

Monday, 19th November, 1923.

TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

Mr. *Anderson* presented a petition from the Corporation of the District of Oak Bay, objecting to certain provisions of Bill (No. 52) intituled "An Act relating to the Corporation of the City of Victoria."

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, the following Bills were introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting:—

Bill (No. 28) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Legal Professions Act.'"

Bill (No. 29) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Distress Act.'"

Bill (No. 30) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Court of Appeal Act.'"

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

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.

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

On the point of order raised by the Hon. Mr. *Oliver* on 16th instant with reference to questions (No. 10 on the Order Paper of November 16th) standing in the name of Mr. *Pooley*, Mr. Speaker delivered his reserved decision, as follows:—

"On Friday, the 16th instant, Mr. *Pooley* asked the Honourable the Attorney-General the following questions:—

"1. What has been the total amount paid to date to the legal firm in Vancouver of which Robert Smith is a member since this Government took office until November 1st, 1923?

"2. Is the said Robert Smith a son of the lady Member of Vancouver?"

"The Honourable the Premier objected to the questions as being contrary to the Rules of this House.

"As to the first question, after careful consideration I find it indefinite and not necessarily related to the public affairs of the Province.

"As to the second question, I can see no relation to the information sought for.

"Attention was drawn to questions on page 75, Journals, 1916.

"There I find two sets of questions directed to the then Honourable Attorney-General as to his business relations with a certain legal firm, the title of the firm being stated.

"The questions now asked differ materially from those quoted.

"I must rule them out of order."

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 16) intituled "An Act respecting the Provincial Police Force and Provincial Gaols."

Bill read a second time 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>Burde</i>	<i>Farris</i>	<i>Henniger</i>	<i>Sutherland</i>
<i>Clearihue</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—13.

Messieurs

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

Bill *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 2) intituled "An Act respecting Cemetery Companies" was again committed. Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 9) intituled "An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems" was committed. Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 22) intituled "An Act respecting Probate Duty" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 25) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Revenue Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 11) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Settlement and Development Act'" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

On the second reading of Bill (No. 20) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal-mines Regulation Act'" a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Guthrie*, adjourned to the next sitting.

Bill (No. 21) intituled "An Act respecting the Marking of Eggs" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 27) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Department of Industries Act'" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 24) intituled "An Act respecting Crown Timber and the Conservation and Preservation of Forests" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 15) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Motor-vehicle Act.'"

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

Bill (No. 18) intituled "An Act respecting the Hours of Labour of Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 19) intituled "An Act respecting the Two-platoon System for Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

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

1. Did the Government or the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company purchase any trucks from the Northern Construction Company?
2. If so, when?
3. And at what price?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. One in July, 1919, which was not suitable. This truck was taken back by Northern Construction Company and credit given, less \$606 for depreciation, and another purchased in March, 1920.
- "3. \$6,076, price of truck purchased in 1919; \$5,470 credit given by Northern Construction Company (\$606 for depreciation) in March, 1920, and \$4,454.35 paid for new truck, making the total cost \$5,060.35."

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

1. Did the Northern Construction Company charge up to the Pacific Great Eastern Railway any automobiles between the years 1918 and the termination of their contract?
2. If so, how many?
3. What makes?
4. And what price per car?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Two.
- "3. Dodge.
- "4. \$1,850 and \$1,985."

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

1. Is the Department continuing the road known as Muir Avenue at Sooke towards the harbour?
2. Is said work being done by contract or day-labour?
3. What is the object of the said road?
4. Does the Government intend to put on a ferry across Sooke Harbour to East Sooke?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Day-labour.
- "3. To provide means of access to terminus of road.
- "4. Under consideration."

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

1. Have all the accounts in connection with the Prince Rupert Court-house been paid?
2. If not, what amount is still unsettled?
3. What was the total cost of the building of said Court-house?
4. What was the cost of furnishing said building?

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

- "1. No.
- "2. \$423.31.
- "3. \$417,995.73.
- "4. \$3,855.18 for linoleum only; each department arranged for its own furnishings."

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

1. Was the hoisting engineer on duty at the Protection Mine, Nanaimo, on October 8th, 9th, and 10th, 1923?
2. If not, was it a contravention of Rule 24 of the General Rules of the "Coal-mines Regulation Act"?
3. If yes, has any prosecution been instituted?
4. If not, why not?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2, 3, and 4. Answered by reply to No. 1."

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

1. What persons are at present employed for the purpose of lumber trade extension?
2. In what capacity and at what salary is each person engaged, and where is each person located?
3. How much has been spent by these officials on travelling from April 1st, 1923, to November 1st, 1923?

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

- "1. Loren L. Brown, A. E. Roberts, and W. Turnbull.
- "2. Loren L. Brown, Senior Commissioner; salary, \$3,600; headquarters, Victoria. A. E. Roberts, Commissioner; salary, \$2,700; headquarters, Toronto. W. Turnbull, Acting-Commissioner; salary, \$3,120; headquarters, Victoria. (L. L. Brown is leaving for England this month to prepare and take charge of the lumber exhibit at the British Empire Exhibition, and W. Turnbull is appointed as Acting-Commissioner during his absence.)
- "3. Loren L. Brown, \$911.63; A. E. Roberts, \$211.98; W. Turnbull, *nil*."

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

1. What did the oil-storage service tank at Williams Lake on the Pacific Great Eastern Railway cost?
2. Was it ever used?
3. What is it now being used for?

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

- "1. Impossible to segregate the cost, as this formed part of the fuel-storage system at Williams Lake. The cost might approximately be \$900.
- "2. Continuously during construction.
- "3. Not in use at present."

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

1. What services did P. P. Brown render in connection with the Acute Mental Hospital at Essondale to entitle him to receive \$62.50 as shown on page A 289, Public Accounts, fiscal year ended March 31st, 1923?
2. By whom was he engaged?
3. What was the date of such employment?

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

"This question was answered by the Hon. the Minister of Public Works a few days ago."

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

1. What sum is in hand arising out of the administration of the "Superannuation Act"?
2. In what securities are the funds invested?
3. If not invested in securities, what form does the investment take?

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

- "1. On October 1st, 1923, \$651,873.58.
- "2. Deposited in the Treasury.
- "3. Handled as other special funds. See Public Accounts, 1922-23, page A ix."

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

1. Give names and particulars of employees retired under the provisions of the "Superannuation Act" since March 31st, 1923, to November 1st, 1923.
2. What notice was given in each case?
3. Is it a fact that less than twenty-four hours' notice was given in some cases of the Ministers' decision to retire the employees from active work?
4. If so, why was a month's notice not given to all persons affected by the superannuation provisions?

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

- "1. Williams, R. T., Foreman, Printing Office; plan, single life; \$55.90 per month; date effective, 1-5-23; O. in C. No. 506/23.
 Pottinger, J., Foreman, Printing Office; plan, single life; \$107.10 per month; date effective, 1-5-23; O. in C. No. 507/23.
 Hall, J., Compositor, Printing Office; plan, single life; \$44.15 per month; date effective, 1-5-23; O. in C. No. 508/23.
 Lloyd, M. B., Clerk, Public Works; plan, single life; \$21.65 per month; date effective, 1-8-23; O. in C. No. 842/23.
 Shakespeare, F. N. E., Compositor, Printing Office; plan, single life; \$71.90 per month; date effective, 1-6-23; O. in C. No. 843/23.
 Packard, J., Janitor, Alberni; plan, single life; \$6.80 per month; date effective, 1-6-23; O. in C. No. 872/23.
 Campbell, C. S., Warden, Oakalla; plan, single life; \$104.50 per month; date effective, 1-4-23; O. in C. No. 940/23.
 Burgess, T. A., Linotype Operator, Printing Office; plan, guaranteed 10 years; \$15.25 per month; date effective 1-9-23; O. in C. No. 1227/23.
 Ballantyne, D. T., Compositor, Printing Office; plan, single life; \$56.30 per month; date effective 1-11-23; O. in C. No. 1252/23.

"2. Williams, R. T., 3 weeks; Pottinger, J., 3 weeks; Hall, J., 3 weeks; Lloyd, M. B., over one month; Shakespeare, F. N. E., absent on sick leave, applied for superannuation June 24th; Campbell, C. S., over one month; Packard, J., absent on sick leave, applied for superannuation June 27th; Burgess, T. A., absent on sick leave, applied for superannuation September 22nd; Ballantyne, D. T., over one month.

"3. No.

"4. Answered by No. 3."

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

1. What amount has been paid to date by the Land Settlement Board in connection with the Merville Settlement?
2. Did the Department of Agriculture receive a report from a committee authorized to revalue certain areas in said settlement?
3. If so, what is the total amount of their valuation?

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

"1. \$534,641.44.

"2. Yes.

"3. \$192,898.52 on portion reappraised."

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

1. What was the acreage purchased by the Government for the Christian Ranch?
2. What has been the total sum with interest expended on this area to November 1st, 1923, including purchase, development, and other items of expenditure?
3. What sum has been received from the sale of lands or in return from the expenditures on this area?

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

"1. 440 acres.

"2. \$70,569.50.

"3. \$10,236.41."

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

1. On what date did the "Superannuation Act" come into force?
2. How many contributors are there now to the fund: (a) Government employees; (b) others?
3. Are there any school-teachers on the permanent staff, contributors?
4. If not, why not? If so, how many?
5. Is the Government contemplating taking any action towards enabling teachers to obtain the benefits under this Act?

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

- "1. April 1st, 1921.
- "2. (a) 1,725; (b) 3.
- "3. Yes. All teachers employed in Government institutions come under Part II.
- "4. Thirty-five.
- "5. Provision now exists for teachers obtaining the benefits of the Act. Those employed in Government institutions come under Part II. Teachers employed by School Boards can obtain the benefits of the Act pursuant to Part IV., providing they and the School Board employing them, with the approval of the Municipal Council, enter into an agreement in writing for the purpose of securing the benefits of the Act and file this agreement with the required notices with the Civil Service Commission."

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

1. What was the acreage purchased by the Government for the Merville Soldier Settlement Area?
2. What has been the total sum with interest expended on this area to November 1st, 1923, including purchase, development, and other items of expenditure?
3. What sum has been received from the sale of lands or in return from the expenditures on this area?

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

- "1. 13,890.09 acres.
- "2. \$746,813.98.
- "3. \$105,984.83; returned soldiers' rebates, \$49,873.10; total, \$155,857.93."

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

1. What was the acreage purchased by the Government for the Creston Soldier Settlement Area?
2. What has been the total sum with interest expended on this area to November 1st, 1923, including purchase, development, and other items of expenditure?
3. What sum has been received from the sale of lands or in return from the expenditures on this area?

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

- "1. 6,997.62 acres.
- "2. 680,829.74.
- "3. Sundry, \$58,797.41; returned soldiers' purchase rebates, \$18,000; total, \$76,797.41."

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

1. What was the acreage purchased by the Government for the Fernie Soldier Settlement Area?
2. What has been the total sum with interest expended on this area to November 1st, 1923, including purchase, development, and other items of expenditure?
3. What sum has been received from the sale of lands or in return from the expenditures on this area?

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

- "1. 1,193.51 acres.
- "2. \$43,992.60.
- "3. Sundry, \$18,536.78; returned soldiers' purchase rebates, \$4,308.24; total, \$22,845.02."

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

What quantity of unmanufactured timber was exported from British Columbia during the years 1920 and 1921 respectively?

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

"1920: From exportable lands, 20,643,389 F.B.M.; from non-exportable lands, 8,030,549 F.B.M.; total for 1920, 28,673,938 F.B.M. 1921: From exportable lands, 61,944,649 F.B.M.; from non-exportable lands, 28,271,858 F.B.M.; total for 1921, 90,216,507 F.B.M."

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

1. How many acres in the Merville Settlement were seeded to grass following the fire in July, 1922?

2. What quantities of seed were used?

3. What was the total cost of said seed?

4. What was the cost of labour in seeding?

5. How was the total cost apportioned?

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

"1. 2,175 acres.

"2. 17,399 lb.

"3. \$5,654.40.

"4. \$1,484.80.

"5. Each lot seeded was charged its own proper proportion of seed (and labour, if any), except twenty-four burnt-out settlers, whose land was seeded free of charge."

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

1. Has the Department authorized the building of a road from Fort St. John towards Fort Nelson?

2. If so, what is the length of that road, and what will be the cost of same?

3. Is the work going on at present? If so, will it be continued this winter?

4. How many settlers are there on the road after it leaves Fort St. John going towards the Nelson River?

5. What is the reason or justification for building this road?

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

"2. About 165 miles; probably \$15,000 or less.

"3. Expect work will be completed this fall, but work to continue only as climatic conditions permit.

"1. Yes, a sleigh-road.

"4 and 5. Present trail inadequate to take care of increasing freight traffic. Freight that formerly went through Alberta will go this route for the north country. Settlers will be in a position to have work provided for their teams and it will also provide a local market for the settlers."

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

1. Did one A. B. Currie, of Salmon Arm, receive a contract last year to rock 2 miles or more of Otter Road without tender?

2. If so, why was this done, and what amount was paid said Currie?

3. Did the same Currie obtain work from the Department this year without tender between Chase and Notch Hill?

4. If so, why, and what amount was paid Currie?

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

"1. One mile of main trunk road, Salmon Arm to Vernon, surfaced with rock. Submitted price to District Engineer and approved by Department.

"2. Work done in this instance was economically and efficiently carried out

"3. District Engineer authorized to carry out work. A. B. Currie employed on station-work by contract.

"4. See first part of answer No. 2; paid to date, \$6,001.64."

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

1. Has the work in connection with the erection of the Acute Mental Hospital at Essondale been carried out according to plans and specifications as at the time contract was awarded?
2. If not, what changes have been made, and why?

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

"1 and 2. Plumbing fixtures altered so as to enable British and Canadian firms to fulfil requirements of specifications; otherwise no material change made."

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

1. Have representations been made by the Provincial Civil Servants' Association with a view to the placing under the dome of the Parliament Buildings of a memorial to those members of the Civil Service of British Columbia who gave up their lives during the Great War?
2. Are other memorials already placed there?
3. What reply was given to the request of the above-mentioned association?
4. If a refusal was given, why?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Yes.
- "3. Request would be given consideration.
- "4. Answered by No. 3."

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 4.45 p.m.

Tuesday, 20th November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* 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 'British Columbia University Loan Act,'" and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.
Government House,

November 20th, 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. 4) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia University Loan 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.

Mr. *Guthrie* rose to a question of privilege with reference to labour conditions in Nanaimo. The Hon. Mr. *Manson* rose to a point of order.

Mr. Speaker ruled that it was not a question of privilege.

Thereupon Mr. *Neelands* moved the adjournment of the House upon a question of urgency.

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

Mr. Speaker ruled the motion out of order as not being within Rule 33, inasmuch as the motion was neither definite nor of urgent public importance; and, moreover, the matter was now being dealt with by the Department of Labour.

Mr. Guthrie appealed from the ruling of the Chair.

The Chair was sustained on the following division:—

YEAS—27.

Messieurs

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

NAYS—12.

Messieurs

<i>Ncclands</i>	<i>McDonald, A.</i>	<i>Hinchliffe</i>	<i>Jones</i>
<i>Guthrie</i>	<i>Esling</i>	<i>Lister</i>	<i>Bowser</i>
<i>Wallinger</i>	<i>Schofield</i>	<i>McKenzie, W. A.</i>	<i>Pooley</i>

The petition from the Corporation of the District of Oak Bay, objecting to certain provisions of Bill (No. 52) intituled "An Act relating to the Corporation of the City of Victoria" was received.

Bill (No. 16) intituled "An Act respecting the Provincial Police Force and Provincial Gaols" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 11) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Settlement and Development Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 21) intituled "An Act respecting the Marking of Eggs" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 27) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Department of Industries Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

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

Bill (No. 28) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Legal Professions Act.'"

Bill (No. 29) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Distress Act.'"

Bill (No. 30) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Court of Appeal Act.'"

Bill (No. 51) intituled "An Act to validate and amend By-law No. 403 of the City of Prince Rupert."

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

1. What amount of money has been received by the Government since April 1st, 1923, as income-tax?

2. What amount has been received as personal-property tax since April 1st, 1923?

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

- "1. To October 31st, \$2,207,843.96.
- "2. To October 31st, \$731,164.30."

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

1. Did the false-work of the Revelstoke Bridge go out?
2. If so, when?
3. Who paid the cost of replacing this?
4. If the Department, why did the Department pay it, and what was the amount paid?
5. Were the materials used in connection with this bridge purchased by the Government to avoid payment of sales-tax?
6. Were tenders called for the construction of this work? If so, who tendered and what was the amount of each tender?
7. What were the unit prices on the various classes of material?
8. How many concrete piers are there in connection with this bridge?
9. What was the total cost of the concrete piers, including excavation?
10. Did any employees lose their lives on this bridge since commencement of work? If yes, how many?
11. Were these men protected by the provisions of the "Workmen's Compensation Act"? If not, will the Government have any financial responsibility for their deaths?

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

- "1. Portion of false-work carried out by 1923 high water.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. Contractors.
- "4. Answered by No. 3.
- "5. No.
- "6. False-work included in contract.
- "7. Answered by No. 6.
- "8. Six piers and one abutment.
- "9. Piers uncompleted.
- "10. One sub-foreman died as result of injuries received; one man drowned (both employed by contractors).
- "11. Yes."

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

1. What was the total revenue received (and from what sources) from the Peace River District in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?
2. What was the total revenue received (and from what sources) from the Fort George constituency in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?

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

- "1. As the area known as the Peace River District is but one portion of a much larger assessment district, the Department is unable to furnish the information.
- "2. The boundaries of Fort George constituency do not conform to assessment district boundaries and therefore it is impossible to give the information."

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

1. Was one Haddrell, of the Abbotsford Hotel, sentenced to thirty days for selling beer?
2. If so, when?
3. How long did he remain in gaol?
4. If released before his term expired, what was the reason for so doing?

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

- "1. Sentenced to one month's imprisonment under section 88 of the 'Government Liquor Act.'
- "2. August 8th, 1923.
- "3. Full time, less remission for good conduct.
- "4. Answered by No. 3."

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

1. How many schools were conducted in the Peace River District in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?
2. What was the total amount paid for education in: (a) Salaries; (b) grants, etc., in the Peace River District in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?
3. How many schools were conducted in the Fort George constituency in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?
4. What was the total amount paid for education in: (a) Salaries; (b) grants, etc., in the Fort George constituency in each year from 1916 to 1922, inclusive?

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

- "1. 1916, 3; 1917, 3; 1918, 4; 1919, 5; 1920, 6; 1921, 9; 1922, 13.
- "2. (a.) Salaries: 1916, \$3,300; 1917, \$3,387.10; 1918, \$4,150; 1919, \$5,998; 1920, \$7,096.50; 1921, \$9,865.25; 1922, \$15,748. (b.) Grants: 1916, nil; 1917, \$75; 1918, \$331.52; 1919, \$550; 1920, \$300; 1921, \$1,538.65; 1922, \$1,550.
- "3. 1916, 19; 1917, 21; 1918, 23; 1919, 31; 1920, 37; 1921, 41; 1922, 54.
- "4. (a.) Salaries: 1916, \$19,592.60; 1917, \$22,333.40; 1918, \$22,758.95; 1919, \$29,230.35; 1920, \$39,312.05; 1921, \$46,856.15; 1922, \$58,642.20. (b.) Grants: 1916, \$1,438; 1917, \$1,207.55; 1918, \$2,854.11; 1919, \$2,656.80; 1920, \$1,673.55; 1921, \$29,879.28; 1922, \$17,762.07."

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

1. Was H. L. Chittenden ever in the employ of the Department as an Inspector of Apiaries?
2. Has Alex. Keir been employed by the Inspectors during 1923? If so, for what purpose?
3. How much was he paid?
4. Was Alex. Keir ever in the employ of the Department as a Bee Inspector?
5. Has W. H. Turnbull, formerly Inspector of Apiaries, been employed by the Department or the Inspectors during the year 1922 or 1923? If so, in what capacity, and how much was he paid?
6. Was W. H. Turnbull employed by any Inspector during 1923 to convey him in his work of inspection? If so, who paid him—the Department or the Inspector?
7. How much was he paid?
8. Was F. D. Todd employed during the month of December, 1919, to examine a colony of bees at Clayburn, British Columbia? If so, what was the total cost of his visit?
9. Has F. D. Todd been employed during the year 1923? If so, in what capacity?
10. What salary was he paid?
11. What expenses did he incur?

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

- "1. Yes, in 1920.
- "2. Engaged by Inspector to scrub out and disinfect building where diseased combs and infested material had been stored by Wilfred M. Smith at Kennedy Road, adjoining Keir's apiary.
- "3. For labour, \$1.50; for carbolic-acid disinfectant, 75 cents.
- "4. Yes.
- "5. Not employed on departmental staff, but paid for auto-hire by Inspector. For 1922, \$78; for 1923, *see* answer to question No. 7.
- "6. Yes; paid auto-hire by Inspector.
- "7. \$85.
- "8. No.
- "9. Not employed on departmental staff but as fall fair judge.
- "10. Usual judge's fees of \$6 per day, including time going and coming.
- "11. \$32."

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

1. How many sawmills are owned by Orientals in this Province?
2. How many are owned by Hindus?
3. How many are operated by Orientals?
4. What is the total number of Oriental sawmill-workers in the Province: (a) Chinese; (b) Japanese; (c) Hindus?

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

“1, 2, and 3. No information.

“4. From returns received in the Department of Labour for 1922 there were: (a) Chinese, 1,784; (b) Japanese, 1,147; (c) Hindus, 565.”

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: (a) *Vancouver Sun*; (b) *Vancouver World*; and (c) *The Hook*?

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

“*Vancouver Sun*, \$2,315.60; *Vancouver World*, \$2,558.09; *The Hook*, \$916.90. The expenditures of the Workmen's Compensation Board are not under Government control.”

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 5.05 p.m.

Wednesday, 21st November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORT No. 4.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
November 21st, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

That your Committee recommends that, owing to the abandonment of the proposed Barbers' Bill and the non-presentation to the Legislature of the petition filed by the promoters, the said petition be returned to and the fee paid in respect of the said petition be refunded to the promoters of the said Bill.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. B. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received.

The Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, Bill (No. 31) intituled “An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Life Insurance Contracts” was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

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.

The Hon. Mr. *Pattullo* moved in amendment, seconded by the Hon. Dr. *MacLean*,—

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."

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

Mr. *Hanes* moved, seconded by Mr. *Menzies*,—

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).

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

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

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.

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

Bill (No. 51) intituled "An Act to validate and amend By-law No. 403 of the City of Prince Rupert" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 21) intituled "An Act respecting the Marking of Eggs" was adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 3) intituled "An Act respecting the Cancellation and Amendment of Plans" was again committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 9) intituled "An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems" was again committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 16) intituled "An Act respecting the Provincial Police Force and Provincial Gaols" was again committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 11) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Settlement and Development Act'" was again committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report adopted.

Third reading at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 24) intituled "An Act respecting Crown Timber and the Conservation and Preservation of Forests" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

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

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

Bill (No. 28) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Legal Professions Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 4) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia University Loan Act'" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

The Hon. the Minister of Education presented the Fifty-second Annual Report of the Public Schools of the Province of British Columbia, 1922-23.

On the motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance, seconded by the Hon. the Premier, it was *Resolved*,—

That a Supply be granted to His Majesty, and that this House do resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole forthwith to consider the Resolution.

(IN THE COMMITTEE.)

Resolved, That a Supply be granted to His Majesty, and that the Committee rise and report the Resolution.

The Resolution was reported and adopted.

On the motion of the Hon. the Minister of Finance, seconded by the Hon. the Premier, it was *Resolved*,—

That the House will at its next sitting resolve itself into a Committee of Supply.

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* presented corrected answers to questions (No. 33 on the Order Paper of November 19th) standing in the name of Mr. W. A. *McKenzie*, as follows:—

1. Did the false-work of the Revelstoke Bridge go out?
2. If so, when?
3. Who paid the cost of replacing this?
4. If the Department, why did the Department pay it, and what was the amount paid?
5. Were the materials used in connection with this bridge purchased by the Government to avoid payment of sales-tax?
6. Were tenders called for the construction of this work? If so, who tendered and what was the amount of each tender?
7. What were the unit prices on the various classes of material?
8. How many concrete piers are there in connection with this bridge?
9. What was the total cost of the concrete piers, including excavation?
10. Did any employees lose their lives on this bridge since commencement of work? If yes, how many?
11. Were these men protected by the provisions of the "Workmen's Compensation Act"? If not, will the Government have any financial responsibility for their deaths?

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

- "1. Portion of false-work carried out by 1923 high water.
- "2. Answered by No. 1.
- "3. Contractors.
- "4. Answered by No. 3.
- "5. No.
- "6. Substructure: Grant, Smith & Co. & McDonnell, Ltd., \$105,851.16; Hodgson, King & Marble, \$106,697.77; Armstrong-Morrison, \$109,117.25; Nickson Construction Co., \$111,060.07; Dredging Contracting Co., \$132,341.90; Northern Construction Co., \$146,313.50. Piers may be extended or otherwise to suit foundations encountered.
- "Superstructure, steel: Phoenix Bridge & Iron Works, \$41,934 (much lighter material; only 656,181 lb. against 990,000 lb.); Hamilton Bridge Works, \$51,975; J. Coughlan & Sons, \$54,450; Canadian Bridge Co., \$56,925; Canadian Northwest Steel Co., \$58,035.67; Dominion Bridge Co., \$58,868.
- "Erection only: Hodgson, King & Marble, \$25,880; Grant, Smith & Co. & McDonnell, Ltd., \$25,880; Dominion Bridge Co., \$28,772; Canadian Bridge Co., \$34,256; Dredging Contracting Co., \$38,898.
- "7. Answered by No. 6.
- "8. Six piers and one abutment.
- "9. Piers uncompleted.
- "10. One sub-foreman died as result of injuries received; two men drowned (employed by contractors).
- "11. Yes."

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

1. Has a request been received for assistance towards starting a creamery in the Peace River District, and from whom?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to afford the necessary assistance to establish the proposed creamery?

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

"1. From H. G. Perry, M.P.P., and Louis P. Codona, the latter as Secretary of the Peace River District Local of the United Farmers of British Columbia.

"2. Yes."

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

1. On what date were tenders called for the Industrial School at Essondale?

2. Who tendered, what was the amount of each tender, and what firm received the contract?

3. Was the work done by contract or on a cost-plus basis? If the latter, what amount of money was paid the contractor for his work?

4. What was the total cost of the building?

5. What was the total cost of the furnishings?

6. Were contracts let for the building of barns in connection with this institution?

7. If yes, who received the contract, and what was the total cost of the barns?

8. How many cottages have been erected in connection with this institution?

9. Was the work done by contract? If so, by whom was the work done?

10. What was the cost of each cottage?

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

"1. February 17th, 1920, and April 6th, 1920.

"2. For Boys' Training School (three cottages): Robertson & Partners, Ltd., \$134,417 (tender accepted); Sloan & Harrison, \$145,000; E. J. Ryan Contracting Co., Ltd., \$158,258. Administration and Dining Block; Robertson & Partners, Ltd., \$79,200 (tender accepted); E. J. Ryan Contracting Co., Ltd., \$85,950.

"3. Answered by No. 2.

"4. \$241,214.98, exclusive of the following done by the institute staff and inmates: Excavation, concrete foundations up to first-floor level, installation of heating and electrical work.

"5. \$33,304.28.

"6. Yes.

"7. McDougall-MacNeill, Ltd., \$18,617.02.

"8. One.

"9. Yes, to include two gates to grounds; F. P. Rogers.

"10. \$3,875, including gates to grounds."

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

1. Has the Government undertaken to build a highway from Golden east towards Leachcoil through Kicking Horse Pass?

2. What is the mileage to be constructed?

3. What is the estimated cost of building this highway?

4. Were tenders called for, or how is the work being carried on?

5. Who was the successful tenderer and the amount of said tender?

6. Is this a settlers' road?

7. How many settlers will be served by said road?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. 2.28 miles.

"3. \$66,744.20.

"4. Yes; work being done by contract.

"5. W. P. Tierney & Co., \$55,998.30.

"6. Main trunk and settlement road.

"7. Main trunk road; answered by No. 6."

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

1. Is one C. L. Dimock still in the employ of the Public Works Office at Smithers?
2. How many hours is he supposed to work each day?
3. Is he a returned soldier?
4. Is said Dimock still holding a homestead about 4 miles from Smithers?
5. If yes, is he now living on said pre-emption?
6. Who was the previous pre-emptor? Was the holder married, with children? If yes, how many?
7. What were the circumstances of the cancellation of any previous pre-emption records?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.
- "3. No information.
- "4. Yes.
- "5. Last inspection report showed him to be in occupation. This pre-emption record was issued under section 28A of the 'Land Act,' which does not require occupation.
- "6. Thaddeus Adam Creamer. Reported pre-emptor died in 1911, leaving a widow and three children. Record cancelled April 1st, 1919, after continued failure of heirs to prove up and complete application for Crown grant under section 31 of the 'Land Act.'
- "7. Two earlier records over this land, one abandoned and the other cancelled for non-occupation."

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

1. What was the total sum collected as fees by the Grazing Commissioner's Office during last financial year?
2. What are the total arrears to date?
3. What were the total expenses, salaries, and otherwise for last financial year?
4. What amount of money was expended by the officials in improving the grazing areas of the Province?

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

- "1. Year 1922, \$8,846.98.
- "2. From July 1st, 1919, to October 31st, 1923, \$13,710.54, of which \$5,504.84 is for the year 1923, the balance being made up largely of 1922 fees.
- "3. \$9,733.51.
- "4. During year 1922, \$1,582.04; total since 1919, \$11,717.41."

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

1. Has the Attorney-General received a copy of a resolution passed by the shareholders of the Gregory Tire & Rubber Company, Limited, of Vancouver, asking the Attorney-General to prosecute one Morton Gregory?
2. Does the Attorney-General intend to launch a prosecution as suggested?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. The matter was under consideration before receipt of the resolution departmentally and with the City Prosecutor of the City of Vancouver. The immediate conduct of the matter is in the hands of counsel."

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

1. Has the old Drill Hall on Menzies Street, Victoria, been renovated for police accommodation?
2. If yes, what was the cost thereof?
3. Was the work done by day-labour or contract?
4. If by contract, what was the name of the contractor?
5. Were tenders called therefor?

The Hon. Dr. *Sutherland* replied for the Hon. Mr. *Manson* as follows:—

“ 1. Yes.

“ 2. \$15,175.39.

“ 3. Day-labour.

“ 4 and 5. Answered by No. 3.”

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, 22nd November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, Bill (No. 33) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Municipalities Incorporation Act’” was introduced, read a first time, and *Ordered* to be read a second time at the next sitting.

The Hon. Mr. *Oliver* 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 ‘Constitution Act,’” and recommends the same to the Legislative Assembly.

Government House,

November 22nd, 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. 32) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Constitution Act,’” a draft of which is annexed to this Resolution.

Resolution and Bill reported.

Bill introduced and read a first time.

Second reading at the next sitting.

The Hon. Mr. *Oliver* presented particulars of registration of voters of Mainland and Vancouver Island constituencies.

To lie on the table.

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.”

Mr. *Hanes* moved in amendment to the amendment, seconded by Mr. *Neelands*,—

That all the words after the word “therefor,” 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.”

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

Mr. *Esling* moved, seconded by Mr. *A. McDonald*,—

That an Order of this House be granted for a Return by the Directors of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway Company of the instructions given to Price, Waterhouse & Company in connection with the audit of the Pacific Great Eastern and Northern Construction Company.

With leave of the House, the motion was withdrawn.

The Hon. Dr. *MacLean* agreed to furnish the information desired.

Bill (No. 18) intituled “An Act respecting the Hours of Labour of Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments” was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 19) intituled “An Act respecting the Two-platoon System for Employees of certain Municipal Fire Departments” was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 14) intituled “An Act for the Protection of Women and Girls in certain Cases” was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the second reading of Bill (No. 6) intituled “An Act to amend the ‘Provincial Elections Act.’”

Question proposed—“That the Bill be read a second time now.”

The Hon. Mr. *Oliver* moved in amendment, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Manson*,—

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

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

Resolved in the negative on the following division:—

YEAS—16.

Messieurs

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

NAYS—23.

Messieurs

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

Question proposed—" Shall the words proposed to be substituted stand part of the question?"

Resolved in the affirmative on the following division:—

YEAS—23.

Messieurs

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

NAYS—16.

Messieurs

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

The motion as amended was *Resolved* in the affirmative on the same division.

Bill (No. 24) intituled "An Act respecting Crown Timber and the Conservation and Preservation of Forests" was again committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 26) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Registry Act'" was committed.

Progress reported.

Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 31) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Life Insurance Contracts" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

The Report on Bill (No. 51) intituled "An Act to validate and amend By-law No. 403 of the City of Prince Rupert" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines 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. *Sloan* replied as follows:—

"\$173.39."

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

1. How many delegates from Great Britain attended the British Empire Forestry Conference in this Province last summer?
2. How many delegates from countries other than Great Britain attended the Conference?
3. How many delegates from Eastern Canada accompanied the delegates to British Columbia?
4. Did any officials of the Forestry Department of British Columbia go to Ottawa to accompany the delegates to British Columbia?
5. If so, how many, and what are the names of such officials?
6. What was the total cost to the Province of British Columbia as a result of this Conference?
7. How were the various expense items made up?
8. What practical results have been obtained as a result of the Conference?

The Hon. Mr. Pattullo replied as follows:—

- "1. Nine.
- "2. Eleven, distributed as follows: Australia, 1; India, 2; Irish Free State, 1; New Zealand, 1; South Africa, 1; Nigeria, 1; Kenya, 1; Ceylon, 1; Straits Settlements, 1; British Guiana, 1.
- "3. Sixteen.
- "4. Yes.
- "5. Two; G. R. Naden, Deputy Minister of Lands, and P. Z. Caverhill, Chief Forester.
- "6. \$7,436.02.
- "7. Lump sum granted along with other Provinces and Dominion towards expenses of Conference, \$5,000; other expenses, \$2,436.02.
- "8. First, greater impetus to general trade in lumber products by bringing British Columbia timber wealth prominently before representatives from all parts of the British Empire; second, focused public attention on the need for forest-conservation, which will materially aid in the problem of forest-protection; third, gave staff opportunity of consulting with and receiving advice from the best forestry talent in the British Empire; fourth, brought out the relation of Canada and British Columbia to the rest of the world as a source of soft-wood supply."

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

1. Was the work on the regrades or diversions of the Pacific Great Eastern Railway north and south of Quesnel done by contract?
2. What was the total cost of the regrade or diversion south of Quesnel?
3. What was the total cost of the regrade or diversion north of Quesnel?

The Hon. Dr. MacLean replied as follows:—

- "1. Yes.
- "2 and 3. See Mr. Sullivan's report *re* these diversions. Report has already been presented to the House."

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

1. How many agricultural fairs were held in the Province in 1923?
2. How many judges were employed?
3. Who selected these judges?
4. Are special qualifications required in judges?
5. Did all judges employed by the Government possess these qualifications?
6. What total amounts were paid as: (a) Remuneration; (b) travelling expenses; (c) all other expenses?

The Hon. Mr. Barrow replied as follows:—

- "1. Seventy-five, of which seventy-three were fall fairs and two stock-shows.
- "2. Approximately eighty-six, of whom twenty-seven were officials of the Department of Agriculture, forty-six non-officials, and thirteen supplied by the Dominion Government.
- "3. The Deputy Minister and Secretary of the Department of Agriculture after consultation with heads of branches.
- "4. Yes.
- "5. Yes.
- "6. (a) \$2,637; (b) \$2,831.74; (c) none."

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

1. Has any money been spent in the Municipality of Smithers on ditching and street-grading?
2. If yes, what amount, and of what does the work consist?
3. Does any part of the ditches enter private property?
4. If yes, who are the owners?
5. If any Government moneys were spent on any ditches, for what purpose was said ditch constructed?

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

- "1. Yes, in the village of Smithers.
- "2. \$5,897.88; clearing, grubbing, and digging ditches.
- "3. Ditch traverses through the main street of Smithers.
- "4. Answered by No. 3.
- "5. To provide adequate drainage for main and adjacent lateral roads."

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

1. Has the Department a garage or garages at Smithers?
2. If so, where are they located?
3. Were Government funds spent on gravelling or building approaches thereto?
4. If yes, how much?
5. Are any of the garages built on private property? If yes, how many, and who are the owners?
6. Have any Government funds been spent on building a sidewalk to the residence of the Assistant Engineer at Smithers?

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

- "1. No.
- "2, 3, 4, and 5. Answered by No. 1.
- "6. No record of such expenditure."

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

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

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

"\$635.52."

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

1. Did the Government during the year 1922 build a road leading to the railway station at Jura?
2. If so, what was the cost of said road?
3. Was it necessary at a later date to construct an additional piece of road to connect with the railway crossing at Jura Station?
4. If so, from whom was such additional road allowance purchased, and what did it cost?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. \$250.50.
- "3. No.
- "4. Answered by No. 3."

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

1. What Government property (if any) is insured against fire in either of the companies known as the Fireman's Fund Company and the British General Insurance Company?
2. What is the amount of such insurance?

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

- "1. None in the Department of Finance.
- "2. Answered by No. 1."

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

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

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

“Furnishings and equipment, School Inspector's office, \$272.90.”

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

1. Did any sub-contractors share in the 30-per-cent. increase granted to the Northern Construction Company in 1920?

2. If so, who were they, and what per cent. of the increase went to the Construction Company and what per cent. to the sub-contractors?

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

“1 and 2. The effect of the 30-per-cent. unit-price increase is given in Sullivan's report, page R 18. This report has been presented to the House.”

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

1. Is one Edward Coteay, of Vasseau Lake, in the employ of the Provincial Government?

2. If so, in what capacity, and what salary does he receive?

3. If so, on what date did he receive the appointment?

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

“1. Not in the employ of the Attorney-General's Department.

“2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.”

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

1. Has any sum for payment of interest or loss on operation in connection with the Pacific Great Eastern ever been paid, except by reborrowing? If so, particulars of payment.

2. Of the \$14,251,104 representing interest and loss of operations as shown in the 1923 financial statement of the Pacific Great Eastern, how much was paid out of the annual revenue of the Province, and what was borrowed by the Province and still remains a debt of the Province?

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

“1. Question indefinite.

“2. \$14,251,104 is not the amount shown in 1923 financial statement as representing interest and loan of operation.”

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Railways 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. Dr. *MacLean* replied as follows:—

“\$5,925.27 for material in connection with improvements on Songhees Reserve.”

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

On what new buildings, bridges, and repairs to buildings did the Government purchase materials of various kinds during each of the years 1922 and 1923?

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

“On all bridges and buildings in the Province not built by contract, the exception being the completion of the University Science Building.”

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture 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. *Barrow* replied as follows:—

“Amount paid Walter S. Fraser & Co., \$1,018.64.”

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

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

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

“\$28,030.80.”

Mr. *Schofield* asked the Hon. the Minister of Lands 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. *Pattullo* replied as follows:—

“\$316.25.”

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

1. What was the gross debt of the Province on November 1st, 1916?
2. What was the net debt of the Province on November 1st, 1916, after deducting sinking funds only on hand at that date?
3. What was the gross debt of the Province on November 1st, 1923?
4. What was the net debt of the Province on November 1st, 1923, after deducting sinking funds only on hand at that date?
5. What amount is now owing to the Canadian Bank of Commerce for money borrowed on Treasury bills, giving particulars of same?
6. When do these bills fall due?
7. Has any money been borrowed by the present Government from any other bank or from any other source on Treasury bills?
8. What amounts are still available for borrowing purposes under the various Loan Acts and other Acts passed by the Legislature, giving particulars?

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

“1 and 2. Gross debt at November 30th, 1916	\$23,153,146 00
<i>Less</i> Sinking Funds only	3,030,611 01
	\$20,122,534 99
Also <i>less</i> Dyking Debentures	445,000 00
	\$19,677,534 99
“3 and 4. Funded debt	\$66,851,436 00
Treasury Bills	4,365,000 00
B.C. House mortgage	215,825 00
	71,432,261 00
Gross debt at November 1st, 1923	71,432,261 00
<i>Less</i> Sinking Funds only	12,139,543 92
	\$59,292,717 08
Also <i>less</i> P.G.E. Stock, collateral	\$ 5,925,125 00
Also <i>less</i> revenue-producing debt	14,592,325 00
	20,517,450 00
Additional deductions from gross debt	20,517,450 00
	\$38,775,267 08
Net debt at November 1st, 1923	\$38,775,267 08
(<i>See also</i> page 219, Journals, 1922.)	

“5. Public Buildings, \$275,000; P.G.E. Railway Co., \$418,000; Land Settlement Board, \$730,000; ‘Soldiers’ Land Act,’ \$535,000; Conservation Fund, \$990,000; Department of Industries, \$25,000; British Columbia University, \$200,000; ‘British Columbia Highway Act,’ \$750,000; British Columbia Electric, Rule of Road, \$142,000; Forest Protection, \$300,000; total, \$4,365,000. Of this total, \$1,000,000 represents the refunding of debentures issued under the ‘Loan Act, 1920.’

"6. January 2nd, 1924.

"7. No.

"8. 'British Columbia University Loan Act, 1920,' \$2,500,000; 'British Columbia Highway Act, 1920,' \$650,000; 'Pacific Great Eastern Construction Loan Act, 1921,' \$670,900; Department of Industries Loan Acts, 1919 and 1920, \$1,975,000 (an Act is now before the Legislature to cancel \$1,000,000 of this amount); 'Loan Act, 1921,' \$12,790 for 'Soldiers' Land Act,' \$145,000 for Conservation Fund, and \$93,000 for British Columbia Electric, Rule of Road; 'Loan Act, 1921 (Second Session),' \$2,000,000 for Soldiers' Settlement; 'Loan Act, 1922,' \$1,275,000 for Public Buildings, \$65,000 for Land Settlement Board, \$110,000 for 'Soldiers' Land Act,' and \$50,000 for Conservation Fund; total, \$9,546,690."

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

1. Was the hoisting engineer on duty at the Protection Mine, Nanaimo, on the afternoon shift on October 8th, 9th, and 10th, 1923?
2. If not, was it a contravention of Rule 24 of the General Rules of the "Coal-mines Regulation Act"?
3. If yes, has any prosecution been instituted?
4. If not, why not?

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

"1. Yes.

"2, 3, and 4. Answered by reply to No. 1."

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

1. Is it a fact that Constable Mortimer in point of service is junior to all other constables in the Cranbrook District?
2. If so, does his preferment indicate a want of initiative in the rest of the force in that district?
3. If not, what is the reason of his promotion?

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

"1. No.

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

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 5.38 p.m.

Friday, 23rd November, 1923.

HALF-PAST TWO O'CLOCK P.M.

Prayers by Mr. Speaker.

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

REPORT No. 5.

LEGISLATIVE COMMITTEE ROOM,
November 23rd, 1923.

MR. SPEAKER:

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

That the time limit be extended for receiving the reports from the Private Bills Committee until December 3rd, 1923.

All of which is respectfully submitted.

M. B. JACKSON, *Chairman*.

The report was received.

The Rules were suspended and the report adopted.

Mr. *Uphill* moved to introduce a Bill intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal-mines Regulation Act.'"

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

Mr. Speaker reserved his decision.

The House resumed the adjourned debate on the motion moved by Mr. *Duncan* on the 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 "therefor," 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."

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

On the motion of the Hon. Mr. *Oliver*, seconded by the Hon. Mr. *Manson*, 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.

The motion above referred to is as follows:—

That Rule 72 be suspended to the extent necessary to permit the receiving of a petition praying for the incorporation of the "Greater Vancouver Water District," and to permit of the receiving of a Bill for the above purpose, 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 the said Bill, to the same extent as if all the Rules of the House in respect to such Bill had been fully complied with.

Bill (No. 9) intituled "An Act respecting Rural Telephone Systems" was read a third time and passed.

The Report on Bill (No. 25) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Revenue Act'" was adopted. Bill read a third time and passed.

The Report on Bill (No. 27) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Department of Industries Act'" was adopted.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Bill (No. 26) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Land Registry Act'" was again committed. Progress reported. Committee to sit again at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 4) intituled "An Act to amend the 'British Columbia University Loan Act'" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 31) intituled "An Act to make Uniform the Law respecting Life Insurance Contracts" was committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

Bill (No. 23) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Coal and Petroleum Act'" was read a second time, and *Ordered* to be committed at the next sitting.

On the second reading of Bill (No. 32) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Constitution Act'" a debate arose, which was, on the motion of Mr. *Bowser*, adjourned to the next sitting.

Bill (No. 33) intituled "An Act to amend the 'Municipalities Incorporation Act'" was read a second time and committed.

Reported complete without amendment.

Report to be considered at the next sitting.

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

1. What was the date when liquor profits were last distributed to the municipalities?
2. What amount was paid?
3. What was the date when the pari-mutuel funds were last distributed to the municipalities?
4. What amount was paid?
5. What was the date when the proportion of motor-vehicle moneys was distributed to the municipalities?
6. How much was paid?
7. When will the next payments from these three funds be made, and the amounts from each?
8. What has been the cause of delay in distributing these moneys to the municipalities?

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

"1. June 15th, 1923.

"2. \$415,689.88.

"3. December 11th, 1922.

"4. \$191,648.26.

"5. August 26th, 1922.

"6. \$201,640.88.

"7. As to pari-mutuel and motor-licence moneys, within ten days; total amount for distribution of liquor profits not yet determined. Pari-mutuel tax, approximately \$225,000; motor-licence fees, \$293,666.91.

"8. Investigating claims of certain municipalities as to the populations upon which their shares should be based."

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

1. What was the cost of cement per sack f.o.b. Penticton used in connection with the Southern Okanagan Irrigation Scheme during the year 1922?

2. What was the cost of cement per sack f.o.b. Oliver used in connection with the Southern Okanagan Irrigation Scheme during the year 1923?

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

"1. \$1.01¼ f.o.b. Penticton.

"2. \$1.03¾ f.o.b. Oliver."

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

1. During what years was seed-grain distributed in British Columbia by the Department of Agriculture?

2. What kinds and amounts were distributed in each year, and the value of such, respectively?

3. Was it an obligation of the persons receiving seed-grain to repay for such in the same year of distribution; and, if so, what amounts were repaid to the Department in such years respectively?

4. What security, if any, is held by the Department for the money owing for seed-grain distributed; and what efforts are being made to enforce collection?

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

"1. Years 1915, 1917, and 1918.

"2. Year 1915: 10 car-loads wheat and oats, also 82,385 lb. potatoes; value, \$23,613.61. Year 1917: Wheat, oats, and barley; value, \$8,519.18. Year 1918: Wheat, 4,881 bushels; oats, 10,570 bushels; barley, 200 lb.; peas, 600 lb.; value, \$27,125.73.

"3. Yes. Year 1915, \$7,786.15; year 1917, \$2,974.27; year 1918, \$8,423.42.

"4. Years 1915 and 1917, promissory notes; year 1918, lien notes chargeable against the land. Frequent applications by this Department and through the Government Agents."

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

1. Was R. W. Haggen, B.C.L.S., employed in the survey of Provincial lands in Cariboo District during the years 1921, 1922, and 1923?

2. Did any returned soldiers, qualified British Columbia land surveyors, or practising and residing in Cariboo District, apply for employment in the survey of Provincial lands in each of the years 1921, 1922, and 1923?

3. If so, what were their names?

4. Were they so employed?

5. If not, why not?

6. Is R. W. Haggen a returned soldier?

7. Was R. W. Haggen employed in the field in the survey of Provincial lands in each of the years 1914 to 1919, inclusive?

8. Was said Haggen also employed as Judge of the Court of Revision for the Barkerville Assessment District?

9. If so, how long has he held this position?

10. Is the said Haggen also President of the Quesnel Liberal Association?

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

"1. Yes.

"2. Yes.

"3. E. J. Gook and G. B. Bagshaw.

"4. No.

"5. Appointments of surveyors are made to do survey-work as required. The surveyor with the best experience and local knowledge is selected for obvious reasons. Seventy-five per cent. of survey-work has been in charge of returned soldier surveyors.

"6. No.

"7. Yes.

"8. No information.

"9. No information.

"10. No information."

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

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

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

“No new purchases made.”

Mr. *W. A. McKenzie* asked the Hon. the Attorney-General the following questions:—

1. Does the Liquor Board ship liquor from Victoria to Fernie, Cranbrook, and other Kootenay points?

2. If yes, why is this practice carried out?

3. What extra cost per car-load is earned by shipping car-load lots from Victoria as against shipments from Vancouver?

4. Is the Board in the habit of shipping liquor from Vancouver to Victoria?

5. If yes, is it the practice to reship any of the aforesaid liquor to Fernie, Cranbrook, or other Kootenay points?

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

“1. Yes.

“2. Because Victoria is the distributing centre for these stores and freight rates are the same from Victoria as from Vancouver. The locality of the store, convenience in shipping and freight rates, determine the stores to be supplied from each warehouse. The division of such stores is made as nearly equal as possible consistent with the above.

“3. No additional cost is involved.

“4. No.

“5. Answered by No. 4.”

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

1. How many motor-licence number-plates were purchased by the Government for 1922 and 1923 respectively?

2. Were tenders called for? If so, who tendered, and what were the amounts of said tenders?

3. Which tender was accepted?

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

“1. 1922: 34,500 pairs motor number-plate markers (patented device). 1923: 41,300 pairs motor number-plates; 2,600 single motor number-plates.

“2. 1922 plates cost \$8,500. No tenders called for as J. R. Tacey & Son, Vancouver, controlled the patents.

“1923. Tenders called for and the following tenders were received: The Thomas Metal Sign Co. of Ontario, \$7,421; The B.C. Iron Works, Victoria, \$10,444; J. R. Tacey & Son, Vancouver, \$10,500; F. Mellor, Esq., Victoria, \$11,190; E. L. Woodruff, Esq., Victoria, 22 gauge \$19,046, 24 gauge \$18,446; The Western Engineering Co., Vancouver, \$22,250; The Hiker Manufacturing Co., Victoria, 24 U.S. \$26,110, 22 English \$26,110; T. A. Hill, Esq., Vancouver, \$26,995; The Western Toy Co., Vancouver, \$28,302.

“3. Tender awarded to J. R. Tacey & Son, Vancouver, B.C.”

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

1. Did the Pacific Great Eastern Railway lend the Dominion Government any rails?

2. If so, how many tons, and when?

3. Have these rails been returned or payment made for same by the Federal Government?

4. If so, when and where were they delivered; or, if payment was made, what was the amount and when was it paid?

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

“1. Yes.

“2. 10,022.10 tons in 1918.

“3. Returned.

“4. 1920; 4,902.30 tons to Prince George, 5,119.80 tons to Squamish.”

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

1. What employees of the Department of Finance have received increases of salary since March 31st, 1923?
2. Give the salary now received by each of the above, the amount of increase, and the date of the previous increase?

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

“These questions will be answered in a Return to be brought down by the Hon. the Provincial Secretary.”

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

1. Did Civil Service Commissioner MacInnes make a trip to Atlin this year?
2. If so, on what duties?
3. How many persons were employed in the offices in Atlin inspected by said MacInnes?
4. What was the total cost of this trip allowed by the Department?
5. What was the amount of the voucher submitted by said MacInnes?
6. Was any deduction made in said bill?
7. If so, how much, and the reasons for making said deductions?
8. Did an Auditor of the Comptroller-General's Department duplicate this trip to Atlin shortly afterwards?
9. If so, what was the justification for both officials taking this trip?
10. What was the expense of the Auditor's trip to Atlin?

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

- “1. Yes.
- “2. Inspection.
- “3. Four.

“4. Trip to Atlin was made in connection with a trip of inspection of the offices at Atlin, Prince Rupert, Smithers, Fort Fraser, Fort George, Quesnel, Barkerville, Williams Lake, Clinton, Ashcroft, Lillooet, and Vancouver. Total cost of whole trip, \$344.15.

“5. \$370.15.

“6 and 7. Voucher submitted included item for all days absent from Victoria at \$6.50 per diem allowance pursuant to Order in Council No. 1256, 1922. Audit Office expressed opinion that per diem allowance should not be paid for the four days on steamer. Commissioner altered voucher accordingly to \$344.15. Voucher as amended paid without any deduction.

“8, 9, and 10. No information in this Department regarding movements of officials of Comptroller-General's Department. Duties of Civil Service Commissioner quite distinct from those of the Comptroller-General and his staff.”

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

1. How many white children were born in the Province in the years 1900, 1910, and 1922 respectively?
2. How many Chinese and Japanese children were born in the Province in the same years?
3. How many Chinese, Japanese, and Hindus entered the Province during the years 1900, 1910, and 1922 respectively?

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

“1. It is impossible to give accurate information on this point, as (a) all births of children born in the Province are not registered, and (b) registrations of births are frequently delayed until years after birth actually occurred; e.g., births that occurred in the years 1881 to 1886 appear in registrations of 1922. The number of registrations, irrespective of the date of birth, was as follows: 1900, 1,774; 1910, 5,005; 1922, 10,834. The following information can be given *re* birth registrations in the year 1922: Total registrations in 1922, 10,834; born and registered in 1922, 8,959; born in 1921, but registered in 1922, 1,236; born in 1920, registered in 1922, 107; born prior to 1920, 532.

“2. The following particulars can be given. Registrations assigned to year of birth. Chinese: 1900, 61; 1910, 106; 1922, 173. Japanese: 1900, 2; 1910, 38; 1922, 553. The number of registrations for 1922 was as follows: Chinese, 264; Japanese, 745.

“3. Information not available here.”

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

1. Has the Government Architect examined the Lloyd George School at Kamloops?
2. Has he recommended the repair of said school?
3. If so, what will said repairs cost?
4. Will the Government contribute anything to said repairs?
5. If so, what responsibility has the Government for contributing?

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

- "1. Yes.
- "2. Yes.
- "3. No report or costs given by Architect to Board.
- "4 and 5. Not under jurisdiction of this Department."

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

1. What is the assessed value respectively of real property, personal property, wild land, and school lands in the Vernon Agency for 1923?
2. What are the sums levied for taxes on each for 1923?
3. What sums of money have been collected to date for motor licences, gun licences, probate duties, or any other tax in the Vernon Agency for 1923?
4. What is the total sum of money received as revenue from the Vernon Agency for 1923?

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

- "1. Real property, \$11,372,712; personal property, \$1,167,103; wild land, \$46,680; school lands, \$8,587,377.
- "2. Real property, \$113,745.17; personal property, \$11,671.03; wild land, \$2,334; school taxes, \$51,521.52.
- "3. Real property, \$73,373.53; wild land, \$1,016; income, \$12,824.05; personal property, \$17,171.57; acreage tax, \$266.75; school tax, \$36,346.70; interest, \$4,469.68; tax-sale deeds, \$130; tax-sale advertising, \$79.25; poll-tax, \$605; amusements-tax, \$5,530.70; real-estate licences, \$287; miscellaneous receipts, \$240.38.
- "4. \$152,340.61."

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

1. What moneys have been paid C. E. Whitney-Griffiths in the way of salary and expenses since October 1st, 1922, to date, with details?
2. What position does he hold?

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

- "1. No salary. Time allowance, \$787.50; travelling expenses, \$1,044.63.
- "2. Secretary and member of Advisory Board of Farmers' Institutes."

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

What was the total cost to the Attorney-General's Department of furnishing the new Prince Rupert Court-house?

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

"\$2,059.95, including alterations, repairs, and reconditioning old furnishings."

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 5.40 p.m.