

Monday, 26th November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision on the point of order raised on Mr. *Uphill's* motion of 23rd instant for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal-mines Regulation Act,'" as follows:—

"On the motion of the Honourable Member for Fernie for leave to introduce a Bill intituled 'An Act to amend the "Coal-mines Regulation Act,"' objection was taken by the Honourable the Minister of Mines that the motion was not in order.

"In consideration of this matter I find there are numerous past decisions on similar questions. I would refer Honourable Members to House Journals, B.C., 1921, page 63, in which Mr. Speaker Manson deals with an almost parallel case. Also to ruling of Mr. Speaker Pooley (House Journals, B.C., 1902, page 130). Also ruling of Mr. Speaker Pooley (House Journals, B.C., 1904, page 60) 'that a motion anticipating discussion of a Bill upon the Order Paper is not in order.' In the present instance a Bill of similar character to the one which the Honourable Member for Fernie seeks to introduce is before the House and stands on the Order Paper for second reading and concerning which the Honourable Member for Fernie adjourned the debate. The amendments which the Honourable Member for Fernie wishes to submit for the consideration of the House can very properly be taken up and considered at the Committee stage of Bill No. 20 standing in the name of the Honourable Minister of Mines.

"The right of the Honourable Member to submit to the consideration of the House any question which may suitably engage its attention is in no way prejudiced and subject only to the limitations of Parliamentary practice.

"I must rule the motion out of order."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Duncan* on 19th instant, as follows:—

Whereas a large quantity of timber is being cut from British Columbia forests and taken outside of Canada for manufacture:

And whereas this practice is resulting in the exploitation of one of our natural resources with little benefit to the Province:

And whereas numbers of wage-earners are leaving British Columbia on account of an insufficiency of employment:

And whereas the manufacture of all timber cut in this Province would materially increase employment and conserve the timber resources for the benefit of Canada:

Therefore be it Resolved, That this House is of the opinion that a heavy export duty should be imposed by the Dominion Government on all unmanufactured British Columbia timber going outside of Canada.

And be it further Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that a copy of the Resolution hereinbefore set out be transmitted to the Hon. Secretary of State or other proper official at Ottawa.

And on the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* on 21st instant, as follows:—

That all the words of the Preamble and of the Resolution after the first word "Whereas" be struck out, and the following words substituted therefor:—

"Quantities of timber are being cut from forests in British Columbia and elsewhere in Canada and taken out of Canada in an unmanufactured condition:

"And whereas it is desirable that Canadian timber should, as far as practicable, be fully manufactured before leaving Canada:

"And whereas the Canadian Government has appointed a Royal Commission for the purpose of inquiring into the exportation of pulp-wood:

"Therefore be it Resolved, That this House would respectfully request the Canadian Government to extend the powers of the before-mentioned Royal Commission, and to instruct them to

inquire into all the circumstances relating to the export of unmanufactured timber, and to report as to what action, if any, should be taken in respect thereof.

"And be it further Resolved, That an humble Address be presented to His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that a copy of the Resolution hereinbefore set out be transmitted by telegraph to the Honourable the Secretary of State for Canada."

And on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. *Hanes* on 22nd instant, as follows:—

That all the words after the word "thereof," in the second line, be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—

"It is desirable that all timber cut in this Province (coming within the jurisdiction of the British Columbia Legislature) be manufactured within the Province:

"Therefore be it Resolved, That in the opinion of this House all timber coming under the jurisdiction of this Province be manufactured within the Province before leaving Canada."

Question proposed—"Shall the words proposed to be struck out of the amendment stand part of the question?"

Resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

YEAS—29.

Messieurs

<i>Pearson</i>	<i>Bowser</i>	<i>Oliver</i>	<i>Mackenzie, I. A.</i>
<i>McDonald, A.</i>	<i>Pooley</i>	<i>Manson</i>	<i>Buckham</i>
<i>Esling</i>	<i>Perry</i>	<i>Sloan</i>	<i>Whiteside</i>
<i>Schofield</i>	<i>Yorston</i>	<i>Campbell</i>	<i>Smith, Mrs.</i>
<i>Clearihue</i>	<i>MacDonald, K. C.</i>	<i>Ramsay</i>	<i>Sutherland</i>
<i>Jackson</i>	<i>Farris</i>	<i>Henniger</i>	<i>Pattullo</i>
<i>McKenzie, W. A.</i>	<i>Hart</i>	<i>Kergin</i>	<i>MacLean</i>
<i>Jones</i>			

NAYS—9.

Messieurs

<i>Hanes</i>	<i>Uphill</i>	<i>Menzies</i>	<i>Hinchliffe</i>
<i>Neelands</i>	<i>Duncan</i>	<i>Hunter</i>	<i>Lister</i>
<i>Guthrie</i>			

Mr. *Bowser* moved in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Mr. *Hinchliffe*,—

That all the words after the words "British Columbia" be struck out, and the following substituted therefor:—

"and taken out of the Province in an unmanufactured condition:

"And whereas this practice is resulting in the exploitation of one of our most valuable natural resources, to the detriment of the interests of the people of this Province:

"And whereas said practice has resulted in large numbers of wage-earners being forced to leave the Province in order to obtain employment elsewhere:

"And whereas the manufacture of all British Columbia timber within the Province would materially increase employment in the Province in all branches of industry and business:

"And whereas it is essential that the present practice be put a stop to:

"And whereas a number of people in this Province are now employed in the logging camps of the Province, and a large sum of money is invested therein:

"And whereas it is just and equitable that proper notice of any drastic change in the present practice be given:

"Therefore be it Resolved, That this House is of the opinion that every possible step should be taken by the Government to prevent the exportation of unmanufactured timber from this Province, and that it is highly desirable that legislation should be brought down at the present Session providing for the prohibition of the exportation of unmanufactured timber from this Province after the 1st day of January, 1925."

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

The Report on Bill (No. 22) intituled "An Act respecting Probate Duty" was adopted. Bill read a third time and passed.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 20) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal-mines Regulation Act.'"

Bill read a second time and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

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

What was the total cost to the Department of Finance of furnishing the new Prince Rupert Court-house?

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

"\$1,020.92."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of pork in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of pork in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of pork in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of pork in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of pork from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 702,000 lb.
- "2. 1,246,000 lb.
- "3. \$108,000.
- "4. \$136,400.
- "5. 76.6 per cent. increase."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of poultry in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of poultry in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of poultry in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of poultry in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 3,356,400 lb.
- "2. 7,189,276 lb.
- "3. \$738,408.
- "4. \$2,012,997.
- "5. 114.2 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of creamery butter in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of creamery butter in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of creamery butter in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of creamery butter in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of creamery butter from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 1,243,292 lb.
- "2. 2,917,665 lb.
- "3. \$497,316.
- "4. \$1,252,751.
- "5. 134.6 per cent."

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:—

What is the total amount paid to W. S. Fraser & Co., Victoria, since November, 1916, up to November 1st, 1923?

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

"\$71.97 on account Department of Finance."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of small fruits in British Columbia for 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of small fruits in British Columbia for 1922?
3. What was the value production of small fruits in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of small fruits in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 3,793,680 lb.
- "2. 9,867,862 lb.
- "3. \$370,173.
- "4. \$1,150,874.
- "5. 160 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of milk in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of milk in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of milk in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of milk in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of milk from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 9,113,500 gallons.
- "2. 11,054,390 gallons fresh milk, 169,229 cases evaporated milk, and 786,300 lb. fat.
- "3. \$2,551,780.
- "4. Fresh milk, \$4,421,756; evaporated milk, \$831,269; other products, \$495,356.
- "5. Milk (as fresh), 21.3 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:—

1. What was the number of pupils enrolled in public schools in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the number of pupils enrolled in public schools in British Columbia in 1923?
3. What was the number of schools in operation in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the number of schools in operation in British Columbia in 1923?
5. What was the enrolment in the Normal School for 1923?
6. What was the enrolment for the University of British Columbia in 1923?

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

- "1. 64,570.
- "2. 94,888.
- "3. 808.
- "4. 1,044.
- "5. 689.
- "6. 1,194; 365 others attended for short courses."

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

1. Has the Waterloo School District been divided?
2. If yes, were the trustees of the district consulted?
3. Did the people of the Waterloo School District vote on the question?
4. If so, what was the result of the vote?

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

"1. The school district formerly called Cassidy School District has been divided into two parts—Cassidy School District and Waterloo School District.

"2. Yes; it was the subject of correspondence between the Board and the Department.

"3 and 4. It was reported to the Education Office that a vote was taken which was favourable to the retention of one district; subsequently a petition was received, signed by forty-four householders on the north side of Haslam Creek, asking for a school in their section of the district. The Inspector after investigation reported in favour of the division of the district into two school areas and the establishment of a school on Cassidy Townsite."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of fodders in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of fodders in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of fodders in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of fodders in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of fodders from 1916 to 1922?

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

- "1. 372,798 tons.
- "2. 518,804 tons.
- "3. \$5,741,979.
- "4. \$12,467,332.
- "5. 39.1 per cent."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of marketed beef in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of marketed beef in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of marketed beef in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of marketed beef in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of marketed beef from 1916 to 1922?

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

- "1. 11,700,000 lb.
- "2. 20,942,000 lb.
- "3. \$1,263,600.
- "4. \$1,190,450.
- "5. 79 per cent."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of eggs in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of eggs in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of eggs in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of eggs in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of eggs from 1916 to 1922?

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

- "1. 4,531,140 dozen.
- "2. 6,069,217 dozen.
- "3. \$1,585,899.
- "4. \$2,002,841.
- "5. 33.9 per cent."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did the late Government order the use of Swedish granite on the base of the Queen Victoria Memorial in the Parliament Buildings grounds?
2. If so, why was not British Columbia granite used?
3. What was the cost of the said granite base f.o.b. Victoria?
4. Was one stone missing in shipment?
5. If so, what was the cost of replacement of same?

The Hon. Dr. Sutherland replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes; upon the recommendation of the sculptor.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. \$5,403.
- "4. One package contained one piece that did not belong to the base; this not observed until the work of erection commenced. Original shipment received 1917; erection started August, 1919.
- "5. \$687.89."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of cheese in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of cheese in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of cheese in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of cheese in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of cheese from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 18,000 lb.
- "2. 437,554 lb.
- "3. \$3,960.
- "4. \$53,875.
- "5. 2,330 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of dairy butter in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of dairy butter in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of dairy butter in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of dairy butter in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of dairy butter from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 568,000 lb.
- "2. 988,750 lb.
- "3. \$198,800.
- "4. \$299,625.
- "5. 74 per cent."

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

1. Is section 2, chapter 54, 1918, of the "Coal-mines Regulation Act" being observed by the Western Fuel Corporation of Canada, Limited, at their No. 1 Mine, Nanaimo?
2. If not, has any prosecution been instituted?
3. If not, why not?

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

- "1. Yes. See definition of mine in 'Coal-mines Regulation Act.'
- "2 and 3. Answered by reply to No. 1."

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

What is the total amount paid to the Ryan Construction Company from January 1st, 1917, to November 1st, 1923?

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

"\$190,018.87."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of potatoes in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of potatoes in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of potatoes in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of potatoes in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of potatoes from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 72,709 tons.
- "2. 115,122 tons.
- "3. \$1,844,612.
- "4. \$2,693,855.
- "5. 58.3 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of silver in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of silver in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the quantity production of copper in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the quantity production of copper in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the quantity production of zinc in British Columbia in 1916?
6. What was the quantity production of zinc in British Columbia in 1922?
7. What was the quantity production of coal in British Columbia in 1916?
8. What was the quantity production of coal in British Columbia in 1922?

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

- "1. 3,301,923 oz.
- "2. 7,101,311 oz.
- "3. 65,379,364 lb.
- "4. 32,359,896 lb.
- "5. 37,168,980 lb.
- "6. 57,146,548 lb.
- "7. 2,485,580 long tons.
- "8. 2,580,915 long tons."

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

1. Has the Government a garage at Kamloops?
2. If so, when was it opened?
3. Have any audits been made of the accounts of said garage?
4. If so, how many?
5. What was the profit and loss shown for each inspection?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. September, 1921.
- "3. Yes.
- "4. One, and periodical inspections by the Mechanical Superintendent.
- "5. No profit or loss shown by the audit; inspection by Mechanical Superintendent shows a profit of \$1,402.41 between April 1st and August 31st, 1923."

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

1. What has been the cost up to November 1st, 1923, of the six piers and one abutment, including excavation, in connection with construction of the new bridge at Revelstoke?
2. What is the estimated cost to complete this portion of the work?

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

- "1 and 2. Contract amounts to \$105,851.16, of which \$72,809.53 has been paid to contractors."

Mr. *Menzies* asked the Hon. the Minister of Education the following questions:—

1. How many white children are attending the public schools in the Province?
2. How many: (a) Chinese; (b) Japanese, children are attending the public schools?

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

"1 and 2. During the school-year which ended June 30th, 1923, there were enrolled altogether in the public schools 94,888 children, of whom 1,346 were Chinese, 1,422 Japanese, and 16 Hindus."

Mr. *McRae* asked the Hon. the Minister of Finance the following question:—

How much has been expended on Government advertising, including that paid from funds under Government control (Forest Protection, Game, Workmen's Compensation, Timber Sales, etc.) since April 1st, 1923, in the *Province* newspaper?

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

"\$2,520.85. The expenditures of the Workmen's Compensation Board are not under Government control."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of swine in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of swine in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of swine in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of swine in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of swine from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 39,055 head.
- "2. 41,738 head.
- "3. \$497,951.
- "4. \$834,760.
- "5. 6.8 per cent."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of tree-fruits in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of tree-fruits in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of tree-fruits in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of tree-fruits in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production from 1916 to 1922?

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

- "1. 70,156,204 lb.
- "2. 166,935,065 lb.
- "3. \$1,806,489.
- "4. \$3,764,730.
- "5. 137.9 per cent."

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

1. What is the total amount authorized for each electoral district under the "British Columbia Loan Act"?
2. What is the total amount authorized for each electoral district under the "Highway Loan Act"?

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

"1. For amounts authorized under the 'British Columbia Loan Act, 1919,' see Reports of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal years 1919-20, 1920-21, and 1921-22.

"2. For amounts authorized under the 'Highway Loan Act, 1920,' to March 31st, 1923, see Reports of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal years 1920-21, 1921-22, and 1922-23. Authorized since April 1st, 1923, for highway-construction: Alberni, \$11,603; Atlin, \$59,000; Cariboo, \$94,650; Chilliwack, \$73,500; Columbia, \$115,467; Comox, \$36,135; Cowichan, \$800; Cranbrook, \$27,475; Delta, \$378,686; Dewdney, \$58,135; Esquimalt, \$18,539; Fernie, \$25,863; Fort George, \$66,767; Grand Forks, \$4,400; Greenwood, \$12,000; Islands, \$94,000; Kamloops, \$54,500; Kaslo, \$50,079; Lillooet, \$15,500; Nanaimo and Newcastle, \$60,800; Nelson, \$1,045; North Okanagan, \$18,000; North Vancouver, \$200; Omineca, \$51,350; Prince Rupert, \$42,000; Revelstoke, \$41,310; Rossland, \$8,000; Richmond, \$2,420; Saanich, \$15,000; Similkameen, \$7,719; Slokan, \$66,000; South Okanagan, \$7,250; South Vancouver, \$5,000; Trail, \$42,400; Yale, \$18,800."

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

1. What amount of money has been expended on the Penticton-Keremeos Road during each of the years 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923 up to November 1st?
2. What amount of money has been paid F. Howell during each of the years in connection with work on this road?

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

"1. \$14,545.11.

"2. 1920-21, \$144; 1921-22, \$157.50; 1922-23, \$348.75; April 1st to November 1st, \$234. F. Howell is foreman in charge of a section of the Penticton-Fish Lake Road and is a returned soldier."



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

1. What was the cost for maintenance of the Matsqui Dyking Area for the year 1922?
2. What was the cost for maintenance of the Pitt Meadows Dyking and Ditching Area for the year 1922?

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

“1. Cost of ordinary maintenance for departmental year 1922—i.e., October 1st, 1921, to September 30th, 1922—Matsqui Dyking District, \$9,523.01.

“2. There is no Pitt Meadows Dyking and Ditching Area; there are three dyking districts in the Pitt Meadows Municipality—namely, Pitt Meadows No. 1, Pitt Meadows No. 2, and Maple Ridge Dyking Districts. Cost of ordinary maintenance for departmental year 1922: Pitt Meadows No. 1 Dyking District, \$1,797.75; Pitt Meadows No. 2 Dyking District, \$2,169.92; Maple Ridge Dyking District, \$6,335.09.”

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of roots in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of roots in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of roots in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of roots in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of roots from 1916 to 1922?

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

- “1. 48,333 tons.
- “2. 73,470 tons.
- “3. \$585,505.
- “4. \$1,116,744.
- “5. 52 per cent.”

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following questions:—

1. What was the quantity production of mutton in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the quantity production of mutton in British Columbia in 1922?
3. What was the value production of mutton in British Columbia in 1916?
4. What was the value production of mutton in British Columbia in 1922?
5. What was the percentage of increase in quantity production of mutton from 1916 to 1922?

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

- “1. 204,000 lb.
- “2. 961,411 lb.
- “3. \$34,272.
- “4. \$87,061.
- “5. 371.2 per cent.”

*Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m. to-morrow.

And then the House adjourned at 4.55 p.m.

Tuesday, 27th November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. *Jackson* presented the Sixth Report from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, as follows:—

REPORT No. 6.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
November 27th, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders begs leave to report as follows:—

That the preamble of the undermentioned Bill has been proved, and the Bill ordered to be reported as amended.

Bill (No. 50) intituled "An Act relating to the Corporation of the District of Burnaby, British Columbia."

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. E. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received.

The Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

Mr. *Guthrie* moved for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Workmen's Compensation Act.'"

The Hon. Mr. *Manson* rose to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

On the motion of Mr. *Perry*, seconded by Mr. *Yorston*, it was *Resolved*,—

Whereas hundreds of settlers have been induced by the Federal Government and the Provincial Government to settle in the Peace River portion of the Province of British Columbia by repeated assurances that transportation facilities would be provided for them in the movement of their crops:

And whereas it appears impossible for the Province of British Columbia to finance the construction of the extension of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway north from Prince George to the Peace River District:

And whereas the Federal Government holds 3,500,000 acres of agricultural land in what is known as the Peace River Block, in the Province of British Columbia, and has recognized its responsibility in the matter of providing railway facilities for the said settlers by voting \$50,000 at the last Session of Parliament to enable the management of the Canadian National Railway to make surveys for a line of railway which will connect the Peace River District with some point on the line of the Canadian National:

And whereas there exists at the present time two known routes for such line of railway which would connect the said district with the Canadian National system, the one from Brule to Grande Prairie, and the other from Prince George via the Pine or Peace River Passes to Pouce Coupe:

And whereas a line of railway constructed from Brule to Grande Prairie will not tap the resources of the Peace River Block in British Columbia unless such line be extended for a further distance of at least 125 miles:

And whereas the distance from Vancouver to Brule is 567 miles, and the distance of a proposed railway from Brule to Grande Prairie is nearly 150 miles, and from Grande Prairie

to a central point in British Columbia is a further 125 miles, giving a total mileage to Vancouver of 842 miles:

And whereas the mileage from Vancouver to Prince George via the Pacific Great Eastern Railway is 430 miles, and the distance from Prince George to a central point in the Peace River District via the Pine Pass is approximately 280 miles, or a total mileage to Vancouver via this route of 710 miles:

And whereas the mileage from Vancouver via the Peace River Pass is about 790 miles:

And whereas the mileage from Prince George to Prince Rupert is 465 miles, giving a total mileage from Prince Rupert via the Pine Pass route to a central point in the Peace River District of 745 miles:

And whereas only the construction of the proposed line of railway from Prince George will open up the tremendous areas of the northern portion of the Province of British Columbia, rich in agricultural, mining, and other natural resources, and at the same time furnish the most direct route for wheat shipments to the Orient via the Port of Prince Rupert, and by the utilization of the Pacific Great Eastern into the Port of Vancouver furnish the most direct route for wheat shipments to the United Kingdom:

And whereas the construction of such a line would have the further advantage from a Provincial standpoint of furnishing an outlet for British Columbia manufactures by way of a return freight into the Peace River District, and will also increase the traffic possibilities for the Pacific Great Eastern Railway:

Therefore be it Resolved, That this Legislature of the Province of British Columbia urge upon the Federal Government and the Directorate of the Canadian National Railway the advisability of making the most searching investigation of the railway route from Prince George to the Peace River District as affording the most economic for the movement of grain from the Peace River to the Pacific Coast; and also as promising to open up a greater area of territory having traffic possibilities for the Canadian National Railway.

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Burde* on 21st instant, as follows:—

Whereas certain representatives of India, at the Imperial Conference and elsewhere, have been urging that natives of India should be given the vote in Canada:

And whereas practically the whole Hindu population in Canada is resident in British Columbia:

And whereas the Indian franchise in India is so extremely limited that if the franchise in British Columbia were extended to those here on the same basis, less than a score would be able to vote:

And whereas those Hindus now here have never voted in India, and have expressed no desire to have the franchise here:

And whereas the Premier of Canada, at the Imperial Conference, stated that the matter would be debated in the House of Commons at its next sitting while dealing with the "Franchise Act"; and also expressed himself in the House of Commons as wishing to hear the views of British Columbia:

And whereas it is desirable that this Legislature should give expression to the wishes of British Columbia on this important subject:

Therefore be it Resolved, That this Legislature is strongly opposed, on economic and social grounds, to allowing any Oriental to vote in this Province, either in Provincial or Dominion elections, and therefore urge the Federal Government to take no steps that would interfere with the undoubted right of the Province to prescribe the form and extent of its own franchise, and further urge the Government of Canada, when defining its Dominion franchise, not to enfranchise Orientals.

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 Right Honourable W. L. McKenzie King, Premier of Canada.

The Resolution was carried unanimously.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Hanes* on 21st instant, as follows:—

That in the opinion of this House the Government should consider the introduction of a Bill at this Session extending the following privileges to married women in this Province: (a) All property owned by either husband or wife before marriage to be his or her separate estate; over which he or she has entire control; (b) all property acquired after marriage (except by gift or bequest) to be joint property, of which neither partner may give away, will away, or otherwise alienate more than half, without the written consent of the other partner; (c) the joint estate to be administered by the spouse transacting the business of the family; (d) all the aforesaid to be subject to the "Testator's Family Maintenance Act" (chap. 94, 1920).

The Hon. Mr. *Oliver* rose to a point of order.  
Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act.'"

Mr. *Bowser* moved, seconded by Mr. *Pooley*,—

That whereas the Bill (No. 32) provides for the increasing of the Members of this Legislature the word "now" be struck out, and the words "this day six months" be substituted therefor.

On the motion of the Hon. Dr. *MacLean*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting.

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

1. What was the total sum collected for grazing fees in the Lillooet District for 1923 up to October 31st?
2. What are the total arrears due from the district to date?
3. What amount has been expended for the year?

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

- "1. Grazing fees are collected by grazing districts and not by electoral districts. Information, therefore, not available.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. \$2,705.35 in range improvements expended to October 31st, 1923."

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

1. Is any export duty imposed on unmanufactured timber coming into British Columbia from the States of Oregon and Washington?
2. What quantity of unmanufactured timber came into British Columbia during 1922 from the aforesaid States?

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

- "1. Member should consult Dominion Statutes.
- "2. Member should consult Dominion Trade Returns."

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following question:—

How much money was spent on the roads in the Fruitvale Subdivision of Trail Riding in 1917, 1918, 1919, 1920, 1921, 1922, and 1923?

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

"Fiscal years 1917-18, \$922.24; 1918-19, nil; 1919-20, \$744.26; 1920-21, \$830.99; 1921-22, \$56.10; 1922-23, \$141.25; 1923-24, \$873.90."

Mr. *Jones* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following question:—

With reference to questions and answers of November 19th *re* Fernie Soldier Settlement Area, how is the sum of \$18,536.78 made up? Give details.

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

"Payments on agreements of sale, \$8,574.10; sale of equipment, etc., \$8,435.69; sundry credits, \$1,526.99; total, \$18,536.78. Receipts from agreements of sale represent cash payments or instalments paid only. Balance is spread over various periods of time from five to ten years."

Mr. Jones asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following question:—

With reference to questions and answers of November 19th *re* Creston Soldier Settlement Area, how is the sum of \$58,797.41 made up? Give details.

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

“Payments on agreements of sale, \$10,954.10; sale of equipment, etc., \$44,588.21; sundry, \$3,255.10; total, \$58,797.41. Receipts from agreements of sale represent cash payments or instalments due and paid only. Balance of purchase price is spread over periods from fifteen to twenty-five years. Six thousand four hundred acres of land (including timbered lands) still remain to be disposed of.”

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

1. What amount of money has been paid out for salaries to Land Settlement Board officials from January 1st, 1923, to November 1st?
2. How many officials are employed, with names and monthly salaries?
3. What amount of expenses has been incurred by said Land Settlement Board officials from January 1st to November 1st?
4. What amount has been paid to the staff other than officials from January 1st to November 1st?
5. What amount of money has been loaned to farmers from January 1st to November 1st?

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

- “1. \$13,750.
- “2. Davies, R. D., Victoria, \$300 per month; Latta, W. S., Victoria, \$225 per month; Hunt, R. A., Victoria, \$185 per month; Sonley, C. E., Victoria, \$175 per month; Hughes, T. L., Victoria (to June 30th), \$150 per month; Munro, D. D., Telkwa, \$225 per month; Sutton, R. G., Prince George, \$175 per month.
- “3. \$3,068.60.
- “4. \$10,498.11.
- “5. \$64,450 to individuals; \$1,003,533.67 to districts; total, \$1,067,983.67.”

Mr. Jones asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following question:—

With reference to questions and answers of November 19th *re* Merville Soldier Settlement Area, how is the sum of \$194,857.70 made up? Give details.

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

“Sale of equipment and supplies, \$90,007.88; sundry equipment and supplies, \$9,521.91; payments on agreements of sale, \$6,455.04; total, \$105,984.83. Receipts from agreements for sale represent cash payments or instalments due and paid only. Balance of purchase price is spread over periods from fifteen to twenty-five years. Seven thousand five hundred acres of land still remain to be disposed of.”

Mr. J. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands the following questions:—

1. What was the number of logging operations in British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the number of logging operations in British Columbia in 1923?
3. What was the quantity of timber scaled in 1916?
4. What was the quantity of timber scaled in 1922?
5. What were the figures for water shipments of timber in British Columbia in 1916?
6. What were the figures for water shipments of timber in British Columbia in 1923?
7. What was the amount of royalty collected from the timber industry in British Columbia for 1916?
8. What was the amount of royalty collected from the timber industry in British Columbia for 1922?
9. What were the stumpages collected in 1916?
10. What were the stumpages collected in 1922?
11. What was the value of pulp produced in 1916?
12. What was the value of pulp produced in 1922?
13. What was the total value of the timber industry in 1916?
14. What was the total value of the timber industry in 1922?

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

- "1. 1,144.
- "2. 2,652 (for 1922).
- "3. 1,280,263,000 F.B.M.
- "4. 1,899,158,273 F.B.M.
- "5. 43,676,523 F.B.M.
- "6. 273,146,800 F.B.M. (for 1922).
- "7. \$456,863.29.
- "8. \$1,203,884.89.
- "9. \$68,779.87.
- "10. \$358,984.19.
- "11. \$3,520,000.
- "12. \$12,590,000.
- "13. \$35,528,000.
- "14. \$59,477,000."

Mr. *Jones* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following question:—

With reference to questions and answers of November 19th *re* Christian Ranch, how is the sum of \$10,236.41 made up? Give details.

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

"Sale of equipment, etc., \$5,465.62; rentals, \$2,361.50; sundry credits, \$2,409.29; total, \$10,236.41."

*Resolved.* That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m. to-morrow.

And then the House adjourned at 5.27 p.m.

---

Wednesday, 28th November, 1923.

---

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. the Minister of Lands presented a Return pursuant to section 29B of the "Forest Act."

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision on the point of order raised on Mr. *Guthrie's* motion for leave to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Workmen's Compensation Act,'" as follows:—

"Mr. *Guthrie* yesterday asked leave to introduce a Bill intituled 'An Act to amend the 'Workmen's Compensation Act.'"

"A point of order was taken by the Honourable the Attorney-General as to whether it was competent for the Honourable Member to introduce such a Bill.

"Upon perusal of the suggested Bill, I find it seeks to amend sections 17 and 18 of the 'Workmen's Compensation Act,' being chapter 77 of the Statutes of 1922, by striking out the words 'sixty-two and one-half' in the third line of subsection (1) of each section, and substituting therefor the word 'seventy-five'; also by adding to the Schedule to said chapter 77 the following words: 'Housemaid's knee—Coal-mining.'

"On looking up chapter 77 of the Statutes of 1922, I find it to be 'An Act respecting the List of Voters for the Trail Electoral District,' which cannot be amended in the manner suggested.

"The motion is out of order."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Duncan* on 19th instant (*re* exportation of timber), and on the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* on 21st instant, and on the amendment to the amendment moved by Mr. *Bowser* on 26th instant.

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* raised a point of order on the amendment to the amendment. Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

Mr. *Jackson* presented the Seventh Report from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, as follows:—

REPORT No. 7.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
November 28th, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders begs leave to report as follows:—

That the preamble of the undermentioned Bill has been proved, and the Bill ordered to be reported as amended.

Bill (No. 52) intituled "An Act relating to the Corporation of the City of Victoria."  
All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. B. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received.

The Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act.'"

And on the motion moved by Mr. *Bowser* on 27th instant, as follows:—

That whereas the Bill (No. 32) provides for the increasing of the Members of this Legislature the word "now" be struck out, and the words "this day six months" be substituted therefor.

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

Mr. *Jackson* presented the Eighth Report from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, as follows:—

REPORT No. 8.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
November 28th, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders begs leave to report as follows:—

Your Committee have considered the matter referred to them by the House on the motion of the Honourable the Premier made the 23rd day of November last, on which it was resolved: "That the motion standing on the Order Paper of 23rd instant in the name of the Premier for the suspension of Rule 72 be referred to the Private Bills Committee, with instructions to report their finding in respect to such motion to the House"; and your Committee respectfully report that in their opinion the Rules should not be suspended to permit the receiving of a petition praying for the incorporation of the "Greater Vancouver Water District" to permit of the receiving of a Bill for the above purpose.

Your Committee would, however, recommend that the Corporation of the City of Vancouver, or such Corporation in conjunction with the other municipalities interested in the proposed Bill, should be given authority to undertake and construct such additional water-storage capacity in connection with their existing water-supply scheme as will ensure a water-supply for the area affected by the proposed Bill adequate for the present and immediate future.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. B. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received, and *Ordered* to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 26) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Registry Act'" was again committed. Reported complete with amendments. Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 8) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Fire Marshal Act'" was committed. Progress reported. Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 12) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Apiaries Act'" was read a second time. To be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 10) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Official Guardians Act'" was again committed.

Reported complete without amendment. Report to be considered at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 18) intituled "An Act respecting the Hours of Labour of Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

The Report on Bill (No. 19) intituled "An Act respecting the Two-platoon System for Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

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

1. Was one Robert Smith, barrister, of Vancouver, retained by the Department in connection with the Federal Act prohibiting the importation of liquor into the Province of British Columbia during the last Session of the Federal Parliament; or did he render any service in connection therewith?

2. Did said Smith go to Ottawa?

3. If yes, what was the amount paid said Smith for fees and disbursements?

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

"1. No. Mr. Smith did render some voluntary services of a minor character for which he made no charge.

"2. Not on behalf of Department.

"3. Answered by 1 and 2."

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

1. What is the total sum of interest to be added to the investment of the Southern Okanagan Project from commencement up to September 30th last?

2. Is the Government operating a nursery in the Southern Okanagan Project?

3. How many acres are contained in this nursery?

4. What has this nursery cost up to September 30th in stock and in operating expenses?

5. What sum of money has been received from operating this nursery from its beginning up to September 30th?

6. Is the man in charge a qualified nurseryman?

7. Have any complaints been received as to the quality of the stock in this nursery?

8. Have all the varieties been true to name?

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

"1. Computation has not been made.

"2. Yes.

"3. 30.6 acres, which includes demonstration plots.

"4. \$54,633.95 (total expenditure including cost of houses, stables, fencing, etc.).

"5. \$13,697.59 cash. Amount owing, \$2,336.23; value of nursery stock on hand, about \$20,000.

"6. Yes.

"7. No.

"8. No information to the contrary."



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

1. Who built the Quesnel Dam, and about what date was it built?
2. Has the dam been removed; and, if yes, by whom, and why?
3. Was there a bridge over this dam; and, if yes, was it in good condition?
4. Has a bridge been built recently in the vicinity of this dam? If yes, where?
5. What is the length of new bridge?
6. What was the total cost?
7. Was a report made on any other bridge-site in this vicinity?
8. Why was the present site selected?

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

"1. The Gold River Company, about 1900.

"2. A breach of 250 feet was made in the dam in April, 1921, by the Public Works Department, because the decayed timbers rendered the dam unsafe.

"3. There was a bridge over the dam, approximately 800 feet long, but timbers were rotten and unsafe.

"4. Yes; on foundations of dam.

"5. 527 feet.

"6. \$19,598.58 for bridge; \$6,590.25 for approaches.

"7. Yes; three other sites were reported on, including site at Poquette Creek.

"8. On account of heavy road-construction, together with unsatisfactory foundations and depth of water, the site at Poquette Creek was not finally adopted. In the case of proposed site immediately above the dam a pile bridge could not be built on account of there being 32 feet of water to contend with and this site was not economical. The present site was determined after careful investigation by the Department."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did the Westholme Lumber Company, Limited, erect the present Chronic Building at Essondale prior to the present Government taking office?

2. Were tenders called for this work?

3. If so, what were the amounts of the tenders?

4. What was the amount of the extras authorized and paid for by the late Government?

5. What additional extras did contractors receive, and when?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes.

"3. Westholme Lumber Co., \$369,322.25; McDonald, Wilson & Snyder, \$373,000; Smith & Sherborne, \$407,973; Rourke & Simpson Co., \$460,000.

"4. \$133,393.

"5. \$50,338.17."

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

1. Were there any extras allowed on the Prince Rupert Court-house?

2. If so, how much, and covering what work?

3. Did the contractor sublet any portion of this contract; if so, what are the particulars?

4. What work or repairs were done on the building in order to remedy leakage to walls and roof?

5. What was the cost of said repairs and who paid same?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. \$5,195.85; water-proofing, flag-pole, extra small mould around corridor trim, changing counters in Land Registry, track and trolley for boiler-room, canopy over chimney, plates lining cell-room doors, changing stone lugs, water-supply pipes, meter-loop, fireplace in Judge's room, etc. These not included in contract.

"3. Yes. Brickwork, J. van Tyle, Vancouver; stonework, A. S. Macdonald & Sons, Vancouver; reinforced concrete, Mr. Mitchell, Vancouver; woodwork and glazing, Lemon, Gonnason & Co., Victoria, and R. Bryson, Prince Rupert; tables, chairs, etc., D. Spencer, Ltd., Victoria;

marble-work, tiling, etc., J. Flester, Calgary; painting, Silversides Bros., Prince Rupert; plumbing, Steer & Longwell, Prince Rupert; electrical, W. R. Williams, Vancouver; plastering, C. Blythe, Prince Rupert; hardware, Morton, Finlayson & Mather, Vancouver; roofing, J. Sweet, Prince Rupert; heating, A. J. Mallett, Prince Rupert.

"4. No trouble with roof (covered by guarantee). East wall water-proofed, receives full force of prevailing gales.

"5. \$3,214.83; the Government and contractors on a fifty-fifty basis."

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

1. What amount has been expended on roads and trails in the Lillooet District from March 31st to October 31st, 1923?

2. What is the cost for supervision, auto-repairs, and gasoline? Give each amount separately.

3. What amount has been expended on Tatla Lake Road since 1918?

The Hon. Dr. Sutherland replied as follows:—

"1. \$56,197.

"2. Supervision, \$3,503.38. Auto expenses: Repairs, \$382.07; gasoline, \$195.85; tires, etc., \$294.93.

"3. \$228.50."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. What is the mileage of road constructed by the Provincial Government on the Banff-Windermere Highway?

2. What was estimated cost of the work done?

3. What was actual cost?

The Hon. Dr. Sutherland replied as follows:—

"1. 18.53 miles, together with 2.46 miles of tote-road.

"2. \$207,362 for entire 60.25 miles.

"3. \$277,192.09, of which Canadian Pacific Railway Company contributed \$75,000."

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

1. Who is the Stipendiary Magistrate at Penticton?

2. On what date did he receive such appointment?

3. Have any appeals been taken from his convictions?

4. If so, how many, and what has been the result of the appeals?

The Hon. Mr. Manson replied as follows:—

"1. W. R. Dewdney.

"2. May 4th, 1922.

"3. No.

"4. Answered by No. 3."

Mr. Pooley asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following question:—

What has been the total amount paid to date to the legal firms of Taylor, Harvey, Stockton & Smith; Taylor, Mayers, Stockton & Smith; and Mayers, Stockton & Smith, or any member thereof, since this Government took office until November 1st, 1923?

The Hon. Mr. Manson replied as follows:—

"Taylor, Harvey, Stockton & Smith, *nil*; Taylor, Mayers, Stockton & Smith, on account law fees and disbursements, Messrs. S. S. Taylor, K.C., and E. C. Mayers acting for the Crown, \$34,534.09; Mayers, Stockton & Smith, on account law fees and disbursements, E. C. Mayers acting for the Crown in several cases and Robert Smith acting as Crown Counsel at the Vancouver Fall Assizes, 1922, and in two cases at Vancouver Spring Assizes, 1923, in respect of which new trials had been granted, and in one criminal appeal, \$8,315.88; total, \$42,849.97.

"Mr. S. S. Taylor, K.C., appeared for the Crown in the following cases:—

"Style of cause: Workmen's Compensation Board *vs.* Canadian Pacific Railway Company. Result: In favour of Workmen's Compensation Board. Established constitutional validity of the 'Workmen's Compensation Act, 1916,' when attacked by Canadian Pacific Railway.

"Style of cause: *Rex vs. Canadian Pacific Wine Co., Ltd.* Result: In favour of Crown. Established constitutional validity of 'Prohibition Act, 1916,' and 'Summary Convictions Act, 1915.'

"Style of cause: *King vs. U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Company & Quagliotti.* Result: In favour of Crown in respect of a bond given under the 'Succession Duty Act' to secure succession duties amounting to \$44,287.50.

"Mr. E. C. Mayers appeared for the Crown in the following amongst other cases:—

"Style of cause: *In re, 'Government Liquor Act'* and *Army & Navy Veterans of Canada.* Result: In favour of Crown, upholding constitutional validity of 'Government Liquor Act, 1921.'

"Style of cause: *Castleman vs. Johnson.* Result: In favour of Chairman of Government Liquor Board. Established the principle that mandamus does not lie against the Chairman of the Liquor Control Board on the application of the servant of the Board.

"Style of cause: *Little vs. Attorney-General of B.C.* Result: Argued by Mr. Taylor in Supreme Court and Mr. Mayers in Court of Appeal. Decision in favour of Attorney-General of British Columbia, upholding the constitutional validity of the taxation provisions in the 'Government Liquor Act.'

"Style of cause: *Canadian Pacific Wine Co. vs. Regan.* Result: Argued by Mr. Taylor in Supreme Court and Mr. Mayers in Court of Appeal on behalf of Crown, when rule nisi for a writ of certiorari to quash the conviction of the Canadian Pacific Wine Company was refused. Amount involved, \$188,533.83.

"Style of cause: *Hall vs. Sumas Dyking Commissioners.* Result: In favour of Sumas Dyking Commissioners, relieving them of paying damages resulting from their operations in the Sumas Reclamation Scheme.

"Style of cause: *Attorney-General vs. Robertson and Partners.* Result: In favour of Crown. This was an action in respect to the condition inserted in permits issued under the 'Forest Act.'

"Style of cause: *Rex vs. Morris Plant.* Result: In favour of Crown."

Mr. I. A. Mackenzie asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following questions:—

1. What adjustments of rates have been secured by the British Columbia Government's fight for equalization of freight rates in respect of: (a) Grain; (b) class rates; (c) lumber rates?
2. In respect to class rates, what were the old standard rates and what are the rates now in effect as a result of British Columbia's fight?
3. In what respect are the reductions on standard class rates reflected in commodity rates such as sugar?
4. Has the 8 cents arbitrary tariff on transcontinental business been removed?
5. Has the Fort William constructive mileage been applied to the haul from Vancouver?
6. What is the estimated value to the Pacific Coast trade of the two last-mentioned adjustments?
7. What is the estimated total value of the rate reductions secured during the last three and one-half years?
8. What other advantages have been derived by the Province as a result of British Columbia's fight?
9. Is it the view of the Government that grain-elevators might reasonably be expected at other places than Vancouver in British Columbia as a result of British Columbia's equalization fight?

The Hon. Mr. Manson replied as follows:—

"1. (a.) Grain: On the nineteen million bushels moved in 1922 the reduction amounted to 3.6 cents per bushel, or a total of approximately \$685,000. To this reduction of 3.6 cents secured in 1922 is to be added the 10-per-cent. reduction, amounting to 1.8 cents per bushel, or making a grand total of reduction upon which the 1923 crop will move approximating 5.4 cents per bushel, or making a total on the 1923 forty million bushels estimated movement of approximately \$2,200,000, or a total for the two years of \$2,800,000.

"(b.) Class rates: The discrimination on class rates was reduced 50 cents, as the following instances show: On 400 miles from 56 to 25 cents; on 500 miles from 66 to 36 cents; and on 700 miles from 78 to 37 cents.

"(c.) Lumber rates: The reduction on lumber rates has been reduced 7½ cents. On the lumber moving in Western Canada this would approximate \$600,000 per year.

"2. Statement of rates charged at the present time on the Pacific Standard Tariff and the rates charged on the Prairie Standard Tariff, showing the difference in the rates, and also a comparison of the same rates, showing the difference at the time of British Columbia's application:—

*Rates in Cents per 100 lb.*

Old rates—		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
Pacific .....	50	62	52	42½	32½	29½
Prairie .....	50	49	41	32½	24½	23
		13	11	10	8	6½
New rates—						
Pacific .....	50	53	44	35	27	24
Prairie .....	50	45	38	30	23	21
		8	6	5	4	3
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	100	97½	81	65	49	42½
Prairie .....	100	75	62	50½	37½	34½
		22½	19	14½	11½	8
New rates—						
Pacific .....	100	81	68	54	39	36
Prairie .....	100	69	57	47	35	32
		12	11	7	4	4
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	200	1.41½	1.17	94½	70	63½
Prairie .....	200	1.10½	93	75	55½	50½
		31	24	19½	14½	13
New rates—						
Pacific .....	200	1.19	98	78	59	53
Prairie .....	200	1.02	86	69	51	47
		17	12	19	8	6
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	300	1.84	1.53	1.23½	93	83
Prairie .....	300	1.41½	1.17	94½	70	63½
		42½	36	27	23	19½
New rates—						
Pacific .....	300	1.52	1.26	1.02	77	69
Prairie .....	300	1.31	1.08	87	65	59
		21	18	15	12	10
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	400	2.27½	1.90½	1.51½	1.14	1.01
Prairie .....	400	1.71	1.43	1.14	86½	78
		56½	47½	37½	27½	23
New rates—						
Pacific .....	400	1.83	1.52	1.22	92	83
Prairie .....	400	1.58	1.32	1.05	80	72
		25	20	17	12	11
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	500	2.65	2.21	1.77½	1.33½	1.17
Prairie .....	500	1.98½	1.64½	1.32	99½	89½
		66½	56½	45½	34	27½

## Rates in Cents per 100 lb.—Continued.

		1.	2.	3.	4.	5.
New rates—						
Pacific .....	500	2.19	1.83	1.45	1.10	98
Prairie .....	500	1.83	1.52	1.22	92	83
		36	31	23	18	15
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	600	2.94½	2.45½	1.97	1.46½	1.17
Prairie .....	600	2.24½	1.87	1.49½	1.12½	89½
		70	58½	47½	34	27½
New rates—						
Pacific .....	600	2.42	2.01	1.61	1.20	1.08
Prairie .....	600	2.07	1.73	1.38	1.04	93
		35	28	23	16	15
Old rates—						
Pacific .....	700	3.27	2.71½	2.16½	1.62½	1.46½
Prairie .....	700	2.49	2.08	1.66	1.25½	1.12½
		78	63½	50½	37	34
New rates—						
Pacific .....	700	2.67	2.22	1.79	1.32	1.20
Prairie .....	700	2.30	1.92	1.53	1.16	1.04
		37	30	26	16	16

"3. The discrimination on commodity rate on sugar was reduced on a 400-mile haul from 32 per cent. to 17 per cent.

"4. Yes. This result was accomplished through the activity of the Vancouver Board of Trade and the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, to whom all credit should be given.

"5. Yes. This adjustment is of substantial value to the Pacific Coast. Two hundred and ninety miles on class rates out of Vancouver is now the mileage charged for a haul of 424 miles. This is the same constructive mileage basis adopted for the distribution of goods out of Fort William and was an interpretation of the judgment of 1914 granted in 1921 by the present Board of Railway Commissioners on an application filed by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association in 1920.

"6. The estimated total value of the last two mentioned adjustments is between one and two million dollars per year to the Pacific Coast trade.

"7. The estimated value of the reduction secured, including that secured at the instance of the activity of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the Vancouver Board of Trade, and the Associated Boards of Trade, is between five and six million dollars. The estimate made by Mr. McClintock, Chairman of the Transportation Bureau of the Vancouver Board of Trade, has placed the reduction as between five and six million dollars per year.

"8. Vancouver has been made the leading wheat port of the Pacific Coast and has laid the foundation which would indicate that Vancouver will be made the greatest grain port of the world.

"9. Yes. Facts have been disclosed that warrant Prince Rupert, Victoria, Port Mann, Kamloops, and New Westminster looking to the time when elevators will be built there."

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

1. What term did the \$60 collected by the Department as rentals for Lot 10, Block 23, Section 1, Prince Rupert, cover?
2. Was any amount other than this \$60 collected by any other parties as rent of this lot?
3. If so, what was the amount collected and who collected it?
4. Has the Department taken any steps to collect this rent from these parties?
5. What buildings, if any, are erected on said Lot 10?

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

- "1. Current month.
- "2. Matter is under investigation.
- "3. Answered by No. 2.
- "4. Answered by No. 2.
- "5. Building reported, but no detailed information."

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

1. How many bridges over navigable waters in the Province which are not maintained or kept up by the Government?
2. If any, state the number and where they are located?
3. How many bridges over navigable water are maintained by the Government?
4. The total cost of maintenance of such bridges?

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

- "1. No official record kept of bridges over navigable waters in cities and municipalities, which the Province does not maintain.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. Seven; which are now opened when required for navigation.
- "4. Maintenance cost taken on a yearly average for five fiscal years from 1918-19 to 1922-23, inclusive: Canoe Pass, \$2,248.74; Pitt River, \$2,203.62; Pritchard, \$537.64; Lulu and Sea Islands (combined), \$7,438.90; Prince George (partial) has no expenditure for the period stated; New Westminster Bridge is under jurisdiction of Railway Department."

*Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m. to-morrow.

And then the House adjourned at 5.25 p.m.

---

Thursday, 29th November, 1923.

---

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. the Minister of Finance presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:—

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor.*

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith—

Estimates of sums required for the service of the Province for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1925;

Supplementary Estimates of Expenditure for the fiscal year ending 31st March, 1924;

Schedule A. Sums granted to His Majesty to make good certain sums expended for the Public Service for the period ended 31st March, 1923, and to indemnify the several Officers and Persons for making such Expenditures;

and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*

*November 28th, 1923.*

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

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

Order for Committee of Supply called.

The Hon. the Minister of Finance moved, seconded by the Hon. the Premier, "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair."

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

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision on the point of order raised on the motion moved by Mr. Hanes on 21st instant, as follows:—

"On the motion of Mr. Hanes on the Order Paper of November 27th, objection was taken that it was not in order. The motion is as follows:—

"That in the opinion of this House the Government should consider the introduction of a Bill at this Session extending the following privileges to married women in this Province: (a) All property owned by either husband or wife before marriage to be his or her separate estate, over which he or she has entire control; (b) all property acquired after marriage (except by gift or bequest) to be joint property, of which neither partner may give away, will away, or otherwise alienate more than half, without the written consent of the other partner; (c) the joint estate to be administered by the spouse transacting the business of the family; (d) all the aforesaid to be subject to the "Testator's Family Maintenance Act" (chap. 94, 1920)."

"The motion of the Honourable Member would, if carried, be in the nature of a direction to the Government to introduce certain legislation.

"I have been unable to find any decisions on a similar point.

"General parliamentary practice would, however, appear to be opposed to such procedure.

"The Honourable Member seeks to impose upon the Government a burden which he is competent to carry himself.

"I must rule the motion out of order."

Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision on the point of order raised on Mr. Bowser's proposed amendment to the amendment of the motion moved by Mr. Duncan on 19th instant, as follows:—

"On the consideration of a motion standing on the Order Paper in the name of the Honourable Member for Cowichan, and to which the Honourable Minister of Lands moved an amendment, and the Honourable Leader of the Opposition an amendment to the amendment, an objection was taken by the Honourable Minister of Lands to the last amendment, the resolution of which reads as follows:—

"Therefore be it Resolved, That this House is of the opinion that every possible step should be taken by the Government to prevent the exportation of unmanufactured timber from this Province, and that it is highly desirable that legislation should be brought down at the present Session providing for the prohibition of the exportation of unmanufactured timber from this Province after the 1st day of January, 1925."

"Objection taken was that the amendment seeks to dictate a policy to the Government in dealing with the property of the Crown.

"There are many Speakers' decisions dealing with the point at issue, all of which clearly show that a motion dictating a policy to the Government regarding the property of the Crown cannot be moved by a private member.

"See decision of Mr. Speaker Pooley, page 61; also Mr. Speaker Booth, page 62; Mr. Speaker Higgins, page 63; Mr. Speaker Eberts, page 132, etc.

"I must rule the motion out of order."

Mr. Bowser appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS—27.

Messieurs

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

NAYS—18.

Messieurs

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

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Duncan* on 19th instant (*re* exportation of timber), and on the amendment thereto moved by the Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* on 21st instant.

Mr. *Hinchliffe* moved in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Mr. *Lister*.—

That all the words of the amendment after the word "Canada," in the fourth line of the Preamble, be deleted, and the following words substituted therefor:—

"Therefore be it Resolved, That this House regrets that the Government has not seen fit to submit legislation providing for the prohibition of the exportation from this Province, after the 31st day of December, 1924, of logs not fully manufactured."

On the motion of Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting.

With the leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Oliver*, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, it was *Resolved*.—

That the following proposed motion to be moved by the Hon. Mr. *Oliver* for the suspension of Rule 72 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, to report their finding in respect to such motion to the House:—

That Rule 72 be suspended to the extent necessary to permit of the receiving of a petition praying for the enactment of "A Bill relating to the Municipality of South Vancouver," and to permit of the receiving of the above-named Bill, and for the reference of such Bill to the Private Bills Committee, and for the receiving of the report of the Private Bills Committee in respect to such Bill, and for the doing of all things necessary to the enactment of said Bill to the same extent as if all the Rules of the House in respect to such Bill had been complied with.

With the leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Oliver*, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, it was *Resolved*.—

That the following proposed motion to be moved by the Hon. Mr. *Oliver* for the suspension of Rule 72 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, to report their finding in respect to such motion to the House:—

That Rule 72 be suspended to the extent necessary to permit of the receiving of a petition praying for the enactment of a Bill intituled "The City of Vancouver Tax Consolidation Act, 1923," and to permit of the receiving of the above-named Bill, and for the reference of such Bill to the Private Bills Committee, and for the receiving of the report of the Private Bills Committee in respect to such Bill, and for the doing of all things necessary to the enactment of said Bill to the same extent as if all the Rules of the House in respect to such Bill had been complied with.

With the leave of the House, on the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Oliver*, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, it was *Resolved*.—

That the following proposed motion to be moved by the Hon. Mr. *Oliver* for the suspension of Rule 72 be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, to report their finding in respect to such motion to the House:—

That Rule 72 be suspended to the extent necessary to permit of the receiving of a petition praying for the introduction of a Bill intituled "The City of North Vancouver Local Improvement By-laws Validation Act," and to permit of the receiving of the above-named Bill, and for the reference of such Bill to the Private Bills Committee, and for the receiving of the report of the Private Bills Committee in respect to such Bill, and for the doing of all things necessary to the enactment of said Bill to the same extent as if all the Rules of the House in respect to such Bill had been complied with.



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

That the Order for second reading of Bill (No. 17) intituled "An Act respecting Sanipractic Physicians" be discharged, and that the Bill be referred to a Select Committee of the House, consisting of Messrs. *Henniger*, *Ramsay*, *Campbell*, *Kergin*, *Wallinger*, *Lister*, and *Uphill*, for the purpose of hearing representations relative to said Bill, and that such Committee shall report its findings and recommendations to the House.

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

Bill (No. 12) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Apiaries Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

With the leave of the House, the Hon. Dr. *MacLean* presented a Return in answer to the following questions standing in the name of Mr. *A. McDonald*:—

1. Did the Government pass any Orders in Council granting increases to any members of the Civil Service subsequent to last Session?

2. If so, give name of each person, together with his or her salary and also his or her increase?

Mr. *Anderson* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:—

1. In what year did the redistribution take place which established the present boundaries of the electoral districts?

2. How many members were added to the Legislature by that redistribution?

3. How was that redistribution made, with the personnel of the body responsible for such, if any?

4. What was the total cost of making that redistribution?

5. What was the salary and expenses paid to each person in connection with that redistribution?

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

"1. Amendment to 'Constitution Act' relating to redistribution passed at Session of 1915; amended 1916. Amending Acts came into effect upon the dissolution of the Legislative Assembly on May 31st, 1916.

"2. Five.

"3. By an amendment to the 'Constitution Act' based upon the report of a Royal Commission appointed on July 18th, 1914, and consisting of the Honourable Mr. Justice Morrison, Commissioner; the Honourable Mr. Justice Macdonald, Commissioner; with W. P. Ogilvie as Secretary.

"4. \$9,236.50.

"5. The Honourable Mr. Justice Macdonald, Commissioner: Services, \$3,000; expenses, \$177. The Honourable Mr. Justice Morrison, Commissioner: Services, \$3,000; expenses, \$372.75. W. P. Ogilvie, Secretary: Services, \$1,000; expenses, \$1,619.07. Balance paid for advertising, etc."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. When was the section of highway known as the "Malahat" built?

2. What was estimated cost?

3. Were tenders called for this work? If so, give names of tenderers.

4. What was actual cost of completion?

5. What was the mileage of contract?

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

"1. Between 1908 and 1912.

"2. \$84,653.29.

"3. Yes. J. Haggerty & Co.; J. D. Wilkinson; E. Pinson; Westholme Lumber Co.; Weeks & Nightingdale; C. C. Smith; Mr. Carlin; Sewell, Johnson & Warren.

"4. \$297,249.24.

"5. 17 miles."

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

1. What are the details of the account of Sharp & Thompson, architects, as shown on page A 299, Public Accounts, ended March 31st, 1923?

2. Is construction-work in connection with the buildings at Point Grey being carried on under the supervision of Sharp & Thompson?

3. If so, what will be the total amount payable to the architects on a basis of the contract prices?

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

"1. Details of account now before the Public Accounts Committee.

"2. Yes.

"3. Remuneration will be based on the amount of work actually carried out."

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

1. What was the total cost of paving the Pacific Highway south of New Westminster known as the Peterson contract?

2. When was this paving commenced and when completed?

3. What is the total cost of all repairs to this pavement to date?

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

"1. \$211,752.98; this includes cement, day-labour work, etc.

"2. August, 1919; completed December, 1920.

"3. \$5,910.69, due to the excessive loading of logging-trucks breaking the concrete slabs, including capital charges which cannot be segregated."

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

1. Is one Colin Merkley employed in the Department?

2. If not, is his appointment under consideration?

3. If so, what office is he to be appointed to, and what salary will he receive?

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

"1, 2, and 3. Colin Merkley unknown to the Department."

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

1. Did the Government make an estimate of the cost of building a road between Kelowna and Naramata? If so, when?

2. What was the amount of the estimate?

3. Has the Government any intention of proceeding with this work next year?

4. What is the length of the road to be constructed?

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

"1. An estimate of cost was made for the building of road between Okanagan Mission and Naramata; August, 1923.

"2. Original estimate made in 1921, revised to conform with current rates, approximately \$307,000.

"3. Under consideration.

"4. 22.7 miles."

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

1. Did the Government make an estimate of the cost of building a road between McCullough and Carmi? If so, when?

2. What was the amount of the estimate?

3. Has the Government any intention of proceeding with this work next year?

4. What is the length of the road to be constructed?

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

"1. Yes; February, 1919.

"2. \$53,500.

"3. Under consideration.

"4. 24 miles."

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

1. Were tenders called for the building of a road from Revelstoke to Arrowhead?
2. If so, on what date were tenders called for?
3. If so, who tendered, what was the amount of each tender, and which tender was accepted?
4. How many miles of road were included in first contract?
5. What were the Engineer's estimates of the cost of the road completed?
6. How many miles of this road have been constructed to date?
7. What amount of money has been expended from March 1st, 1922, up to November 1st, 1923?
8. Was the surfacing of the road included in the original contract?
9. If not, what is the estimated cost per mile of surfacing?
10. What amount will be required to finish said road?
11. When will the road be completed?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. July, 1919; May, 1923.
- "3. 1919 tenders: Angus McDonnell, unit basis, approximately \$9,474; Charles Granston, \$11,925; tender of Angus McDonnell accepted. 1923 tenders: Walter Hardman, Sections 1, 2, and 3, unit basis, approximately \$4,246 (accepted); James & Tony Oziro, Sections 4 and 5, unit basis, approximately \$2,327 (accepted); Kay Alexander, unit basis, approximately \$20,000 (accepted).
- "4. Two miles.
- "5. No estimate of the cost of the entire road was ever made. Estimates were made by District Engineer from time to time of portions of road.
- "6. The road is now practically completed, with the exception of certain points which will require to be widened in the future; it was not considered advisable to spend the money on said widening at present time.
- "7. \$87,696.22.
- "8. No.
- "9. \$800 per mile (average).
- "10. \$17,000 (inclusive of surfacing).
- "11. Will be ready for traffic early in the spring."

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

1. Did the Government or the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company enter into a contract for the purchase of steel rails for use on the Pacific Great Eastern Railway?
2. If so, who signed this said contract on behalf of the Government or Pacific Great Eastern Railway and the contractors?
3. On what date was said contract entered into?
4. On what day, month, and year were these rails delivered to the Pacific Great Eastern Railway?
5. If delivered on various dates, what were these dates and tonnage received on same?

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

- "1. Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company entered into contract.
- "2. D'Arcy Tate, Vice-President, and R. D. Thomas, Secretary, for Pacific Great Eastern Railway; Evans, Coleman & Evans, agents for U.S. Steel Products Company.
- "3. November 15th, 1916.
- "4. May, 1918, shipments began and continued to May, 1919.
- "5. Answered by No. 4. Dates too numerous to give."

Mr. *Anderson* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture the following question:—

What amounts are owing to the Government for seed-grain distributed in the years 1915, 1917, and 1918, respectively?

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

"Year 1915, \$5,186.96; year 1917, \$1,916.80; year 1918, \$7,005.64."

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

1. What was the total amount of money spent on the New Denver—Three Forks Wagon-road during each of the years 1922 and 1923 up to November 15th?
2. Has the road been completed?
3. If not, when will the work be completed?
4. What is the estimated cost to complete the road?

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

"1. Fiscal year 1922—23, \$10,706.76; 1923—24 (to date), \$2,545.71.

"2. Yes.

"3 and 4. Answered by No. 2."

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

1. How many miles of wagon-road were built by the Northern Construction Company in and around the Williams Lake Townsite?
2. What price was paid the Northern Construction Company for these roads?
3. Who was the sub-contractor, and what price did he receive?

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

"1. Grading on Railway Avenue and Oliver Street.

"2. \$2,815.92.

"3. Goodrich & Henderson, \$2,815.92."

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

1. Did the Government make an estimate of the cost of building a road between Peachland and Princeton? If so, when?
2. What was the amount of the estimate?
3. Has the Government any intention of proceeding with this work next year?
4. What is the length of the road to be constructed?

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

"1. No detailed survey made of length on which to base an intelligent statement.

"2. Answered by No. 1.

"3. Will be considered.

"4. Answered by No. 1."

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

1. Was one C. McAllister employed as Superintendent on the construction of the Hardy Bay Road?
2. If so, when was he appointed, at what salary, and how long did he work?
3. Did said McAllister employ his own team or teams?
4. If so, what was the total amount paid him for such team or teams?
5. Did said McAllister board the men on said work?
6. If so, what were his charges, and how much did he receive from this source?
7. Is the said McAllister still in the employ of the Government?
8. How much money did said McAllister (inclusive of salary, teams, and boarding men) receive while in the employ of the Government?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. May 11th; \$225 per month; to May 31st.

"3. No.

"4. Answered by No. 3.

"5. Yes; he paying for all camp supplies.

"6. \$1.25 per day; \$1,592.89; this covers period during which supplies were purchased by him during May and June.

"7. No.

"8. \$1,745.31 (salary, \$152.42, and board deductions, \$1,592.89, as stated in answer No. 6)."

Mr. *Neelands* asked the Hon. the Provincial Secretary the following questions:—

1. What is the number of attendants employed at Industrial School for Boys at Coquitlam?
2. How many hours per shift are they on duty?
3. How many hours per week are they on duty?

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

- "1. Eight male attendants, including nightwatchman.
- "2. Nine hours, including meal-time.
- "3. Sixty-three hours per week."

Mr. *Hunter* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public works the following questions:—

1. Was one J. P. Coates in charge of the surveys of the Edgewood-Vernon Road?
2. If so, how long has he been in that position, and what salary is paid him?
3. What has been the total cost of survey-work on that road from September 1st, 1921, to September 1st, 1923?
4. What amount has been paid on account of wages in connection with this work?
5. What amount has been paid on account of auto-hire in connection with this work?
6. What amount has been paid on account of packing material in connection with this work?
7. What amount has been paid on account of camp equipment in connection with this work?
8. What amount has been paid on account of food and board and lodging in connection with this work?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Since June 15th, 1921; \$180 per month when first appointed, now \$7 per diem.
- "3. \$12,319.20.
- "4. \$8,337.61.
- "5. \$261.
- "6. \$251.28.
- "7. \$626.92.
- "8. \$2,812.89; miscellaneous accounts, phone, etc., \$29.50."

*Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m. to-morrow.

And then the House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Friday, 30th November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. *Jackson* presented the Ninth Report from the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, as follows:—

REPORT No. 9.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,  
November 30th, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

Your Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders begs leave to report as follows:—

Your Committee have considered the matters referred to them by the House on the motion of the Hon. the Premier made the 29th day of November last, on which it was resolved that the proposed motions to be moved by the Hon. the Premier for the suspension of Rule 72 with respect to the undermentioned Bills be referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private

Bills and Standing Orders, to report their finding in respect to such motion to the House, and your Committee respectfully report that in their opinion the Rules should be suspended to permit the receiving of a petition praying for the introduction of the following Bills:—

A Bill relating to the Municipality of South Vancouver;

The City of Vancouver Tax Consolidation Act, 1923;

The City of North Vancouver Local Improvement By-laws Validation Act;

and to permit of the receiving of Bills for the above purposes.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. B. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received.

The Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

Mr. *Hanco* presented a petition from the Corporation of the City of North Vancouver, for leave to introduce a Private Bill for validating certain Local Improvement By-laws, and for other powers.

The petition was received.

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

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor*.

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act respecting the Titles to certain Foreshores and Lands covered by the Waters of False Creek, in the City of Vancouver," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*

*November 30th, 1923.*

*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. 34) intituled "An Act respecting the Titles to certain Foreshores and Lands covered by the Waters of False Creek, in the City of Vancouver," 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.

On the motion of Mr. *Guthrie*, a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Workmen's Compensation Act'" was introduced.

On the motion of Mr. *Guthrie*, That the Bill be read a first time,

The Hon. Mr. *Manson* rose to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

Mr. *Pooley* moved, seconded by Mr. *Schofield*,—

That an Order of this House be granted for the Return of all telegrams and letters passing between the Premier, Attorney-General, Deputy Attorney-General, or any other Minister or official of the Provincial Government and the Minister of Justice, Deputy Minister of Justice, or any other Minister or official of the Federal Government, dealing with any matters connected with the Royal Commission now sitting in Vancouver in connection with the investigations into the Royal Canadian Mounted Police.

The Hon. the Attorney-General made a statement to the House.

With the leave of the House, the motion was withdrawn.

The report (No. 8) of the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders, presented on 28th instant, was adopted.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" for the purpose of going into Committee of Supply.

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

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act.'"

And on the motion moved by Mr. *Bowser* on 27th instant, as follows:—

That whereas the Bill (No. 32) provides for the increasing of the Members of this Legislature the word "now" be struck out, and the words "this day six months" be substituted therefor.

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

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

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor.*

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Imposition and Collection of a Tax on Gasolene," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*  
*November 30th, 1923.*

*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. 35) intituled "An Act to provide for the Imposition and Collection of a Tax on Gasolene," 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 Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:—

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor.*

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to provide for the Imposition and Collection of a Tax on Fuel-oil," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*  
*November 30th, 1923.*

*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. 36) intituled "An Act to provide for the Imposition and Collection of a Tax on Fuel-oil," 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.

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. When was the present timber bridge built over Columbia River at Revelstoke?
2. What was estimated cost?
3. Were tenders called for construction of this bridge?
4. If so, who tendered, and what were amounts of tenders?
5. What was the total cost of the work?
6. What sum has been expended on maintenance to date?
7. Why was it necessary to replace this bridge?
8. Does the Government expect that the estimated cost of new bridge will be exceeded?

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

"1. 1909-10.

"2. Not known.

"3. Yes.

"4. Construction: Gillett & McDonald, \$43,500; International Contract Co., \$47,928; Boyd & Greenlees, \$67,910; Chas. Harvey, \$150,000.

"Ironwork: Wm. O'Neil & Co., wrought iron per 100 lb. \$4.95, cast iron per 100 lb. \$4.10; Ross & Howard Ironworks, wrought iron per 100 lb. \$5.67, cast iron per 100 lb. \$3.67; Schaaque Machine Works, wrought iron per 100 lb. \$6, cast iron per 100 lb. \$3 and \$3.50; Robertson Iron Works, wrought iron per 100 lb. \$6.50.

"5. \$95,531.91. Of this amount, \$36,218.20 expended on matting and riprapping the piers not provided for in contract.

"6. \$38,465.48.

"7. On account of its dangerous condition and being unfit for traffic.

"8. No."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. When was the highway bridge at Shuswap, Kamloops District, built?
2. What was total length?
3. What was estimated cost?
4. Was work done by contract?
5. If so, who tendered, and at what prices?
6. What was actual cost?
7. Is this bridge in the proper location?

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

"1. 1913.

"2. 1,800 lineal feet.

"3. \$26,180.

"4. No; by day-labour.

"5. Answered by No. 4.

"6. \$26,772.52.

"7. No."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. When was bridge built on Upper Squamish adjacent to Judd's ranch?
2. What was cost of same?
3. When was this bridge condemned?
4. Why were road approaches not built during life of bridge?
5. When was bridge taken down?

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

"1. Bridge built adjacent to Madden's Ranch; no information as to date; approximately 1910.

"2. No information.

"3. October, 1919.

"4. No information.

"5. December, 1919, and January, 1920."



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

1. Is a man named Walsh, Government Inspector under the Liquor Board, at present inspecting an export warehouse at Prince Rupert?
2. Is one Ole Besner interested in said export warehouse?
3. Is Walsh living at the Knox Hotel, owned by said Besner?
4. Does the Department pay the board of said Walsh?

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

- "1. Mr. Walsh, an Inspector under the Liquor Control Board, was at one time in Prince Rupert, in the course of his duties, to inspect records of export warehouses and common carriers.
- "2. No information.
- "3. No.
- "4. The Liquor Control Board grants a subsistence allowance of \$1.50 per day to men engaged on this class of work while they are away from home."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Minister of Public Works the following questions:—

1. Did the Provincial Government construct a portion of road known as Revelstoke Mountain Road, in the Revelstoke District?
2. If so, give date.
3. What was the estimated cost?
4. What was mileage built and total cost of same?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Between the years 1912-14.
- "3. \$40,000 to complete approximately 14 miles, or an average of \$2,860 per mile.
- "4. Approximately 2 miles; cost \$12,220; balance of construction taken over by Dominion Government through Parks Branch. Cost not available in this Department."

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

1. What was the cost of new high-level bridge across Goat River at Erickson (Kaslo Riding), built during 1920-21?
2. What is the carrying capacity of said bridge?

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

- "1. \$24,125.16.
- "2. A live load of 15 tons concentrated, depending on type of vehicle."

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

1. When did Captain Rowberry enter employ of the Land Settlement Board?
2. What were his duties and compensation?
3. When did development operations cease at Camp Lister?
4. Has Captain Rowberry left Camp Lister? If so, when?
5. What were his duties between August, 1922, and time of leaving, and amount of remuneration for this period?
6. Is he still in the employ of the Land Settlement Board? If so, where, and what remuneration is being paid to him?

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

- "1. January, 1920.
- "2. General Superintendent of Development Area No. 2, Camp Lister. February, 1920, \$150 per month; March to May, \$175 per month; June, 1920, to October, 1922, \$200 per month; November, 1922, to date, \$150 per month.
- "3. Major clearing and building operations were discontinued November, 1921. Since that time there has been a great deal of detail work carried on in connection with the subdivision of remainder of area, establishment of orchards, development of individual farms, disposal of equipment, sale of lands, etc.
- "4. Yes; end of October, 1923.

"5. General supervision of Area No. 2, Camp Lister, and Area No. 3, Fernie; also appraiser and representative in connection with Land Settlement Board loans throughout South-eastern British Columbia. Amount of remuneration answered by question 2.

"6. Employed temporarily in connection with ploughing and seeding Sumas Lake lands at \$150 per month."

Mr. *I. A. Mackenzie* asked the Hon. the Commissioner of Fisheries the following questions:—

1. What was the total value of the fishery production of British Columbia in 1916?
2. What was the total value of the fishery production of British Columbia in 1922?

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

- "1. \$14,538,320, or 40.54 per cent. of the total fishery products of the Dominion of Canada.
- "2. \$18,849,658, or 45 per cent. of the total fishery products of the Dominion of Canada."

*Resolved*, That the House, at its rising, do stand adjourned until 2.30 o'clock p.m. on Monday next.

And then the House adjourned at 5.42 p.m.

## Monday, 3rd December, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

On the motion of Mr. *Hanes* the Rules were suspended, and Bill (No. 53) intituled "An Act relating to certain Local Improvement Works and By-laws of the Corporation of the City of North Vancouver" was introduced, read a first time, and referred to the Select Standing Committee on Private Bills and Standing Orders.

With the leave of the House, the Hon. Dr. *MacLean* presented a Return in answer to questions standing on the Order Paper of the 3rd instant in the name of Mr. *Estling*, as follows:—

1. What was the amount of each separate estimate from No. 1 to No. 39 presented for payment by the Northern Construction Company?
2. What was the date of settlement of each separate estimate and the amount paid on each settlement?

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

1. How many acres of privately owned lands are within the reclaimed area of Sumas Lake Reclamation Scheme?
2. How many acres are owned by the Dominion Government within said Sumas Reclamation Area?
3. Has the Dominion Government accepted the dyking scheme of the Sumas Reclamation Area up to date?
4. If not, why?

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

- "1. Approximately 20,000 acres.
  - "2. Approximately 12,000 acres.
  - "3. Question of acceptance of dyking scheme does not arise at the present time. Purchase agreement contains usual provision that after completion of works, and before title is issued to settlers, an inspection shall be carried out by a representative of the Minister of the Interior in order to certify that lands to be deeded have been adequately reclaimed.
  - "4. Answered by No. 3.
- "NOTE.—Owing to incompleting surveys in small portions of the area, exact acreage figures cannot be given at the present time."

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

1. Did the Government buy a motor-car for the District Engineer at Kamloops?
2. If so, when, and what price was paid?
3. What has been the total cost to November 1st, 1923, of: (a) Repairs to car; (b) upkeep, including tires, gas, and oil?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. November, 1921; \$1,657.40.
- "3. (a) \$1,916.83; (b) \$1,572.54 for a mileage of 38,568 miles, operating cost of 9 cents per mile."

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

1. Did Edgar E. B. Montpelier work on the Government road at Moyie during July and August of the years 1921, 1922, and 1923?
2. If so, at what salary?

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

"1 and 2. Edgar E. B. Montpelier has never worked on Government road."

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

1. What was the total expenditure in the Fort George Electoral District during the year 1922-23?
2. What was the overhead expenditure: (a) For supervision, Public Works Office, in the City of Prince George; (b) for the entire electoral district; giving the percentage of overhead cost in each case?

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

- "1. \$199,821.
- "2. (a) \$3,783, including District Engineer's salary and expenses, 2.9 per cent.; (b) \$16,110, including Peace River, 7.8 per cent."

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

1. In cases where settlement was not made by the 15th of each month, did the Northern Construction Company charge the Government, or the Pacific Great Eastern, interest on accounts for material moved and supplies furnished?
2. What rate of interest was charged?
3. Were any sums of money advanced by the Pacific Great Eastern to the Northern Construction Company at any time during the period of construction?
4. If so, what amount, and when?

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

"1. At the final settlement, the 15th of each month was set as an equitable date on which payments should be made, and interest was allowed the Northern Construction Company for payments delayed after that date.

"2. 6 per cent. was allowed.

"3. Payments were made on account of different estimates and interest at 6 per cent. charged the Northern Construction Company in the final settlement.

"4. Various amounts at different dates."

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

1. Have Price, Waterhouse & Company received instructions to audit the books of the Northern Construction Company in so far as they relate to the Pacific Great Eastern under paragraph 23 of the contract?

2. Did the firm of Murdock & Company receive payment for any sub-contracts? If so, what amount?

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

"1. No.

"2. Yes; \$2,541,797.55."

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

1. Who is the Police Magistrate at Penticton?
2. On what date did he receive such appointment?
3. Have any appeals been taken from his convictions?
4. If so, how many, and what has been the result of the appeals?

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

- "1. Thomas Archdale Pope.
- "2. July 1st, 1921.
- "3. Yes.
- "4. Twelve. Eight appeals allowed, four dismissed."

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

1. Have the Government employed Mr. G. G. McGeer, K.C., to represent them in connection with the increase in Western express rates?
2. If so, what will this work consist of?
3. Have the Government entered into any agreement with said McGeer as to the amount of his remuneration?
4. If so, what are the terms of his employment?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Presenting reasons to the Board of Railway Commissioners why application for increased rates should not be granted, and further making a claim for a reduction proportioned to the reduction made in 1922 to the Mountain Rate Scale.
- "3 and 4. No."

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

1. How many contracts were awarded to: (a) Road-work; (b) bridge-work, between the fiscal years 1909-10 and 1916-17, inclusive?
2. Of the contracts awarded, how many were on: (a) A lump-sum basis; (b) a unit basis; giving the names in each instance of the work, whether road or bridge, which was so undertaken by contract?

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

"1 and 2. Two road contracts—Vancouver Island Trunk on lump-sum basis; Granville Street on unit basis. Nine bridge contracts. Five bridges on lump-sum basis—Michel, near mouth; South Fork of Michel Creek, No. 4; No. 2, Michel Creek; No. 3, Michel Creek; Sooke River, Milne's Landing. Four bridges on unit basis—Walhachin, Chilcotin (metal only), Trail, Pitt River (substructure)."

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

1. What was the total yardage charged by the Northern Construction Company for clearing out Kaolin Cut, south of Williams Lake, and what was the total cost?
2. What was the yardage of each classification?
3. In the monthly estimates from 1918 to October, 1922, did the Construction Company credit the Government with unclaimed wages? If so, what was the aggregate of the credits?

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

- "1. Location given too indefinite.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. No."

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

1. Why did the Government Architect examine the Lloyd George School at Kamloops?
2. Who instructed him to do so?
3. Will the Government contribute anything to any repairs which may be made to this school?
4. If so, what responsibility is there for this contribution on the part of the Government?

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

"1 and 2. The Kamloops School Board experienced difficulty in keeping the High School properly heated and ventilated and requested that a competent man be sent up to make an inspection of the building. The Government Architect was accordingly asked to examine the building for the local Board.

"3. No.

"4. Answered by No. 3."

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

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion "That Mr. Speaker do now leave the Chair" for the purpose of going into Committee of Supply.

On the motion of Mr *W. A. McKenzie*, the debate was adjourned to the next sitting.

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

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor.*

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Summary Convictions Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

*Government House,*  
*December 3rd, 1923.*

*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. 42) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Summary Convictions 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. *Barrow* presented to Mr. Speaker a Message from His Honour the Lieutenant-Governor, which read as follows:—

W. C. NICHOL,  
*Lieutenant-Governor.*

The Lieutenant-Governor transmits herewith a Bill intituled "An Act respecting Stockyards and Live-stock Exchanges," and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly."

*Government House,*  
*December 3rd, 1923.*

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

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

*Resolved*, That the Committee rise and report to the House, recommending the introduction of a Bill (No. 37) intituled "An Act respecting Stockyards and Live-stock Exchanges," 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.

*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.