giving them the work. There is a crisis there already.

We've got the crisis that's having the ripple-down effect on contractors. I've got to say, contractors aren't usually supporters of the official opposition. They're not usually people who come to us and say: "What do we do?"

But with the crisis in this industry and with the recession that we already have happening in my community, we have contractors who come to me and say: "What am I supposed to do? I'm laying off people. I'm going to go out of work. I'm going to go under. I have had three generations of working in the industry, but I cannot make it work any longer, and I'm getting no help at all from a government that seems to be turning its back on the industry that brought this province up, the industry that created this province, and turning its back on the people who tried to create this province." It's shameful.

A person of great dignity says: "What do I do? I have to sell my house. I have to lay off my workers. I have to close down something that I have worked...." This is what this government is supposed to represent and supposed to support — a small businessman, a contractor who can't work because of the crisis in the industry and getting no help from this government, getting the government turning its back on them, in fact.

The hundreds of people who work in the mills. We had a viable sawmill in my community which was allowed to close, even though the company that owned the mill still had a TFL on public lands that could have supplied the mill. Even though this mill was still viable, it closed. TimberWest mill in Campbell River closed, throwing people out of work.

It's not just the people who work there. As we all know, it's not just the individuals who work on the line who are out of work. It has a ripple-down effect. It has a ripple-down effect right through the community. As soon as you start laying off people, you are having that knock-on effect, whether it's the stores or the restaurants or the schools. This is the start of a crisis, and we are already seeing it in my community.

We're seeing it at the Catalyst mill, where we've already got people out of work there, and it's going to be scaled

down further. Again, well-paid jobs, jobs that support our economy — and getting no help from this government. Instead, what do we get? We get a bill that, yes, reduces personal income tax, which is great for those who are working, but there are already many, many people who are out of work. There are many people who have been laid off by this government's inaction.

[1110]

Instead of taking the opportunity, seizing the opportunity, and saying: "We're coming back to work. There is an economic crisis...." We are not fools. We know there is an economic crisis, but let's look at what we can do. Let's look at what we can do to make this a better, stronger province.

Let's look at what we can do to reinforce our resource industries. Let's look at how we can ensure that we have a future — a future for everyone, not a future for people who maybe have families still living here, and other people have to leave the province to go and work, or worst case, which I think we're going to see, of many, many people unemployed, many people without any jobs to turn to. We're not seeing any solutions from this government.

A resource-based community. We have two underground mines in my community. I think it's the only place in Canada where there are two underground mines, and one of them is likely to close. It is a zinc mine.

This government took all the credit when the times were good. It was as though they had created these great markets. We kept trying to tell them that it is cyclical. It is the world markets that they're playing with. They cannot take the credit for world markets.

Sadly, we are now seeing the cost of that and, also, getting no recognition from the government. Now, suddenly, it is a world issue; it's got nothing to do with them. They take the credit in the good times and refuse to take the responsibility in the bad times.

My community is already seeing what life is like when it's hard. I wouldn't wish this on anyone else, but I know it's going to happen elsewhere, and I fear that it's going to get worse in all communities where people are living in poverty.

We keep returning to that statistic because it is so shameful: that now, for the fifth year running, B.C. has the worst child poverty record — five years. We had good times, we had record surpluses, and we had a booming economy. Instead of taking that booming economy and making it work for people, investing in people, the government squandered it and continues to squander it on wasteful advertising.

I represent a community where we have weekly papers, biweekly papers — some issued every two weeks. You open them up, and what do we get? In one paper, I counted three half-page ads for this government and many, many small ones. You go into the classifieds — little ads for LiveSmart B.C. or if you want to sell your washing machine, your truck or whatever it is, and you're going to be able to get some rebate.

How much advertising does this government have to do to try and convince itself that it's doing a good job when it is actually failing the people of B.C., when we have record poverty levels, when we have people who are already falling out of the workplace, where we have people leaving communities because they cannot find work, and where we have massive homelessness?

I go to Vancouver occasionally, and I've got to say, you see there — as you see in Victoria, see in the big cities — homelessness right in front of you. I find it, I hope like everybody, extremely painful.

The other day I was in Vancouver, and I saw somebody settling down in a doorstep at night. I was heading back to where I was staying. They were settling down in a doorstep and pulling a blanket over them, and like a lot of people, they had a book they were reading before they went to sleep. For me, that was one of the most pitiful visions and such an emblem of the things that this government has done so badly wrong — that somebody's life is that doorstep.

It's not just Vancouver; it's not just Victoria. In rural communities, too, we have homelessness. We have huge homelessness. We don't have it necessarily so visible, because people are couch-surfing. People are managing to crash with families, and so you have multiple families living in one home. Or you have people living in caves, or you have, like in Campbell River, an advocacy project that actually basically says it cannot do anything but wants to fundraise so it can give out sleeping bags and tents to the homeless, because they know that they send them off to the new ministry for employment and income assistance — whatever new configuration that has with it housing — and they're not going to get any solution.

What do we get, Madam Speaker? We get Bill 45, which says: "We're going to give some tax cuts to people." Now, as I say, we're not criticizing the tax cuts. We know this is going to help some people, but this isn't what is going to help the people of B.C. as a whole. This is not going to be the answer for the people of B.C. This isn't going to get us out of an economic crisis.

[1115]

We have also in Bill 45 the property assessment freeze, which is really smoke and mirrors because so many people are assuming that this is going to be a property tax freeze, and I think that the government is pretty clear on that — that it's going to be up to municipalities. The Union of B.C. Municipalities has written to the Premier and has written to others to say: "This is not going to work for us." Yet this government ignores it.

Other economic stimuli that this government brings in.... Without Bill 45, what did they announce? They announced that we were going to have a reduction of our ferry fares for two months to stimulate the economy in our coastal communities. That is such an outrageously cynical move. I mean, I wonder whether the Minister of Transportation and the Premier were laughing when they actually decided they were going to do that.

A two-month reduction of 33 percent. Well, of course nobody is going to complain that their ferry fares are going to come down for two months. It's great to have a reduction. But this is going to stimulate our coastal economies? Madam Speaker, what are they thinking?

In December, sure, people can go off to town and do some Christmas shopping. Well, I hope that they are also shopping in their own communities. Yes, people can come visit relatives. But where was this commitment to our coastal communities when the fares went up in the first place? Where is the commitment in the long term, end of January, when the fares are going to go up again?

For the last seven years we've been hearing that the government cannot interfere with setting rates for ferries. The government cannot interfere with the ferry system because of the Coastal Ferry Act. The government is at arm's length from the ferries. Well, we've now seen that the government can interfere and can interfere to the benefit of people in coastal communities.

Let's hope that instead of turning around at the end of two months and saying cynically, "Oh well, that was it, you know. We've had our two-month reduction in ferry fares. Now go on. You're going to pay your exceedingly high rates to a semi-private corporation again," the government will actually say that this is a stimulus for our economies. It's a stimulus not just for the small coastal communities; it's a stimulus for every single person in B.C., because we all rely on these ferries.

Where are we here in Victoria? In Victoria we're on an island. The government may have forgotten this. The government may just come in on its helijet or its floatplane or however it comes in. I don't know whether the Premier does travel on the ferries and whether the Minister of Transportation travels on the ferries, but we are on an island. We need the ferries. They are a part of our highway system, and the government....

Interjection.

C. Trevena: With their friends, yes.

The government should recognize this and look at investment. I mean, this is now the time to invest. We have an economic crisis. As well as reducing taxes, the other area that you go to when you have an economic crisis is that you start looking at investment. You invest in infrastructure.

You invest in things like ferries, which are part of our highway system. You don't send them out to Germany to fix and have some sort of foreign-made lemons that can't be sailed anywhere because they're not fit for sailing. You invest in B.C. You invest in the infrastructure in B.C.

Interjections.

C. Trevena: Unless you are the B.C. Liberals. That's quite right. The B.C. Liberals just have no commitment to our jobs and our economy, because if they did, they wouldn't just present us with Bill 45. They would actually give us a full session and allow us to continue debating the issues — the real issues — that matter to the people of B.C.

We need to see investment. We need to see a commitment by this government. We have huge opportunities, whether it is our infrastructure in our ferries or in our roads; whether it is in housing to deal with homelessness; whether it is in education, because unless we have a well-educated population we have nothing; whether it is in child care, because we have seen the benefits of investing in child care for every single person in B.C. We have huge opportunities that are simply being squandered.

They're being squandered by this government's approach to say: "Okay, come on back. We'll just have you back for five days. We're going to push this through. You really don't have that much time to debate it, but we're going to get it through, so don't worry."

[1120]

Others have likened this economic crisis to the Great Depression of the '30s. I am not an economist, and I will not give a prognosis about that, but in the Depression of the '30s, what got people out of it were two things. One was a commitment to spend — a commitment to invest in big projects, in communities, in society; a commitment to build society, a chance to build society.

There was that, and also — I think everybody is very well aware — there was a war. The war helped people get out of the Depression. There was a lot of investment in that global battle.

Well, we now have a government that claims to be a hugely green government. We have a government that has effectively greenwashed itself and is going out there in front of climate change and saying: "This is it. This is our new agenda. We are going to come out there, and we're going to defend the environment."

D. Routley: That was just an ad, though.

C. Trevena: It might have been just an ad. I get the sense it was just an ad, because if this government was really committed to dealing with climate change, to fighting this global threat, it would have used this opportunity to say: "All right, we're going to fight it, and we're going to make real investments in a green economy. We're going to change the paradigms. We're going to make things happen that will have an effect not just today but in the future."

Whether it is an investment in the forest industry or whether it's looking at a massive investment in retrofitting homes or wind energy or looking at other areas, there was such opportunity, and again, the government has squandered it. The government is giving us Bill 45, which is

really so thin. There is so much else that could have been done. There's so much else that could have been done with the minds that are there, with the thoughts that are there, with us in a way that we can work together.

I've got to say that I listened to the Minister of Finance before we came back to the Legislature. He was being interviewed on the radio, and I was listening to him talk. He was saying.... The question was: would we be able to work in a bipartisan way? And he said: "Oh, I don't think the opposition will let us."

Well, I've got to say that I don't think the Minister of Finance is letting us do this, because we don't have the time to really discuss the issues. I don't think the Premier is allowing us to do this, because we don't have the time to discuss the issues. We want to discuss the issues. Instead, what do we get? We get massive advertising. We want to work on ways of building up B.C., and what do we get? We get Bill 45.

This is really a lost opportunity. It's a lost opportunity because the government isn't willing to invest where it's really needed — in housing for our homeless, in education for our children, in child care for every single family that needs it, in our infrastructure, in our ferries and our highways. And it hasn't grasped the opportunity of investing in new areas, of looking at things that it could have done if it was truly committed. Instead, it has squandered this opportunity.

If it was really committed, it would have said: "We're going to invest. We're going to say that the minimum wage should go up because people need to get paid a living wage, and then they will have more money to spend." In the same way that you bring down taxes, if you pay people a little bit more, it's going to make the economy work better.

It's a lost opportunity, because what we have is a province that has just celebrated 150 years with great pride, a province that has a lot of hope and a lot of people who want to have hope. Instead, what this government gives them are a few tax cuts and not much else — a few tax cuts and ads telling people how lucky they are to be in B.C.

Well, I think that people know whether they're lucky or not. They don't have to have government tell them whether they are lucky or not. What this government needs to do is ensure that there is investment in the areas which need it, investment in our communities, investment in the people of B.C. and investment in the future of B.C. Madam Speaker, this bill, Bill 45, lets people down on all those levels.

[1125]

C. Wyse: It indeed is my pleasure to be here today to talk on Bill 45, the Economic Incentive and Stabilization Statutes Amendment Act, 2008.

I would like to begin my observations with you, Madam Speaker. Here we are at the end of November, and I'm provided this opportunity, but in actual fact,

where I'm from in the Interior, we were looking forward to having had this opportunity to talk about the economy of the province — at least how the Interior was being affected — in October, when we were scheduled to be back here.

At that period of time, where I'm from, in the area that I'm representing.... When I look across the floor, likewise, some of my colleagues opposite represent similar types of areas.

Already back in the summer we knew that forestry was having a very difficult time and had been having a very difficult time for years. Agriculture was having a difficult time. It was encountering new issues that were facing them. Tourism was having a difficult time. The rubber traffic from the Interior was down substantially. Likewise, by late August moving into September, there were already signs beginning to show that there was difficulty in the mining industry in the interior of the province.

At that time I was letting the people of the Cariboo know how much I was looking forward to being here in the House in October to talk about these issues, to work here collectively with my colleagues to see what we could come up with to deal with these economic engines here within the province that were now showing signs of sputtering and stuttering and, in some cases, beginning to fail completely.

I'm now here to speak to Bill 45. But before I go on and speak about Bill 45, I want to acknowledge that it was approximately Halloween when I got some indication that this session was going to take place, when the Premier spoke — I believe it was in Penticton — to a convention of the Liberal Party and made some announcements that there were some things that the government was considering to do.

I know that where I'm from, from the interior of the province, we didn't jump up and down with glee and joy to have heard those announcements being made in that venue when this area was hurting. This area was beginning to feel the need for a government that was in touch, a government that was able to relate to the economic engines that drive the province.

It is my pleasure to be here today to speak about this. I'd like to put it into context. I want to be clearly on the record that I will be voting for the accelerated personal income tax reduction of \$144 million. I wish to be on the record that I will be voting for the small business incentives of \$14 million, and I'll be voting for the industrial lands for the school tax with a 50 percent credit for \$13 million.

[1130]

That is a total of \$171 million in '08 and '09 — \$171 million in '08 and '09. That's the incentives. That's what's contained in here, and I wish to be on the record that I'll be voting for them.

I would like to put that in the context that the budget that was passed earlier this year found \$200 million to

give to the banks, found \$327 million to give to oil and gas, and approximately that same sum of money will be found in next year's budget if this government is returned.

There's the comparison. There's the incentive that is here. So it is with very, very mixed feelings that I stand here in front of this House to be addressing this particular bill.

Now, there is a property tax deferral program. I hope that we will not have a lot of people here in the province that will be forced into looking at using this particular function, this particular aspect of the bill, to retain their property. I doubt that there's anybody in this House, on either side, that hopes that this part of the bill will be used by many people around the province.

I hope any of the ambiguities about the regulations, of how much money needs to be contained in your house for equity and what year it may apply to, is sorted out very quickly, so that those people that may be forced into looking after this type of a part for surviving do not have the ambiguity of knowing exactly what the numbers are going to be and what year that they will apply to.

Likewise contained in the bill, the third part that I wish to talk about with this House is the property assessment freeze, the stabilization part. Now, when the Minister of Small Business and Revenue was explaining the intent behind this in interviews that he gave.... He is quoted as saying that he had to get some good news out fast. Well, in getting the good news out fast, it has created a number of questions and concerns about government being involved in the assessment process, an assessment process that is market-driven.

The B.C. Assessment Authority, which is recognized as being, if not the best in North America, assuredly in the top three.... It provided the security and the stability that is necessary for local governments and others — taxing agencies — that are dependent upon land value in order to raise their revenue, in order to deal with a system that had a record of being stable, being predictable and not having been interfered with until recently.

Now, that raised concerns with UBCM, the Union of B.C. Municipalities. It raised concerns with them because of that interference with the market-based assessment and the possibility of future interventions by the cabinet.

[1135]

Now, the UBCM also has some political concerns around this item. The stabilization aspect of the assessment being frozen, in actual fact, is at no cost to the province. This is not a monetary giveaway. This is not a monetary cash deal that is passed on to local government. It is a move that has, because of how it's been announced and delivered, left the impression that the province has frozen the property tax at the local level.

That concerns local government, but local government will deal with that. I've got great confidence in their abil-

ity to be able to explain how they have come about their tax bill and how they have decided what the services are that they need to provide for their community.

They have been able to do that for decades in the past, but they were able to do that without having had the Assessment Authority tinkered with. That now brings in questions and concerns. Therefore, in this part of the bill I have severe reservations about support for it — severe reservations.

A rationale that has been given for this part of the bill is that there could be increased numbers of appeals based upon assessments. Only time is going to tell whether this interference, this political opportunism that has been taken by the government to come out fast with some apparent good news so it looks like they're doing something, in actual fact did achieve what their goal is — and if it did achieve it or did not achieve it, that it will be on the back of someone else.

That is not only out of touch but raises some questions about why this part of the bill in actual fact is here.

Now, with the assessments, are they frozen? At what year — '07, '08, '09? Who knows? They're open for appeal to the cabinet. What they do with it and how they go about dealing with it, we will never know. The public will never know. Cabinet's decisions are in secret. They are done out of any type of a review by the population of British Columbia.

It's that part of the bill that I have got serious concerns about. There are no assurances that I have been able to find in questions that I have raised with the ministers on the opposite responsible for this particular bill.

There are no assurances I've been able to find, from people that are much more knowledgeable, much more informed, much more intelligent and much wiser than I am, that you actually are providing protection to the homeowner. Or have you just simply created a brand-new list of winners and losers in a new system that nobody knows how to go about appealing within? That part of the bill I have very serious reservations about.

Organizations such as Union of B.C. Municipalities have voiced their concerns. They have voiced their concerns once more about the lack of consultation, as what is supposed to be provided underneath the Community Charter is three days for a reaction to this particular bill.

[1140]

I can understand myself why that organization is upset. I guess they hadn't been listening to the press announcements dealing with the convention back on Halloween, I think in Penticton.

So on that part, I've looked at the bill itself and what is contained in it. Now, there are some things that are not contained in Bill 45, the Economic Incentive and Stabilization Statutes Amendment Act, 2008. In the agriculture industry, members opposite represent the Peace area. They know that in the Peace area they are

suffering a severe drought this year. They know that this is year 2 in the last three years of drought. They know that in 2006 the ranching community of the Peace area had to sell up to 30 percent of their breeding stock in order to stay afloat.

They made representation here to the government on October 16 looking for some type of an incentive to be able to weather a situation of nature. As of Monday, still no response. In their presentation they pointed out that there is not the hay in order to winter the herds over. They will be forced to sell off more of their herds. Assuredly, they are going out of business. They've knocked on the door, and nobody has answered. That is not contained in Bill 45.

While we're here and we're talking about agriculture, this is the government that spends 5 percent of the agriculture gross national product for the promotion of the agricultural industry, compared to the provincial average across Canada of 15 percent. This is the province that provided the meat industry regulations that have driven literally hundreds of ma-and-pa operations of meat producers out of business.

The gas tax, a government policy, added indirect costs to the agriculture industry. The ranchers — \$1,300 per 200 head of cattle. I didn't notice any incentives for the agriculture industry. Where I come from, the agriculture industry is integral to our community.

Also not contained in Bill 45 is the forest industry. The forest industry has been on its knees for months to years, depending upon who you talk to — 20,000 jobs lost, 50 mills shut down. Where I'm from, mills are on reduced workweeks.

To give you an example of how it's not just the mills, for those of you who are not familiar with the forest industry, independent log haulers have been in my office talking about how they've been forced to reduce their workforce by two-thirds. With the number of workers left, they are working eight- to ten-hour days rather than the usual ten- to 14-hour days.

[1145]

The forest industry is not covered in Bill 45. When we look at decisions that were made — tree farm licences — we took forest companies here in British Columbia and turned them into land developers. Not covered in Bill 45 is the cyclicalness that is involved in the forest industry. I'm old enough to be able to describe to you and possibly share a story or two with you here.

The forest industry has its ups and downs. Right now, with policy changes that have been made here over the last five years, we are cascading. We know for sure that we have got record loss of revenues, just announced today. The forest industry has been the backbone of this province for decades. Generations of people have been affected. Reflect upon this particular bill that I back here.

In my judgment and in the judgment of many, many people here in British Columbia, we should have been

back in this House at the beginning of October, dealing with those situations at that time, not at the end of November, not dealing with a bill with \$171 million in it for incentives. That is an insult to what is and has been occurring here in our province. Those are the things that are also contained indirectly in Bill 45.

Now, let me go on to tourism. Where I'm from, I had tourist operators that were contacting my office in the summertime, talking to me about how no tourists were turning up. There is no way in my judgment that a little, old, country MLA sitting up in the Cariboo-Chilcotin can be that far ahead of understanding what was going on here in the province of British Columbia, where the government has got literally hundreds of employees that are paid to be tracking these things.

I still thought that I would be able to be back here in October to bring forward those concerns so that we could be talking about what was happening to the economic engines here in the province, so that we could be looking at things that were possibly broader and had more depth to them and more insight than Bill 45.

I will be voting for those tax incentives. I will be.

But still, we haven't talked about mining yet. Back at the end of August the mining industry was beginning to show some signs. It was the brighter part in our economic engines, but there were already signs on the horizon that the demands for their commodity were dropping.

Where I'm from, we've had announcements recently of hundreds of jobs having been cancelled in the mining industry. Before I started speaking today I got sent a press release about 49 more jobs being let go in the mining industry in the riding neighbouring me, but many of those people live in my riding. Now, this bill does not include a job commissioner. That's been done away with.

[1150]

In the bad old days industries had the ability to work with the various levels of government to weather tougher times. In the bad old days, when copper was 60 cents, the job commission was able to keep mines up in my area going for an extended period of time.

These mines are wobbling again. They are wobbling, and there is no safety net anywhere in this province for dealing with the effect of what's happening in the economy. We are here in this House debating a bill that holds a very, very limited part to it.

[Mr. Speaker in the chair.]

Now, Madam Speaker... My apologies, Mr. Speaker. No, let me start over again, Mr. Speaker.

An Hon. Member: Good decision.

C. Wyse: You're right. It is a good decision.

I want to have a look at the expenditure aspect and put it into comparison with what I've talked about, which is

not included in Bill 45: the expenditures. Think about these to determine whether the government is in touch with the times. Not out of touch. See whether they are in touch.

Salary increases announced recently for senior politicians, salary increases, for that matter, for everyone here in this Legislature. Advertisements that go on and on and on. Tens of millions of dollars — consider that when you require an ambulance in the Interior, and we can't find \$2 million for training for paramedics. Consider that. Consider those priorities. Weigh them.

Now, Madam Speaker, look at the Olympics. Mr. Speaker, my apologies. As you can tell, my mind is wrapped up with what I want to talk about, and I apologize again most profusely.

What I want to talk with you about are the choices that are being made around the Olympics: cost overruns of hundreds of millions of dollars for the Vancouver Trade and Convention Centre — hundreds of millions of dollars. No cost known yet for what the security is going to be for that event.

Bill 45. This morning I got another e-mail. I want to talk about health here just for a second and the priorities that aren't covered underneath these incentives in Bill 45. This woman is a diabetic. She's waiting in line in Cariboo Memorial Hospital in Williams Lake, has driven in for an hour, is going through the normal types of things that occur with a diabetic. I've been advised that when I get back, full documentation will be there, and there will be pictures of that situation.

Homelessness. I know my time is getting relatively close, so very, very quickly, I want to move on to homelessness.

In Williams Lake a recent count — 84 absolutely homeless people found in Williams Lake, times four, 332. When I get talking about 100 Mile and the south Cariboo community's response to homelessness from 2007, they couldn't find the funds to do an actual head count.

At the moment there is a critical shortage of rental properties within 100 Mile itself, due to the real estate boom of '06, when many rental properties were sold. Service providers reported having clients who searched for several months to find accommodation.

[1155]

People have had to move to outlying areas, in some cases into poorly constructed substandard homes. Some are living in shelter not meant for human habitation, such as buses, horse trailers or garden sheds. Living outside 100 Mile creates transportation issues for those with no vehicle or lack of funds to make trips to town for work, health care, shopping or social support.

C. Wyse moved adjournment of debate.

Motion approved.

Hon. M. Coell moved adjournment of the House.

Motion approved.

Mr. Speaker: This House stands adjourned until 1:30 this afternoon.

The House adjourned at 11:56 a.m.

HANSARD SERVICES

Director
Jo-Anne Kern

Manager of Print Production
Robert Sutherland

Post-Production Team Leader
Christine Fedoruk

Editorial Team Leaders
Laurel Bernard, Janet Brazier, Robyn Swanson

Senior Editor — Galleys
Heather Bright

Technical Operations Officers
Pamela Holmes, Emily Jacques, Dan Kerr

Indexers
Jaime Apolonio, Shannon Ash, Julie McClung, Robin Rohrmoser

Researchers
Mike Beninger, Caitlin Roberts

Editors
Anton Baer, Aaron Ellingsen, Deirdre Gotto, Margaret Gracie,
Jane Grainger, Betsy Gray, Linda Guy, Barb Horricks, Bill Hrick,
Paula Lee, Donna McCloskey, Anne Maclean, Cristy McLennan,
Constance Maskery, Jill Milkert, Lind Miller, Lou Mitchell, Karol Morris,
Dorothy Pearson, Erik Pedersen, Peggy Pedersen, Janet Pink, Melanie Platz,
Heather Warren, Arlene Wells, Glenn Wigmore

Published by British Columbia Hansard Services, and printed under the authority of the Speaker by the Queen's Printer, Victoria. Rates: single issue, \$2.85; per calendar year, mailed daily, \$378. GST extra.
Agent: Crown Publications Inc., 106 Ontario St., Victoria, B.C. V8V 1M9.
Toll-Free: 1-877-747-4636. Telephone: (250) 386-4636. Fax: (250) 386-0221.

www.leg.bc.ca

Hansard Services publishes transcripts both in print and on the Internet.
Chamber debates are broadcast on television and webcast on the Internet.
Question Period podcasts are available on the Internet.