

Wednesday, 6th December, 1922.

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

The following Bills were introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting:—

By the Hon. Dr. *MacLean*—Bill (No. 67) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘British Columbia Railway Act.’”

By Mr. *Whiteside*—Bill (No. 77) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Administration Act.’”

By Mr. *Whiteside*—Bill (No. 78) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘County Courts Act.’”

By the Hon. Mr. *Manson*—Bill (No. 74) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Interpretation Act.’”

Mr. *Duncan* moved, seconded by Mr. *Guthrie*,—

That an Order of this House be granted for a Return of all correspondence, including letters and telegrams, between any member of the Government of British Columbia and the Federal Government at Ottawa relative to a re-enactment of the “Vancouver Island Settlers’ Rights Act, 1904, Amendment Act, 1920.”

A debate arose, which was, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Sloan*, adjourned to the next sitting.

The Rules were suspended, and on the motion of the Hon. the Premier, seconded by Mr. *Paterson*, it was *Resolved*,—

That the Committee in charge of Bill (No. 28) intituled “An Act respecting Chiropractic” be empowered to sit and hear evidence during the time the House is in Session.

The Report on Bill (No. 50) intituled “An Act to create and perpetuate certain Building Restrictions in that Portion of the Municipality of the Corporation of Point Grey known as Shaughnessy Heights” was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 51) intituled “An Act relating to the Corporation of the City of Victoria” was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

On the consideration of the Report on Bill (No. 18) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Dyking Assessments Adjustment Act, 1905,’” the Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* moved to amend by striking out section 5 and renumbering the following section.

The amendment was carried.

Report adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 39) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Factories Act’” was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 17) intituled “An Act to provide for the Inspection and Regulation of Premises and Equipment for the Generation, Transmission, Supply, or Use of Electrical Energy” was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 56) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Tranquille Sanatorium Agreement Ratification Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 66) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Infants Act'" was committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 70) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Creditors' Relief Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 71) intituled "An Act to repeal certain Enactments which have become Obsolete" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 72) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditional Sales of Goods" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

On the motion of Mr. *Hanes*, Bill (No. 80) intituled "An Act to amend the 'West Vancouver Incorporation Act'" was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

The House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

256. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,587,281.36 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, Sinking Funds, to 31st March, 1924.

257. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$591,366.10 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company—Interest on Guaranteed Bonds due 15th July, 1923, and 15th January, 1924, to 31st March, 1924.

258. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$500,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company—*Re* deficit on Operations and Maintenance Account, and for purchase of equipment, etc., to 31st March, 1924.

259. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$9,700 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, British Columbia House, London, England—Instalment on mortgage, to 31st March, 1924.

260. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$15,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, Lock-ups (Kimberley, Abbotsford, and other points), to 31st March, 1924.

261. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$2,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Capital Expenditures, Girls' Industrial School—Root-house and store-room, to 31st March, 1924.

67. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$409,169 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Provincial Police, to 31st March, 1924.

245. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$58,312 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Administration, to 31st March, 1924.

246. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$124,621 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Maintenance of Parliament Buildings and Grounds, to 31st March, 1924.

247. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$20,445 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Maintenance of Government House and Grounds, to 31st March, 1924.

249. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$78,245 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Steam-boiler Inspection, to 31st March, 1924.

250. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$8,060 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, "Electrical Energy Inspection Act," to 31st March, 1924.

253. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$24,660 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Railways, General Office, to 31st March, 1924.

254. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$50,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Railways, Fraser River Bridge, New Westminster, to 31st March, 1924.

255. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$4,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Railways, Freight Rates Traffic Bureau, Vancouver, to 31st March, 1924.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Mr. *McRae* asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following questions:—

1. Did a man named Paul H. Schaffer shoot himself accidentally in the Peace River Block?
2. If so, when did said accident happen?
3. What property did he die possessed of?
4. What became of said property?
5. If sold, was it sold privately or by public auction?
6. What was the amount received from the sale of the property, giving particulars in each case?
7. Were there any horses left by said Schaffer?
8. If so, what became of them?

The Hon. Mr. *Manson* replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes.
- "2. No information as to date of accident. Died April 23rd, 1922.
- "3. No information. Estate administered by Official Administrator, Pouce Coupe.
- "4. Certain personal property was sold by the Official Administrator.
- "5. No information as to nature of sale.
- "6. R. L. Harper, sale of horses, \$75; Mrs. Baronde, sale of food, etc., \$35; J. H. Fynn, \$30; George Hart, merchant, \$7.25; total, \$147.25.
- "7. Yes.
- "8. Sold to R. L. Harper."

Mr. *Bowser* asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following questions:—

1. When was the Liquor Store at Pouce Coupe opened?
2. What has been the amount of liquor sold from the opening of said store until November 1st last?

The Hon. Mr. *Manson* replied as follows:—

- "1. September 26th, 1921.
- "2. \$36,539.75."

Mr. *W. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Railways the following questions:—

1. Did the Government contract with the firm of M. P. Cotton Company the work of putting on a cement covering on the draw of the New Westminster Bridge?
2. If so, what was the amount of this contract?
3. Was it found after the work was done that the weight carried on the draw had such an effect on it that it could not be closed?
4. Was it necessary to tear up this cement covering?
5. If so, what was the cost to the Department for tearing it up and the expense of relaying it?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"1. The Government let a contract to the Cotton Co., Ltd., for paving the entire steel highway section of Westminster Bridge, including the swing-span.

"2. \$9,654.42.

"3. The weight of paving did not prevent closing of swing-span, but made it difficult to accomplish.

"4. A portion of the paving was removed from each end of the swing-span only.

"5. \$1,865.87."

Mr. W. A. *McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:—

1. What amount of insurance is being carried on the Tranquille Sanatorium?

2. With what agents is the insurance placed?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"1. It is not the general practice to insure Government property. In the case of Tranquille Sanatorium the Government continued the policies in force when the property was taken over by the Government on April 1st, 1921, allowing policies to lapse as they expired. At the present time insurance to the amount of \$297,300 is still in force.

"2. All insurance on Tranquille Sanatorium was written in the first instance by the British Columbia Anti-Tuberculosis Society, under arrangements with the London British North America Company, which company distributed the same among various agents in Victoria, Vancouver, Kamloops, New Westminster, etc."

Mr. *Esling* asked the Hon. the Minister of Railways the following question:—

Between the dates when the Government took over the Pacific Great Eastern Railway in 1918 down to the termination of its arrangements with the Northern Construction Company on October 31st, 1922, how much has been expended: (a) For construction; (b) for interest; (c) for operating loss?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"(a) \$7,732,469.24; (b) interest on guaranteed debentures \$4,128,499.56, interest due on loans to September 30th \$2,862,378.96; (c) \$1,308,182.16."

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

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Thursday, 7th December, 1922.

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. *Perry* presented the Fifth Report of the Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters, as follows:—

REPORT No. 5.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,

December 7th, 1922.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Municipal Matters begs leave to report as follows:—

Your Committee has held almost daily sittings during the Session and has heard delegations from many associations directly or indirectly interested in municipal affairs.

Several amendments have been proposed to the "Municipal Act," "Municipal Elections Act," "Hospital Act," and other Statutes in which the municipalities are interested. These amendments will be submitted for your consideration during the present Session.

Delegations have appeared before your Committee in reference to the increase in cost of education in the municipalities. Suggestions have been made to your Committee that the entire cost of education be borne by the Provincial Government.

Representations were made to your Committee advocating the levy of an additional one mill on ordinary school taxes in municipalities, and the amount so collected to be reserved and allocated for the purpose of creating a building fund at the disposal of the school trustees.

Representations were made to your Committee advocating a tax of three cents a gallon on gasoline consumption, such tax to be collected by the Provincial Government, and two-thirds of the amount collected to be distributed to the municipalities and one-third to be retained by the Province.

Representations were made to your Committee advocating an increase of the income-tax, and that such increase be distributed to the municipalities to further assist their general revenue.

Your Committee has given the utmost thought to all representations made, both for and against the above-mentioned and other suggestions for increasing the financial resources of the municipalities.

Your Committee believes the "Public Schools Act" provides power for an additional one mill levy for creating a School Building Fund where it is so desired, and is of the opinion this power should remain optional at present, and not be compulsory upon the municipalities.

The following statistics have guided your Committee in arriving at these findings:—

Expenditure on behalf of Schools, 1914-20, inclusive. (Figures supplied by Municipal Officials.)

Year.	School Population in Municipalities.	Operation and Maintenance, exclusive of Government Grants.	Government Grants.	Annual Redemption Charges.	Total Annual Cost.	Per Capita Cost, in Municipalities.	Capital Expenditure.
1914	45,436	\$1,540,570 79	\$ 753,604 33	\$498,625 63	\$2,798,800 75	\$61 46	\$811,371 23
1915	46,310	1,403,382 79	764,291 34	524,164 46	2,691,838 59	58 12	286,269 48
1916	47,001	1,396,389 25	751,309 15	528,975 44	2,676,673 84	56 94	44,377 07
1917	49,839	1,504,816 05	815,102 56	533,650 55	2,889,569 16	57 97	51,794 83
1918	51,608	1,623,273 64	938,313 89	525,047 25	3,086,634 78	59 80	35,267 67
1919	56,259	2,207,421 16	910,260 72	533,449 69	3,651,131 57	64 89	261,634 81
1920	61,029	3,025,477 73	1,051,911 62	556,412 33	4,633,801 68	75 92	426,858 90
1921	67,878	3,583,446 59	1,087,278 00	627,338 70	4,670,724 59	68 22	*

* Not yet available.

Municipal Debt on Account of Schools.

1914	\$9,424,330 64
1915	9,423,588 61
1916	9,405,251 42
1917	9,422,509 35
1918	9,423,704 06
1919	9,562,462 22
1920	9,978,377 62†

† Being 10.33 per cent. of total municipal debt, 1920.

*Payments and Grants made to Municipalities and Municipal Undertakings from
Provincial Government.*

Nature of Payment.	1911.	1914.	1916.	1918.	1922.
Statutory grants to hospitals	\$140,078 37	\$183,314 65	\$ 214,329 95	\$ 275,249 55	\$ 334,749 25
Special grants to hospitals..	69,650 00	93,800 00	10,000 00	41,050 00	21,325 00
Per capita grants to schools	406,672 51	666,835 10	765,346 75	810,246 08	1,087,278 83
Grant, North Cowichan account roads	2,000 00
Public works contingencies..	6,327 24
Grant in aid of—					
City of Rossland	6,000 00	12,000 00	12,000 00	12,000 00	12,000 00
City of Phoenix	1,000 00	4,000 00	4,000 00	4,500 00
Conveying children to central schools	1,827 70	1,708 20	1,975 49	24,125 45
Grants towards manual-training equipment	3,752 50	2,499 59	607 65
Grant to City of Greenwood	2,500 00	1,000 00	1,000 00
Proportion of liquor revenue	800,000 00
Proportion of motor licences	201,634 86
Receipts for race taxes.....	192,796 18
Grants in aid of industrial education	14,032 93
Grants for school buildings..	238,595 25
Delinquent extra-municipal school taxes	35,702 71
City of Nelson, land taxes, Fairview Area	3,735 63
Contribution re unemployment Relief and unemployment	55,485 15
Johnson Street Bridge at Victoria	145,031 48
Liquor profits to be distributed	200,000 00
	500,000 00
	\$631,728 12	\$965,529 95	\$1,009,884 90	\$1,148,520 71	\$3,871,120 37

Provincial Totals, including Municipal and Schools in Unorganized Districts.

	Enrolment.	Grand Total Cost.	Per Capita.
1914-15	64,624	\$3,917,446 05	\$60 61
1915-16	64,570	3,216,349 96	49 81
1916-17	65,118	3,237,663 97	49 72
1917-18	67,516	3,519,014 61	52 12
1918-19	72,006	4,228,719 92	58 72
1919-20	79,243	5,365,180 37	67 70
1920-21	85,950	6,725,029 50	78 23
1921-22	91,919	7,358,578 20	78 20

*Statistics compiled from figures furnished by Public Hospitals for year ended
December 31st, 1921.*

Cost of building and equipment	\$3,396,693
Insurance on building and equipment	1,586,567
Receipts—	
Government per diem grant	372,828
Municipal grants	284,603
Fees from paying patients	470,038
Receipts from contract patients	156,694
Receipts from Workmen's Compensation Board	71,717
Donations	58,937
Special Government grants	48,769
Total income	2,028,438
Schedule of charges—	
Public wards per week	12-30
Private wards per week	15-42
Maternity cases per week	14-31½

*Statistics compiled from figures furnished by Public Hospitals for year ended
December 31st, 1921—Continued.*

Schedule of charges—*Continued.*

Charges for operating-room	\$ 3-20
X-ray charges	1-25
Expenditure—	
Salaries of all kinds	443,627
Food and provisions	337,194
Medical and surgical supplies	169,819
Light, heat, power, and water	116,262
Laundry	33,193
Total expenses	2,154,258
Deficit for year on Operating Account	249,699
Surplus for year on Operating Account	22,234
Number of beds	3,096
Total number of employees	708

The total cost of administration of schools for 1921 was \$3,583,446.59, and the school population about 4,000 more than that of 1920. Increase in administration costs each year since 1917 is 35 per cent. The cost for 1922 would therefore be approximately \$4,000,000, exclusive of Government grants and interest and redemption. The amount of revenue now given by the Government to municipalities is:—

Liquor profits	\$1,300,000 00
Race-track	191,000 00
Motor licences	203,000 00

\$1,694,000 00

If, therefore, this amount was applied to educational cost by the Government, instead of given to the municipalities, the additional revenue required to meet administration costs would be

.....	\$4,000,000 00
Less revenue now applied	1,694,000 00

\$2,306,000 00

In addition to this, the ever-increasing Government grants must be also taken into consideration. This year the estimates contain \$300,000 more than the current year. This would mean that \$2,606,000 additional revenue would have to be provided by the Government. Furthermore, it is anticipated that liquor profits will not be as large as that of 1922-23 by \$500,000; \$250,000 of such loss will be the municipalities' share. Motor taxes and race-tax receipts may be more, but this is problematical; in addition, income tax is written down \$150,000 in Estimates for the year 1924. It will therefore be seen that to provide for all contingencies approximately \$3,000,000 additional would have to be raised. Against this there is the suggestion of the gasoline tax, with an estimated revenue of \$500,000 at three cents per gallon. This leaves a net shortage of Provincial revenue, if the school administration were taken over by the Province, of \$2,500,000.

The increasing demand for school building grants, which this year amounted to \$240,000, must also be taken into consideration.

There are approximately 35,000 cars and trucks in the Province. It is difficult to secure accurate information, without delay, on the number of cars that come into the Province, but 50,000 has been mentioned by Customs officials as being the approximate number.

Your Committee cannot recommend that the entire cost of education at the present time be borne by the Provincial Government.

Your Committee recommends that the Legislature should give serious consideration to the proposal to group the social service taxation, such as educational cost, hospital cost, and mothers' pensions, with the view of affording relief to municipalities who are at present called upon to bear the constant increasing cost for education and for hospitals, and are limited in procuring revenue chiefly from one source, being taxation on lands (including improvements), excepting

for the additional sources of revenues granted by the Government during the past few years. The ability of the resources at the command of the municipalities for taxation purposes, to meet any further increase of taxation for schools and hospitals, is already strained.

We recommend that the Legislature and Government secure the fullest information before next Session, and give serious consideration to the proposals for providing additional revenue to meet the services above mentioned, by imposing:—

(a.) A tax on gasoline consumption.

(b.) For increasing and broadening the income tax, with the object of collecting taxes from many residents of the Province who enjoy its many advantages, and who escape taxation at present, for educational and hospital expenditures, and also with the object of providing further assistance to municipalities to meet the increasing annual cost of these services.

A. D. PATERSON, *Chairman.*

The report was received.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by the Hon. Mr. *Manson* on 1st instant, as follows:—

Whereas a plebiscite was taken in the Province of British Columbia in October, 1920, on the following question:—

WHICH DO YOU PREFER?

(1.) The present "Prohibition Act"?

or

(2.) An Act to provide for Government Control and Sale in Sealed Packages of Spirituous and Malt Liquors?

And whereas the vote was strongly in favour of Government Control and Sale:

And whereas as a result of the said plebiscite there was passed by the Legislature of this Province the "Government Liquor Act":

And whereas eighteen months of administration under that Act has demonstrated the necessity for the prohibition of the importation of liquor into this Province by other than the Provincial Government in order to accomplish the effective working of the said Act:

And whereas Federal legislation to that end was sought at the meeting of the Federal Parliament in the spring of 1922, and the said proposed legislation met with the unanimous approval of the House of Commons, but was defeated in the Senate at the close of its Session when many Senators were not present:

And whereas it is desirable that this Province again seek the enactment of the proposed legislation:

Therefore be it Resolved, That the Federal Parliament be requested at its next sittings to enact legislation providing for the prohibition of the importation of intoxicating liquor into British Columbia for use therein except by the Provincial Government; such legislation to be for the purpose of supplementing and giving effect to the aforementioned "Government Liquor Act" and to be contingent upon and to exist only during its continuance.

And be it further Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he will cause a copy of the preamble and Resolution hereinbefore set out to be transmitted to the Hon. the Secretary of State at Ottawa.

The House divided, and the Resolution was carried on the following division:—

YEAS—30.

Messieurs

<i>Hanes,</i>	<i>Perry,</i>	<i>Manson,</i>	<i>Buckham,</i>
<i>Neclands,</i>	<i>Yorston,</i>	<i>Sloan,</i>	<i>Smith, Mrs.</i>
<i>Guthrie,</i>	<i>MacDonald, K. C.,</i>	<i>Campbell,</i>	<i>Whiteside,</i>
<i>Uphill,</i>	<i>Anderson,</i>	<i>Ramsay,</i>	<i>Barrow,</i>
<i>Duncan,</i>	<i>Paterson,</i>	<i>Henniger,</i>	<i>Sutherland,</i>
<i>Menzies,</i>	<i>Farris,</i>	<i>Kergin,</i>	<i>Pattullo,</i>
<i>Clearihue,</i>	<i>Hart,</i>	<i>Mackenzie, I. A.</i>	<i>MacLean,</i>
<i>Jackson,</i>	<i>Oliver,</i>		

NAVS—14.

Messieurs

<i>Wallinger,</i>	<i>McDonald, A.,</i>	<i>Hinchliffe,</i>	<i>Jones,</i>
<i>McRae,</i>	<i>Esling,</i>	<i>Lister,</i>	<i>Bowser,</i>
<i>Catherwood,</i>	<i>Schofield,</i>	<i>McKenzie, W. A.,</i>	<i>Pooley.</i>
<i>Pearson,</i>	<i>Hunter,</i>		

Pursuant to an Order of the House, the Hon. the Minister of Education presented a Return showing the number of professors on the staff of the British Columbia University and their salaries, the number of Chinese and Japanese students in attendance at such University, and the total cost of the Faculty of Agriculture.

Mr. *Anderson* moved, seconded by Mr. *Yorston*,—

Whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada, when constructing a railway, which was later presented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, destroyed certain portions of an existing highway from Hope to Spences Bridge, known as a part of the Cariboo Road:

And whereas the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, which Company is now included in the Canadian National Railways, owned and controlled by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, destroyed portions of the said Cariboo Road from the old Suspension Bridge to near Lytton:

Therefore be it Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Legislature, the Provincial Government should immediately present a claim for a grant of money to the Dominion Government for the replacement and reconstruction of the destroyed portions of the highway above referred to, and that the Provincial Government should use every effort to obtain a fulfilment of such claim.

A debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Farris*, adjourned to the next sitting.

With leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, Bill (No. 82) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Plans Cancellation Act'" was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

With leave of the House, on the motion of Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie*, Bill (No. 81) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Married Women's Property Act'" was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Mr. *Farris* presented the report of the Select Committee of the House on matters relating to the administration of the "Mothers' Pensions Act," as follows:—

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
December 7th, 1922.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Committee relating to the administration of the "Mothers' Pensions Act" begs to report as follows:—

Your Committee met on Thursday, November 23rd, at 10 a.m., to hear evidence, and again on December 6th, to consider its report.

There were in attendance before your Committee on the first date Messrs. E. S. H. Winn, Chairman of the Workmen's Compensation Board; Mr. H. B. Gilmour, a member of the Board; Mr. George F. Pyke, the chief assistant of the Mothers' Pensions Department; Mr. C. H. Bonner, who is in charge of the administration of the Canadian Patriotic Fund for the Greater Vancouver District; and Miss J. C. Brown, who is in charge at Victoria and for the rest of the Province.

The Honourable the second Member for Victoria formulated for the Committee five propositions which he suggested were the subject for investigation:—

1. The question of the adoption by the Workmen's Compensation Board of the policy complained of, in its administration of the "Mothers' Pensions Act," by an agreement with the representatives of the Patriotic Fund.

2. As to the nature of the agreement entered into.

3. The fact that by the adoption of this policy certain women were put on a charity fund, whilst others drew the mothers' pensions and retained their feeling of independence.

4. That certain women were under the humiliation of appealing twice for assistance, first to the Mothers' Pensions Board, and then to the Patriotic Fund, while others were not under this necessity.

5. That under the policy complained of, if a woman is referred by the Board to the Patriotic Fund, and is by them refused, she is then debarred from an allowance by the Board, without further hearing being given by the Board.

Propositions 1 and 2 may be considered together. It appears from the evidence that, prior to the appointment of the Workmen's Compensation Board to administer the mothers' pensions, there had been no uniform policy as to cases which might come under the Patriotic Fund. In Vancouver the cases were largely left to the Patriotic Fund, whilst in Victoria they were provided for by the Mothers' Pensions Board. As no uniform system had been reached, Mr. W. F. Nichol, the General Secretary for Canada of the Patriotic Fund, came to Vancouver to take up with Mr. Bonner the question of making a permanent arrangement with the Mothers' Pensions Board. This was in the fall of 1921. He delegated to Mr. Bonner the duty and authority to make a permanent adjustment of the question. Immediately after the Workmen's Compensation Board took over the duties of administering the mothers' pensions, a conference was held between Mr. Winn, Chairman of that Board, and Mr. Bonner. On March 25th, 1922, Mr. Winn wrote a letter to Mr. Bonner confirming the arrangement, and a similar letter was sent to Miss Brown at Victoria. The arrangement was as follows: That in all cases which might come under both the Canadian Patriotic Fund and the "Mothers' Pensions Act," the Workmen's Compensation Board would provide the assistance:—

- (1.) To deserted mothers with children under the age of sixteen years, who have been deserted after six months after the date of discharge of the husband in British Columbia, at the expiration of a two-year period.
- (2.) To grant assistance to widows of returned men, having children under the age of sixteen years, where the death of the husband has occurred six months after discharge in British Columbia, where the death is not due to war effects.

In either of the above cases, if the desertion was within the six months, it was understood that the assistance would be provided out of the Patriotic Fund. From this date the agreement as above outlined has been fully adhered to by the Workmen's Compensation Board and the representatives of the Patriotic Fund both at Vancouver and at Victoria.

Proposition 3: "That certain women are put on a charity fund, whilst others obtain mothers' pensions and maintain their feeling of independence." The essence of this allegation is that the Mothers' Pensions Fund is a fund from which assistance may be received by mothers without any loss of independence, whilst, on the other hand, the Canadian Patriotic Fund is a charitable fund, and that there is a loss of self-respect attached to those receiving its benefits.

Your Committee finds this comparison to be an odious one and utterly unwarranted.

The Canadian Patriotic Fund had its inception in 1914, shortly after the commencement of the war. The fund was provided by the citizens of Canada as a duty and an obligation to provide for the families of those who were fighting overseas. The organization was incorporated by an Act of the Canadian Parliament, and it was provided that His Majesty the King should be the patron; the Honorary President, His Royal Highness the Duke of Connaught; President, the Governor-General of Canada; and the Vice-Presidents, the Lieutenant-Governors of the various Provinces of Canada and other distinguished public men. The auditor of the funds to be administered is the Auditor-General of Canada. No funds have been collected since the termination of the war, but the organization has on hand \$12,000,000, out of which it is now providing assistance for all the permanent cases that have come before it, and it is estimated on the basis of mortuary tables that this fund will provide continual assistance for these cases for a period of thirteen years more. The theory upon which the Honourable second Member for Victoria has attempted to distinguish mothers' pensions from the Patriotic Fund, as he stated it before the Board, was that mothers' pensions were not of a charitable nature, as the services rendered in looking after their children constituted a return for the moneys advanced, whilst this principle was not involved in the Patriotic Fund.

Your Committee is in complete accord with the suggestion that the mothers' pensions are not charity, but it takes strong exception to the further suggestion that assistance from the Patriotic Fund is by way of charity. Charity was defined before your Committee as "Something received for which nothing is given in return." To apply this interpretation to the Patriotic

Fund is to do a great injustice to those who gladly contributed to the fund, and to show an absolute lack of appreciation of the splendid and magnificent services and sacrifices given and made by those whose families, because of such services and sacrifices, are now the recipients of this fund. Both Miss Brown and Mr. Bonner were most emphatic, as to the policy of the Patriotic Fund, in maintaining at all times the attitude towards the beneficiaries of the fund that the assistance came to them as a matter of right.

Your Committee therefore finds that the Mothers' Pensions Fund in its nature is the fulfilment by the State of an obligation to assist mothers in caring for their children. The Canadian Patriotic Fund in its nature is the fulfilment of an obligation by the citizens of Canada to assist the families of those who have given such heroic services in the war.

Proposition 4: "That certain women were under the humiliation of appealing twice for assistance, first to the Mothers' Pensions Board, and then to the Patriotic Fund, while others were not under this necessity." Your Committee finds that, with a proper appreciation of the nature of both funds, as above considered, there is no humiliation to those entitled thereto applying for assistance to either the Mothers' Pensions Fund or the Patriotic Fund.

Proposition 5: "That under the policy complained of, if a woman is referred by the Board to the Patriotic Fund, and is by them refused, she is then debarred from an allowance by the Board, without further hearing being given by the Board." The only basis for this complaint was a letter written to one applicant by the Board, informing her that her case had been referred to the Patriotic Fund, as her case was a military one. This letter did not put the applicant in possession of the full facts. It appears, however, that both Boards were in possession of information that this applicant had means, and was not entitled to assistance from either fund, so that a reconsideration of her case would have been useless.

Your Committee finds, as a fact, that any applicant who had been referred by the Board to the Patriotic Fund was not thereby debarred from an allowance by the Board, nor shut out from any further hearing. The Chairman of the Board was very emphatic in stating that any case refused by the Patriotic Fund would be again considered by the Mothers' Pensions Board and dealt with on its merits. From the evidence it appears that of the cases referred by the Board to the Patriotic Fund, all but three were taken care of, either by the Patriotic Fund or by the Board. Of these three it appears there were good reasons for refusal, namely: One had means, one was remarried, and the third had a husband who was an American citizen.

Dealing generally with the policy adopted, your Committee finds it has been of distinct advantage in two ways.

The allowance paid by the Patriotic Fund is larger than paid by the Mothers' Pensions Board. To a deserted wife or widow the Patriotic Fund pays \$55 per month, as against \$35 for mother's pension. For a first child the Patriotic Fund pays \$12; for a second child, \$10; and for each additional child, \$8, as against \$7.50 for each child for mother's pension. The women who have been referred to the Patriotic Fund as a result of the agreement made are enabled to obtain these larger amounts. Then, again, the Patriotic Fund is one drawn from all Canada. It is a distinct advantage to the Mothers' Pensions Board to have a portion of the financial burden assumed by the Patriotic Fund, leaving them in a much better financial position to care for the balance of the cases in their care.

Your Committee finds that the policy adopted was entered into by the representatives of the two Boards after careful consideration. It was done in a spirit of friendly co-operation, with a desire single for the benefit of the women and children affected. As a result of the policy adopted, no wrong has been done, but only benefits have followed. The Board and members of the Patriotic Fund are to be commended, and it is to be regretted that reflection has been cast without proper consideration or justification.

Respectfully submitted.

J. W. DE B. FARRIS, *Chairman.*

The report was received.

Bill (No. 29) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Optometry Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 58) intituled "An Act to incorporate the Greater Victoria Water District" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 33) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Hours of Work Act.'"

Mr. *Ramsay* moved in amendment, seconded by Mr. *Paterson*,—

That the word "now" be struck out, and the words "this day six months" be substituted therefor.

And it being 6 o'clock Mr. Speaker left the Chair, to resume it again at 8.30 p.m.

HALF-PAST EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

Debate resumed.

Question proposed—"Shall the word proposed to be struck out stand part of the question?" and *Resolved* in the affirmative on the following division:—

YEAS—34.

Messieurs

<i>Hanes,</i>	<i>Clearihue,</i>	<i>Yorston,</i>	<i>Kergin,</i>
<i>Neelands,</i>	<i>Jackson,</i>	<i>MacDonald, K. C.,</i>	<i>Mackenzie, I. A.,</i>
<i>Guthrie,</i>	<i>Hunter,</i>	<i>Farris,</i>	<i>Buckham,</i>
<i>Uphill,</i>	<i>Hinchliffe,</i>	<i>Hart,</i>	<i>Whiteside,</i>
<i>Esting,</i>	<i>Lister,</i>	<i>Oliver,</i>	<i>Smith, Mrs.</i>
<i>Schofield,</i>	<i>McKenzie, W. A.,</i>	<i>Sloan,</i>	<i>Sutherland,</i>
<i>Duncan,</i>	<i>Bowser,</i>	<i>Campbell,</i>	<i>Pattullo,</i>
<i>Menzies,</i>	<i>Pooley,</i>	<i>Henniger,</i>	<i>MacLean.</i>
<i>Burde,</i>	<i>Perry,</i>		

NAYS—6.

Messieurs

<i>Pearson,</i>	<i>Jones,</i>	<i>Manson,</i>	<i>Ramsay.</i>
<i>McDonald, A.,</i>	<i>Paterson,</i>		

The motion for second reading was negatived on the following division:—

YEAS—18.

Messieurs

<i>Hanes,</i>	<i>Schofield,</i>	<i>Lister,</i>	<i>Perry,</i>
<i>Neelands,</i>	<i>Duncan,</i>	<i>McKenzie, W. A.,</i>	<i>Sloan,</i>
<i>Guthrie,</i>	<i>Menzies,</i>	<i>Bowser,</i>	<i>Kergin,</i>
<i>Uphill,</i>	<i>Burde,</i>	<i>Pooley,</i>	<i>Mackenzie, I. A.</i>
<i>Esting,</i>	<i>Hinchliffe,</i>		

NAYS—22.

Messieurs

<i>Pearson,</i>	<i>Yorston,</i>	<i>Manson,</i>	<i>Whiteside,</i>
<i>McDonald, A.,</i>	<i>MacDonald, K. C.,</i>	<i>Campbell,</i>	<i>Smith, Mrs.</i>
<i>Clearihue,</i>	<i>Paterson,</i>	<i>Ramsay,</i>	<i>Sutherland,</i>
<i>Jackson,</i>	<i>Farris,</i>	<i>Henniger,</i>	<i>Pattullo,</i>
<i>Hunter,</i>	<i>Hart,</i>	<i>Buckham,</i>	<i>MacLean.</i>
<i>Jones,</i>	<i>Oliver,</i>		

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Insurance Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
November 14th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Insurance Act,'" a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

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

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Regulation of Passenger Rates chargeable by the British Columbia Electric Railway Company," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 7th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 73) intituled "An Act to provide for the Regulation of Passenger Rates chargeable by the British Columbia Electric Railway Company," a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

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

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend and consolidate certain Acts relating to the Assessment, Levy, and Collection of Taxes on Property and Income," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 7th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 76) intituled "An Act to amend and consolidate certain Acts relating to the Assessment, Levy, and Collection of Taxes on Property and Income," a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

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

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Johnson Street Bridge Agreements Validation Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 7th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 79) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Johnson Street Bridge Agreements Validation Act,'" a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.
Bill introduced and read a first time.
Bill read a second time.
To be committed at the next sitting.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 42) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal-mines Regulation Act.'"

On the motion of Mr. *Menzies*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting.

The following Bills were read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting:—

Bill (No. 45) intituled "An Act to ratify and confirm an Agreement bearing Date the Fifteenth Day of November, A.D. 1922, between the Corporation of the City of Duncan, the Corporation of the District of North Cowichan, and the Board of School Trustees of the Duncan (City) School District."

Bill (No. 26) intituled "An Act to prohibit the Erection of Advertising Hoardings."

Bill (No. 62) intituled "An Act relating to Sewers belonging to the Corporation of the City of Victoria and the Corporation of the District of Oak Bay."

Bill (No. 63) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Woodman's Lien for Wages Act.'"

Bill (No. 69) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Registry Act.'"

Bill (No. 77) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Administration Act.'"

Bill (No. 78) intituled "An Act to amend the 'County Courts Act.'"

Bill (No. 80) intituled "An Act to amend the 'West Vancouver Incorporation Act.'"

Bill (No. 46) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Co-operative Associations Act.'"

Bill (No. 31) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia Fire Insurance Act.'"

Bill (No. 67) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia Railway Act.'"

Bill (No. 74) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Interpretation Act.'"

On the second reading of Bill (No. 34) intituled "An Act to ratify and make Provision for the Carrying-out of an Agreement between His Majesty in Right of the Dominion and His Majesty in Right of the Province relating to the Examination of Iron-ore Deposits in British Columbia" a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Esling*, adjourned to the next sitting.

Mr. *McRae* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did one Cottingham, a lawyer at Pouce Coupe, purchase what is known as the Leroy quarter-section adjoining the village of Pouce Coupe?

2. Did the said Cottingham subdivide 30 acres of this farm into town lots?

3. Did George Hart, Liquor Vendor, purchase one of these lots and build a general store on it?

4. Did the Government spend money grading streets, putting in culverts, and fixing the town-site up in a general way?

5. Did the Government receive a quarter interest in this townsite?

6. How much money did the Government spend in teams, graders, and wages of men working on this townsite?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1, 2, and 3. No information.

"4. No records of the Department showing money spent as indicated.

"5. No information.

"6. Answered by No. 4.

"NOTE.—Pouce Coupe is in the block of land conveyed to the Government of the Dominion and the Province would not be entitled to a one-fourth interest in the townsite."

Mr. *Jones* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Were tenders called for the gravelling of approximately 4 miles of the Mara-Sicamous Road this year?

2. If so, what were the amounts of tenders submitted and by whom?

3. How many yards of gravel were called for in said tenders?

4. What was the estimated cost of this work?

5. Was this work done by the Government by day-labour?

6. If yes, what was the total cost to the Government?

7. How many yards of gravel were put on this piece of road?

8. What amount of wages was paid to each per diem: (a) Teamsters, (b) shovellers, employed on this work?

9. Give names of all employed on this work, number of days worked, and amounts paid to each?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. James Bell, \$2.98 per cubic yard; Wm. Schoon and A. Makella, \$2 per cubic yard; A. R. Smith & Co., \$1.95 per cubic yard; H. J. Blurton, \$1.70 per cubic yard; James Harwood, \$1.60 per cubic yard.

"3. 1,174 cubic yards per mile for a distance of approximately 4 miles.

"4. District Engineer reported that he could do work by day-labour for 20 cents per cubic yard less than lowest tender.

"5. Yes.

"6. \$5,615.55.

"7. 5,011¾ cubic yards.

"8. Man and team, \$7.25; labourers, \$3.50.

"9. J. Clark, 2 days, \$7; C. Embleton, 4 days, \$14; H. R. Coell, 13¼ days, \$46.38; L. O. Zettergreen, foreman, 55 days, \$247.50; S. Cuddy and team, 53 days, \$384.25; R. Dale and team, 33 days, \$239.25; F. Bowden, 56½ days, \$180.25; Mat. Cadden, 55 days, \$192.50; P. Hillier, 52 days, \$182; Mrs. P. Hillier, cook, 45½ days, \$149.52; A. L. Zettergreen, driver, 54 days, \$189; E. N. Senior, 48 days, \$168; Mrs. Campbell and team, 41 days, \$296.35; J. C. Charlesworth and team, 3¾ days, \$28.10; B. Gibbard and team, 15 days, \$108.75; J. Harwood, 3 teams, 16 days,

\$348; C. W. Gibbard and team, 23 days, \$166.75; W. Kenyon and team, 48 days, \$348; A. Makella and team, 31 days, \$244.75; A. Makella, labourer, 3 days, \$28; M. Sihoon and team, 19 days, \$166.75; M. Sihoon, labourer, 15 days, \$52.50; A. G. Zettergreen and team, 28 days, \$203; A. G. Zettergreen, labourer, 5 days, \$17.50; E. Bennett, 22 days, \$77; M. Collins, 10 days, \$35; R. Goodridge, 1 day, \$3.50; A. B. Harley, 23 days, \$80.50; H. Kersfelt, 34 days, \$119; J. Kersfelt, 1½ days, \$5.25; A. Olsen, 26 days, \$91; W. Powell, 25 days, \$87.50; F. Robbins, 32 days, \$112; J. Rota, 42 days, \$147; J. Spilsted, 22 days, \$77; N. W. Anderson, 7 days, \$24.50; J. R. Clark, 7 days, \$24.50; J. Simpson, driver, 4 days, \$18; and T. Swift, 4 days, \$14."

Mr. *Bowser* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Has a contract been entered into between the Department of Finance and a company at Victoria for timber-cruising equalization?
2. If so, what was the name of said company?
3. What are the terms of the contract?
4. When will this work be completed?
5. What sum has already been paid on account of the contract?
6. What does the Department estimate the total cost to be?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes, covering Crown-granted timber limits.
- "2. Ryan-McIntosh Timber Company, Limited.
- "3. The company has to furnish all necessary maps and information giving the species of timber, the proportion of each species, the diameter and height of trees, the approximate value per thousand of the timber as it stands on the ground, the contour and nature of the ground, the character of the soil, logging conditions and cost of logging, cost of transportation, and all data and information required by the Department in order to assist in arriving at the true value of the timber. Cost of cruising to be 35 cents per acre for a 20-per-cent. cruise in the heavily timbered areas west of the Cascades, 25 cents per acre for a 10-per-cent. cruise east of the Cascades, 15 cents per acre for inspection and valuation of damaged and partially logged-off and burnt areas, and for check-cruises (covering small areas already cruised, privately or otherwise, and made for purposes of verification) 35 cents per acre for the actual area recruised.

"4. It is proposed to complete the assessment in time for the 1923 rolls or supplementary rolls.

"5. \$169,725.16.

"6. \$265,000."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did one George Hart work for the Government on the Hall Road or any other road in West Dawson, Peace River, in the summer of 1920?
2. In what capacity was he employed, and what remuneration did he receive per day?
3. What was the total amount received by said Hart from the Government on account of such work?
4. Is the said Hart now the Liquor Vendor at Pouce Coupe?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes; George F. Hart.

"2. Road Foreman; \$5.25 per day.

"3. \$78.75.

"4. No information."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Was W. Flett, of Peace River Block, employed by the Government with his teams during the years 1920, 1921, and 1922 in connection with road-work?
2. If so, what were the services that he performed and the amounts paid him during each year, giving particulars for himself and on account of his teams?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. No.

"2. Answered by No. 1."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. What has been the total amount of money spent by the Government in the Peace River Block for the years 1921 and 1922?
2. In what way has this money been spent, giving particulars?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. \$45,960.08.

"2. 1921: Roads, \$16,574.75; bridges, \$7,661.88; ferries, \$1,146.01. 1922: Roads, \$12,047.55; bridges, \$2,140.77; ferries, \$6,389.12."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was there a dispute between the Granby Company and the Government as to taxes to be paid by the company?
2. Did the Government or the Minister reduce the taxes of the company for the years 1917 and 1918?
3. If so, when did this reduction take place, and what was the amount allowed the company by way of reduction?
4. Did the Department allow the company in June, 1922, to pay their taxes for the years 1919 and 1920 and allow them a 10-per-cent. discount?
5. If so, what was the authority for this action?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

"1. No. There was a difference of opinion as to whether the company was entitled to the 10 per cent. discount, and this question is now before the Privy Council for decision.

"2. No. The usual audit and adjustment was made regarding depreciation, development, and other allowances under the Act.

"3. Answered by No. 2.

"4. No.

"5. See answer to No. 1."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Premier the following questions:—

1. How many settlers were burned out by the Lang Bay fire on July 6th, 1922?
2. What was the amount of losses incurred by said fire?
3. What compensation has been paid to the said settlers by the Government?

The Hon. Mr. *Oliver* replied as follows:—

"1. Eleven settlers' houses or shacks; two squatters' shacks on logging company's property, together with a number of houses and buildings belonging to the company; lumber on ground for erection of houses for two other settlers; four summer homes and five summer cottages which were for rental by visitors.

"2. No information.

"3. No compensation. Relief was given by the Provincial Government to the extent of \$2,426.54, made up of \$926.54 in provisions, supplies, etc., and \$1,500 in cash; \$43 in cash was subscribed to the relief fund by the general public, and a generous distribution of clothing, etc., was made by the British Columbia Division of the Canadian Red Cross."

Mr. *McRae* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Was Josephine Landry or any other Landry, of Peace River Block, employed by the Government with her or his teams during the years 1920, 1921, and 1922 in connection with road-work?
2. If so, what were the services that she or he performed and the amounts paid her or him during each year, giving particulars for herself or himself and on account of her or his teams?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes; J. Landry, W. Landry, and Mrs. J. Landry.

"2. J. Landry: Labour, 1920, \$62.68; 1922, \$54.37; man and team, 1920, \$72.50; 1922, \$157.50. W. Landry: Labour, 1920, \$42.50; 1922, \$15; man and team, 1921, \$98. Mrs. J. Landry: Team, 1920, \$60.75."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Was one LaReviere, of Peace River Block, employed by the Government with his teams during the years 1920, 1921, and 1922 in connection with road-work?

2. If so, what were the services that he performed and the amounts paid him during each year, giving particulars for himself and on account of his teams?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. No.

"2. Answered by No. 1."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did one George Hartley work for the Government on the Hall Road or any other road in West Dawson, Peave River, in the summer of 1920?

2. In what capacity was he employed, and what remuneration did he receive per day?

3. What was the total amount received by said Hartley from the Government on account of such work?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. No.

"2 and 3. Answered by No. 1."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Was J. Fynn, of Peace River Block, employed by the Government with his teams during the years 1920, 1921, and 1922 in connection with road-work?

2. If so, what were the services that he performed and the amounts paid him during each year, giving particulars for himself and on account of his teams?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. Hauling road material; 1920, man and team, \$451.37; 1921, man and team, \$840.50; labour, \$13.50; 1922, man and team, \$225.75; hauling grader, 1921, \$125."

Mr. *Bousser* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did the Government build and install a ferry across the Peace River at Fort St. John?

2. If so, when was this ferry completed?

3. What was the total cost of the ferry, including approaches?

4. Was the said ferry a failure?

5. If so, did the Department cease operating the same?

6. Where is the ferry at the present time?

7. Did the Department haul the lumber to build this ferry from Rolla, a distance of about 50 miles?

8. Was there not a mill known as the Yates Mill operating on the Peace River right where the ferry was built?

9. If so, why was the lumber not purchased from this mill?

10. What price was paid a thousand for this lumber used in building the ferry?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. The only ferry in this locality crosses the Peace River at Taylor's Flats, approximately 10 miles below Fort St. John.

"2. July 18th, 1922.

"3. \$6,954.97.

"4. No.

"5. Answered by No. 4.

"6. At Taylor's Flats.

"7. Yes.

"8. Yes.

"9. Mill not in operation at time lumber required.

"10. \$24."

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

And then the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Friday, 8th December, 1922.

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Duncan* on 5th instant, as follows:—

That an Order of this House be granted for a Return of all correspondence, including letters and telegrams, between any member of the Government of British Columbia and the Federal Government at Ottawa relative to a re-enactment of the "Vancouver Island Settlers' Rights Act, 1904, Amendment Act, 1920."

The motion was carried.

Pursuant to such Order, the Hon. Mr. *Sloan* presented the Return above referred to.

The Hon. the Provincial Secretary presented the First Report of the business done in pursuance of the "Superannuation Act" for the Year ending 31st March, 1922.

On the motion of Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie*, seconded by Mr. *Uphill*, it was *Resolved*,—

That on Monday next this House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the question of the sale of malt liquors under the "Government Liquor Act, 1921."

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act respecting Notaries Public," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 8th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 83) intituled "An Act respecting Notaries Public," a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

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

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Motor-vehicle Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 8th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 84) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Motor-vehicle Act,'" a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 44) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Royal Columbian Hospital Act, 1901'" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 64) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia University Act'" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 66) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Infants Act'" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 35) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Water Act, 1914'" was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 36) intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the 'Public Schools Act'" was again committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 60) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Pre-emptors' Free Grants Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 68) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia Land Surveyors Act'" was committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 79) intituled "An Act to amend the Johnson Street Bridge Agreements Validation Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Mr. *Catherwood* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was there a by-election held in Revelstoke in the month of February last?
2. What Ministers of the Crown visited Revelstoke during that period?
3. What was the amount of their travelling expenses during the trip to Revelstoke, and were these travelling expenses charged up to their various departments?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes.
- "2. The Honourable the Ministers of Public Works, Mines, Lands, Education, and Finance.
- "3. \$480.15, charged to departments. The Hon. the Minister of Finance did not charge any expenses to Department, not being on departmental business."

Mr. W. A. *McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did the Government construct a paved road from Langley to Murray's Corners during the year 1922?
2. If so, what is the mileage of such road, and what did it cost?
3. Were tenders called for the work; if so, who tendered, what was the amount of each tender, and what firm did the work?
4. Did the municipality in which such pavement was constructed contribute anything towards the cost; if so, what was the amount?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2 and 3. See page 6, Votes and Proceedings, Nos. 28 and 29.

"4. Matter under consideration."

Mr. A. *McDonald* asked the Hon. the Minister of Railways the following questions:—

1. Was a barge connected with the Pacific Great Eastern Railway sunk during last February while tied up to the Squamish Wharf?
2. If so, what was the cause of the said barge sinking?
3. Were there any goods consigned to people in Lillooet District on said barge?
4. Were these goods damaged or destroyed?
5. What was done with the goods after being salvaged?
6. Does the Pacific Great Eastern Railway intend to pay the owners of the goods for their loss?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. Surveyor for insurance company states: 'Part of wharf that was cut away the owners of same had had the piles in question cut flush with the bottom contour, and it is the opinion of the surveyor that the piles that had protruded—the bottom of which there was no evidence of when soundings were taken upon placing the barge in that position—had become loosened at the heels of same through the scouring of the bed of the river at that position, and became loose and floated in an upright position, with only partial remaining hold to the bottom contour.'

"3. Yes.

"4. Partly damaged and partly destroyed.

"5. Dealt with by salvage company.

"6. Railway solicitors advise no liability."

Mr. *Pooley* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. Has the Cowichan Bay Railway Company made application to the Government for a grant of foreshore lands at Cowichan Bay?
2. What is the area in acres covered by this application?
3. What is the approximate length of shore-line covered by said application?
4. Does said application cut off public access from Cowichan Bay?
5. If not entirely, to what extent?
6. Has any subsidy been asked for by the promoters or the company from the Government?
7. If yes, of what does it consist?
8. Has any been promised? If yes, to what extent?
9. What are the objects of the railway company?
10. Where does the company propose that its line shall run to, and where does it propose to establish its termini?
11. Has part of the foreshore area applied for already been reserved to the public under Order in Council in 1909?
12. Has the Government granted said foreshore application? If so, when, and under what terms?
13. Has the Government received a large petition from the residents of the district protesting against the application for foreshore being granted?

14. Is there any reason why the railway company's water terminus should not be established on the north shore of Cowichan Bay?

15. What section of the Island will this railway tap?

16. What is the estimated amount of timber in said section?

17. Is not the section of the Island proposed to be tapped by this railway already tributary to the line of the Canadian National Railway?

18. Will not this proposed line of railway have to compete with the Canadian Pacific Railway?

19. Is the Government aware that the promoters of this railway are trying to purchase some 70 acres of the Indian reserve near Cowichan Bay for townsite purposes?

20. Who are the promoters of the said railway company?

21. Who is acting as solicitor or agent of the company in negotiations with the Government?

The Hon. Mr. Pattullo replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. Between 400 and 500 acres.

"3. 2¾ miles.

"4. No.

"5. Very little, if any.

"6. No, except land applied for.

"7. Answered by No. 6.

"8. Favourable consideration of application.

"9. See 'Railway Act.'

"10. See articles of incorporation.

"11. Yes, a small portion.

"12. No.

"13. Yes.

"14. No information.

"15. See maps and articles of incorporation.

"16. Company reports 1,000,000,000 feet cruised and estimate 1,000,000,000 feet additional not cruised.

"17. To some extent.

"18. Possibly.

"19. Have been told so.

"20. See articles of incorporation.

"21. Hall & O'Halloran."

Mr. Jones asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. What has been the total cost to the Government for work done for the past two years on the stream known as Sullivan's Creek at Mara, dating from the month of May, 1920, to the month of August, 1922?

2. Give names of all employed, showing dates and months and amounts paid to each?

The Hon. Dr. Sutherland replied as follows:—

"1. \$1,288.25.

"2. William Owen, Foreman, 1921, March 12, 17 (½), 21, 23 (½), 28-31, November 19, 21-26, 28-30, December 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 19-21, 23, 24, 26-31, \$194.25; Ernest Bennett, labourer, 1921, March 28-31, \$17; Fred Dean, labourer, 1921, March 28-31, \$17; Roger Dale, labourer, 1921, March 30, 31 (½), November 21-23, 24 (½), 25, 26 (½), 27 (½), 28 (½), 29 (½), December 1, 2 (½), 10, 13, 14, 15 (½), 20-31, \$57.13; Roger Dale, man and team, 1921, March 31 (½), November 24 (½), 26 (½), 28 (½), 29 (½), 30 (½), December 2 (½), 3, 5-9, 12, 15 (½), 16, 19, 20, 21 (½), 23, 24, 26-28; 1922, April 11 (½), 12-14, 15 (½), \$170.88; Matt Cadden, labourer, 1921, November 21-26, 28-30, December 1-3, 5-10, 12-16, 19, 20, 21 (½), 23 (½), 24, 26-31; 1922, April 12-15, 27 (½), 28 (¾), 29, 30, \$140.88; Dan McManus, man and team, December 3, 5-9, 12-16, 19, 20, 21 (½), 22, 23, 26-31, \$155.88; L. Zettergreen, labourer, 1921, December 3, 5-9, 12-16, 19, 20, 21 (½), 23, 24, 26-28, 29 (½), 30, 31 (½), \$71.75; L. O. Zettergreen, Foreman, 1922, April 11 (½), 12-15, 26-30, \$42.75; Wm. Kenyon, labourer, 1921, December 13-16, 19 (½), 20, 21 (½), 23, 24, 26-30; 1922, April 26 (½), 27, 28 (¾), 29, 30, \$60.38; H. O.

Kellett, 1922, April 27, 28 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 30, \$19.93; S. Cuddy, man and team, 1922, April 27 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 28 ($\frac{3}{4}$), 29, 30, \$23.56; A. T. Zettergreen, labourer, 1922, April 11 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 12-14, 15 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 27, 28 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 29, 30, \$26.25; J. Graham, labourer, 1922, April 12 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 13-15, \$12.25; H. Blurton, labourer, 1922, April 26 ($\frac{1}{2}$), 27, 28 ($\frac{5}{8}$), 29, \$11.38; Wm. Sihoon, labourer, 1922, April 27, 28 ($\frac{3}{4}$), 29, \$9.63; A. MacKellar, labourer, 1922, April 27, 28 ($\frac{3}{4}$), 29, \$9.63. The following labour is also charged in addition, segregated details of time in Engineer's office: 1922, February 1-17, \$25.12; May 1, 17-20, \$30.25; June 1-7, \$75.50."

Mr. *Guthrie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Labour the following questions:—

1. Has the Hon. Minister of Labour any information concerning the operation of labour employment agencies other than Government Bureaus?

2. If yes, are these labour agencies operating legally?

3. If not, will you have the offending parties prosecuted?

The Hon. Mr. *Manson* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes. A circular was received from the Lumber Workers' Industrial Union of Canada under date of November 13th, stating that the Loggers' Agency, Limited, incorporated September 12th, 1919, carried on an employment agency, and blacklisted every man who was sympathetic to organized labour. The objects of the Loggers' Agency, Limited, did not refer to the business of an employment agency, but included the following, *inter alia*: 'To carry on the business of general agents, and to transact every kind of agency business, and for such purposes on its own account, or on account of its customers or members, to enter into contracts of . . . labour.'

"2. The question is being very thoroughly looked into with a view to confirming the statements of the Lumber Workers' Industrial Union of Canada, and, if correct, ascertaining the legal right of the said company to carry on an employment agency.

"3. Prosecutions will follow in the event of it being found proper."

Mr. *Catherwood* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was there a by-election held in Cranbrook in the month of August last?

2. What Ministers of the Crown visited Cranbrook during that period?

3. What was the amount of their travelling expenses during the trip to Cranbrook, and were these travelling expenses charged up to their various departments?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. The Honourables the Premier, Attorney-General, Provincial Secretary, and Ministers of Agriculture, Public Works, and Finance.

"3. \$442.01, charged to departments. The Honourables the Premier, Minister of Agriculture, and Minister of Finance did not charge any expenses to departments, not being on departmental business."

Mr. *Catherwood* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. How many Road Superintendents are employed by the Public Works Department in the different electoral ridings?

2. What monthly salary is allowed such Road Superintendents?

3. How many months per year are they employed?

4. How many Road Foremen are employed and paid full time by the Department?

5. What are the names of such Road Foremen, what salary does each man receive, and in which electoral riding is each employed?

6. How many Road Foremen are employed for ten months of the year?

7. What are the names and in what electoral riding is each employed?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. 19. (General Road Foremen have superseded Road Superintendents.)

"2. 18, \$180; 1, \$150.

"3. 18, twelve months; 1, ten months.

"4. Local Road Foremen employed as occasion requires; no permanent appointments.

"5, 6, and 7. Answered by No. 4."

Mr. *Uphill* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was there a dispute between the Department of Finance and David Spencer, Limited, in reference to the payment of their income or other taxes?
2. What years did this dispute cover?
3. What was the amount claimed by the Department that the firm should pay?
4. What was the amount the firm claimed was due from them?
5. Has this matter been investigated by the Department?
6. Has the amount that the firm should pay been settled upon?
7. If so, what was the amount agreed upon, and has it been paid?
8. If so, when was it paid?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

"1 to 8. There was no dispute. The books of this firm were audited in the usual way and taxes found due were paid in December, 1921. It is not in the public interest nor is it consistent with section 23 of the 'Taxation Act' to give details of a taxpayer's business."

Mr. *W. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:—

1. What sum of money has been spent towards maintaining the Faculty of Agriculture in the University of British Columbia since its organization?
2. What number of students have graduated from the Faculty of Agriculture of the University of British Columbia during the same period?
3. What number of students are taking the course in agriculture at the University of British Columbia during the present term?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"1. Total expenditure for maintenance of Faculty of Agriculture from inception to March 31st, 1922, \$475,307.95; capital account for the period, \$152,250.45.

"2. Graduates in agriculture (B.S.A.): May, 1921, 8; May, 1922, 10; total, 18.

"3. Attendance in agriculture, present session: First year, 32; second year, 18; third year, 14; fourth year, 12; graduates, 8; total, 84."

Mr. *Catherwood* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was there a by-election held in Nelson in the month of March last?
2. What Ministers of the Crown visited Nelson during that period?
3. What was the amount of their travelling expenses during the trip to Nelson, and were these travelling expenses charged up to their various departments?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. The Honourables the Premier, Attorney-General, Provincial Secretary, and Ministers of Mines, Lands, Finance, and Public Works.

"3. \$479.29, charged to departments. The Honourable the Premier and the Honourable the Minister of Finance did not charge any expenses to departments, not being on departmental business."

Mr. *McRae* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. What was the length of the first contract on the Ymir Road?
2. Were tenders called for said contract?
3. Who were the tenderers, and what was the amount in each case?
4. Who was the successful tenderer, and what was the amount of his tender?
5. Has this portion of the road been completed?
6. What was the total amount paid on account of this contract?
7. What was the estimated amount of this contract by the Department?
8. Has a second contract been given for another portion of the road?
9. If so, what was the length of this road?
10. Were tenders called for this second contract?
11. If not, why not?
12. Who received the contract for the second portion of the road, and what was the amount?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Approximately 9 miles.

"2. Yes.

"3. All tenders on unit basis at the following approximate amounts: DeWolf & Ham, \$79,029.70; Robertson & Rendell, \$91,515.50; E. J. Ryan Contracting Co., \$92,447.92; A. E. Griffin, \$92,978.36; Grant, Smith & Co., \$94,077.83; Cotton Co. Ltd., \$97,390.17; Rawlings & LaBrash, \$101,309.34; Hodgson, King & Marble, \$105,493.63; A. B. Palmer Co., \$105,560.32; A. H. Green, \$112,481; C. D. Collard, \$117,063.10; Clayton Bros. & Angelus, \$129,362.92; F. J. Dawson, \$92,851.78.

"4. DeWolf & Ham, approximately \$79,029.70.

"5. No.

"6. Answered by No. 5.

"7. Approximately \$110,239.20.

"8. No; original contract extended as provided for therein.

"9. Extension beyond original contract, 9 miles unless otherwise ordered.

"10. Answered by No. 8.

"11. In view of the urgent demand for early completion of work, and fact that contractors had efficient organization and plant on the ground and were able to proceed immediately, it was deemed advisable in public interest to extend work in terms of contract.

"12. Answered by No. 8. Amount will depend on units of work performed."

Mr. *Hinchliffe* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following question:—

What books in use in the public or high schools are: (1.) Obtained direct from England? (2.) American editions of works written or published in England? (3.) Produced entirely in the United States of America? (4.) Produced entirely in Canada?

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

"(1.) Obtained direct from England, 19, as follows: Canadian Second Reader; Canadian Third Reader; Scott's 'Ivanhoe'; The 'Highroads' Dictionary; Royal Atlas; Hall and Knight's Elementary Algebra; Hall and Stevens' School Geometry; Siepman's Primary French Course, Part I.; Siepman's Primary French Course, Part II.; Physics and Chemistry (Gregory & Simmons), Stages I., II., III.; Scott's 'Quentin Durward'; Washington Irving's 'The Sketch Book'; Scott's 'Kenilworth'; 'Silas Marner'; 'As You Like It'; Tennyson's 'Gareth and Lynette'; Shakespeare's 'Henry V.'; Virgil, Aeneid, Book II.; Syllabus of Physical Training for Schools.

"(2.) Tennyson's 'Gareth and Lynette' (Ginn).

"(3.) Produced in the United States, 12, as follows: Specimens of the Short Story; 'La Mere Michel et Son Chat'; European History, Part I.; French Life; Bergen & Caldwell's Practical Botany; General Science, Caldwell & Eikenberry (optional); White's First Greek Book (optional); 'Bilderbuch ohne Bilder' (optional); Zinnecker's 'Deutsch fur Anfanger' (optional); Goebel's 'Rubezahl' (optional); New Educational Music Course (optional); Song Reader (optional).

"(4.) Edited and published in Canada, 44, as follows: Beginner's Reader; Canadian Fourth Reader; Canadian Fifth Reader; Golden Steps; Narrative and Lyric Poems; Scott's 'Lay of the Last Minstrel'; Scott's 'The Lady of the Lake'; 'A Christmas Carol' and 'King of the Golden River'; Lamb's 'Tales from Shakespeare'; Sharp Eyes and Winter Neighbours; Selections from Irving and Hawthorne; The Public School Speller; Writing Compendiums Nos. 1, 2, 3, 4; Senior Writing Manual; Teachers' Manual; Public School Grammar; Elementary Composition; History of Canada; Canadian Civics; History of England; Dominion School Geography; Arithmetic, Book I.; Arithmetic, Book II.; How to be Healthy; Drawing Series, Books I., II., III., IV., IV.A.; Fifth Reader for High Schools; Stevenson's 'Kidnapped'; High School English Composition; Dominion High School Arithmetic; Latin Lessons for Beginners; Fraser and Squair, High School French Grammar; 'Silas Marner'; Vandersmissen and Fraser's High School German Grammar (optional); Drawing Series, Books V. and VI.; Longer Narrative Poems; Shakespeare, 'Julius Caesar'; Cornish's Chemistry; Merchant and Chant's High School Physics; Shakespeare, 'As You Like It'; Southey's 'Life of Nelson'; Shakespeare, 'Merchant of Venice'; Caesar, Gallic Wars, Books IV. and V.; Virgil, Aeneid, Book II.; School and Community Song Book (optional).

"Besides the above, many texts are recommended as Supplementary Readers (which are optional) and Teachers' Reference Books. They are distributed as follows: (1) 32; (2) *nil*; (3) 29; (4) 19."

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8.30 o'clock p.m. to-day.

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Friday, 8th December, 1922.

HALF-PAST EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

On the motion of the Hon. the Attorney-General, the House proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "'An Act to amend the 'Succession Duty Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 8th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 85) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Succession Duty Act,'" a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

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

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith amendments to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1924, and amendments to the Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1923, enclosed herewith, and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,
December 7th, 1922.

(ENCLOSURE.)

Amendments to "Estimates of the Revenue and Expenditure of British Columbia for the Fiscal Year ending 31st March, 1924."

Page E 17, "Department of Agriculture—Miscellaneous Grants, etc.": Amend Vote No. 20, "Tubercular cattle—compensation, supplies, temporary assistance, etc.," by inserting the figures "\$15,000."

Page E 69, "Department of Lands—Miscellaneous Votes": Immediately under Vote No. 192 insert "No. 192A, Immigration, \$50,000."

And to amend all statements of totals and sums carried or brought forward in said Estimates so far as such amendments are necessary in consequence of the above-mentioned amendments.

*Amendments to Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the Fiscal Year ending
31st March, 1923.*

Page E 97, "Department of the Attorney-General": Add after Vote No. 65, the following vote: "Vote No. 72, Girls' Industrial School—Salaries and expenses, \$1,000"; and after Vote No. 81, "Vote No. 86c, Revision of the Statutes—Legislative Counsel, \$3,000."

Page E 98, "Department of Finance": Add before Vote No. 115, "Vote 112, Timber-cruising, equalization, etc., \$40,000."

Page E 99, "Department of the Provincial Secretary": Add before Vote No. 216 the following vote: "Vote No. 206, Provincial Board of Health—New engine and repairs for quarantine boat 'Sanita,' \$4,500."

Page E 99: Add after Vote 225A, "Vote 233, Returned Soldiers' Aid Commission, \$25,000."

And to amend all statements of totals and sums carried or brought forward in said Supplementary Estimates so far as such amendments are necessary in consequence of the above-mentioned amendments.

Ordered, That the said Message, and the amendments to the Estimates of Revenue and Expenditure accompanying the same, be referred to the Committee of Supply.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 44) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Royal Columbian Hospital Act, 1901.'"

Bill (No. 64) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia University Act.'"

Bill (No. 66) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Infants Act.'"

Bill (No. 70) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Creditors' Relief Act'" was again committed. Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 65) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Forest Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 74) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Interpretation Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 82) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Plans Cancellation Act'" was read a second time and committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Insurance Act'" was read a second time.

To be committed at the next sitting.

On the second reading of Bill (No. 73) intituled "An Act to provide for the Regulation of Passenger Rates chargeable by the British Columbia Electric Railway Company" a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Pooley*, adjourned to the next sitting.

On the second reading of Bill (No. 83) intituled "An Act respecting Notaries Public" a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Duncan*, adjourned to the next sitting.

Bill (No. 84) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Motor-vehicle Act'" was read a second time To be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 58) intituled "An Act to incorporate the Greater Victoria Water District" was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

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

And then the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Monday, 11th December, 1922.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

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

J. A. MACDONALD,
Administrator.

The Administrator transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,

December 11th, 1922.

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 86) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act,'" a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading at the next sitting.

Pursuant to an Order of the House, the Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* presented the specifications and blue-prints relating to the contract for the Acute Building to Mental Hospital at Essondale.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Anderson* on 7th instant, as follows:—

Whereas the Government of the Dominion of Canada, when constructing a railway, which was later presented to the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, destroyed certain portions of an existing highway from Hope to Spences Bridge, known as a part of the Cariboo Road:

And whereas the Canadian Northern Pacific Railway Company, which Company is now included in the Canadian National Railways, owned and controlled by the Government of the Dominion of Canada, destroyed portions of the said Cariboo Road from the old Suspension Bridge to near Lytton:

Therefore, be it Resolved, That, in the opinion of this Legislature, the Provincial Government should immediately present a claim for a grant of money to the Dominion Government for the replacement and reconstruction of the destroyed portions of the highway above referred to, and that the Provincial Government should use every effort to obtain a fulfilment of such claim.

The motion was carried.

On the motion of Mr. *Pooley*, seconded by Mr. *Esling*, it was *Resolved*,—

That an Order of the House be granted for a Return of the names of all persons, corporations, lodges, associations, or other parties to whom special permits have been granted under the "Government Liquor Act" to November 1st, 1922.

On the motion of the Hon. Dr. *MacLean*, Bill (No. 87) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Health Act'" was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

Pursuant to Order, the House resolved itself into a Committee of the Whole to consider the question of the sale of malt liquors under the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," in pursuance of the Resolution moved by Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* on 8th instant.

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* moved, seconded by Mr. *Burde*,—

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Administrator, praying that a Bill be submitted to the House providing for the taking of a referendum to determine if the electors of the Province are in favour of amending the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," to make provision for the sale of beer by the glass in approved establishments under Government control, and to assure His Honour that this House will make good the same.

A point of order arose.

The Chairman reserved his decision.

The Committee rose and reported progress.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 21) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Pound District Act'" was read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 18) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Dyking Assessments Adjustment Act, 1905'" was read a third time and passed.

The Reports on the following Bills were adopted, and the Bills *Ordered* to be read a third time at the next sitting:—

Bill (No. 7) intituled "An Act to provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children."

Bill (No. 15) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Execution Act.'"

Bill (No. 4) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Warehousemen's Liens."

Bill (No. 20) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Supreme Court Act.'"

Bill (No. 23) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditions in Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

Bill (No. 24) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditions in Policies of Automobile Insurance."

On the motion of the Hon. the Attorney-General, the Order for the Report on Bill (No. 12) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Sale of Goods Act'" was discharged.

The Report on Bill (No. 3) intituled "An Act respecting Legitimation by Subsequent Marriage" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 41) intituled "An Act to consolidate the 'Assignment of Book Accounts Act' and Amending Acts" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 37) intituled "An Act to amend and consolidate the 'Boilers Inspection Act'" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Report on Bill (No. 19) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Highway Act'" was adopted. Bill read a third time and passed.

On the motion of the Hon. the Attorney-General, the Order for the Report on Bill (No. 43) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Companies Act, 1921'" was discharged, and the Bill recommitted. Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 47) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Societies Act'" was adopted. Third reading at the next sitting.

On the motion of the Hon. the Attorney-General, the Order for the Report on Bill (No. 53) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Trust Companies Act'" was discharged, and the Bill recommitted.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The Reports on the following Bills were adopted, and the Bills *Ordered* to be read a third time at the next sitting:—

Bill (No. 39) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Factories Act.'"

Bill (No. 17) intituled "An Act to provide for the Inspection and Regulation of Premises and Equipment for the Generation, Transmission, Supply, or Use of Electrical Energy."

Bill (No. 71) intituled "An Act to repeal certain Enactments which have become Obsolete."

Bill (No. 72) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditional Sales of Goods."

Bill (No. 35) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Water Act, 1914.'"

Bill (No. 79) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Johnson Street Bridge Agreements Validation Act.'"

Bill (No. 70) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Creditors' Relief Act.'"

Bill (No. 74) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Interpretation Act.'"

Bill (No. 82) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Plans Cancellation Act.'"

The Report on Bill (No. 68) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia Land Surveyors Act'" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 36) intituled "An Act to consolidate and amend the 'Public Schools Act'" was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 14) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Local Improvement Act'" was again committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 40) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Village Municipalities Act'" was again committed.

Reported complete with amendments.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 65) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Forest Act'" was again committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 30) intituled "An Act to provide for the Licensing of Insurance Agents and Insurance Adjusters" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* presented an amended answer to the following questions asked by Mr. *Catherwood* on December 8th:—

1. Was there a by-election held in Nelson in the month of March last?
2. What Ministers of the Crown visited Nelson during that period?
3. What was the amount of their travelling expenses during the trip to Nelson, and were these travelling expenses charged up to their various departments?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. The Honourables the Premier, Provincial Secretary, and Ministers of Mines, Lands, Finance, and Public Works.

"3. \$479.29 charged to departments. The Hon. the Premier and the Hon. the Minister of Finance did not charge any expenses to departments, not being on departmental business."

Mr. *Guthrie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. What steps (if any) have been taken to carry out the promises made by the Minister of Lands in the election campaign of 1916 to open up all closed towns in British Columbia?
2. Have any of the closed towns been opened up?
3. Has the Government opened Liquor Stores in any of the closed towns in the Province?
4. If so, why is it that other people are not allowed to open stores for transaction of ordinary business in these same towns?

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

"1. The Minister of Lands made no promises in the election campaign of 1916 to open up all so-called closed towns in British Columbia. He did state he would endeavour to remedy existing abuses.

"2. The abuses referred to in No. 1 no longer exist.

"3. Yes.

"4. The Government offers no prohibition to other people doing business in these towns."

Mr. *Jones* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. Did the Government make an investigation of the water-supply for the Barnes Estate, Walhachin, during 1921 and 1922?
2. What was the estimated cost to repair and reconstruct the said irrigation system?
3. How many acres were supposed to be irrigated by this system?
4. How many acres are capable of being irrigated by said system?
5. Does the Government intend to advance any moneys from the Conservation Fund to the water-users of the Barnes Estate? If so, when, and how much?
6. What arrangement did the Hon. Minister of Lands make with the Marquis of Anglesey on his recent trip to England concerning the reconstruction of the irrigation system?

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. \$240,058.

"3. Total area under existing system, 3,183 acres.

"4. If repaired and reconstructed, 3,183 acres.

"5. \$5,000 was advanced in 1921 to settlers under this system in order to effect immediate repairs to ensure operation during that year. This was repaid at the end of the season according to agreement. In 1922 the settlers under the system advised the Department that they would not apply for a further loan.

"6. None."

Mr. W. A. *McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Was there a gang of men working this year on the road from Meldrum Creek to Chimney Creek Bridge?
2. If so, how many men worked there, giving their names and the time they worked and the money received from the Department in each case?
3. Was the District Engineer supervising this work himself?
4. If so, how many trips did he make to the work?
5. Who was in charge of said work, and what has been the experience of said Foreman?
6. Was the work done this year of a satisfactory nature?
7. Has the work been completed yet?
8. If not, how much will it take to complete it?
9. What was the total cost of the work this year?
10. What was the estimate of the Department for the said work?
11. Does the Department intend to finish the work?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Yes.

"2. J. Mackill: July 4-31, \$128.25; August 1-31, \$128.25. D. Barlow: July 4-31, \$86.25; August 1-31, \$101.25. N. Barlow: July 22-31, \$37.50; August 1-31, \$116.25. C. Foyle: July 4-31, \$93.75; August 1-31, \$110.62. J. Kennedy: July 4-31, \$82.50; August 1-31, \$93.75. J. Meldrum: July 10-14, \$25; August 19-26, \$10. A. McIlroy: July 10-31, \$71.25; August 1-31, \$101.25. J. Naden. July 4-31, \$97.50; August 1-31, \$101.25. T. Thorson: July 4-30, \$90; August 1-31, \$101.25. Teams:—F. Douglas: July 4-31, \$70; August 1-31, \$54; September 1-5, \$10. G. Evans: July 4-17, \$45. J. Malone: July 4-31, \$181.25; September 1-5, \$38.75. T. Malone: August 1-31, \$224.25. J. Naden: September 1-5, \$18.75. D. Stowell: July 17-31, \$48.75. R. Stowell: August 1-31, \$101.25.

"3. No; work entirely under supervision of General Foreman.

"4. Answered by No. 3.

"5. James Mackill; six years with Public Works Department, four years as foreman.

"6. Yes.

"7. No.

"8. \$2,000.

"9. \$2,445.

"10. \$6,000.

"11. Yes."

Mr. *Lister* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did Boyd Young supply any materials to the Department of Public Works for road-work in the Skeena District in 1922?
2. If so, what did these materials consist of, and what was the amount paid by the Government to him for them?
3. Did said Young buy any lumber for the Government during this period in this district?
4. If so, what did it amount to, and what price did the Government pay him, or was he paid a commission for purchasing? If so, what commission was paid him?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

"1. Materials supplied by R. Boyd Young & Co.

"2. Lumber and hardware, \$319.95.

"3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

"4. Cost of lumber purchased from the company, \$271.08."

Mr. *Hanes* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. Under sections 7 and 8, chapter 28, Statutes of B.C. 1921, how many pulp districts have been approved by the Lieutenant-Governor in Council and published in the Gazette?
2. Who are the owners of same?
3. How many timber licences are there in each district?
4. In how many of the above pulp districts have the timber licences included therein been converted into pulp licences?

5. What were the amounts due the Government for annual renewal fees?
6. Over what period has the payment of such arrears been spread?
7. What is the saving to the owners of each pulp district in annual renewal fees in each year?

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

- "1. One.
- "2. Made in respect of the Pacific Mills, Ltd. Title still in the Crown.
- "3. Approximately 160 in the one area.
- "4. None.
- "5, 6, and 7. Answered by No. 4."

Mr. *Perry* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. Have negotiations with the Fraser Timber Syndicate concerning the establishment of a pulp and paper industry near Prince George been discontinued?
2. What were the chief privileges asked by said syndicate and which were not acceded to by your Department?
3. What is the approximate number of square miles in the proposed area near Prince George?
4. Has said area been defined as a pulp area?
5. Is it the intention of your Department to vigorously advertise said pulp area for *bona-fide* development?

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Special legislation was passed which, it was thought, would meet reasonable requests of syndicate. Subsequently syndicate renewed importunities which could not be acceded to—namely, fixed taxation and fixed royalty for thirty years.
- "3. 195 square miles.
- "4. No.
- "5. Yes, at expedient time."

Mr. *W. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. In connection with the new addition to the Mental Home at Essondale, do the specifications call for the doors to be of American manufacture?
2. If so, why were not doors of Canadian manufacture specified?
3. Do the specifications call for American marble to be supplied; if so, why was not Canadian marble specified?
4. What is the estimated value of the marble to be used in connection with this building?
5. Do the specifications call for any portion of the hardware to be supplied by other than that manufactured by Canadian firms; if so, why?
6. Do the specifications require that mastic floors are to be of American product?
7. If so, why was not Canadian product specified?
8. Do the specifications require that the plumbing and heating materials be of American manufacture?
9. If so, why was not Canadian material specified?
10. What is the estimated value for plumbing and heating supplies to be used in connection with this building?
11. Have the steel sash used in connection with this building been purchased from American firms?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied as follows:—

- "1. No; when a special brand or article is specified it is to be regarded as a standard of quality. Any brand or article equally good and efficient in the opinion of the Public Works Engineer may, by special request in writing, be accepted in lieu thereof.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. No. All marble to be best-quality grey marble from an approved quarry, and to a sample to be approved by the Supervising Architect.
- "4. \$3,115.

"5. Majority of locks from Messrs. Gibbons, Wolverhampton, being special asylum lock. Those for offices, 'Corbin' locks to master with those at the present Chronic Building. No other firm wishes to master with some one else's locks.

"6. Yes.

"7. Canadian product had to be taken out of Deaf, Dumb, and Blind School, Point Grey, as not satisfactory.

"8. No. Answered by No. 1.

"9. Special features for hydrotherapy plumbing only made by Mott, Clow, or Crane. Fans from Kitchener, Ontario; radiation, Canadian; valves, Dunhams, Toronto.

"10. Plumbing, \$23,500; heating, \$34,633.

"11. No. From Canadian Metal Window and Steel Products, Ltd., Toronto."

Mr. *Perry* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. What is the amount of royalty per M. on timber in the (a) Coast District; (b) Southern Interior; (c) Northern Interior?

2. Is the royalty higher in the Northern Interior than in other districts; and, if so, how much?

3. Why was the basic royalty fixed higher in the Northern Interior?

4. Is it the intention of the Minister to adjust inequalities in royalties?

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

"1. (a) Coast District, Nos. 1 and 2 Grades, \$1.22; No. 3 Grade, 87 cents; (b) Southern Interior, ungraded, 87 cents; (c) Northern Interior, ungraded, \$1.02.

"2. Answered by No. 1.

"3. Lower shipping weights and easier freight-hauls.

"4. The royalty question will be reviewed during the coming year."

Resolved, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 8.30 o'clock p.m. to-day.

And then the House adjourned at 5.59 p.m.

Monday, 11th December, 1922.

HALF-PAST EIGHT O'CLOCK P.M.

On the motion of the Hon. the Premier, the House proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

The House again resolved itself into Committee of the Whole to consider the question of the sale of malt liquors under the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," in pursuance of the Resolution moved by Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* on 8th instant, and on the point of order raised on the Resolution moved in Committee by Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* on 11th instant, as follows:—

That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Administrator, praying that a Bill be submitted to the House providing for the taking of a referendum to determine if the electors of the Province are in favour of amending the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," to make provision for the sale of beer by the glass in approved establishments under Government control, and to assure His Honour that this House will make good the same.

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

The Chairman ruled the Resolution out of order under Rule 118.

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* appealed to the House from the ruling of the Chairman.

The Chairman was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS—34.

Messieurs

<i>Hanes,</i>	<i>Duncan,</i>	<i>Yorston,</i>	<i>Henniger,</i>
<i>Neclands,</i>	<i>Menzies,</i>	<i>MacDonald, K. C.,</i>	<i>Buckham,</i>
<i>Guthrie,</i>	<i>Clearihue,</i>	<i>Paterson,</i>	<i>Whiteside,</i>
<i>Wallinger,</i>	<i>Hinchliffe,</i>	<i>Hart,</i>	<i>Smith, Mrs.</i>
<i>McRae,</i>	<i>Lister,</i>	<i>Oliver,</i>	<i>Barrot.</i>
<i>Catherwood,</i>	<i>McKenzie, W. A.,</i>	<i>Manson,</i>	<i>Sutherland,</i>
<i>Pearson,</i>	<i>Jones,</i>	<i>Sloan.</i>	<i>Pattullo,</i>
<i>McDonald, A.,</i>	<i>Bowser,</i>	<i>Ramsay,</i>	<i>MacLean.</i>
<i>Esling,</i>	<i>Pooley,</i>		

NAYS—10.

Messieurs

<i>Uphill,</i>	<i>Hunter,</i>	<i>Farris,</i>	<i>Mackenzie, I. A.</i>
<i>Schofield,</i>	<i>Perry,</i>	<i>Campbell,</i>	
<i>Burde,</i>	<i>Anderson,</i>	<i>Kergin,</i>	

Mr. *Uphill* moved, seconded by Mr. *Burde*,—

Whereas since the passing of the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," there has been a widespread demand among the electors that the Act be amended so as to make provision for the sale of malt liquors by the glass:

Therefore be it Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Administrator, praying that he cause to be passed before the House for its consideration a Bill amending the "Government Liquor Act, 1921," so as to make provision under Government control for the sale of malt liquors in standard hotels and *bona-fide* clubs, and that such Address be presented by such Members of the House as are of the Executive Council.

The Committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.
Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The House again resolved itself into the Committee of Supply.

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

121. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$15,850 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Cranbrook Agency, to 31st March, 1924.

114. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$83,900 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Agent-General's Office and B.C. House, London, England, to 31st March, 1924.

239. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$12,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Provincial Secretary, Grant to Pacific North-west Tourist Association, to 31st March, 1924.

244. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$13,040 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, Minister's Office, to 31st March, 1924.

248. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$60,580 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Public Works, District Engineers, to 31st March, 1924.

16. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$7,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Veterinary Branch, to 31st March, 1923.

20. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$4,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Tubercular cattle, to 31st March, 1923.

41A. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Quesnel Creamery, to 31st March, 1923.

44B. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$2,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Agriculture, Assistance in connection with marketing British Columbia fruit, to 31st March, 1923.

45. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Attorney-General's Office, to 31st March, 1923.

56. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$300 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Land Registry Office, Nelson, to 31st March, 1923.

57. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Land Registry Office, New Westminster, to 31st March, 1923.

58. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Land Registry Office, Prince Rupert, to 31st March, 1923.

61. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$300 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Supreme and County Courts, Chilliwack, to 31st March, 1923.

65. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,200 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Supreme and County Courts, Prince Rupert, to 31st March, 1923.

80. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$10,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Constitutional litigation and general law costs, to 31st March, 1923.

81. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$10,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Attorney-General, Game protection, etc., to 31st March, 1923.

87. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$150 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, General Office, to 31st March, 1923.

92. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$710 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, Normal School, Vancouver, to 31st March, 1923.

93. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,625 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, Normal School, Victoria, to 31st March, 1923.

95, 96. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$100,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, *Per Capita* Grants, Cities and municipalities, to 31st March, 1923.

97. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$10,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, *Per Capita* Grants, Rural school districts, to 31st March, 1923.

98. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$20,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, Teachers' Salaries, Assisted schools, to 31st March, 1923.

99. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Education, Teachers' Salaries, E. & N. Railway Belt, to 31st March, 1923.

118. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,400 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Ashcroft Sub-agency, to 31st March, 1923.

120. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Barkerville Sub-agency, to 31st March, 1923.

123. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Cumberland Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

127. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$7,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Fort George Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

134. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Merrit Sub-agency, to 31st March, 1923.

135. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$700 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Nanaimo Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

136. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,700 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Nelson Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

138. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$600 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, New Denver Sub-agency, to 31st March, 1923.

139. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$2,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Williams Lake Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

140. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$3,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Penticton Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

142. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$4,500 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Prince Rupert Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

146. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$840 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Rossland Sub-agency, to 31st March, 1923.

147. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$400 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Smithers Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

150. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$1,200 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Finance, Vernon Agency, to 31st March, 1923.

177. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$10,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of Lands, Insect damage: investigation and control, to 31st March, 1923.

216. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$21,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Provincial Secretary, Tranquille Sanatorium Farm, to 31st March, 1923.

221. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$10,000 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Provincial Secretary, In aid of destitute poor and sick, to 31st March, 1923.

225A. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$8,600 be granted to His Majesty to defray the expenses of Department of the Provincial Secretary, Special contribution supplementing allowances under section 34 of the "Superannuation Act, 1921," to 31st March, 1923.

Schedule A. *Resolved*, That a sum not exceeding \$46,714.49 be granted to His Majesty to make good certain sums expended for the Public Service for the period ended 31st March, 1922, and to indemnify the several officers and persons for making such expenditures.

The Committee reported the Resolutions.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

The following Bills were read a third time and passed:—

Bill (No. 7) intituled "An Act to provide for the Maintenance of Parents by their Children."

Bill (No. 15) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Execution Act.'"

Bill (No. 4) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Warehousemen's Liens."

Bill (No. 20) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Supreme Court Act.'"

Bill (No. 23) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditions in Policies of Accident and Sickness Insurance."

Bill (No. 24) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditions in Policies of Automobile Insurance."

Bill (No. 3) intituled "An Act respecting Legitimation by Subsequent Marriage."

Bill (No. 41) intituled "An Act to consolidate the 'Assignment of Book Accounts Act' and Amending Acts."

Bill (No. 47) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Societies Act.'"

Bill (No. 39) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Factories Act.'"

Bill (No. 17) intituled "An Act to provide for the Inspection and Regulation of Premises and Equipment for the Generation, Transmission, Supply, or Use of Electrical Energy."

Bill (No. 71) intituled "An Act to repeal certain Enactments which have become Obsolete."

Bill (No. 72) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Conditional Sales of Goods."

Bill (No. 79) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Johnson Street Bridge Agreements Validation Act.'"

Bill (No. 70) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Creditors' Relief Act.'"

Bill (No. 74) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Interpretation Act.'"

Bill (No. 82) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Plans Cancellation Act.'"

Mr. *W. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. How many experimental farms are being operated in British Columbia by the Federal Department of Agriculture?

2. In what district is each farm located?

The Hon. Mr. *Barrow* replied as follows:—

“1. The Annual Report of the Director of Experimental Farms shows experimental farms conducted by the Federal Department of Agriculture at Agassiz on the Lower Mainland, in Saanich District on Vancouver Island, at Summerland in the Okanagan Valley, and at Invermere in East Kootenay District.

“2. Answered by No. 1.”

Mr. *Hanes* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. When the Sumas Lake reclamation scheme is completed, what will be the approximate value per acre of the lands now comprising the portion covered by water by Sumas Lake, or what price per acre will these lands be offered for?

2. What is the nature of the soil of the Sumas Lake bottom?

3. Does the Minister of Agriculture consider that the Sumas Lake bottom will be first-class agricultural lands?

The Hon. Mr. *Barrow* replied as follows:—

“1. These lands will be sold by public auction or by tender to the highest bidder. It is inadvisable to give a personal opinion as to the value.

“2. An alluvial deposit by the Vedder and Fraser Rivers.

“3. Answered by No. 1.”

Mr. *Lister* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following questions:—

1. Was one R. W. Hagen, of Quesnel, appointed a Court of Revision?

2. If so, when was he appointed, and how long has he acted in that capacity?

3. What area does his work cover?

4. How much has he received from the Government to date by way of remuneration?

5. How much has been paid him to date for travelling expenses?

The Hon. Mr. *Hart* replied as follows:—

“1. Yes.

“2. January 10th, 1921, as from December 15th, 1920.

“3. Barkerville Assessment District.

“4. 1920-21, \$290; 1921-22, \$350.

“5. 1920-21, \$302.10; 1921-22, \$372.10.”

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

And then the House adjourned at 11.45 p.m.