

A P R

1892

APRIL 1, 1892.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Endless Eloquence on the Crofters' Bill From Both Sides of the House.

Information Demanded by the Opposition—Governmental Equivocation.

In the House yesterday, after the brief discussion on the McLeod inquiry, Mr. Kitchen presented a petition re inquiry into the claims of John Cross to certain lands in New Westminster, substantiating Cross's claim, was read, received and directed to be printed.

Mr. Horna presented a petition for the B. C. Fishing and Trading Company. Read, received and directed to be printed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. Semlin asked the provincial secretary if all the correspondence and information regarding the Deep Sea Fisheries and Crofters' Bills had been laid before the House. The House was quite in the dark in the matter; they wished to know a little more about these bills than had been given. It was necessary that this House should know the terms of agreement between the fishermen and the company; the terms upon which they held the lands from the company and many other vitally important questions relative to this subject.

Hon. Mr. Davie replying said all the information the House was going to get it had got the other day when the bill was thoroughly discussed. The details demanded could not be given now. The attorney-general then reiterated his former arguments about the bills.

Mr. Milne asking the same information received the same reply.

House went into committee on the Oaths Bill, Mr. Nason in the chair.

The committee on the Oaths Bill rose and reported progress.

THE STENOGRAPHERS' BILL.

Hon. T. Davie moved the second reading of the amendment to the Stenographers' Bill, to make provision for the creation of stenographers in the province for the law courts. An Act was passed some years ago for the purpose of providing that the evidence given in the provincial courts of justice should be reported stenographically. In times past the effect of the appointments was highly satisfactory and had fully accomplished the objects of the measure. The business of the courts was increasing rapidly and cases multiplying; the bill as it stood permitted only one stenographer at Victoria. But there were other points of the province where there was a large volume of legal business, New Westminster for instance. It was not expected at first that shorthand reporting of evidence would be self-supporting, but it had proved itself so owing to the fees paid by the litigants, which equalled the salaries and expenses. But it was now necessary to have a staff of stenographers as the work was becoming so much heavier. One day's shorthand writing required four or five days to transcribe. The idea was to allow the stenographer such a remuneration that he would be able to engage assistants, as the Government could not be expected to support a staff of stenographers in each court. It requires four or five reporters. If a transcription is called for it can be made, but the notes will not be transcribed unless called for. In long trials a daily transcript would have to be made and would require the best efforts of the whole staff. This bill was to meet the growing needs of the country and to secure for the increasing business of the courts a useful service.

Mr. Semlin asked what was the use of taking these notes if they were not to be transcribed.

Hon. Mr. Davie replied that if there was no appeal it was not necessary. The second reading passed and the House went into committee on the bill, Mr. Nason in the chair. Committee rose and reported the bill complete without amendments. Report adopted, the bill read a third time and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. Kitchen rose to a question of privilege, saying he had been wrongly reported regarding the Sumas Reclamation Bill by the Daily News, and set himself right.

THE CROFTERS' BILLS.

Mr. Semlin claimed the floor when the call for the second reading of these bills came up, as he had held it on the adjournment of the debate. He said: In addressing you at this time and upon this subject, I think that I am speaking upon the most important matter, sir, ever discussed in this House. The development of our deep sea fisheries is a question which is worthy the most dispassionate discussion. The planting of a race of fishermen along our north-west coast and the islands adjacent is a question involving so many and collateral matters that it should not be passed upon hurriedly. We are all deeply anxious to see our coasts and islands peopled by a hardy, loyal and happy maritime people. We want to have no mistake in this. A false step at first may be fatal to the success of the whole question. We all alike wish to see British power and privilege increased on the Pacific ocean and the Dominion of Canada showing as bold and prosperous a front on the Pacific as she does on the Atlantic. We, on this side of the House, are fully alive to and quite appreciate the situation as a whole. I repeat we want a prosperous, loyal and enterprising maritime population. In this particular we join hands with those who have

spoken in favor of these bills. But here we part company. The supporters of this scheme take all for granted. They in substance say borrow money from the Imperial Government, or give this syndicate these lands, trust our government to attend to all matters of detail. We do not care to know about these bargains with the empire and the province or between the province and the syndicate. Now, we on this side of the House, are not prepared to go it blind. We want to be sure as to the responsibilities we are assuming for the province. While we want to see a contented British people on British land and sea, we want to be assured that we do not get just the reverse of this. We want no thriftless, discontented, mutinous and idle people. If this House intends to pass these bills we ask this House to insist upon the fullest information. Now, what information do the government give us? On this side of the House we urged the government to take us into its confidence when we went into committee upon these resolutions, but they there declined. They said, we will submit the bills in the regular course and the members can learn themselves and be ready to discuss them on the second reading. Now, sir, what do those bills teach us? Bill 6 says in clause 1: "It shall be lawful for the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to make such arrangements as may be deemed advisable to bring 1250 families from the United Kingdom. Now turn to the fourth paragraph of bill 63 and you find it stated that it is desirable that the Government should be authorized to make and conclude arrangements with the intended company when formed and be further authorized to make a grant of public land in aid of each settlement. You will see, sir, that we are asked to legislate away our power to the Government. The people sent us here to protect their interests, not to entrust those interests to the Governor in Council, and it is making a far off legislation to shirk our duties upon the Governor and Council. They tell us that Great Britain will loan us \$750,000 at 3 per cent, for what? To aid Great Britain to get rid of some troublesome semi-paupers from the congested districts of the Old Country. If Britain wants to help her poor to emigrate let Britain do so, she is amply able, and if she thinks it is her interest to move her poor from one part of the Empire and the people are willing to be moved, let her do so. Let the responsibility of placing them be hers. The land is here, the islands are here, the sea is here, and I believe the fish are in the sea. But are we to get the fishing population? We see now that instead of crofters they are now called Colonists, which may mean that this company found that just this number of families and no more should come. I hope that this commercial company do not take up all the other available spots, so that more fishermen would be trespassing upon its ground. I doubt the policy of assisted immigration. The leader of the Government says we will get the pick of the class; this I very much doubt. That portion of the class is less likely to move or be moved than the poorest and most suffering. The kind of people to settle new countries and develop new industries are the pushing and enterprising. History teaches us the kind of people that settled the United States and Eastern Canada; we ourselves know the kind that settled this Province. This scheme will not bring such classes, or if it should they will not stay the bondsmen of a commercial monopoly. And now a word about this commercial company with this enormous capital of \$5,000,000; what risks does it take? Its agents have been here and looked over the land and sea, and say there is a profitable market anywhere in North America. If they are correct, if they have the capital and the market why not enter into the enterprise? Business men satisfied with an abundant capital to invest in a sure product with an unfailing market it seems to me would not wait for the slow action of governments, but would at once proceed to put their capital in motion and realize the profits which they seem so sure of. This capital, you will observe, although called \$5,000,000, may not be any such amount. By reading the sixth paragraph on page one of the commissioners' letter to the Leader of the Government you will see that one-fifth of the sum may not be called up.

Once the colonists are here and go to work what guarantee have they that they are going to succeed? They will have to sell to this company at what rate? I presume a living rate is expected, for the Government says it is to collect \$50 a year from these people to repay the Province the \$750,000 advanced, which will doubtless be swollen by interest to a million and a quarter before we repay the Imperial Government. These people must work for the company, must sell to the company, must buy from the company, and must pay back to the Government the amount of their passage money. A bright prospect, surely, for these people. I don't wish to be prophetic; I am not a prophet, but it surely seems to me that these people will soon tire of this philanthropic company, and hunt new seas and freer condition and leave both company and government, the one to hunt for a new lot of serfs and the other to repay as best it can the Imperial Government.

The leader of the Government says we can trust this company for there is a nobility in it. Well, I don't know

the particular peer, if peer he be, to whom he refers, but I think this House is not justified in trusting too much to this company even if there is a nobleman in it. It seems that the Imperial Government is not carried off its base by the knowledge that there is a nobleman in the company. That Government, the leader of our Government tells us, will see that the colonists are not oppressed, but that Government is 7000 miles away and however solicitous for the welfare of these people whom we have to pay for it can not be in a position to know how well or how badly they are treated—we do not know that fishing on the deep sea is a dangerous occupation that storms will arise and vessels will be lost, that widows and orphans will be the result and which of the contracting parties are responsible for the care of these destitute?

I consider that the whole scheme is one of danger to this Province. In fact the Province is one that must stand the whole brunt. While the Imperial Government is sure of its money, while the company need lose nothing, for its steamboats and moveable property can be turned into other profitable channels the Province will be held to make good the money advanced. While the more enterprising fishermen will seek employment elsewhere we will be left to support by public aid a few scattering villages along the islands and the northwest coast. The Finance Minister did tell us something. He told us that our neighbors to the south of us have developed their deep sea fisheries and that the product was over \$1,000,000 a year, and their whale fisheries \$750,000 a year. I am sure that those people depended for this upon the people who came to them; there was no assisted immigration there of a public sort. That development was of a safe sort, the people of sufficient enterprise to get there, found a profitable business and pursued it. It is such men that make nations. It is such men that make success. I cannot vote for the passage of these bills at the present time, as I think the responsibilities incurred are greater to British Columbia than the uncertain results warrant.

Mr. Baker said this was the first attempt of this Government at assisted immigration. He then went into statistics and figures to show that to assist immigration was a good thing. For the sums which were to be handed to the individual families there would be the personal bond of the fishermen, with the collateral security by the commercial company stepping in to supply boats and tackle. In return they were to receive half a million acres of land, part of which was to go to the colonists. Personally, he knew a good deal about the crofters, he had travelled in their country. He would make it imperative that every young man of these immigrants should be forced to marry a young woman before they left the country. Of course, with an unlimited family £150 was a small sum. The crofters on the western islands of Scotland were poor, ignorant people, living on the most miserable soil and in the most miserable climate imaginable; they were hardy, but they were not a living. Their hard lot had degraded them and they had degenerated into a lazy, worthless set of people. In the east of Scotland on the other hand things were very different. Whether more advantageous climatic conditions, a better soil and other circumstances there lived a race of hardy, honest industrious fishermen who would be a credit to any land. Again in the west of Ireland there was the finest material possible to obtain for this proposed scheme. There was also in England a large surplus population who would be glad to be assisted out here, and he did not think that the people who had shown the rim they had in subjugating one-sixth of the entire surface of the globe would be failures here. He hoped this Government might in future assist the agricultural masses of England as it sought now to do with the fishermen.

Mr. Hunter said he did not wish to make a long speech, but he wished to remove a wrong impression from the mind of Mr. Baker who had just shown his entire ignorance of the people whom the House was then discussing. Mr. Semlin had made somewhat similar remarks also showing ignorance of that people, but his were probably made for political purposes. Mr. Hunter then read a report from the Royal Commission appointed to enquire into the condition of the Crofters in the Hebrides of Scotland, which spoke in highly eulogistic terms of the people of those islands. (At this point an enthusiastic Scotch member burst out with a "hear, hear," for which Mr. Hunter thanked him to the great diversion of the House.) These people, the report stated, were hardy, honorable, moral and intelligent, and provided the finest materials obtainable anywhere for recruits to the British navy. The male population, the report stated, was enough to fully man seven armored ships of war of the first class, their efficiency as seamen was not surpassed by any nation in the world; physically they stood second to none; their intelligence ranked higher than that of any similar class in the world. They possessed no great significance in numbers, but they were undoubtedly a splendid race.

"There," said Mr. Hunter addressing his remarks to Mr. Baker, "what does the Honorable member say to that? Here we have flat contradiction to his statements by the highest authority possible to obtain, an unbiased commissioner of the Crown. And these are the people we want to plant around our shores; why, sir, we could man seven first class men-of-war and the United States dare not show their face up here? (laughter). "What a comfortable thing it would be to have those splendid sailors at hand when all those rumors of war with Russia and

which he explained, the committee would be able to begin work so the proposer of the bill said, a second time.

TO BE CONSIDERED.

With rose to a point of order, information on the Architects' bill. He thought this bill was for the nation of a trade, which was to the regulations. If it were ed as a private bill it would ndless applications for similar

MATTHEW MATRIMONIAL.

Committee on the marriage bill called, producing a long from the Honorable member omox which caused universal. The Speaker said he really have a bachelor in the chair on the bill in the House. (Laughter.)

He went into committee on the Rogers in the chair. Mr. Hunter and Robson did not proper that a notary public discharge all the functions of age ceremony.

He said there was an old nning, "married in haste, re-leisure." If this Act went into would be sure to be abused, remonies and formalities which own around marriage were a ng. He thought Mr. Brown's admit women to vote should en bound with this one. If the got a seat in this House he felt at a lady prime minister who beyond the age of 35 would be have a strong following.

Kitchen said this bill was merely oth the way for young people s of entering the married state. men in country districts often had 150 or 60 miles to declare their ns and obtain a license and this eat hardship.

Mr. Turner said when he was g man it would have been nothing to go 100 miles for purpose (laughter).

Kitchen—Yes, they might do a little courting (roars of n). Mr. Kitchen then moved amendment to the effect that no over 21 years of age should be or a seat in this House unless married.

Chairman ruled the amendment order amid great merriment. Forster said the mover of the ment wanted to cut out some further competition (laughter). bill was finally reported comd read a third time.

House went into committee on articulture bill, Mr. Forster in r. Committee rose and re- the bill complete without ment. Bill read a third time sed.

SLAND VERSUS MAINLAND.

House went into a committee of ole on the University bill, Mr. n, chairman.

McKenzie moved an amendment ortion the members of the Sen-he University in the various dis-of the Province.

Semlin was sorry to see section-reeping into the bill as proposed amendment.

Mr. Robson said this gen-ersity scheme had narrowly d total ruin among the rocks and rs of sectionalism, but he thought dment offered would be a safe-against sectionalism.

Brown charged that the Island en more favored than the Main-land denounced this as a gross of faith, and a shame and an e and he protested against it.

Mr. Robson said Mr. Brown's ents were absolutely incorrect, was no truth in them at all. Mr. was speaking purely upon ason. Mr. Brown's statements unfounded and unreasonable. He worst friend the Mainland had d done the Mainland more harm y other Honorable member in ouse.

Brown charged the Premier with ty in presuming to stand up and uch humbugging nonsense.

Mr. Davie said if this provision had been offered would wreck l the bill would have to be wreck- on sectionalism had been shown fore in this bill, and he hoped would be no opposition to an ment which had the commend- object in view of destroying that alism.

Grant said he would rather see andland have its university and its own than to have a repe- of the doing of last summer. was no reason to believe that fferent course would be followed future. It was very desirable Province; it would be a great in-ent to families thinking of com- to settle. The first question eople asked was, "what are your tional advantages?"

Smith said the Mainland and the were two separate portions of rovince; the water that divided could never be erased; the two never be cemented.

Hunter after six separate at- to speak at last spoke in favor clause recommended by Mr. Mc- e. He then directed his remarks at Mr. Brown and said the only o deal with these Mainlanders was upulsion. They had to be driven; would not be led.

Semlin wanted to know if there two British Columbias. Many of had been striving for years to do with this feeling.

Brown said the Mainland paid

arguments having been before advanced on a similar question. The section carried.

Hon. Mr. Turner also moved the following: "Any person giving information leading to the conviction of any person under this Act, shall be entitled to receive one-half of any pecuniary penalty inflicted under this Act."—Carried.

The report of the bill was adopted.

COQUITLAM ELECTRIC POWER BILL.

House went into committee on the Coquitlam Electric Power Bill, Mr. Croft in the chair. A good deal of discussion took place on the question of monopoly of power companies and the extent to which their works were. Hon. Mr. Beaven thought that this bill conferred extraordinary and dangerous powers upon the company.

Col. Baker could not see the matter in this light at all. Messrs. Hunter and Cotton here had a difference of opinion. Mr. Cotton charged Mr. Hunter with using his professional knowledge to deceive the committee. Mr. Hunter retorted that Mr. Cotton employed the same cunning sophistry he used in the editorials in his paper in attempting to deceive the committee.

Mr. Brown thought it would be hard after he had laid out some fine orchard, to have some company like this come in and erect a horrible dam next it and not to its advantage.

Hon. Mr. Robson said this was exactly similar to a request for powers to run an electric railway, and there were no such differences as the Hon. member from New Westminster attempted to introduce.

The committee rose and reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

Hon. Mr. Davis asked leave to introduce an act relating to the Legislative Assembly; an act to amend the Execution Act; an act to amend the Employer's Liability Act. All read a first time and second reading set for Monday.

Hon. Mr. Davis asked Mr. Brown if he would have any objection to the introduction of an amendment in the Railway Act, "this shall not apply to the New Westminster Southern Railway."

Mr. Brown made an exhaustive reply stating that he was not fully informed in the matter. He knew that the New Westminster Railway Company wanted to register and come under the Act.

Hon. Mr. Davis said Mr. Brown had been made a fool of without knowing it. This company had extended its line without authority, through private lands for which compensation should have been given.

The debate on this subject was postponed.

Mr. Cotton offered a lengthy amendment to the Vancouver City bill, which was taken as read; read a first and second time and adopted. The report of the bill was then adopted, read a third time and passed.

House adjourned at 11:35 until 2 p.m. on Monday.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Principle of Mayors Possessing the Veto Power Rejected by the House.

A Lively Discussion on the Location of Terminal Works for the C. N. Railway.

MONDAY, April 4, 1893.

The Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY NEEDED.

Mr. Kellie moved the following resolution.

Whereas it is most necessary for the due development of the great mineral wealth of the District of West Kootenay that reliable information as to the geological formation of the various portions of the district may be readily obtained by the general public;

Therefore, be it resolved, that a respectful address be presented to His Honor, the Lieutenant-Governor in Council, requesting him to strongly urge upon the Dominion Government the necessity of having a geological survey made of the West Kootenay district during the present year.

Mr. Kellie in moving the resolution called the attention of the House to the fact that it was the custom of the mineral producing states to the South to employ permanent geological surveyors to give authentic reports of the country. It would be well to have some in Kootenay if it were practicable; but he was satisfied that a geological survey of the Kootenay Lake and Big Bend districts in Kootenay by a competent mineralogist would result in great good to the district and Province.

Hon. Mr. Robson said he was satisfied that the Dominion Government would carry out the policy it had in past years in this respect. He had no objection to the resolution, though he did not think it would result in any good.

The resolution carried without dissent.

NO OFFICIAL INFORMATION.

Col. Baker asked the Honorable the Provincial Secretary the following question:—

What are the names of all the candidates nominated during last year by the members of non-vocation to represent them on the senate of the British Columbia University, specially indicating those who were elected and rejected at the same meeting?

Hon. Mr. Robson answered that the Government had received no official information on the matter and referred the Honorable member to newspaper report.

THE MUNICIPAL BILLS.

The House went into committee on the municipal bills, Mr. McKenzie in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Beaven offered to amend section 5, sub-section d, to provide that the mayor or reeve of a municipality should have power to dismiss as well as suspend an officer; also that every case of suspension shall be reported to the council at its next sittings, and if two-thirds of the council decide by resolution to reinstate any officer who has been suspended they may do so; or the council may decide to make such suspension absolute.

The Attorney-General objected to giving any mayor or reeve power to dismiss an officer.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said the Attorney-General forgot that he was the author of a provision in the bill placing summary powers in municipalities in the hands of a government officer, and also making the mayor responsible for the actions of officers. The mayor should have power to dismiss officers if he was to be held responsible for their actions.

Other members opposed the granting to mayors the power of dismissing officers, and Mr. Beaven withdrew from his amendment this provision. After some further discussion the amendment carried.

PROPOSED VETO POWER.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to amend the bill by inserting the following clause:—

"Section . . . Notwithstanding anything to the contrary contained in any law it shall be lawful for the mayor or reeve of a municipality to intervene and return for reconsideration, or to veto, any by-law, resolution, or proceeding of the council:

"(a.) The mayor or reeve may state his objections, or any suggestions or amendments he may desire, to the council, and the clerk shall enter such objections, suggestions, or amendments proposed at large in the minute book:

"(b.) The council shall, as soon thereafter as convenient consider them, and may accept or reject them.

"(c.) If after such reconsideration two-thirds in number of the members of the council shall decide on division to pass such by-law, resolution, or proceeding in the form in which it was first passed by the council, the by-law, resolution, or proceeding shall be as valid and effectual as if it was prior to the intervention of the mayor or reeve, but in all such cases the vote shall be determined by a show of hands of the members of the council, and the names of the members voting for or against the by-law, resolution, or proceeding shall be entered by the clerk in the minute book:

"(d.) If the by-law, resolution, or proceeding does not receive upon such reconsideration the votes of at least two-thirds of the members of the council as aforesaid, or is not amended to meet the objections, or suggestions, or amendments of the mayor or reeve, it shall be deemed to be absolutely vetoed and be of no force or effect whatever,

and shall not be introduced again into the council during the term of office of the council for that year, except with the unanimous consent of the council, including that of the mayor or reeve."

Mr. Beaven said this was a new feature in municipal government, and proposed giving a veto power. He had given the matter of municipal government considerable study, and came to the conclusion the present system needed amendment. He had been asked to offer this amendment, and many of the standard authorities on municipal government favored this change, claiming that the giving of the veto power to mayors would provide a remedy for many of existing evils and abuses in municipal government. He quoted from Harrison, who was generally admitted to be an authority

on municipal matters, who was strongly in favor of placing more power in the executive branch of municipalities, and held that doing this would provide a cure for many of the municipal ills.

Mr. Booth was strongly in favor of the amendment, which he characterized as one of the most useful introduced in the House.

Hon. Mr. Robson said he could not see why municipal governments were different from any other. The amendment seemed to be out of joint with pre-conceived ideas of government, and proposed to allow the mayor to override the opinions of the other members of the council. Governments ruled by minorities, and he could not understand why the Leader of the Opposition offered this change. The veto power was one of which the people were very jealous and should not be conferred without consideration. He thought the Leader of the Opposition was endeavoring to concentrate powers in the hands of the mayors.

Mr. Grant opposed the amendment. He expressed himself in favor of governing by majority.

Hon. Mr. Turner said it was hardly fair to ask the House to accept such a radical change. It might be very good, but he would like to have an expression from the municipalities and would oppose the amendment.

Mr. Hunter supported Mr. Beaven's amendment. The heads of municipalities required more powers than they had at present.

The Attorney-General objected to the amendment, claiming that it proposed to allow the minority to rule in civic affairs. Responsible mayors would not accept office as councillor if such a law were passed. It would make them mere figureheads.

Mr. Kitchen considered the amendment a move in the right direction. The Mayors and Reeves of municipalities represented the whole municipality while the ordinary members only represented wards. He knew of many instances where evil legislation might have been avoided had the head of the municipal executive had the right to veto, and refer matters back for consideration. He would favor giving the Lieut.-Governor power to veto were he elected by a popular vote of the people as mayor were, and he was sure if the Lieut.-Governor was so elected and had the veto power he would veto a great deal of the legislation passed by this House.

Hon. Mr. Beaven again stated that he admitted this was a new departure. His attention had been directed to it as a cure for abuses that had grown up in municipal governments, and it commended itself to his intelligence. He did not think it would be long till this was a general law, and in fact, he believed the board system would be abolished altogether.

Hon. Mr. Pooley claimed that if the amendment were passed it would give mayors and Reeves greater power than it was intended when they were elected. He would not object if it only gave the mayor power to send matters back for reconsideration, but this provided that a larger vote was required to carry on reconsideration.

Mr. Kitchen said he would be satisfied if power was given to mayors to send a resolution or by-law back for reconsideration.

Hon. Mr. Pooley said he would vote in favor of giving mayors power to veto and send back for reconsideration, provided that only a majority should be necessary to carry on reconsideration.

Hon. Mr. Beaven amended the resolution, so that on reconsideration a majority of the whole council should carry, and the amendment carried only the premier, attorney-general, Mr. Grant and Mr. Hall voting against it.

The committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

Hon. Mr. Davis moved the second reading of the Legislative Assembly Bill. He explained that the House had all the powers contained in the act, but to prevent any mistake it would be well to have the powers defined by act of Parliament.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said every minister of justice who reported on the bill would say let it go on the statute book and let the court decide the value. He had brought up a similar bill some time ago, but withdrew it. He would record his vote against the bill, as he did not think the House had power to pass it. He doubted if the English House of Commons had some of the powers which it was proposed to put in the bill. He supposed this bill was brought forward to carry out the idea of the Attorney-General to bring a man before the bar of the House.

The second reading of the bill was passed.

Hon. Mr. Davis moved the second reading of the Highway Bill. The bill is for the purpose to regulate the rule of the road. For instance, in Vancouver if you meet a man on the road you go to the left, and when you get in the country you must enter the right.

On this account it is doubtful if damages could be obtained in case of a collision. The bill provided that a driver shall go to the left.

The bill was read a second time, after which the House adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 7:30 o'clock when.

Hon. Mr. Turner presented a message from His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor transmitting a bill entitled, "An Act to authorize the granting of a certain land subsidy for and in aid of the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway."

The message was read and on motion of Hon. Mr. Turner it was resolved to consider it at the next sitting of the House.

THE NELSON ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.

On the recommendation of the bill to incorporate the Nelson Electric Light Company, Limited.

Mr. Kellie moved that clause 18 be struck out and the following inserted in lieu thereof:

"The said company may conduct, maintain, complete and operate works for the production of electricity for the purpose of supplying the town of Nelson and parts adjacent thereto with electric lights, and may conduct the electricity by means of wire, through, along and under the streets, highways and public places of the said town. And for the purpose of generating electricity for the supply of the said system the company shall have full power and authority to divert, take and use so much of the waters of Cootawood-Smith Creek as may be necessary, but not to exceed 200 inches: Provided that such water shall be taken at any point within half a mile of the Falls on the said Creek. (a) Provided further that nothing in this Act contained shall be deemed to in anywise restrict the Nelson Saw Mill Company, Limited, from utilizing so much of the waters of Cootawood-Smith Creek (not exceeding 40 inches) and Give Out Creek (not exceeding 60 inches) as have heretofore been used by them in their milling operations, and their right of user thereof is hereby ratified and confirmed, as far as the rights of the Nelson Electric Light Company, Limited, are concerned."

The clause as amended was carried.

The committee then rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

THE CROFTERS' ACT.

Mr. Milne moved, on consideration of the Crofters' Bill, to add the following as a new clause:

"That no agreement entered into by the lieutenant-governor-in-council under the provisions of this act shall be valid until submitted to and approved by the legislative assembly of this Province."

Hon. Mr. Davis objected to the passage of the amendment on the ground that it would render the Government powerless to make any effective or satisfactory agreement with the Imperial Government.

The amendment was lost and the bill then passed its third reading.

THE DEEP SEA FISHERIES ACT.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved, on consideration of the Deep Sea Fisheries Bill, to amend Section 2 by adding the words, "such locations for the colonies to be selected by a representative of the Provincial Government and a representative of the company."

The motion was carried and then the bill passed its third reading.

THE NEW WESTMINSTER BILL.

Hon. Mr. Robson moved the second reading of the bill to provide for a grant to the corporation of the city of New Westminster of certain lands in the city of New Westminster; carried unanimously without debate.

THE SUPREME COURT BILL.

Hon. Mr. Davis moved the second reading of the Supreme Court Act amendment Bill, providing for the establishment of a separate judicial district for Vancouver city. He did not, however, expect that the Dominion Government would appoint another Supreme Court judge, but it might be that one of the present judges would take up his residence in Vancouver. It would be advisable to add a clause to the effect that the act should not come in force until assented to by the Dominion Government.

Hon. Mr. Beaven, while not wishing to encourage the belief that the Dominion Government would appoint a sixth judge yet, thought that perhaps the Attorney-General's influence at Ottawa would secure his appointment to that position. It would be a beautiful sight to see the Attorney-General sitting with Bro. Walkem on the bench. (Laughter.)

The bill was read a second time, to be committed on Tuesday.

OTHER BILLS.

The Sheriff's Bill, the Employers' Liability Bill, the Jurors' Bill passed their second reading.

THE EXECUTION BILL.

Hon. Mr. Davis, moving the second reading of the Execution Bill, said that last session a law was passed which sacrificed the material man for the protection of the laborer. But he failed to see how the laborer had been benefited.

The bill provides among other things that in cases where executions are made for wages and not sufficient realized the execution creditor has yet the right to proceed again.

The bill was read a second time.

THE CANADIAN NORTHERN RAILWAY.

The House went into committee of the whole to consider the Canadian Northern Bill, Mr. Sward in the chair. The clauses passed rapidly without amendment or discussion until the last clause was reached which reads as follows:

Terminal workshops and other structures, works, docks and equipment shall be erected in the immediate vicinity of Victoria or Esquimalt."

Mr. Rogers moved that the clause be struck out.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to strike the clause and insert the following in lieu thereof:

"The main terminus of the railway the terminal workshops and other structures, works, docks and equipment shall be erected in the immediate vicinity of the harbor Esquimalt."

Mr. Eberts stated that while the promoters of the Canadian Northern Railway entertained only the kindest feelings for Victoria and Esquimalt still was imposing a most onerous condition on the company to ask it to build terminal works here. The charter provided that the line should commence at northern extremity of the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway and it scarcely fair to ask the company to build terminal works at a place where they might be unable to reach. As to whether the cars and engines of Canadian Northern would be allowed to Victoria by the E. & N. Ry., that was simply a matter of agreement between the two companies. The minus of the transcontinental would be Victoria or Esquimalt, but would be unfair to saddle this particular company with the task of constructing those works when it might be possible to make such terms with E. & N. Ry. as would enable them to run their cars to Victoria.

Hon. Mr. Beaven thought that Eberts was looking at the matter from a wrong stand point. It was not much that Victoria would be benefited as that the railway would be benefited by having its terminal facilities proximity to the finest harbor on Pacific Coast and not away up mountains.

Mr. Smith objected to the insertion of any clause simply to gratify the city of Victoria.

Mr. Milne thought it would be unfair to strike out the clause as it passed the railway committee.

Hon. Mr. Davis said he would have voted for the second reading of the bill were it not that he understood it was to be, in this respect, on the footing as the Canada Western.

Mr. Hunter claimed that it was a condition on the Canadian Northern that does not exist in the of any other line in America. Mr. Eberts consulted the papers and said they would be satisfied with the clause as it stood. The bill then passed, Hon. Mr. Beaven to his amendment on the consideration of the report.

DYKING BILL.

Mr. Sward moved the second reading of the Drainage, Dyking and Reclamation Bill. Carried.

SURREY DEBENTURES BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Surrey Municipal Debentures Bill, Mr. Smith in the chair.

An almost interminable discussion arose over the question as to whether the whole municipality or the whole of the Surrey Municipal Debentures should be responsible to the Montreal. It was just a repetition of what was said at its second reading. The committee then rose and the bill complete with amendments. The House adjourned at 1 a.m.

account it is doubtful if dam-
ould be obtained in case of a col-
The bill provided that a driver
to the left.
The bill was read a second time, at
which the House adjourned.

EVENING SESSION.

Speaker took the chair at 7:30
when
Mr. Turner presented a mes-
sage from His Honor the Lieutenant-
Governor transmitting a bill entitled,
"An Act to authorize the granting of a
land subsidy for and in aid of
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Rail-
way."

message was read and on mo-
Hon. Mr. Turner it was resolved
sider it at the next sitting of the

NELSON ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.

The recommittee of the bill to in-
state the Nelson Electric Light
Company Limited.
Kollie moved that clause 18 be
out and the following inserted
thereof:

"The said company may conduct,
own, complete and operate works
for the production of electricity for the
use of supplying the town of Nel-
son and parts adjacent thereto with
electric lights, and may conduct the
city by means of wire, through,
and under the streets, highways
public places of the said

And for the purpose of
supplying electricity for the sup-
ply of the said system the com-
pany shall have full power and
authority to divert, take and use
any of the waters of Cowichan
Creek as may be necessary, but

not exceeding 200 inches: Provided that
water shall be taken at any point
not less than half a mile from the
mouth of the creek. (a) Provided further that
in this Act contained shall be
devised to in anywise restrict the Nel-
son Mill Company, Limited, from
using so much of the waters of Cow-
ichan Creek (not exceeding 40
inches) and Give Out Creek (not exceed-
ing 20 inches) as have heretofore been
used by them in their milling opera-

and their right of user thereof is
ratified and confirmed, as far as
this of the Nelson Electric Light
Company, Limited, are concerned."

clause as amended was carried.
committee then rose and reported
bill complete with amendments.

THE CROFTERS' ACT.

Mr. Milne moved, on consideration
Crofters' Bill, to add the follow-
ing new clause:

"No agreement entered into
between the lieutenant-governor-in-council
and the provisions of this act shall be
until submitted to and approved
by the legislative assembly of this
provincy."

Hon. Mr. Davie objected to the
of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the amendment on the
that it would render the Gov-
ernment powerless to make any
agreement or satisfactory agreement with
the crofters.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Fort Sheppard Railway Land
Grant Bill is Reported to the
House.

Committee Work on the Municipal
Bills is Finally Brought to
an End.

No Evening Session Held to Allow the
Government Members to Meet
in Caucus.

TUESDAY, April 5, 1902.
The Speaker took the chair at 2
o'clock.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.
Hon. Mr. Davie rose to a question of
privilege, and complained of two in-
stances of misreporting in the Colonist.

PORT SHEPPARD RAILWAY.
The House then went into committee
of the whole on the message of His
Honor the Lieutenant-Governor on the
bill to authorize the granting of certain
land subsidy for and in aid of the
Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway,
Mr. Martin in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved that the bill
be reported to the House.
Hon. Mr. Beaven said he had not
time to fully examine into the pro-
visions of the bill, and hoped that the
Finance Minister would explain them.

Hon. Mr. Turner replied that the bill
merely proposed to make the ordinary
land grant. The land would be granted
in alternate blocks, which would have
the effect of adding a certain value to
land intervening owned by the Govern-
ment. The railway would open up a
mining country and assist in its devel-
opment.

Hon. Mr. Beaven, while expressing
himself in opposition to the principle of
granting lands to railways, said he was
pleased to notice the Government had
adopted a feature for which he had con-
tended for some time, viz: requiring a
security from the company. He did
not know whether the amount of the
security, \$25,000, was sufficient, but the
principle was good.

The committee rose and reported the
bill to the House, and the report was
adopted.

On motion of the Finance Minister,
the bill was read a second time, and
placed on the orders for second read-
ing at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Horne moved, that a respectful
address be presented to His Honor the
Lieutenant-Governor in Council pray-
ing His Honor to take such steps as he
may deem necessary to have that por-
tion of False Creek lying to the east of
Westminster avenue, transferred to the
Province of British Columbia for the
purpose of having said land conveyed
to the corporation of the city of Van-
couver.

Mr. Martin objected to the resolution.
He did not think the City of Vancouver
should be allowed to monopolize this
land. The revenue realized from the
sale of the property should go to the
whole province.

Dr. Milne supported the resolution.
From a sanitary standpoint it was
necessary that Vancouver should get
possession of the property. The cost of
reclaiming the land and the settling of
the foreshore rights would make it cer-
tain that Vancouver would not get the
property for less than its value.

Hon. Mr. Robson, Mr. Brown and
Mr. Cotton also spoke in favor of the
resolution, which was finally carried.

FURTHER RETURNS WANTED.
Mr. Grant moved that an Order of
the House be granted for a printed re-
turn of all papers and correspondence
which have passed between Mr. J.
Vantreight and the Hon. Provincial
Secretary, or any officer of the Govern-
ment, with reference to educational
matters. Carried.

AFTER ANOTHER PAPER.
Hon. Mr. Robson rose to a question
of privilege. The News-Advertiser of
the 1st inst., a fragment of which he
held in his hand, reported the member
for Westminster City as saying at a
meeting in that city, that he knew the
Bishop of New Westminster had been
put off from time to time when he ap-
plied for the purchase of certain lands,
the Government claiming that it was
reserved, while at the same time the
Government was selling lots in the
same property by private sale to private
parties. The honorable member was
entirely mistaken if he made such a
statement.

The Speaker said the Hon. member
complaining must produce the paper.
Hon. Mr. Robson remarked that the
paper was only a fragment at best.
Mr. Brown explained that he was
slightly misreported by the paper. He
did state that last year a committee
enquired into this matter had discovered
that the Government had sold to a
private party a lot in the vicinity of the
property applied for by the Bishop of
New Westminster, notwithstanding the
Government said a reserve was placed
upon the land.

NO REDISTRIBUTION.
Mr. Brown asked the Hon. the
Premier—Is it the intention of the Gov-
ernment to introduce a Redistribution
Bill during the present session of
the Legislature. The Premier answered
"No."

THE MUNICIPAL BILLS.
The adjourned committee on the
Municipal Bills was resumed, Mr. Mc-
Kenzie in the chair.
Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to amend
sub-section 4 of section 83 by striking
out the words: "But after the building
or improvement of the formerly
licensed premises has been completed,
the license shall be issued in the name

of the owner (or a suitable person), or
of any suitable person satisfactory to
the owner, such suitability to be estab-
lished to the satisfaction of the license
board."

The Attorney-General strongly op-
posed the amendment. The effect of it
would be to multiply licenses.

Mr. Brown favored the amendment.
If the bill became law as it stood at
present it would practically create a
vested interest in a license.

The statute saying it was not a vested
right would make no difference.
After considerable discussion the
amendment was defeated.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to strike
out section 158 of the Municipal Act
and insert in lieu thereof the following:
"The Mayor or Reeve may temporarily
grant permission for a transfer of a
license for the sale or liquor by retail,
either from one premises to another or
from one person to another, but sub-
ject to ratification by the Board of
Licensing Commissioners at its first
sitting thereafter. If such permission
is not so ratified and extended, it shall
thereafter be null and void. The
Mayor or Reeve is not hereby em-
powered to again temporarily grant
permission for the transfer of a license
the transfer of which has been abso-
lutely refused by the Board of Licen-
sing Commissioners."

The Attorney-General opposed the
amendment on the ground that the
clause was explicit enough as it stood.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said the clause had
been a source of disagreement at the
Licensing Board for years.

The clause carried by a vote of 7 to 5.
Mr. Beaven moved to strike out sub-
section 4 of section 159 of the bill.

Hon. Mr. Davie raised a point of
order. No motion had been made to
reconsider the section which had al-
ready been passed.

Mr. Beaven acknowledged that he
was out of order. He understood, how-
ever, that the Attorney-General had
abandoned the idea of making licenses
vested rights. He would withdraw the
amendment and move it on report.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the following
section: "Notwithstanding anything
in the 'Municipal Act, 1891,' or any
amendments thereto, any applicant for
a license to sell wine, spirits, beer or
other fermented or intoxicating liquor
in any hotel containing not less than
thirty rooms used for hotel purposes,
shall not be required to obtain a peti-
tion or requisition signed by lot owners
or householders or their wives, for the
granting of such license, but applica-
tion for the granting of such license
shall be made direct to the Board of
Licensing Commissioners not less than
thirty days before the sitting of said
Board, and the Board of Licensing
Commissioners shall have power to
grant such license for the term of one
year, or to renew the same upon the
expiration thereof, if, in the opinion of
a majority of the Board then present,
such grant or renewal is in the public
interest." The Attorney-General said
he thought a great mistake was made
in not making a distinction between
mere drink shops and respectable
hotels. He knew of several cases
where men had spent large sums of
money in erecting fine buildings and
owing to the restrictions placed in the
way of obtaining licenses they were
unable to get a license. He thought
this amendment would correct the evil.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said he was of the
opinion that there ought to be a distinct
license for the hotels, but he did not think
the Attorney-General's proposed amend-
ment solved the problem. It would
have the effect of doing away with the
local option part of the act. The At-
torney-General had almost spoiled the
utility of the statute and he probably
intended to wipe it out altogether.

Mr. Hunter opposed the motion. He
could see no necessity for change. The
hotels could do as much harm as sa-
loons.

Mr. Brown did not approve of taking
the power out of the hands of the peo-
ple to say where a hotel license should
be granted. He never knew of a license
being refused where there was a neces-
sity for a hotel.

Mr. Booth opposed the motion of the
Attorney-General. If it were confined
to the fire limits of cities it would meet
with his approbation.

Dr. Milne also vigorously opposed the
proposed amendment.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to amend
section 119 to make the word "drains"
read "sewers," and also to provide for
the laying of connecting pipes. The
amendment carried.

Sections 152 and 153 were also slightly
amended.

Mr. Sword moved to amend the
Municipal Act to provide that when
town sites were surveyed in munici-
palities there must be a sale of at least
20 lots to different purchasers before
the property of the townsite can be ex-
empt from the municipality taxation.
The amendment carried.

Several other amendments were pro-
posed, but it was decided to defer them
until report.

On motion of Mr. Beaven the com-
mittee rose and reported the bill com-
plete with amendments.

The report was adopted amid ap-
plause, and it was decided the bill
should come up for report on Monday.

LAND GRANT BILL.
The House went into committee on
the New Westminster City Land Grant
Bill, Mr. Hunter in the chair.

The committee rose and reported the
bill complete, and the report was
adopted.

MINERAL BILL.
On motion of the Attorney-General
the Mineral Bill was given its second
reading.

SUPREME COURT BILL.
The House went into committee on
the Supreme Court Bill, Mr. Semlin in
the chair.

Mr. Ritchie objected that the pro-
posed boundaries of the Vancouver
Judicial District were wrongly defined.
After some discussion the matter was
allowed to drop.

On motion of the Attorney-General
section 8 was amended by adding the
words "After the Governor-General in
Council shall signify his assent to the
provisions thereof."

The committee then reported the bill
complete with amendment, and the re-
port was adopted.

The Premier moved that the House in
rising stood adjourned till 2 o'clock to-
day.

Mr. Semlin asked why it was the
Premier did not propose that the House
should sit in the evening as announced.

Hon. Mr. Robson answered that the
majority of the members of the House
had engagements for the evening.

Mr. Semlin suggested that the Gov-
ernment should hold its caucus in the
morning.

The Premier said it could not.
The House then adjourned.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

A Peaceful Session With not a Question of Privilege to Disturb Proceedings.

Several Important Bills Passed in Committee and on Their Third Reading.

Hon. Mr. Beaven's Anti-Chinese Amendment Clause is Defeated by 17 to 10.

WEDNESDAY, April 6, 1892.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

NORTH VANCOUVER ELECTRIC BILL.
The House went into committee on the North Vancouver Electric Bill, Mr. Anderson in the chair.

The bill passed without any amendment worthy of mention, until section 20, authorizing the company to take water from Seymour and Capilano rivers, etc., was reached. At this juncture Mr. Sword suggested that the committee rise and report progress. Rights which it was proposed to be conferred by this clause, was the cause of considerable discussion. The Attorney-General had undertaken to bring in a bill to settle the question of these rights and it would be well to defer consideration of the bill until the Attorney-General's bill was passed.

Hon. Mr. Davis said his bill was already printed and before the members. Owing to want of time it had not received as much consideration as it deserved and might need amendment. He also had prepared a clause which he proposed inserting in these water bills, providing that the privileges granted under them were subject to the rights of the Crown and future legislation in the matter.

After some further discussion, on motion of Mr. Horne the committee rose and reported progress.

Mr. Hunter asked why this action was taken.
The Attorney-General answered that the amendments he proposed to make could not be reconciled with those of other members of the House, therefore the object was not to take up the time of the House.

BILLS OF SALE BILL.

The Bills of Sale Bill came up on report.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Davis the report was amended requiring that all bills of sale affecting property in the province must be registered, no matter where they are executed.

The report was adopted and the Bill passed its third reading.

ESQUIMALT WATER WORKS BILL.

The House went into committee on the Esquimalt Water Works Bill, Mr. Smith in the chair.

On motion of Mr. Croft the proposed amendments protecting the rights of the City of Victoria were added to the bill.

The committee then rose and reported the Bill complete with amendments.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY BILL.

On motion of Mr. Hall Bill 43, an act to amend the Westminster and Vancouver Short Line Railway Act, received its second reading.

VICTORIA CITY BILL.

The adjourned committee on the Victoria City Bill was resumed, Mr. Stoddart in the chair.

Section 9 of the second part was amended to provide that all water rates shall go into the general revenue fund of the city to be deposited with the city treasurer monthly.

Hon. Mr. Robson took objection to Mr. Beaven's clause providing that no Chinese shall be employed in or about any work authorized by the Victoria Water Works Co. The Chinese clause was very foolish, and he did not think the statutes should be disgraced by such clauses.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said it was the wish of the people that such clause should be inserted.

Mr. Hunter contended that such a clause would affect any loans which the city might attempt to float to carry on water works improvements.

Dr. Milne spoke in favor of the resolution. Millions might be spent by the city in extending its water works, and it might be necessary to let contracts for the work, and it should be made plain by statute that no Chinese could be employed on the work. The people of the city wished this provision in the bill.

The motion to pass the clause was defeated on the following vote:
Yeas—Messrs. McKenzie, Kitchen, Cotton, Punch, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Horne, Foster—9.

Nays—Messrs. Robson, Vernon, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Grant, Smith, Sword—13.

Hon. Mr. Pooley offered an amendment to make provision that the city of Victoria by a resolution of the council might enter into an agreement with Esquimalt Waterworks Company to secure water at a certain rate, etc.

Mr. Beaven stated that the Municipal bill provided without an expression from the ratepayers of the city such agreement could not be entered into. It would be better to provide that the city should be empowered to enter into such agreement by law.

Mr. Eberts supported Mr. Beaven's view.
The proposed amendment was withdrawn for report.

On motion of Mr. Beaven the words "part 1" and "part 2" were struck out and the bill was reported as two separate bills.

The first bill was amended to enable

the corporation to pay the bills referred to at once, without waiting until debentures were issued.

The committee then rose and reported the bills completed as amended.

COUNTY COURTS BILL KILLED.

On motion of Mr. Brown the order calling for the second reading of the County Courts Bill was discharged.

REPORTED AND PASSED.

The reports of Catholic Bishop Bill and the Sisters of Charity Bill were adopted, and the bills read a third time and passed.

KOOTENAY POWER BILL.

The Kootenay Power Bill came up on report.

On motion of Mr. Davis the report was amended by adding providing that

the electric works authorized shall be commenced within twenty months, and the tramway system commenced and in operation within four years.

Mr. Beaven moved his amendment to exclude Chinese from being employed on the work, which was lost on the following division:
Yeas—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie, Cotton, Milne, Brown, Horne, Beaven, Foster, Keith, Fletcher—10.

Nays—Messrs. Sword, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davis, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson—17.

The consideration of the report, on motion of Col. Baker, was adjourned.

SUMAS RECLAMATION BILL.

The House went into committee on the bill to incorporate the Sumas Reclamation Company, Mr. Grant in the chair.

Mr. Sword moved to amend section 20 by providing that in event of the company failing to protect the lands dyked from overflow for three years, (except in case of a freshet greater than that of 1883, the lands overflowed shall not be liable for interest during the year of the overflow, and the company shall not be relieved from liability until said lands have been protected for three consecutive years.

Mr. Martin vigorously opposed the proposed amendment. It would do a great injustice to the company.

Mr. Hunter said the clause would kill the scheme.

The amendment was lost by 11 to 10.

Section 23, on motion of Mr. Sword,

was amended by adding the following: "The plans and specifications for the said works and things shall be referred to and be subject to the approval of an engineer nominated by the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, should a majority of the owners of the lands mentioned in this section request the appointment of such engineer, and the costs of such reference shall be borne by the persons making such request."

The committee then rose and reported progress.

The House adjourned at 5:40.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

After a Warm Discussion the University Bill is Killed in Committee.

The Legislature Will Have Protection Against Attack From all Sources.

Architects' Close Corporation—The Game Bill Slain—The Liquor Law.

THURSDAY, April 7, 1892.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

UNIVERSITY BILL KILLED.

The House went into committee on the University Bill, Mr. Kitchen in the chair.

Mr. McKenzie moved to amend section 2, by providing that of the seven elected members of Senate, four should be allotted to the Mainland and three to the Island.

Mr. Brown objected to the amendment. It was calculated, he said, to arouse a sectional feeling which the members of convocation were anxious to keep down. At a meeting recently held a number of the members of the convocation, representing both the Mainland and the Island, it was unanimously decided to ask the House to amend the Act as provided in the bill introduced by Mr. Eberts. It would be unfair to change this at the last moment without giving notice, and the House was morally bound to support the bill as introduced. The members of the Senate should be elected according to fitness, not because of where they lived.

Mr. Hunter said there was nothing to prevent the mainland proceeding as it did before. Friendly meetings were no indication of what would follow. To prevent sectional trouble the proposed amendment was necessary. He characterized Mr. Brown as the Mother Goose who hatched the mainland association. This association did not represent the mainland, but the mud flats of the Fraser river and the fishing village of Westminster.

Mr. Brown informed the member for Comox that if the mainland association only represented the mud flats of the Fraser river, it represented more people than the whole of Vancouver Island.

Hon. Mr. Robson contended that the best way to bury sectional feeling would be to adopt the amendment.

Mr. Booth favored wiping the whole bill of the statutes. The university was only on paper, and the trouble was caused by real estate agents pulling for the establishment of the proposed university where they would be benefited. The bill proposed to establish only an examining board, and there would be sectional strife until the location of the university was fixed.

Mr. Horne agreed with Mr. Booth in opposing the amendment.

The Premier stated that some of the best universities in the world were only examining and degree conferring institutions.

Mr. Semlin thought the amendment was opposed to the interests of education. Members of the Senate should be elected because of their competence irrespective of locality. The bill should be withdrawn until such time as it could be introduced without creating sectional feeling.

Mr. Keith took the same view as Mr. Semlin, and moved that the committee rise.

The motion was put and carried.

NEW WESTMINSTER LAND BILL.

The New Westminster Land Grant Bill came up on report. The report was adopted and the bill read a third time and passed.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

Mr. Milne asked the Honorable the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works the following questions—

On what grounds were the application of J. C. Blackett and others for mining claims on the Work Estate refused? On the ground that the Work Estate is apparently not land whereon the right to enter and mine for gold and silver has been reserved to the Crown, and also because it is questionable whether section 10 of the Mineral Act would apply within the limits of the City of Victoria.

2. Do the Government intend to allow the applicants to submit the case for trial? a. The Government will interpose no obstacle to any legal steps which the applicants may be entitled to take.

SUPREME COURT BILL.

On report of the Supreme Court Bill, Mr. Horne moved to amend section 8, by striking off the clause providing that the bill shall not become law until the Governor-General gives assent to its provisions. The motion carried, and the report was adopted as amended and the bill read a third time and passed.

TURN TO THE LEFT.

The House went into committee on the Highways Bill, Mr. Semlin in the chair. The bill was slightly amended and reported complete.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY BILL.

The Legislative Assembly Bill was next taken up in committee.

Mr. Brown said this sort of legislation was a mistake. It was ridiculous for the House to assume that it should have the same powers as the British House of Commons. The bill proposed to set up a tribunal not at all judicial. He protested against this and moved that the committee rise.

The Attorney-General asked if Mr. Brown contended that the House had

no power to pass this bill.

Mr. Brown replied that the House might pass the bill, but it would be another thing to enforce it. He had read the opinions of high legal authority, which held that no colony had power to legislate to the extent this bill proposed. Outside of law the policy was bad. The object was not to protect, but to acquire power to oppress the majority.

The Attorney-General stated that Bourinot gave it as his opinion that the House had the power to enforce such a law as proposed.

Mr. Brown doubted Dr. Bourinot's knowledge of the facts, as his opinion was given on newspaper report. The motion that the committee rise was lost.

Clauses 9 and 10 were struck out on motion of the Attorney-General, and the committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY BILL.

The Employer's Liability Bill was passed in committee, Mr. Hall in the chair, and reported without amendment.

EXECUTION BILL.

The Execution Bill was also passed in committee, Mr. Rogers in the chair, and the bill reported complete as amended.

RAILWAY LAND GRANT.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved the second reading of the Nelson & Fort Sheppard Railway land grant bill.

Mr. Brown opposed the motion. There were other ways to encourage railways than by making land grants. To guard the interests of the province it was necessary that the public lands should not be given away.

Mr. Cotton also expressed himself as opposed to the method of aiding railways by land subsidies.

The bill passed its second reading on the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Robson, Davis, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Mason, Kellie, Horne, Smith, Baker—19.

Nays—Milne, Beaven, Brown, Foster, Keith, Cotton, Punch, Sword, Kitchen, McKenzie, Semlin.

ARCHITECTS' BILL.

The House went into committee on the Architects' Protection bill, Mr. Fletcher in the chair.

When section 5 was reached, Mr. Kitchen moved that the committee rise. He disagreed totally with the provisions of this clause, which proposed to place in the hands of nine men the power to say who should be admitted as members of the architects' institute.

Messrs. Hall, Smith, Foster and Brown favored Mr. Kitchen's amendment, and approved of killing the bill entirely.

The motion was put and lost.

Mr. Smith, on consideration of section 17, wanted a clause inserted to make architects responsible for defects in their work.

Mr. Sword also favored this view, but it did not meet with the approbation of the majority of the House.

Mr. Kitchen moved to amend clause 19 by adding to it that no person who was not a British subject should be allowed to practice the profession of architect in the Province.

This met with a vigorous opposition on all sides.

Mr. Kitchen said this show of opposition pleased him. He had just made the motion to show the injustice of the whole excursion bill, and the action of the members in this particular showed that the principle of the bill was not a good one.

Mr. Forster characterized the clause as useless class legislation and moved that the committee rise without reporting.

The motion was put and the vote stood 13 to 13, but the chairman decided against the motion and it was declared lost.

Mr. Kitchen moved to strike out clause 20, providing for a penalty for inspection of Institute rules, and a vigorous debate as to the utility of protecting the professions generally and architects particularly followed.

Mr. Foster said there would be a big hubbub if working men brought in a bill to make it compulsory that every man should work under their unions, and providing a penalty of \$50 for every offence and making every day so worked a separate offence, as this bill proposed to do for architects.

Mr. Keith also warmly opposed the clause, classing the bill as close corporation legislation.

Mr. Eberts said the Miners' Protective Association, to which the member for Nanaimo belonged, said men must not be allowed to work in the mines who did not belong to this union and who did not contribute 10 per cent. of their earnings to its support.

Mr. Semlin replied that the union men did not ask to have their rules made law.

The committee, on motion of Mr. Cotton, rose and reported progress and the House rose for refreshment.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

THE ARCHITECTS' BILL.

The consideration of the Architects' Bill was resumed in committee of the whole, Mr. Fletcher in the chair.

Mr. Kitchen moved to strike out clause 20, which motion was lost.

Mr. Sword moved an amendment the effect of which would be that an architect, though not a member of the British Columbia Institute of Architects, would still be allowed to carry on the business of an architect.

The amendment was lost and then the clause passed.

On motion of the Hon. Mr. Davis clause 25 was amended so as to provide that anyone found guilty of making a

fraudulent declaration or representation should be liable to a fine not exceeding \$250.

Clause 24, providing for the payment of architects giving evidence in the professional capacity, was struck out.

Clause 25 was amended by striking out the subsections that provided that all sums of money arising from the recovery of penalties should be paid to the registrar of the council, which in turn might allot a portion of it to a prosecutor.

Mr. Kitchen proposed that a new clause be added, viz: "Notwithstanding anything that the act contains the Board of Examiners shall be appointed by Lieutenant-Governor in Council."

This motion was lost.

The following schedule of fees payable under the Act was agreed to: registration of architect, \$10; registration of student, \$5; annual fee of architect, \$20; for final examination, \$10; application for examination of student, \$5.

The committee then rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

INFERIOR COURTS BILL.

The report on the Bill to Limit Inferior Courts Practitioners' Act adopted.

THE MINERAL BILL.

Mr. Speaker left the chair and House went into committee of the whole on the Mineral Bill, Mr. Booth in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Davis objected to the consideration of the bill and the amendments proposed by the mining committee in the form in which they were presented. It would be better to incorporate the amendments in the bill; this could easily be done by one or two savings the time of honorable members.

The committee therefore rose and reported progress.

THE GAME BILL.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved that the order for the third reading of the Game Bill be discharged for the purpose of recommending the bill with the view of striking out sub-section (a) of section 1 and inserting—

"No person shall in any one year more than two bull wapiti or elk or two bull moose."

This motion was carried, and the bill was re-committed with Mr. Stoddart in the chair.

Mr. Croft explained briefly his amendment in introducing his amendment, which Mr. Horne rose and said that on time had been wasted over the bill when the old bill would have equally well. He therefore moved that the committee rise.

This, if carried, would kill the bill and accordingly

Hon. Mr. Vernon pointed out that it would scarcely be fair to kill the bill by a side issue of adding of the bill in re-committing it being to certain amendments. If Hon. Mr. Croft wished to kill the bill, they should strike it out.

Mr. Horne then withdrew his motion and the amendment proposed by Croft was considered.

Mr. Hunter said he had no desire to say anything that would be construed in any way disparaging to the trish sportsman, but he certainly was in favor of legislation that was intended to benefit youths who were not sportsmen in the true sense of the term, but to be considered as such. The tenaciousness of those would be sportsmen was really amusing. They had seen almost every day walking on their streets dressed in a most fashionable style, with their waistcoat over overcoats and their shirts over waistcoats. One of these overcoats had written a letter to the papers and succeeded in showing profound ignorance of the subject which he presumed to pose as an authority. In that letter he made a statement as follows: "Thirteen years ago 400 head of big game, including horn and over 100 wapiti, on one Western Wyoming."

Mr. Hunter, "he should have himself." The fact, however, was that a great English Nimrod had a trading expedition to Wyoming might have been trying to say a hard bargain with the Indians with all the avidity of a Sharpe. The writer of the letter after stating his own exploits, went on to say how others had followed him and in this way succeeded in exterminating the hundreds of thousands of wapiti and other animals that time before roamed through the West and Dakota, and he did not fail to assure the Legislature for all time He evidently believed in all time to do the slaughtering but the proposed legislation be House was in harmony with the laws of other provinces, notably Ontario, as the report of the resolutions suggested by the committee appointed to enquire into the laws of that province would show (Mr. Hunter) wished to see the elk of Vancouver Island protected before hunting enforced on it at least.

Mr. Turner pointed out that amendment would give liberty only two wapiti, a which rate take a very long time to death. It was not fair for the hon. member who had just said that it was amusing observations on Englishmen. They might as well have seen some of the hon. member's brother Scots arrayed in clothing. The letter to Mr. Hunter alluded was written by a trish and not by an Englishman. The present bill was merely a copy of three acts now in force. It was a mistake to prevent the many acts as well as to prevent more birds and the noble therefore hoped they would

ment by striking out section 8 of the Mining Act of 1891.

Col. Baker objected to this being made other than at the end of the bill. Mr. Speaker decided that the proper way to make the amendment would be as suggested by Col. Baker, or on report, and Mr. Kellie withheld his amendment for report.

Section 10 to amend section 26 of the

Mineral Act by striking out all the words after "purchase," in the third line thereof, and by substituting the following:—"but a free miner shall be entitled to locate and record additional claims on separate veins or lodes, in each mining division, provided, always, that he shall obtain and record a certificate of work for each prior located claim in such mining division before locating another claim," caused considerable discussion.

Col. Baker proposed to amend the clause by adding the words "not exceeding four," after the word "lodes."

Mr. Kellie objected to this limitation of the number of claims a prospector could locate. It would paralyze prospecting in the country.

Col. Baker finally withdrew his amendment, and Mr. Kellie's motion to strike out the clause was put and carried.

Dr. Milne thought it would be as well to strike out the whole bill. Last year \$390 had been paid a commission to prepare a bill, which was said to be all that was needed.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved that section 10 be reconsidered. To kill it was practically to kill the mining industry. As the law stood at present prospectors could take up any number of claims. They could stake out the whole country and place what price they pleased on their locations, thus shutting out bona fide miners. Section 10 would allow prospectors to take up all the claims they wanted, provided they could produce certificates to show they had done the necessary work in one claim before taking up another.

Mr. Kellie said if this clause was passed it would keep prospectors out of the mining districts. It was these men who brought the mineral wealth of the Province into notice. Not 3 per cent. of the claims located ever amounted to anything, and if prospectors were required to develop every discovery they made before they took up another they would work a season on every location.

Mr. Rogers supported the motion to reconsider. Mr. Kellie, he said, by his opposition showed he did not know much about quartz mining.

Mr. Kellie retorted that it was evident Mr. Rogers did not know any more about quartz mining than a horse did about astronomy.

The motion to reconsider the clause carried, and the clause passed as introduced in the bill. The committee then rose and reported the bill complete as amended.

THE GAME BILL DEAD.

Mr. Speaker gave his decision that the report of the committee of the whole on the Game Bill having been negative, the bill disappeared from the orders of the day. Unless a new motion was made the bill could not be again placed on the orders.

HIGHWAYS BILL.

On report the Highways Bill was adopted, and read a third time and passed.

SURREY DEBENTURES BILL.

The Surrey Debentures Bill, on report, was amended to correct clerical errors. The report was adopted as amended, and the bill read a third time and passed.

ESQUIMALT WATER BILL.

The Esquimalt Water Bill was also slightly amended on report, and the bill read a third time and passed.

SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

The New Westminster & Vancouver Short Line Railway was taken up in committee. Mr. Crofton in the chair.

The Attorney-General moved to amend section 4 to provide that the company should not have the power to operate their road by electric power.

Mr. Brown opposed this amendment.

Hon. Mr. Davie explained that if this amendment were not inserted the railway would be empowered to enter into competition with the Vancouver & Westminster Tramway. He was under the impression that the Honorable member for Westminster city was the innocent tool of some tricksters who wished to injure the tramway he referred to.

Mr. Brown repudiated the insinuation of the Attorney-General, who he said appeared to be the tool of the tramway company, in the interests of which he even appeared before the private bills committee.

The bill was amended as prepared by the Attorney-General, and was so reported to the House.

The report was adopted and read a third time and passed.

The House then rose for refreshment.

EVENING SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

The report on the Victoria City bill was considered when after some amendments by the Hon. Mr. Beaven, its further consideration was adjourned till the next sitting of the House.

SUMAS RECLAMATION BILL.

The House then went into committee of the whole on the Sumas Reclamation bill. Mr. Semlin in the chair.

A new clause was added to the effect that the company be required to deposit to the order of the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council within one month after the passage of the act the sum of \$5000 or give bonds to that amount satisfactory to the Lieut. Governor-in-Council as security that they will commence work within six months after the passage of the act and vigorously carry on the work to completion, such amount

to be returned or such bond to be discharged if the work has been so commenced and such amount to be forfeited and become a part of the consolidated revenue of the province if the committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

LAND SURVEYORS' BILL.

Mr. Martin moved the second reading of the Land Surveyors' bill.

Hon. Mr. Beaven objected to the limitation which required that, in order to make a survey valid, the surveyor must be a British surveyor.

Mr. Hunter thought it absurd that engineers of much experience, who had served an apprenticeship and had mastered and become conversant with all the details of his profession, should

be forbidden to make surveys in the province. He had no objection to requiring that engineers who came here should have to serve one year under a provincial land surveyor.

Hon. Mr. Vernon explained that certain gentlemen had come here and made representations which had led to their being placed on the roll of Provincial Land Surveyors, but that they had not come up to expectations. A man might be a competent civil engineer and still be utterly unable to survey a piece of land. There was as much difference between a surveyor and a civil engineer as there was between a surgeon and a medical man. It was necessary for the protection of the public that lands should be accurately surveyed.

The bill was then read a second time.

THE BREEDING STOCK BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole on the bill to amend the Breeding Stock Act. Mr. Hunter in the chair.

Confusion prevailed and after 20 minutes conversation the committee rose and reported progress.

COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RAILWAY.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Columbia and Kootenay Railway Bill. Mr. Sward in the chair.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved to amend section 3 to read as follows: 2. Section 14 of the said act is hereby amended by inserting after the word "Columbia" in the sixth line thereof the following words, "and a line of railway from a point at or near the aforesaid Columbia and Kootenay Railway crosses the Slokan River and making a junction therewith, thence along the bank of Slokan River and the shore of Slokan Lake to a point at or near the north end of Slokan Lake, and thence to a point on the Upper Arrow Lake at or near the mouth of the Na-Kusp Creek, and from thence to Revelstoke."

Mr. Grant rose to a point of order. It was well known, he said, that the promoters of the bill were the Canadian Pacific Railway. Regarding its merits he would have something to say at the proper time, but at present he would merely raise a point of order on the admissibility of an amendment of the kind proposed by the hon. the Attorney-General. It was proposed by the amendment to extend the line to Revelstoke, a distance of 60 miles and yet only two days' notice had been given. It had not come before the railway committee, which was supposed to be constituted to look after such matters, nor yet had it been referred to the private bills committee, whose duty it was to see that no private interests were injured. The amendment would give greater privileges than the bill itself. If such was to be a proper course of procedure in matters so important, then it might be possible for a bill to be introduced granting the privilege of extending a line six miles and, by giving two days' notice, make a further extension of 100 or 1000 miles.

Mr. Baker stated that it was quite true that it had not gone before the Railway Committee or the Private Bills Committee, and that only two days' notice had been given, but it should be remembered that the Canadian Pacific Company could, by their charter, build the line without applying to the Legislature.

Mr. Grant—"If the C.P.R. Company are the promoters and can build it without asking the consent of the Legislature, then there is no necessity for such a bill to be introduced."

Mr. Hunter was sorry that the point of order had been raised. In the Kootenay district were growing towns such as Kaslo and Nelson, all anxious to have an outlet. If the C.P.R. proposed to build a length of line double what they had intended to, why should an objection be raised? What was desired was that that district should have uninterrupted communication between the points mentioned instead of as it was now, partly by rail and partly by water.

Hon. Mr. Davie contended that he was acting quite within his rights, inasmuch as rule 56 of the Standing Rules and Orders was to the effect that "no important amendment can be given without two days' notice." If this were true, the converse of the proposition would also be true, namely, that by giving two days' notice an important amendment might be introduced.

Mr. Grant: "If the C.P.R. company have the power to build the line why do they not make Revelstoke their initial point and build south? He would insist on a ruling on his point of order."

Mr. Sward, the chairman, considered that it would be better to leave the matter to the decision of Mr. Speaker, and accordingly the committee rose for that purpose. On the point of order being stated.

Mr. Speaker was of the opinion that it was well taken, but would reserve his decision until to-day.

The bill was therefore laid over until Monday.

SHERIFFS' SALE.

The House went into a committee of the whole on a Bill to amend the Sheriff's Act. Mr. Mason in the chair.

The Bill provides for a sheriff for the newly created judicial district of Vancouver, embracing Vancouver city and a portion of Westminster district, and shall come into operation on a day to be fixed by the Lieutenant-Governor-in-Council.

The committee rose and reported the Bill complete with amendments.

JURORS' BILL.

The House again went into committee of the whole on the Jurors' Bill. Mr. Rogers in the chair. The Bill provides for the altered situation arising from the formation of the newly created Vancouver judicial district.

The committee arose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

Hon. Mr. Robson moved that the House, at its rising, stand adjourned till 2 o'clock to-day. Carried.

And then the House adjourned at 11:30.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Another Order Summoning the Kennedy Brothers Before the House.

The Game Bill is Received, and the Architects' Bill is Killed on Report.

Two New Government Bills Referring to Railways Before the House.

SATURDAY, 9th April, 1892.
The Speaker took the chair at two o'clock.

GAME ACT REVIVED.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved that the Game Act be placed on the orders for consideration on report on Monday next. The motion carried without dissent.

JURORS' BILL PASSED.

On report the Jurors' Bill was slightly amended on motion of the Attorney-General, and so reported to the House. The report was accepted and the bill read a third time and passed.

MUST NOT ENCRUCH ON YALE.

Mr. Semlin moved the following resolution:—

"That in the opinion of this House the application of A. St. G. Hamersley for the incorporation of a Municipality near the mouth of Harrison River be granted; provided, that the limits of the proposed Municipality do not extend beyond the boundary of New Westminster district, and provided further that the steps taken are in accordance with the provisions of the Municipal Act."

Hon. Mr. Robson said this matter was brought before the attention of the Government and was receiving careful consideration, and would certainly be dealt with in accordance with the Act. It was not proposed that Yale should be robbed to form a municipality in Westminster district.

Mr. Semlin expressed satisfaction that the object of his resolution was attained, and by permission of the House withdrew the resolution.

TO SUMMON THE KENNEDYS.

Hon. Mr. Pooley presented the following report of the special committee to enquire into the Kennedy libel.

Mr. Speaker—Your committee to whom the matter of the scandalous libel and contempt of James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy was referred, have the honor to report:—

That having enquired into the matter they recommend that the House proceed against the said James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy for the said scandalous libel and contempt.

CHAS. E. POOLEY,

Friday, 8th April, 1892. Chairman.

The report was received.

Hon. Mr. Beaven asked if it was intended to adopt the report. The regular notice would have to be given before the report could be adopted.

The Attorney-General said it was a matter of privilege, and could be proceeded with at once.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Robson—Be it resolved in pursuance of the recommendation of a select committee of the House that James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, both of the city of New Westminster, be summoned to personally appear at the bar of this House on Tuesday the 12th day of April instant, at the hour of 2:30 o'clock, p. m., to answer to a certain article appearing on Thursday the 17th of March, 1892, in the Daily Columbian newspaper (whereof it is stated that the said Robert Kennedy and James M. Kennedy are the publishers) entitled, "Outrageous Presumption," which article is a scandalous libel upon certain members of this House.

Mr. Beaven rose to a point of order, claiming that the resolution could not be considered, as the rules required that a motion to adopt a report required notice to be given. The report of the select committee could not be adopted without notice of motion, nor could the resolution. The question of privilege was disposed of when the House ordered that these men be brought before the bar of the House.

Hon. Mr. Robson contended that what was now proposed was just a further step in the question of privilege, and could be so dealt with.

Mr. Speaker declared that the House was dealing with the question of privilege, and ruled that the proceedings were perfectly in order.

Mr. Grant expressed the belief that the Kennedy Brothers had acted unwisely in not appearing before the House. He did not believe they would have been severely dealt with, and it would have been better all round had they appeared before the House as summoned. He would like to know, however, if the House had the power to enforce its summons before further action was taken.

Mr. Brown reviewed the circumstances in connection with the alleged scandalous libel. The paper complained of repudiated the meaning members of the House attached to their words, and practically apologized. Considering the provocation leading to the criticism, the House proposed dealing too severely with these publishers. To set up a principle that the majority of the House can legislate to oppress those who criticize its actions, subject's rights would be seriously interfered with. He opposed the resolution, and thought the matter should be allowed to drop.

Mr. Martin said criticism was one thing and insult another. When members were insulted in the gross, cowardly and dirty manner in which the

private bills committee was attacked was necessary that members should be protected.

Mr. Booth reviewed the circumstances of the case, and expressed the opinion that the House was dealing leniently with the publishers of the Columbian in giving them another chance to appear before the House, after once regarding the summons of the Speaker. If the House had the power to enforce its mandate, this should be ascertained. Dr. Milne asked the Attorney-General for an opinion as to the legality of the proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Davie stated that in opinion the House had abundant power to enforce its mandate. Bill giving Legislative Assembly Bill giving House power to try offences committed against it. The statute was retroactive in its power. The best way to find the powers of the House in this respect especially in view of the fact that Kennedy Bros. had the temerity to in the face of the summons of the House and were anxious to pose as public tyrants, was to pass the resolution.

Mr. Semlin said he thought the House would be making a mistake in attempting to punish parties for expressing opinion. To punish for an error of judgment was not in the interests of justice, nor was it calculated to uphold the dignity of the House, and would exercise an oppressive and tyrannical power. The benefits of a free press were better than the ills it led to. It was an apology offered. The Government members might laugh, but if insisted on calling these men before the House they themselves would be laughing stock of the country at large.

Mr. Cotton also disapproved of resolution. A law had been passed practically to meet this case, and to exercise this power was not calculated to win that respect for the House which the members would wish it to have.

Mr. Hall expressed astonishment at the remarks of the last two speakers. It was right to say these men should be brought before the bar of the House.

Mr. Sward did not favor prolonging the debate on this subject, and motion was negatived.

Mr. Beaven said the House was acting itself ridiculous. The Attorney-General was dragging it through mire, and he hoped the silly resolution would be voted down.

The Premier thought the question had simply dwindled down to one party, with two noble exceptions. The House had decided that a scandalous libel had been committed. Every done was in order. The Legislature bill did not create new powers, only defined the powers, rights, privileges of the House—what should have been done long ago. The House was entitled to an ample apology.

The authors of the libel only made petition of the charge. If they gentlemen they would not rest until they had made a proper amendment.

Mr. Hunter then moved the proposition which carried.

The motion was resolved in the affirmative on the following divisions: Ayes—Messrs. Punch, Milne, Hayes, Baker, Robson, Davie, Veale, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, N. Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, H. Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher—21.

Nays—Messrs. Semlin, S. Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Beaven, B. Forster, Keith—9.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. Robson rose to a question of privilege. The TIMES of the instant, he claimed, in a leading article criticizing the debate on the Railway grant, put words in his mouth he had never used. It made him the E. & N. land grant was a "give away." He had said "look from a present point of view it is to be considered a give away."

He also made to say it was a "one arrangement," and that he did not think another government would be found to repeat the "same misdeed." It was inexcusable to put words in his mouth in an article that were credited to him in a report of the proceedings, and when the words were not used. The reporters should remember they were in the House, and he had not much to find with their work; but it was tempting policy to misrepresent TIMES did.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Day County Court bill was given its reading.

NEW GOVERNMENT BILLS.

Hon. Mr. Davie introduced a bill from the Lieut. Governor recommending an Act respecting the Canadian Central Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

On motion of the Attorney-General the message from the Lieut. Governor was referred to the House for consideration on Monday.

The Attorney-General also introduced messages from the Lieut. Governor, recommending an amendment in the act to amend Vancouver City Incorporation Act, and also recommending an act to amend the granting of certain land and in aid of "The Upper Columbia Navigation and Tramway Company." These messages were treated as the first.

CROWN WATER.

The Attorney-General introduced a bill to confirm to the crown a ceded and unappropriated water power in the Province, for other purposes. The bill received first reading.

VICTORIA CITY BILLS.

The Victoria City Bills were on report, and read a third time and passed.

The consideration of the Bill 38 to amend the Victoria C

INICIAL LEGISLATURE.

Order Summoning the
dy Brothers Before
the House.

Bill is Received, and the
rects' Bill is Killed
on Report.

Government Bills Referring
always Before the
House.

TURDAY, 9th April, 1892.
ker took the chair at two

ME ACT REVIVED.
Turner moved that the
placed on the orders for
a on report on Monday
motion carried without dis-

ONS' BILL PASSED.
the Jurors' Bill was slight-
on motion of the Attorney-
so reported to the House.
was accepted and the bill
time and passed.

T ENCROACH ON YALE.
lin moved the following

opinion of this House the
of A. St. G. Hamersley for
ration of a Municipality
th of Harrison River be-
d, that the limits of
d Municipality do not ex-
d the boundary of New
district, and provided fur-
tups taken are in accord-
provisions of the Muni-

Robson said this matter
before the attention of the
and was receiving careful
n, and would certainly be
accordance with the Act.
proposed that Yale should
form a municipality in
district.

expressed satisfaction that
his resolution was attain-
permission of the House
resolution.

MON THE KENNEDYS.
Pooley presented the fol-
of the special committee
to the Kennedy libel.

ker—Your committee to
matter of the scandalous
tempt of James M. Ken-
bert Kennedy was referred,
nor to report:
ing enquired into the matter
that the House pro-
the said James M. Ken-
bert Kennedy for the said
libel and contempt.

CHAS. E. POOLEY.
April, 1892. Chairman.

was received.
Beaven asked if it was in-
adopt the report. The
e would have to be given
port could be adopted.

ney-General said it was a
privilege, and could be pro-
at once.
Davie moved, seconded by
Robson—Be it resolved in
the recommendation of a
lities of the House that
Kennedy and Robert Ken-
of the city of New West-
summoned to personally
the bar of this House on
12th day of April instant,
of 2:30 o'clock, p. m., to
certain article appearing
the 17th of March, 1892,
y Columbian newspaper
stated that the said Rob-
y and James M. Kennedy
blishers) entitled, "Out-
sumption," which article is
a libel upon certain mem-

in rose to a point of order,
the resolution could not
ed, as the rules required
on to adopt a report re-
e to be given. The report
committee could not be
out notice of motion, nor
olution. The question of
as disposed of when the
red that these men be
re the bar of the House.

Robson contended that
we proposed was just a in-
the question of privilege,
so dealt with.
er declared that the House
with the question of privi-
led that the proceedings
ly in order.

expressed the belief that
y Brothers had acted un-
not appearing before the
did not believe they would
severely dealt with, and it
been better all round had
red before the House as
He would like to know,
the House had the power
summons before further
aken.

in reviewed the circum-
connection with the alleged
libel. The paper complain-
the meaning members
be attached to their words,
ally apologized. Consider-
ation leading to the criti-
cous proposed dealing too
n these publishers. To set
le that the majority of the
legislate to oppress those
his actions, subject's rights
iously interfered with. He
resolution, and thought
should be allowed to drop.

in said criticism was one
sult another. When mem-
sented in the gross, cow-
manner in which the

private bills committee was attacked it
was necessary that members should be
protected.

Mr. Booth reviewed the circumstan-
ces of the case, and expressed the opin-
ion that the House was dealing leniently
with the publishers of the Columbian
in giving them another chance to ap-
pear before the House, after once dis-
regarding the summons of the Speaker.
If the House had the power to enforce
its mandate, this should be ascertained.
Dr. Milne asked the Attorney-Gen-
eral for an opinion as to the legality of
the proceedings.

Hon. Mr. Davie stated that in his
opinion the House had abundant power
to enforce its mandate prior to the
Legislative Assembly Bill giving the
House power to try offences committed
against it. The statute was retroactive
against it.

in its power. The best way to find out
the powers of the House in this respect,
especially in view of the fact that the
Kennedy Bros. had the temerity to fly
in the face of the summons of the House
and were anxious to pose as public mar-
tyrs, was to pass the resolution.

Mr. Semlin said he thought the House
would be making a mistake in attempt-
ing to punish parties for expressing an
opinion. To punish for an error of
judgment was not in the interests of
justice, nor was it calculated to uphold
the dignity of the House, and would be
exercising an oppressive and tyranni-
cal power. The benefits of a free press
were better than the ills it led to. There
was an apology offered. The Govern-
ment members might laugh, but if they
insisted on calling these men before the
House they themselves would be the
laughing stock of the country at large.

Mr. Cotton also disapproved of the
resolution. A law had been passed
practically to meet this case, and to ex-
ercise this power was not calculated to
win that respect for the House which
the members would wish it to have.

Mr. Hall expressed astonishment at
the remarks of the last two speakers.
It was right to say these men should be
brought before the bar of the House.
Mr. Sword did not favor prolonging
the debate on this subject, and moved
the adjournment of the debate, but the
motion was negatived.

Mr. Beaven said the House was mak-
ing itself ridiculous. The Attorney-
General was dragging it through the
mire, and he hoped the silly resolution
would be voted down.

The Premier thought the question
had simply dwindled down to one of
party, with two noble exceptions. The
House had decided that a scandalous
libel had been committed. Everything
done was in order. The Legislative
bill did not create new powers, but
only defined the powers, rights and
privileges of the House—what should
have been done long ago. The House
was entitled to an ample apology, but
the authors of the libel only made a re-
petition of the charge. If they were
gentlemen they would not rest satisfied
till they had made a proper amende.

Mr. Hunter then moved the previous
question which carried.
The motion was resolved in the af-
firmative on the following division:—
Ayes—Messrs. Punch, Milne, Horne,
Smith, Baker, Robson, Davie, Vernon,
Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason,
Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter,
Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher—31.
Nays—Messrs. Semlin, Sword,
Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Beaven, Brown,
Forster, Keith—9.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.
Hon. Mr. Robson rose to a question
of privilege. The TIMES of the 8th
instant, he claimed, in a leading article
criticising the debate on the Island
Railway grant, put words in his mouth
he had never used. It made him say
the E. & N. land grant was a "dead
give away." He had said "looking at
it from a present point of view it might
be considered a give away." He was
also made to say it was a "one-sided
arrangement," and that he did not
think another government would ever
be found to repeat the "same mistake."
It was inconceivable to put words in his
mouth in an article that were not
credited to him in a report of the same
proceedings, and when the words were
not used. The reporters should re-
member they were in the House on
sufferance. He had not much fault to
find with their work; but it was a con-
temptible policy to misrepresent as the
TIMES did.

COUNTY COURT ACT.
On motion of Hon. Mr. Davie the
County Court bill was given its second
reading.

NEW GOVERNMENT BILLS.
Hon. Mr. Davie introduced a message
from the Lieut. Governor recommend-
ing an Act respecting the Canadian
Western Central Railway Company,
and the Canadian Northern Railway
Company.

On motion of the Attorney-General
the message from the Lieutenant-
Governor was referred to the House for
consideration on Monday.

The Attorney-General also intro-
duced messages from the Lieutenant-
Governor, recommending a slight
amendment in the act to amend the
Vancouver City Incorporation Act, and
also recommended an act to authorize
the granting of certain land subsidies
for and in aid of "The Upper Columbia
Navigation and Tramway Company."
These messages were treated the same
as the first.

CROWN WATER.
The Attorney-General introduced an
act to confirm to the crown all unre-
corded and unappropriated water and
water power in the Province, and for
other purposes. The bill received a
first reading.

VICTORIA CITY BILLS.
The Victoria City Bills were accepted
on report, and read a third time and
passed.

The consideration of the report on
Bill 28 to amend the Victoria Corpora-

tion Water Works Act, was adjourned,
to allow notice of an amendment to be
given.

NELSON BILLS.
The Nelson Water Works Bill and
the Kootenay Power Bill came up on
report, and were amended by the addi-
tion of a clause reserving the rights of
the crown to the water, notwithstanding
the privileges granted.

ARCHITECTS' BILL KILLED.
The Architects' Bill came up on re-
port, and on motion of Mr. Brown was
amended by striking out the clause
providing for a penalty in cases where
persons not belonging to the Architects'
Institute practiced as architects.

Mr. Kitchen said he would move that
the bill be read the third time six
months hence.

The Premier admitted the bill was
practically killed.

The motion to report the bill was put
and negatived on the following divi-
sion:—
Ayes—Messrs. Grant, Cotton, Brown,
Baker, Davie, Eberts, Pooley, Turner,
Croft, Hunter, Rogers—11.
Nays—Messrs. Semlin, Sword, Kitch-
en, Punch, Beaven, Smith, Foster,
Keith, Robson, Hall, Nason, Fletcher
—12.

BREEDING STOCK ACT.
The Breeding Stock Act was con-
sidered, in committee. Mr. Hunter in
the chair.

Some minor amendments were made
to the bill, which was then reported
complete.

The House then adjourned.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Upper Columbia Navigation and
Tramway Subsidy Bill Ad-
vanced a Stage.

Prospectors May Locate But Two
Mineral Claims on the Same
Lode or Vein.

The Municipal Bill Again Carved--
No Extension of Franchise
for Westminster.

MONDAY, April 11, 1892.
Mr. Speaker took the chair at 2
o'clock.

The Premier presented a petition
from 288 property owners in New West-
minster in respect to the extension of
municipal franchise. The petition was
received and read and ordered to be
printed.

VANCOUVER INCORPORATION BILL.
The House went into committee on
the message from the Lieut.-Governor
returning bill 48, an act to amend the
Vancouver Incorporation Act, 1891,
Mr. Anderson in the chair.

On motion of the Attorney-General
sub-section d of section 1 was amended
to correct a clerical error.

The amendment passed the usual
routine and the clause as amended was
finally added to the bill.

UPPER COLUMBIA SUBSIDY ACT.
The House went into committee to
consider the message from the Lieut.-
Governor, recommending an act to
authorize the granting of certain land
subsidy for and in aid of "The Upper
Columbia Navigation and Tramway
Company," Mr. Rogers in the chair.

On motion of the Attorney-General
the committee rose and reported the
bill to the House.

The report was adopted and bill read
a first time.

COUNTY COURT BILL.
The House went into committee on
the County Court Bill, Mr. Croft in the
chair.

A number of unimportant amend-
ments were made in committee, and
the bill reported complete.

The report was adopted and the bill
read a third time and passed.

MINERAL BILL.
The Mineral Bill came up on report.
On motion of Col. Baker section 10
was amended by limiting the number of
claims possible for a free mine to be
located in any district to two.

Several slight amendments were also
made on motion of Mr. Smith and Col.
Baker.

Mr. Kellie moved to amend the bill
by inserting the following as section 29:
No person shall by reason of his hav-
ing supplied the locator of any claim
with money, materials, or provisions be
regarded as or taken to be the holder of
any interest, either as a partner or
otherwise, in such claim located or re-
corded by the person to whom such
money, materials, or provisions were
supplied, unless a partnership or other
agreement declaring what interest such
person is to have in such claim, signed
by the parties to same, is filed and re-
corded with the Mining Recorder."

The motion was negatived by a vote
of 14 to 10.

Mr. Nason moved to amend the Min-
eral Act providing for a tax of \$1 an
acre on quartz claims to which Crown
grants have been issued.

The Speaker declared the amend-
ment out of order.

The report was adopted as amended
and the bill read a third time and
passed.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.
On motion of the Attorney-General
the Water Reservation Bill was read a
second time.

THE MUNICIPAL BILL.
The Municipal Bill came up on re-
port.

A motion of the Attorney-General to
amend sub-section d of section 8, by
providing that in cases where the
Mayor of a city suspended an officer,
only a majority vote should be required
to reinstate an officer so suspended,
caused considerable debate.

The amendment was carried on the
following division:
Ayes—Messrs. Pooley, Turner, Mar-
tin, Croft, Rogers, Anderson, Robson,
Davie, Vernon, Booth, Nason, Grant,
Punch, Smith, Horne—15.
Nays—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Brown,
Foster, Keith, Baker, McKenzie, Sword,
Kitchen, Cotton, Stoddart, Hunter—13.

An amendment offered by the At-
torney-General to change section 9, re-
quiring only a vote of a majority of
councillors present at a meeting to de-
cide any matter referred back for con-
sideration by the mayor or reeve, was
lost by a vote of 11 to 13.

A tie was the result on the Attorney-
General's motion to strike out sub-
section (d) and in lieu thereof insert: "If
upon such reconsideration the by-law,
resolution or proceeding shall not pass
the council, either in its original or in
some amended form, it shall be deemed
to be absolutely voted, and shall be of
no force or effect whatever, and shall
not be introduced again into the coun-
cil during its then term, except with the
unanimous consent of the council, in-
cluding the mayor. Should such by-
law, resolution or proceeding be
amended upon such reconsideration,
the same shall be deemed to have
passed in its amended form."

The amendment was carried, the
Speaker giving his casting vote in its
favor.

The Attorney-General also moved to
strike out clause 16, providing for the
extension of the municipal franchise in
New Westminster city. He said a peti-
tion had been received from 288 prop-

erty owners of New Westminster city
objecting to this clause proposing to ex-
tend the franchise to persons who did
not hold property in the city.

Mr. Brown said the 288 names on the
petition only represented about one
quarter of the property owners of West-
minster. A representative meeting had
decided in favor of the section he
wished to have inserted in the bill. In
concluding Mr. Brown proposed to
amend the section by adding that it
should not come in force until assented
by a vote of the ratepayers of the
city.

The Speaker decided Mr. Brown's
amendment out of order.

The Premier supported the Attorney-
General's amendment, and in reply to
Mr. Brown said the meeting held at
Westminster, asking for the extension
of the franchise did not represent the
property owners of Westminster. It
only voiced the single tax advocates,
who were communists—men who wished
to have all property levelled out,—and
these were the men the member for
Westminster city represented. Men
who only contributed \$5 a year taxes
should not have the same voice in
municipal affairs as property owners.

Mr. Forster objected to the Premier
trading the character of Westminster
ratepayers, and explained that single
tax advocates believed that it was not
right to tax improvements, and that
land and speculators should be taxed.

Hon. Mr. Beaven pointed out that
the franchise in Victoria and Nanaimo
was more liberal at present than what
Mr. Brown asked for Westminster.

The Attorney-General's motion to
strike out the section was carried on
the following division:—
Ayes—Messrs. Pooley, Turner, Mar-
tin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson,
Fletcher, Robson, Davie, Vernon,
Eberts, Booth, Nason, Horne, Smith,
Baker—17.

Nays—Messrs. Semlin, Grant, Mac-
kenzie, Sword, Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie,
Beaven, Brown, Foster, Keith—11.

A RULING BY THE SPEAKER.
Mr. Speaker gave the following rul-
ing:
In committee of the whole on bill
(No. 42) intituled "An Act to amend
the 'Columbia and Kootenay Railway
and Navigation Company Act, 1890,'" a
point of order (viz., as to the "right
to propose amendments to the bill giving
extended powers to the company, which
were not considered by the railway
committee and not embraced in the
published notices of application for the
bill) having arisen, the committee re-
ported the matter to the Speaker for
his decision, and asked leave to sit
again.

I have examined the petition for the
bill, and find that the amendment pro-
posed to allow the petitioners to carry
their line to a point far beyond the
limits originally described in the peti-
tion.

Rule 50 requires that a notice, clearly
and distinctly specifying the nature and
object of the application, shall be pub-
lished in the British Columbia Gazette
and in one newspaper in or nearest the
district affected in which a newspaper
is published. Notices that comported
with the petition were published, but
they did not embrace the limits pro-
posed to be inserted by the amend-
ments in the bill.

The bill was duly reported by the
committee on standing orders, and
came before the House and reached the
committee of the whole in the usual
way. Up to this point, I think, the pro-
ceedings were in accordance with par-
liamentary practice; but I doubt the
power of a committee of the whole to
make so extensive and sweeping a
change in a bill except on petition,
which should reach the House in the
customary manner.

May, page 788, says: "If, after the
introduction of a private bill, any ad-
ditional provision should be made in
the bill in respect of matters to which
the standing orders are applicable, a
petition for that purpose should be pre-
sented to the House, with a printed
copy of the proposed clauses annexed.
The petition will be referred to the
examiners of petitions for private bills,
who are to be given at least two clear
days' notice of the day on which it will
be examined. After hearing the
parties in the same manner as in the
case of the original petition on the bill,
the examiner reports to the House
whether the standing orders have been
complied with or not, or whether any
be applicable to the petition for addi-
tional provision." (The committee on
standing orders and private bills stand
in the relation of examiners towards
this House.)

Rule No. 66 of this House requires
two days' notice of any important
amendment to any private bill in a
committee of the whole House; but I
am of opinion that that rule cannot be
held to apply to the amendment moved
as Rule 62 requires that the attention
of the House shall be specially called to
any provision that does not appear to
have been contemplated in the notice
for the same as reported upon by the
committee on standing orders.

If an amendment of the nature
moved can be proposed at this stage of
the bill, what would be the value of the
notices or petitions in which the line
was first defined, or how would parties
whose interests might be affected by
the amendment be made aware of the
contemplated extension?

I rule that the amendment can only
come before the House in the usual
way, by petition. D. W. HIGGINS.

The House rose for recess.

EVENING SESSION.
The House began work again at 8
o'clock.

Messrs. Beaven and Davie moved
several amendments to the Municipal
Amendment Bill, which were passed.

Hon. Mr. Davie took exception to the

clause dealing with election petitions on the ground that the time named, 10 days, was too short for outlying municipalities. At another clause proposed to be struck out the Attorney-General disputed the statements made by Hon. Mr. Beaven. That gentleman said that it might enlighten the Attorney-General to know that the clause as contended for by the hon. Leader of the Opposition was in the Ontario statutes. (Laughter.)

The words "Queen's birthday" were struck out and the words "reigning sovereign" substituted. This was an amendment of Hon. Mr. Davie's. Hon. Mr. Beaven said he had thought of this, but did not like to bring it up. After a considerable amount of discussion further debate on the bill was adjourned.

Mr. Kitchen moved the adjournment of the Sumas Reclamation Bill as he had received information on the matter from the residents of that locality. The bill was laid over.

Hon. Mr. Turner moved the adoption of the Game Bill as amended on the 4th inst. Carried. Mr. Semlin said that in view of the great division of opinion on this bill the bill should not be hastily forwarded, but be read again that day six months. The amendment was lost and the bill read a third time and passed.

House went into committee of the whole on the North Vancouver Electric Light Bill, Mr. Anderson in the chair. The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

The House then adjourned till 11 o'clock this morning.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Upper Columbia Tramway Subsidy Endorsed and Mr. Kellie's Bill Killed.

The Kennedy Brothers Fail to Appear and are Adjudged Guilty of Contempt.

The Sergeant-at-Arms to Be Sent After Them—The House Adjourned For a Week.

TUESDAY, 12th April 1892.

The House was called to order at 11 o'clock.

In the absence of Mr. Speaker, on motion of the Premier, seconded by Mr. Beaven, Mr. Martin was elected to the chair.

NEW RAILWAY BILL.

On motion of the Attorney-General the House went into committee to consider the message of the Lieutenant-Governor recommending an act respecting the Canada Western Central Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Davie the committee rose and reported the bill to the House.

The bill was subsequently introduced and read a first time.

LAND SUBSIDY BILL.

The Premier moved the second reading of the bill to authorize the granting of a certain land subsidy for and in aid of the Upper Columbia Navigation and Tramway Company. He explained that there was a part of the Columbia River not navigable a great part of the year. There were extensive mining and other interests above this point which remained undeveloped owing to this obstruction to navigation and transportation. The tramway proposed to be subsidized when built would afford a cheap means of transportation. Special arrangements would be made to ship quartz from the mines of the district to the smelter at Golden, and the manner of transportation in that part of the country would be revolutionized. The tramway would prove of benefit not alone to those living in the upper Columbia valley, but also the commercial centres of the provinces, as it would connect with the chief transportation system of the country. The land grant would only be 2000 acres, to the mile for six miles. A special provision in the bill provided that these lands would be treated the same as crown lands and may be acquired as provided by the Land Act, at \$1 an acre.

Mr. Kellie admitted the bill had some good features, but it also had objectionable provisions. It was proposed to allow the company to take up land anywhere in the district outside of the railway belt. The land should be given in alternate blocks along the line of tramway. He regretted to see the Government proposed to pursue the same policy in the grant as it did with regard to the Kootenay & Columbia Railway. Great injustice would be done by allowing the company to take up 100 acre blocks anywhere in the country.

Mr. Sword agreed with the member for West Kootenay. The Premier, he said, had dilated upon the advantages to be gained by the building of the tramway, but he had neglected to give an idea of the cost of construction of the road. To say that this company should be given 16,000 acres of land to be taken up at will all over the country was too much. Assuming that a land grant should be made, the land should be along the line of tramway. Mr. Sword in concluding his remarks moved that the bill be given the six months' hold.

This motion was negatived and the bill was read a second time.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.

The House went into committee on the Water Reservation Bill, Mr. Kellie in the chair.

A number of amendments were made to the bill, and it was reported to the House.

VICTORIA CITY BILL.

The Victoria City Bill was taken up on report.

Mr. Croft moved to amend the bill by inserting as clause 14:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, or in the Corporation of Victoria Water Works Act, 1873, the corporation of Victoria shall not distribute water within the area where the Esquimalt Water Works Company have the right to distribute water under their Act, unless the said company shall fail to furnish an adequate supply, or shall demand rates in excess of those charged by the Corporation of the City of Victoria."

Mr. Beaven said this matter was considered in committee. Mr. Croft had said that if the clause were not inserted Victoria City would be allowed to confiscate the rights of the Esquimalt Water Company, but on the contrary, if this clause were inserted it would mean an actual confiscation of Victoria City's rights, given to the corporation by the Act of 1873. He did not think the House should allow the Esquimalt Company to insert in the city's bill a clause to take away power now possessed by the city. If this clause was inserted the bill might be withdrawn.

Hon. Mr. Pooley thought the clause was a proper one. If the city of Victoria had the rights it claimed, why did it bring this bill before the House? The city should have taken objection to the Esquimalt company laying pipes in the Victoria suburbs.

Mr. Semlin held that it would be wrong to place the citizens of Victoria West at the mercy of a monopoly.

Mr. Hunter supported the amendment. He did not think the city of Victoria should have power to distribute water in Victoria West. He did not care whether the leader of the Opposition withdrew his bill or not.

Mr. Grant as a representative of the city thought the rights of the Esquimalt company should not be confiscated by the city, and favored the amendment.

Dr. Milne said he considered the insertion of such a clause as proposed would be unfair to the city of Victoria. The clause provided that where the Esquimalt Water Works Company were supplying water, the city of Victoria was prohibited from doing so. This was the worst kind of monopoly. The city of Victoria had rights existing since 1873, which the House now asked to wipe out. If this clause became law the people in Victoria West might complain of the bad condition of their water supply, when the city would be able to do nothing but by litigation. This contingency might arise in the future, and it was proposed to legislate for the future. He was willing to put a clause in the act allowing the city to purchase what pipe and plant the city may want for use within the city limits. This should be considered fair and would amend the law so that no one could be oppressed. There was a certainty that if the clause passed it would give the Esquimalt Water Works Company a power which in the near future might compel the City of Victoria to purchase the water pipes in Victoria West, and might compel the corporation of Victoria to purchase the whole plant—in fact buy out the present Esquimalt Company altogether.

Mr. Speaker read his ruling on the constitutionality of the Esquimalt Water Works Bill.

The House then rose for recess.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Speaker resumed his seat at 2:30 o'clock.

The sergeant-at-arms was instructed by the Speaker to call the Kennedy Brothers three times at the door of the House. He returned the summonses to the Speaker and the House was informed that there had been no response to the call.

MR. CROFT'S AMENDMENT.

The debate on the City of Victoria Bill was resumed.

The Attorney-General favored the amendment. The rights of the City of Victoria were amply protected, and in the interests of justice and equity the amendment should be added to the bill.

Mr. Brown opposed the amendment, which he claimed would debar the City of Victoria from supplying its citizens with water, and would compel them to get their supply from a private company.

Mr. Keith supported the views of the Attorney-General.

The amendment was put to a vote and carried on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Kellie, Grant, Baker, Keith, Smith, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher—19.

Nays—Messrs. Semlin, Mackenzie, Sword, Cotton, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Forster, Kitchen—9.

Report on the bill was deferred for a day.

LAND SURVEYORS' BILL.

The Land Surveyors' Bill was taken up in committee, Mr. Forster in the chair.

Mr. Beaven moved to amend section 1 by providing that qualified engineers of any nationality should be allowed to practice in the province.

Col. Baker said this would allow Chinese surveyors to practice in the province, and he was surprised at the leader of the Opposition, who was always moving to exclude Chinese from the province.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said the remarks of the last speaker came with bad grace from that quarter. Col. Baker always favored Chinese when they came in competition with white labor.

Mr. Hunter opposed Mr. Beaven's amendment, and especially opposed the idea of allowing United States surveyors practising in the Province. These people had been engaged in twisting the British lion's tail, and he did not propose to allow them to enter into competition with native Canadians or any other British subjects.

Mr. Beaven's amendment was lost.

Several minor changes were made in the bill, when the committee rose and reported it complete with amendments.

NEW RAILWAY BILL.

Mr. Kellie moved the second reading of his Railway, Tramway and Telegraph Bill. The object of the bill, he said, was to make it as easy for a railway, tramway or telegraph company to get incorporation as any other stock company. This method proposed was adopted in other countries and was found to work well and there was no reason why it should not prove a success in British Columbia.

The Premier did not think it would be wise to pass a bill of this kind at the present time. Free trade in railways might be very well, but he did not think the Province had arrived at that stage when the adoption of such a policy would prove beneficial.

Hon. Mr. Beaven thought the bill meant more than some members realized. He supported the principle of the bill, but he did not see how a private member could make a success of it. He believed it should be made as easy to build a railway as to build a wagon road; but to do so right of way must be obtained. A private member's bill could not give the right to cross and expropriate crown lands, and he asked the honorable member to withdraw the bill, as there was no doubt that as the Premier opposed it, it would be voted down.

The motion to read the bill a second

time was defeated on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Semlin, Grant, Sword, McKenzie, Kitchen, Punch, Cotton, Kellie, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Foster, Keith, Rogers—14.

Nays—Messrs. Horne, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Anderson, Fletcher—18.

BREEDING STOCK BILL.

The report of the Breeding Stock Bill was adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

DYKING BILL.

The Drainage, Dyking and Irrigation bill also came up on report. The report was adopted and the bill read a third time and passed.

COQUITLAN ELECTRIC BILL.

The above bill was taken up in committee, Mr. Croft in the chair.

The Attorney-General's amendment to reserve crown rights was added to the bill, and other amendments made. The committee then rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

The Attorney-General rose to a question of privilege, and moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Robson:

Be it resolved, that James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, having been summoned to attend this House this day, and not attending in obedience to such summons, are guilty of a contempt, and that they be sent for in the hands of the sergeant-at-arms, and custody of the sergeant-at-arms, and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly.

Mr. Martin immediately rose and moved the "previous question," which was carried.

The motion was then resolved in the affirmative on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Milne, Horne, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher—20.

Nays—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie, Sword, Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Beaven, Brown, Foster, Keith—10.

COLUMBIA & KOOTENAY BILL.

The Columbia & Kootenay Railway Bill was considered in committee, Mr. Sword in the chair. The Attorney-General's amendment, which Mr. Speaker ruled out of order, was withdrawn.

The committee rose and reported the bill with slight amendment.

SUMAS RECLAMATION BILL.

The above bill was amended for report to allow the company three months to make its guarantee deposit, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

ANOTHER WATER BILL.

The North Vancouver Electric Bill came up on report. Several clerical errors were corrected, and the consideration of the report was adjourned.

ADJOURNED FOR A WEEK.

The Premier announced that in view of the work before the Attorney-General of looking over all the bills, and the proposal to consolidate the municipal acts, which task had been undertaken by the Leader of the Opposition, it was proposed to adjourn the House till Tuesday next.

Mr. Semlin objected to such an adjournment, and was advised to pair off with some member on the Government side. This he declined to do, remarking that he would continue to represent his constituents till the end of the session.

TWO MORE BILLS.

The Attorney-General introduced a bill to amend the Companies Act, and a bill to amend the Land Registry Act, which was read a first time and placed on the orders for second reading on Tuesday next.

The House then adjourned till Tuesday next.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Canada Central and Canadian Northern Railway Bills Called a Give Away.

Supplementary Estimates Are Presented and Referred to Committee of Supply.

The Victoria & Sidney and Kaslo & Slocan Railways to Get Land Grants.

TUESDAY, April 19th, 1892.

The Legislature resumed its labors this afternoon, Mr. Speaker calling the House to order at 2 o'clock.

KENNEDYS DO NOT APPEAR.

Mr. Speaker announced that the Sergeant-at-Arms had returned the warrants issued by him for James and Robert Kennedy, as the parties could not be served, they not being in Westminster or in the province. The warrants, he said, would remain alive in the hands of the Sergeant-at-Arms.

TO CONSOLIDATE THE MUNICIPAL ACTS.

Hon. Mr. Beaven introduced a bill entitled "The Municipal Act, 1892," which was read a first time, and placed in the orders for second reading at the next sitting of the House.

LAND REGISTRY ACT.

On motion of the Attorney-General the bill to amend the Land Registry was read a second time.

TRAMWAY SUBSIDY.

The House went into committee to consider the bill to authorize the granting of certain land subsidy for and in aid of "The Upper Columbia Navigation and Tramway Company."

Mr. Sword moved to amend section 1 to provide that land granted the company must be taken up along the tramway line, instead of allowing the company to take up the 16,000 acres in blocks as small as 160 in any place in the district.

Col. Baker objected to the amendment. He said it did not matter whether the company was allowed to take up the land. The company would not get money from pre-emptions, and would be to their interests to secure pre-emptors.

Mr. Milne thought the grant was one of the most absurd propositions ever brought before the House.

Mr. Beaven characterized the grant as an absolute "give away." It appeared to be the policy of the Government to give away the public lands for nothing.

Mr. Semlin said that to allow the company to take up the land anywhere was giving an enormous subsidy. To acres selected was as good as 1000 acres of land lies.

Mr. Sword's amendment was lost by a vote of 10 to 16.

On motion of Col. Baker clause 3 was amended to allow the company to take up land subject only to the provision of the Land Act, which permits of the pre-emption of blocks as small as acres.

The Opposition members, with the exception of Messrs. Forster and Keith, opposed this amendment, but to no purpose.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

On motion of the Attorney-General the report of the County Courts Bill was adopted, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.

On consideration of the report of the Water Reservation Bill, the bill was amended on motion of Mr. Cotton, requiring that in cases where companies apply for water rights it will be necessary for the applicants to give the quantity of water to be diverted or utilized, or the amount of horse-power to be developed.

Mr. Sword moved to amend the bill by making provision that companies which have heretofore acquired water privileges by special act, on application to a judge may have the powers conferred by the act apply to their charters.

The Attorney-General said there was no necessity for the amendment, and the motion was lost.

Further consideration of the bill was postponed.

ANOTHER GIVE AWAY BILL.

Mr. Turner moved the second reading of the bill respecting the Canadian Western Central Railway Company, the Canadian Northern Railway Company. The bill, he considered, one of the most important brought into House this session. In the event of a railway being built as these companies proposed one of the finest parts of the Province would be opened up, and meant a new transcontinental route and one which would not only cross mainland portion of the Province, would also cross the Island.

Mr. Semlin pointed out that the center for the Canada Western Central had lapsed, and he did not see how House could renew it without its being before the House in the usual manner.

Mr. Cotton rose to a point of order. Bill 76, he protested, had been read a first time, then changed and its second reading moved.

Mr. Speaker ruled that after the bill was read a first time it was not competent to make changes.

Mr. Davie said there was nothing extraordinary about this matter. The Canada Western Central was authorized for an extension of its charter, and other company was applying for a charter to build over practically the same route. The Government wished to build a railway built over this route, and to be in a position to deal with

as defeated on the following
—Messrs. Semlin, Grant, Sword,
zie, Kitchen, Pouch, Cotton,
Milne, Beaven, Brown, Foster
Rogers—14.
—Messrs. Horne, Smith, Baker,
Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stod-
dard, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Tur-
martin, Croft, Hunter, Anderson,
er—18.
BREEDING STOCK BILL.
report of the Breeding Stock bill
opted, and the bill read a third
and passed.
DYKING BILL.
Drainage, Dyking and Irrigation
came up on report. The res-
as adopted and the bill read a
time and passed.
COQUITLAM ELECTRIC BILL.
above bill was taken up in com-
Mr. Croft in the chair.
Attorney-General's amendment
ve crown rights was added to
l, and other amendments made.
committee then rose and report-
bill complete with amendments.
QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.
Attorney-General rose to a ques-
tion of privilege, and moved, seconded
by Mr. Robson:
Resolved, that James M. Ken-
and Robert Kennedy, having been
oned to attend this House this
and not attending in obedience to
summons, are guilty of a con-
tempt, and that they be sent for in
the name of the sergeant-at-arms, and
Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant
rdingly.
Mr. Martin immediately rose and
ed the "previous question," which
carried.
The motion was then resolved in the
native on the following division:
—Messrs. Milne, Horne, Smith,
r, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts,
hart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley,
er, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers,
erson, Fletcher—20.
—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie,
y, Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Beaven,
va, Foster Keith—10.
COLUMBIA & KOOTENAY BILL.
e Columbia & Kootenay Railway
was considered in committee, Mr.
d in the chair. The Attorney-
ral's amendment, which Mr.
ker ruled out of order, was with-
n.
e committee rose and reported the
with slight amendment.
SUMAS RECLAMATION BILL.
e above bill was amended for re-
to allow the company three months
ake its guarantee deposit, and the
as read a third time and passed.
ANOTHER WATER BILL.
e North Vancouver Electric Bill
up on report. Several clerical
s were corrected, and the con-
ation of the report was adjourned.
ADJOURNED FOR A WEEK.
e Premier announced that in view
e work before the Attorney-Gen-
of looking over all the bills, and
proposal to consolidate the mun-
acts, which task had been under-
by the Leader of the Opposition,
e proposed to adjourn the House
uesday next.
e Semlin objected to such an ad-
ment, and was advised to pair off
some member on the Government
This he declined to do, remark-
that he would continue to represent
constituents till the end of the
on.
TWO MORE BILLS.
e Attorney-General introduced a
to amend the Companies Act, and
to amend the Land Registry Act,
as read a first time and placed
e orders for second reading on
ay next.
e House then adjourned till Tues-
ext.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Canada Central and Canada
Northern Railway Bills Called
a Give Away.

Supplementary Estimates Are Pre-
sented and Referred to Com-
mittee of Supply.

The Victoria & Sidney and Kaslo &
Slocan Railways to Get
Land Grants.

TUESDAY, April 19th, 1902.
The Legislature resumed its labors
this afternoon, Mr. Speaker calling the
House to order at 2 o'clock.

KENNEDY DOES NOT APPEAR.
Mr. Speaker announced that the
Sergeant-at-arms had returned the war-
rant issued by him for James and
Robert Kennedy, as the parties could
not be served, they not being in West-
minster or in the province. The war-
rant, he said, would remain alive in the
hands of the Sergeant-at-arms.

TO CONSOLIDATE THE MUNICIPAL ACT.
Hon. Mr. Beaven introduced a bill
entitled "The Municipal Act, 1902,"
which was read a first time, and placed
in the orders for second reading
at the next sitting of the House.

LAND REGISTRY ACT.
On motion of the Attorney-General
the bill to amend the Land Registry was
read a second time.

TRAMWAY SUBSIDY.
The House went into committee to
consider the bill to authorize the grant-
ing of certain land subsidy for and in
aid of "The Upper Columbia Naviga-
tion and Tramway Company."

Mr. Sword moved to amend section 1
to provide that land granted the com-
pany must be taken up along the tram-
way line, instead of allowing the com-
pany to take up the 16,000 acres in
blocks as small as 160 in any place in the
district.

Col. Baker objected to the amend-
ment. He said it did not matter where
the company was allowed to take up
the land. The company would only
get money from pre-emptions, and it
would be to their interests to secure
pre-emptors.

Mr. Milne thought the grant was one
of the most absurd propositions ever
brought before the House.

Mr. Beaven characterized the grant
as an absolute "give-away." It ap-
peared to be the policy of the Govern-
ment to give away the public lands for
nothing.

Mr. Semlin said that to allow the
company to take up the land anywhere
was giving an enormous subsidy. Ten
acres selected was as good as 1000 acres
as the land lies.

Mr. Sword's amendment was lost by
a vote of 19 to 16.

On motion of Col. Baker clause 3 was
amended to allow the company to take
up land subject only to the provisions
of the Land Act, which permits of the
pre-emption of blocks as small as 40
acres.

The Opposition members, with the
exception of Messrs. Forster and Keith,
opposed this amendment, but to no
purpose.

The committee rose and reported the
bill complete with amendments.

COUNTY COURTS BILL.
On motion of the Attorney-General
the report of the County Courts Bill
was adopted, and the bill was read a
third time and passed.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.
On consideration of the report of the
Water Reservation Bill, the bill was
amended on motion of Mr. Cotton, re-
quiring that in cases where companies
apply for water rights it will be neces-
sary for the applicants to give the quan-
tity of water to be diverted or utilized,
or the amount of horse-power to be
developed.

Mr. Sword moved to amend the bill
by making provision that companies
which have heretofore acquired water
privileges by special act, on application
to a judge may have the powers conferred
by the act apply to their charters.

The Attorney-General said there was
no necessity for the amendment, and
the motion was lost.

Further consideration of the bill was
postponed.

ANOTHER GIVE AWAY BILL.
Mr. Turner moved the second read-
ing of the bill respecting the Canada
Western Central Railway Company and
the Canadian Northern Railway Com-
pany. The bill, he considered, one of
the most important brought into the
House this season. In the event of a
railway being built as these companies
proposed one of the finest parts of the
Province would be opened up. It
meant a new transcontinental route,
and one which would not only cross the
mainland portion of the Province, but
would also cross the island.

Mr. Semlin pointed out that the char-
ter for the Canada Western Central
had lapsed, and he did not see how the
House could renew it without its com-
ing before the House in the usual way.

Mr. Cotton rose to a point of order.
Bill 70, he protested, had been read
first time, then changed and its second
reading moved.

Mr. Speaker ruled that after the bill
was read a first time it was not com-
petent to make changes.

Mr. Davie said there was nothing ex-
traordinary about this matter. The
Canada Western Central was asking
for an extension of its charter, and
other company was applying for a char-
ter to build over practically the same
route. The Government wished to have
a railway built over this route, and wish-
ed to be in a position to deal with the

company which could furnish the best
guarantee to build the road. The bill
Mr. Cotton complained of had been
placed before the members to allow
them to see what changes were con-
templated by the Government in com-
mittee. The bill as read the first time
was before the House for consideration.

The Premier repeated what Hon. Mr.
Davie had said, adding that both com-
panies were anxious to make explora-
tory surveys this season, and this work
would have to be done before they could
give any guarantee to build a road. It
was necessary that the Government
should be in a position to treat with the
companies so as to have these surveys
carried out. Men would have to be
placed in the field at once, if the work
was to be done this year. Capitalists

would not put up money to guarantee
the building of a railway till the route
was first surveyed.

Mr. Cotton objected to the granting
of long tracts of land to railway com-
panies and exempting them from taxa-
tion. As the Premier had said in con-
nection with the E. & N. railway deal,
it was a great give away.

The Premier protested that he had
said no such thing.

Mr. Cotton continued that the Prem-
ier might argue that it was a good
policy to give away lands and then ex-
empt them from taxation for an in-
definite period, but he thought 10 years'
exemption would be quite enough.

Mr. Brown opposed the bill because
he thought it proposed "a dead give
away." The Government proposed to
be desirous of opening up the country;
but it was evident its only ambition in
opening up the country was to allow
companies to get a good thing.

The Attorney General characterized
the measure before the House as an
enabling bill. He hoped the province
would have big companies mining big
things and then the country would
prosper. The companies granted land
could not make a big thing if they
locked up their lands. He favored the
principle of not taxing lands granted
to railways till they were alienated, but
he said, it did not follow, this principle
would be adopted in dealing with the
Canadian Central and Northern Rail-
ways. The Government would make
the best bargain possible.

Hon. Mr. Beaven objected to the re-
newal of a charter which had lapsed.
He did not think the House had power
to revive a charter which had expired—
it was dead. The Canada Western
Company had only got a charter with
the hope of selling it, and it did not
succeed. He always contended that
the Government's railway policy was
wrong. They only put power in the
hands of parties to make money by
speculation. Outside of C. F. M.
branches all the railway charters grant-
ed companies in a province with the
exception of the Westminister-Southern
and E. & N. had resulted in nothing.
He objected to the paper railway policy
of the Government, and he could find
no authority by which it could revive
the Canada Western railway charter
and land grant.

Hon. Mr. Pooley gave it as his op-
inion that the Canada Western charter
could be revived. The charter expired
on the 6th of April, and the time be-
tween that date and the present was
not worth considering. The land grant
had not expired, he claimed.

The building of the railway proposed would
result in the settlement of the northern
part of the mainland, and would be an
offset to the Croft bill, which the
member for Westminister said was a
scheme to secure a population for the
Island.

Mr. Mackenzie said he would vote
against the bill. He hoped the Govern-
ment would not repeat the old mistake
of giving away lands to be locked up
as it had to the E. & N. Railway Com-
pany.

Mr. Forster objected to the bill.
Were land granted as proposed to the
Canada Western Central, that company
could lock up the alternate blocks it
held and wait till the Government
lands were settled, which would great-
ly increase the value of the company's
lands.

The bill passed its second reading on
the following division:
Ayes—Messrs. Pooley, Turner, Mar-
tin, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Robson,
Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddard, Booth,
Nason, Smith, Baker—15.
Nays—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Brown,
Forster, Kellie, Keith, Cotton, Pouch,
Sword, Kitchen, Mackenzie, Grant,
Semlin—12.

NO SMOKING ALLOWED.
Mr. Smith complained of tobacco
smoke in the House.

Mr. Speaker announced that hence-
forth he would not even allow the pipe
of peace to be smoked in the House.

Hon. Mr. Pooley objected to this
ruling. He wanted to smoke in the
members' room.

Mr. Speaker said his ruling only ap-
plied to the Assembly room and lobby.

"WANTED TO AMEND."
Mr. Grant asked if it would be com-
petent to amend the Municipal Bill on
report.

Mr. Speaker answered in the affirma-
tive. The bill could be re-committed
if the House wished it.

Mr. Beaven did not want to see the
bill which he had gone to so much
trouble to consolidate mutilated. If
any amendments were made, bills 21
and 27 should be dealt with.

The Premier coincided with Mr.
Beaven's views. He looked on the bill
as a most valuable measure, and no at-
tempt should be made to strangle it
with amendments. It should be taken
as read.

SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES.
Hon. Mr. Turner presented a mes-
sage from the Lieutenant-Governor,
recommending to the House supple-
mentary estimates for the years ending
June 30, 1902, and 1903.

On motion of the Finance Minister

the House went into committee to con-
sider the message, which, together with
the estimates, were referred to the com-
mittee of supply.

LAND SURVEYORS BILL.
A clerical error in the Land Sur-
veyors bill was corrected in the report,
and the bill read a third time and
passed.

COQUITLAM ELECTRIC BILL.
Mr. Sword moved to amend section
20 of this bill on report, so as to limit the
company to one site on each stream.

This amendment was lost, but the bill
was amended by adding the Attorney-
General's section reserving crown
rights.

A slight amendment was also made
on motion of Mr. Brown, making the
running of wires in cities subject as the
municipality.

The report was adopted as amended
and read a third time and passed.

MUNICIPAL BILLS.
On consideration of the report on the
Municipal Bill, the bill was amended on
the motion of the Attorney-General to
extend the franchise in New West-
minster city to householders who pay a
rental of \$400 a year.

Mr. Brown moved to amend the bill
by providing that "Householders"
should apply to person leasing stores,
or residing in portions of buildings.
This amendment was lost.

Mr. Grant proposed to amend section
167 providing the method to be adopt-
ed in dealing with the hotel licenses.
The amendment was declared out of
order, the question having already been
dealt with by the House.

On motion of the Attorney-General a
clause was inserted providing that no
person shall have the right to enter
upon any land in city or town limits for
the purpose of locating mineral claims.
A number of superfluous clauses were
struck out and further consideration
of the report adjourned.

The House then rose for recess.

EVENING SESSION.
The House resumed its sittings at
eight o'clock.

The Premier presented two bills from
the Lieut. Governor, approved: one the
Land Subsidy to the Victoria and Sidney
Railway Company. The other to autho-
rize a land grant to the Kaslo and Slo-
can Railway Company. The two bills
were then committed to Mr. Stoddart in
the chair. Moved by Hon. Mr. Robson
that the Victoria and Sidney Railway
Company Bill be reported to the House.
Committee rose and reported the bill
to the House.

The report was adopted and the bill
was read a first time, second reading
for to-morrow. The Sloan and Kaslo
bill followed the same course.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.
Hon. Mr. Turner moved that the
House go into committee of supply.

Mr. Cotton objected that sufficient
time had not been allowed to examine
them properly.

Hon. Mr. Robson said it was neces-
sary to proceed with business and there
should be no interruptions from the
Opposition members. There were
other things coming up in the course of
business which could not follow the
regular order as regard to notice, as it
was necessary to save time.

Mr. Semlin said it was very unfair for
the Government to enforce the taking
up of those estimates, as they could by
their numerical strength. The esti-
mates had been sprung upon the House
unexpectedly.

Col. Baker eloquently expatiated
upon the extreme simplicity of the
estimates.

F. G. Vernon said the Government
did not care how much time was spent
wrangling over the matter; their homes
were here and they could attend with-
out trouble to themselves. The up-
country members would be the suf-
ferers.

Dr. Milne said as the House had had
a week's holiday, and the country
members had done their seeding, so to
speak, they could afford to spend three
or four days in consideration of this
important measure. A supplementary
vote to the amount in these esti-
mates required the most careful con-
sideration, and he thought the hon-
orable members were quite willing to
spend this time.

Mr. Keith demanded to know why
the estimates had not been presented
before this date. It was only fair to al-
low these estimates to be considered
properly. An hour's notice was not
enough for consideration of such a sub-
ject.

The Speaker cited rulings by former
speakers on this question.

Hon. Mr. Turner said the supple-
mentary estimates had been brought for-
ward with the view to expedite busi-
ness, not to force them through. He
hoped there would be no objection to
proceed with them to-morrow.

A long discussion taken part in by
nearly all the members followed.

It was finally resolved that the House
go into committee of supply on the sup-
plementary estimates next day.

NORTH VANCOUVER ELECTRIC BILL.
Hon. Mr. Davie and Mr. Brown
offered slight amendments to the North
Vancouver Electric Bill, which carried.
The report of the bill was adopted, and
it went through finally and passed.

THE COMPANIES ACT.
Hon. Mr. Davie moved the second
reading of the bill to amend the Com-
panies Act and explained the objects of
the bill.

Mr. Cotton argued that as the bill
dealt with a most important question
he would move that the second reading
be put off until to-morrow.

Mr. Brown supported the adjourn-
ment.

The motion to adjourn the debate
was lost by a vote of 16 to 12.

It was finally decided to take up the
bill at some later date.

LONG STANDING QUESTION.
Mr. Hall asked the honorable the
attorney-general the following ques-
tions:—

Is clause 7 of bill No. 35 (game bill)
constitutional?

Is the prohibition therein contained,
which prevents the exportation of deer
skins (of which this province has ex-
ported at least \$20,000 worth annually)
an interference with trade and com-
merce?

The attorney-general did not think
these questions in order and did not
see that they called for a reply as they
had no reference to public business.

Mr. Hall thought they were of such
public importance that every hon-
member in the House could speak to
them at any time, especially the hon-
orable member for Comox.

Mr. Semlin said he was of opinion
that if we walked into the attorney-
general's office and asked the question
he would try very hard to find an
answer. (Laughter). He recommend-
ed Mr. Hall to make his question a
standing one and have it on the order
paper at the opening of the next
session. (Laughter).

Mr. Hall said the attorney-general and
the president of the council were sup-
posed to be the legal advisers of the
House and the persons to guide in
matters of this kind. They were not
all lawyers or the sons of lawyers.

Mr. Brown expressed great astonish-
ment to the great amusement of the
House that a Government member
should accuse the attorney-general of
allowing an illegal act to pass.

The speaker ruled the question out
of order on the ground of a ruling in
the Imperial House that it was a ques-
tion liable to diversity of opinion.

The House adjourned at 9:15 until 2
p.m. to-day.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

The Government is Mum as Mice on the Motion to go into Committee of Supply.

It is Roasted Unmercifully by the Opposition Yet Does Not Defend Its Policy.

The Indian Style of Government in Vogue—Reserves and Pot-latches the Rule.

WEDNESDAY, April 20, 1892.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

Mr. Cotton raised a point of order and asked the Speaker if the rules of House had been complied with in the Canadian Northern Bill, which proposed to revive the charter of the Canadian Western Central Railway company, which expired on the 31st of April.

At the request of the Premier the matter was left over till the Attorney-General was in his seat.

The Finance Minister moved that the House go into committee of supply to consider the message of the Lieutenant-Governor, together with the supplementary estimates.

Mr. Brown took advantage of this opportunity to haul the Premier over the coals for characterizing his constituents, who were single tax advocates as communists and socialists, and read extracts to show the difference between these parties. He also referred to the document issued by the Government purporting to be the census of British Columbia. The Premier had acknowledged that a redistribution measure would be brought down when there was a sufficient preponderance of population on the Mainland to warrant it; but he was pledged to more, as he promised to bring about redistribution as soon as possible after the census of the province was taken. The object of publishing this paper was ostensibly to bring about a recount of the population, but in reality it was to stave off the evil day when the Government would be obliged to carry out its pledges. The document was most inaccurate in almost every particular, and could only have the effect of injuring the province in the eyes of the world. The representation in the House showed the urgent necessity for redistribution, even on Vancouver Island. One constituency of 200 population has a representative, while another having a population of 5000 has only one member. He denied having objected to the Crofters bill because it was proposed to settle people on the Island, but he admitted that he had said in criticizing it that the Government recognized that it would be forced to bring about a redistribution and was taking steps to get wealthy companies to support it. With regard to the supplementary estimates he had not much to say. He did not object to increasing the salaries of the members if the members did their work; but if the policy of the Government was to provide deputies who were to do the departmental work which should fall upon the Ministers, he would oppose that policy.

Mr. Keith did not oppose the increase in Ministerial salaries, or the creation of a Minister of Railways. He thought there was need for a number of railways and for new railway policy. He was surprised that the supplementary estimates did not contain an appropriation for a school at Nanaimo, which was urgently needed. Old buildings were being pressed into service and they did not give sufficient accommodation. He noticed that Vancouver got \$20,000 for a new court house at the solicitation of the junior member for Vancouver city. That member had gone over to the Government side of the House, and the Government had practically bought him for \$20,000.

Mr. Hunter interrupted the speaker with the remark that Mr. Horne was cheap at that price; and asked if the member for Nanaimo could not be bought for \$10,000.

Mr. Keith ignored the interruption and continued criticizing the policy of the Government with regard to the Crofter scheme. He said he knew a fisherman up the coast who had applied for a land grant to carry on the fishing industry. He could not get the land, however, as he did not belong to a syndicate. It was evident the policy of the Government was to foster monopolies as far as possible. He also referred to the redistribution question, pointing out that as matters stood at present the 20 members who supported the Government, including the member for Vancouver city, received 4545 votes, while the 13 Opposition members represented 9468 votes. If justice were done redistribution would be brought about at once.

Dr. Milne was surprised that the Government had seen fit to treat the House with so much contempt as not even to listen to the members on an occasion of this kind, when the supplementary estimates were being discussed. Every member of the Cabinet was absent from his seat. It was proposed to vote an increase of salary to the ministers and to create a new minister. He thought that when such a change was contemplated an explanation from the Government was due. Referring to the matter of the census, it was deplorable to notice by the Dominion census returns that in the rural districts of the Province the white population has decreased 1800 in the last 10 years. The district of Cariboo, represented by the Premier, has decreased 2000 in the same time. The cities had prospered owing to the enter-

prise of the inhabitants, and not owing to anything the Government had done, and they were all opposed to the Government. The Premier said that the Opposition were disloyal in opposing the Crofter scheme. He (Dr. Milne) maintained that the Opposition were loyal in a triple sense. They had said that if the selling fleet of the Province had been offered 500,000 acres of land, as had the crofters syndicate, and on the same terms, they would have at once accepted such a grand "give away." The Opposition were truly loyal in opposing the foreign syndicate scheme. They were also loyal to the crofters in endeavoring to maintain their rights, for it was proposed by the Government to bring them to the Province and leave them

over to the mercy of a company. The Premier made these statements about disloyalty because he had a bad cause to maintain, and no doubt would take back what he had said, as on other occasions.

Mr. Semlin had hoped for some enlightenment with regard to the Government's policy in the expenditure of the supplementary estimates and the elevation to the treasury benches of a new Minister. The estimates had been prepared before the House adjourned a week ago, and he thought the Opposition had been treated in a most unbecoming manner by the Government. They represented a portion of the country on the floor of the House, and they were entitled to different treatment. The Government wished to decide everything in caucus and give the Opposition no information at all; and would ask them to vote \$300,000 without discussing the manner in which it should be spent. It had been shown that there was a decrease in the rural population, yet in the face of this expenditures were running up on all sides. The honorable members of the Government should at least explain this strange discrepancy before they proposed to increase the ministry. If there was an increase in the Ministers' salaries, or an increase in the ministry, it should not be made until the last session of the House. The Government shipped under these articles and it was mutiny to increase their officers and pay when the voyage was half over and the ship at sea—especially when the expenses of the concern were greater than was at first contemplated. The estimates were altogether wrong and he opposed them with the utmost vigor.

Mr. Forster took the members of the Government to task for absenting themselves during the debate. The proposal to abolish the exemption from taxes on the E. & N. lands, brought in by Mr. McKenzie's bill which the Government voted down, he referred to. The President of the Council had said to tax these lands would be confiscation. He was surprised that such an opinion was expressed, when history gave numerous instances where such action was taken and was not deemed confiscation. The E. & N. Company would sell only surface rights, retaining stone, coal, timber, and foreshore rights, and an imposition of taxes was absolutely necessary. The Government was adopting the Indian style of government. They had their reserves all over the country, and were now adopting the "potlatch" system, or as the Premier would say "give-away" system, to keep their chief in power. Appropriations were made only with regard to Government support. The necessity of a redistribution of seats was also apparent. The country was sadly misrepresented. Populous districts had very little representation, while some of the members on the Government side efficiently represented beaver and muskrats.

Mr. McKenzie was disappointed because the supplementary estimates did not alter the injustice done his district. With regard to the increase of salary proposed to be given the ministers, he would have no objection provided efficient ministers were appointed. The country was especially in need of a competent and live chief commissioner, but that gentleman's annual report showed his entire incapability. The education department also needed waking up. Schools were not reported in the returns and were not visited by the inspectors.

Mr. Kitchen complained of the gross injustice done the district of Westminster by the estimates, and which injustice was not redressed by the supplementary estimates. The policy of the Government seemed to be to give away lands to keep itself in power; bleeding the district he represented and others which did not return Government supporters, to feed newly created pocket boroughs, which would support the Government. Although he had not intended to oppose the increase of salary to the ministers he must object to the payment of \$2100 to an assistant to do the work of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Sword agreed with his colleague. He was not surprised at the silence of the Government supporters, as it would be impossible to defend their policy. In concluding his remarks he moved an amendment to the motion that the House go into committee of supply, "that a fair system of representation should be introduced by the Government."

The motion was negatived on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Beaven, Milne, Brown, Keith, Kelle, Cotton, Punch, Sword, Kitchen, McKenzie, Grant, Semlin—12. Nays—Messrs. Horne, Smith, Baker, Forster, Turner, Martin, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Robson, Davis, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nasos—18.

The original motion was resolved in the affirmative on the same division, with the exception that Mr. Forster also voted with the Opposition.

COMMITTEE OF SUPPLY.

The House then went into committee

of supply, Mr. Martin in the chair.

The first item on the list challenged was that of \$5000 an addition to the \$30000 voted last year for artesian well boring. Mr. Semlin asked the Chief Commissioner if this \$5000 was to be spent in continuing the experiment this year. The people of his district were anxious that the work should be gone on with, and he learned that in the Yakima valley, in Washington, which was much the same formation as in Yale, an engineer who was now in Victoria had been successful in sinking three flowing wells.

The Chief Commissioner replied that the sum was to be devoted to meeting an over-expenditure of last year, and added that the work of boring for artesian wells would not be continued by the Government. It was proposed to sell the machinery or hire it to anyone who might wish to use it.

Mr. Kitchen next objected to the grant of \$1000 proposed to be expended in replacing a dam on Okanagan creek. This was reclaiming private lands at the public expense.

The Chief Commissioner scouted the idea of building reclamation works with \$1000.

Mr. Forster could not see how the people in the Chief Commissioner's district could get dams built when those in Nanaimo could not.

The committee then rose and reported progress.

The Premier informed the Speaker that it was the intention to sit in the evening.

Mr. Kitchen objected to this and asked the reason of the change of programme.

Hon. Mr. Robson replied that it was to punish the Opposition for gassing during the afternoon.

Mr. Brown remarked that the Government were too cowardly to say anything in support of their policy, but because they used their mechanical majority to force legislation upon them, it did not follow that they could gag them too. No advantage would be gained by the night session.

Mr. Martin began to speak, but Mr. Speaker called "6 o'clock" and left the chair.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at eight o'clock.

THAT DAM.

The House then went into committee on supply, Mr. Martin in the chair. The discussion on the appropriation of \$1000 for rebuilding a dam at Mission creek, Okanagan, was resumed.

Mr. Kitchen contended that this was another instance of favoritism on the part of the Government towards their political supporters. If the Government meant to inaugurate a new system, why should it not be made to apply to the Fraser river as well as to Okanagan? He knew of settlers in the Squamish valley who could not get a few dollars to build a road, much less get an appropriation for dyking purposes. Why was not the same assistance given to them? It was quite evident that the Government was legislating in the interest of private individuals and not for the benefit of the public at large.

Hon. Mr. Vernon explained that this was a case where the river overflowed its banks and the settlers—about 40 in number—were too poor to construct the dam. It was therefore but right that the Government should come to their assistance.

Dr. Milne raised objection on the ground that if the House passed such legislation for the benefit of outlying districts, it would tend to keep them from forming themselves into municipalities, as they could get the public works done more cheaply by the Government. He would like to know more about the history of this dam.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—"Would you?" Messrs. Keith and Foster spoke in the same strain, pointing out the impossibility of getting appropriations for much-needed public works in Nanaimo district.

The item then passed.

THE FAITHFUL REWARDED.

The appropriation of \$1000 (additional) for Esquimalt, Cowichan and Comox districts met with opposition on the grounds that the large districts of New Westminster and Nanaimo were allowed only the same amount and that no explanation was offered by the Government, as to where, or on what public works, it was proposed to spend the amount.

Messrs. Milne, Keith, Forster, Sword and Kitchen repeatedly asked for information, but received no answer. The amount, they claimed, was put down in the estimates at random, no regard apparently having been paid to the importance or needs of the districts or the length of the roads. The only consideration evidently was fidelity to the Government. When the estimates were brought down the Finance Minister promised that the House would be furnished with information regarding every detail, but now it was clear that it was the intention to choke off discussion.

The various items passed.

SURVEYS.

Mr. Kitchen asked why \$47,000 was placed on the estimates for surveys, if after the lands were surveyed, if the public expense they were then given away. This was the case with the E. & N. railway belt, and also with the lands in the northern portion of Vancouver Island, which were handed over to a monopoly. He would like the Hon. Chief Commissioner to justify such an expenditure.

Mr. Hall rose to answer for the Hon. Chief Commissioner, whereupon Mr. Kitchen objected, stating that he sought the information from the Hon. Chief Commissioner.

Mr. Hall—"I am a member of this House and can speak on any question

that arises in the House."

Mr. Kitchen—"I admit that whatever the hon. gentleman may say has the strongest claims on the consideration of this House, for the published returns show that the district of Cassiar, which he represents, has contributed in the past year the sum of \$1.50 for real estate tax." (Great laughter.)

The item then passed.

THE MINISTER OF EDUCATION.

Mr. Semlin asked what circumstances had arisen to necessitate the creation of a new portfolio. Was it intended as a reward for a political supporter?

Hon. Mr. Davie referred Mr. Semlin to the Leader of the Opposition. He was an ex-Minister and would be able to explain.

Mr. Cotton asked if it was intended that the new Minister should exercise the functions of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would require additional legislation to make the change.

Hon. Mr. Davie replied that the Council of Public Instruction would still enjoy its powers.

Mr. Semlin stated that 10 years ago, when C. C. McKenzie was Superintendent of Education, Mr. Robson intimated that, in order to carry on the work of the department effectively, it was necessary to have a live superintendent. At that time the department cost \$8000; now it would cost \$14,000 and the work done was the same as that performed 10 years ago by the superintendent alone. The Government might say that the work of the department had increased, but his belief was that the reward of a faithful supporter was the real reason.

The item then passed.

EXPROPRIATION.

Hon. Chief Commissioner explained that the item of \$80,000 for expropriation of land for public purposes was to enable the Government to acquire property between Birdseye Walk and the Government grounds in order to build a land registry office.

The committee then rose and reported to the House.

The Hon. Mr. Robson moved that the House adjourn until 11 o'clock Thursday. Carried.

The House then adjourned at 10:45 o'clock.

AT THE BAR OF THE HOUSE.

The Sergeant-at-Arms with His Midable Mace and His Military Escort.

Introduces the Kennedy Brothers, Mr. Speaker and the Honorable Members.

All Admire the Awful Dignity of Representatives of Rotten Boroughs.

THURSDAY, April 21, 1892.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 10 o'clock.

The House considered the report of resolutions adopted in committee of supply, the several amounts being agreed to after passing through usual routine.

MONEY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE. Hon. Mr. Turner introduced a bill grant certain sums of money to public service of the province.

The bill was on motion considered in committee of the whole, and reported to the House. The report was adopted and the bill read a first and second time.

POINT OF ORDER.

Mr. Speaker gave the following ruling on the point of order raised by Mr. Cotton:

"The objection raised by the honorable senior member for Vancouver bill 76, might prevail had the bill been introduced by a private member, or if sought to alter the bill or enlarge area of the land grant of the Canadian Western Company acquired under act of 1889. But bill No. 76 only proposes to extend the time limit for commencement of construction work imposed by the act of 1889 and does not disturb any other of the conditions that act. Moreover the bill came by message from the Governor and being a Government measure is not assailable on the grounds stated by the honorable member."

Mr. Beaven asked upon what parliamentary authority the Government could revive a charter by a public measure without petition. Mr. Speaker referred Mr. Beaven to the Sumas Dyking Act, 1878, which was a private act, amended by a public act.

The Attorney-General quoted a Settlement Bill, 1883, as a precedent. Hon. Mr. Beaven did not consider these parallel cases. Then there was nothing brought before the House would show that the Canada Western Central want the charter revived.

Hon. Mr. Robson thought there was no vital principle violated. It was yesterday the charter expired. He proposed to revive this charter as a result of numerous interviews with company that the Government took such steps.

ANOTHER REVIVAL MADE.

Mr. Eberts moved the following resolution:

To move that the House do resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider Bill (No. 34) intitled "An act to amend the British Columbia University amendment Act, 1891."

Mr. Hunter and the Premier favored the resolution.

Mr. Semlin objected to the resolution because it was proposed to amend it secure a certain representation for Island. Mr. Smith also said he would vote to protect the interests of the mainland.

Mr. Booth could see no necessity in the bill, and Mr. Brown and Dr. Milne advised that it be held over for a year.

The resolution was negatived on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Robson, Vernon, Eberts, Hunter, Anderson, Fletcher, Beaven, Grant, Smith—9. Nays—Messrs. Milne, Horne, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Panch, Sword, Kitchen, McKenzie, Semlin, Rogers, Booth, Stoddart—14.

ALBERTA WANTS COMMUNICATION.

Mr. Fletcher moved the following resolution:

That whereas the rich and important district of Alberta is practically isolated from the rest of the Province; and whereas a contract, to which Dominion Government is a party, has been entered into for the extension of the Victoria-Wellington telegraph to Comox, within easy distance Alberta;

And whereas extensive milling and manufacturing interests are now being established in the said district;

And whereas it is believed that further extension of this line to head of Albert canal, in the said district, could be accomplished for moderate sum of \$1400;

And whereas such further extension would be of immense benefit to said district, as well as to the whole of west coast of Vancouver Island;

Therefore, be it resolved, that honorable address be presented to Honorable the Lieutenant-Governor; urging that he may be pleased to move Dominion Government to take steps as may be necessary to secure speedy construction of the work referred to.

Mr. Fletcher called the attention of the House to the great undeveloped wealth of his district and the need of communication with the outside world.

Dr. Milne seconded the resolution and congratulated the member for his able speech in support of his request.

The motion passed unanimously.

in the House." "I admit that whatever gentleman may say has the claims on the consideration of the House, for the published returns of the district of Cassiar, which have been contributed in the sum of \$1.50 for real estate (Great laughter.) "I then passed."

MINISTER OF EDUCATION. "I admit that whatever gentleman may say has the claims on the consideration of the House, for the published returns of the district of Cassiar, which have been contributed in the sum of \$1.50 for real estate (Great laughter.) "I then passed."

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

Mr. Speaker asked if it was intended to exercise the powers of the Council of Public Instruction, and if so whether it would be a political supporter? Mr. Semlin, Minister of the Opposition, He Minister and would be able to answer.

AT THE BAR OF THE HOUSE.

The Sergeant-at-Arms with His Formidable Mace and His Military Escort.

Introduces the Kennedy Brothers to Mr. Speaker and the Honorable Members.

All Admire the Awful Dignity of the Representatives of Rotten Boroughs.

THURSDAY, April 31, 1893.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 11 o'clock. The House considered the report of resolutions adopted in committee of supply, the several amounts being agreed to after passing through the usual routine.

MONEY FOR PUBLIC SERVICE. Hon. Mr. Turner introduced a bill to grant certain sums of money to the public service of the province. The bill was on motion considered in committee of the whole, and reported to the House. The report was then adopted and the bill read a first and second time.

POINT OF ORDER. Mr. Speaker gave the following ruling on the point of order raised by Mr. Cotton:

"The objection raised by the honorable member for Vancouver to bill 76, might prevail had the bill been introduced by a private member, or had it sought to alter the bill or enlarge the area of the land grant of the Canada Western Company acquired under the act of 1889. But bill No. 76 only proposes to extend the time limit for the commencement of construction works imposed by the act of 1889 and does not disturb any other of the conditions of that act. Moreover the bill came down by message from the Governor and being a Government measure is not assailable on the grounds stated by the honorable member."

Mr. Beaven asked upon what parliamentary authority the Government could revive a charter by a public measure without petition.

Mr. Speaker referred Mr. Beaven to the *Sumas Dyking Act, 1878*, which was a private act, amended by a public act.

The Attorney-General quoted the *Settlement Bill, 1883*, as a precedent.

Hon. Mr. Beaven did not consider these parallel cases. Then there was nothing brought before the House that would show that the Canada Western Central want the charter revived.

Hon. Mr. Robson thought there was no vital principle involved. It was only yesterday the charter expired. It was proposed to revive this charter as the result of numerous interviews with company that the Government took such steps.

ANOTHER REVIVAL MADE. Mr. Eberts moved the following resolution:

"To move that the House do resolve itself into a committee of the whole to consider Bill (No. 84) intitled 'An Act to amend the British Columbia University Amendment Act, 1891.'"

Mr. Hunter and the Premier favored the resolution. Mr. Semlin objected to the resolution because it was proposed to amend it to secure a certain representation for the Island. Mr. Smith also said he would vote to protect the interests of the mainland.

Mr. Booth could see no necessity for the bill, and Mr. Brown and Dr. Milne advised that it be held over for a year. The resolution was negatived on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Robson, Vernon, Eberts, Hunter, Anderson, Fletcher, Beaven, Grant, Smith—9.

Nays—Messrs. Milne, Horne, Brown, Foster, Keith, Cotton, Panch, Sword, Kitchen, McKenzie, Semlin, Rogers, Booth, Stoddart—14.

ALBURNI WANTS COMMUNICATION. Mr. Fletcher moved the following resolution:

"That whereas the rich and important district of Alberni is practically isolated from the rest of the Province;

And whereas a contract, to which the Dominion Government is a party, has been entered into for the extension of the Victoria-Wellington telegraph line to Comox, within easy distance of Alberni;

And whereas extensive milling and manufacturing interests are now being established in the said district;

And whereas it is believed that the further extension of this line to the head of Alberni canal, in the said district, could be accomplished for the moderate sum of \$1400;

And whereas such further extension would be of immense benefit to said interests, as well as to the whole of the west coast of Vancouver Island;

Therefore, be it resolved, that an humble address be presented to His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that he may be pleased to move the Dominion Government to take such steps as may be necessary to secure the speedy construction of the work referred to.

Mr. Fletcher called the attention of the House to the great undeveloped wealth of his district and the necessity of communication with the outside world.

Dr. Milne seconded the resolution, and congratulated the member for Alberni on his able speech in support of his request.

The motion passed unanimously.

NO INFORMATION.

Mr. Grant asked the Premier if the Government had received any notification from the Dominion Government as to how it proposed dealing with the resolution regarding the Nelson & Port Sheppard Railway.

The Premier answered that no information had been received. The House then rose for recess.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The speaker took the chair at 3:30. **QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.**

The Premier expressed regret that he had so warmly opposed the ruling of the speaker on March 11th regarding the constitutionality of the *Equimault Water Bill*, which ruling on investigation of the highest authorities was justified and sustained.

Hon. Mr. Beaven thought the second

ruling of Mr. Speaker and the opinion of Mr. A. Richards sustained the position he had taken.

Mr. Speaker accepted the Premier's regrets. The remarks of Mr. Beaven, he said, were only another evidence how great minds will differ. The *Water Privilege Act* passed by the House since the 17th of March, more than sustained his ruling.

THE COMPANIES BILL.

The House went into committee on the Companies Bill, Mr. Cotton in the chair.

Some minor amendments were made and the bill reported to the House. The report was adopted and the bill read a third time and passed.

LAND REGISTRY BILL.

The above bill was considered in committee, Mr. Smith in the chair. Several amendments were made in committee and the bill reported to the House.

The Upper Columbia Tramway Land Grant Subsidy Bill was considered on report.

Mr. Sword moved to amend section 4 by adding, "Royalty on coal and timber shall not be included in such grant, and all rents for timber shall only be granted to the company for a term of seven years."

The amendment was voted down. Mr. Beaven's amendment to exclude Chinese from the work of constructing the tramway, was defeated on the following division:

Ayes—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Horne, Foster, Keith, Cotton, Kellie, Kitchen, McKenzie, Grant, Semlin, Fletcher—13. Nays—Messrs. Smith, Baker, Sword, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Hall, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson—17.

The committee rose and reported the bill, and the report was adopted and the bill read a third time and passed.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.

The above bill was also considered on report, and read a third time and passed.

RAILWAY BILL.

The Canada Western and Canada Northern Railway bill was considered in committee, Mr. Horne in the chair.

Mr. Semlin complimented the Government for adopting the policy of allowing rival railways in the country, and he hoped this policy would be adhered to.

The Premier would not admit that the Government proposed to change its policy in this particular. It was only proposed to deal with whichever road was proposed to offer the best guarantee to undertake the building of a road over the route.

Mr. Sword moved to amend the bill by inserting a clause to provide that the land granted to the railway should be taxed after 10 years.

The Premier objected to such an amendment. The Government did not want to be hampered by any such condition. The Government should have latitude, he thought, and be allowed to make the best bargain it could.

Mr. Foster did not think the Government should be allowed to give away land and exempt it from taxation. Ten years hence the Premier of the province would be saying as the present Premier did in regard to the Island Railway land grant, that it was "a great give away."

The Premier again denied that he had said the E. & N. Railway land grant was a give away.

The Attorney-General cited the case of the C.P.R. as an instance where a liberal land grant had benefited the country.

Mr. Grant was of the opinion that it was necessary to give a liberal grant to any railway which would open up the northern part of the interior.

Mr. Cotton favored Mr. Sword's amendment. It was necessary that the interests of the province should be protected.

The amendment was lost and section 2 was passed. The committee rose and reported progress.

BEFORE THE BRAZEN BAR.

At this juncture there was a stir in the galleries, which were rapidly filled up with an eager audience. Then the sergeant-at-arms placed the mace over his shoulder and walked down the aisle of the House, lifted the brass bar and proceeded outside. In a minute or so he returned with the now celebrated Kennedy brothers of the Columbian, who took the stand before the "bar of the House" amid applause from the Opposition and the galleries. Behind the Kennedy brothers stood the Superintendent and Sergeant of Provincial Police in uniform, and Gov. Moresby of Westminster, and several other officers.

Mr. Speaker announced that there must be no applause from the galleries,

but the members had a right to express their feelings.

The Clerk of the House read the motion of the 12th inst., fixing the charge of contempt of the House upon the Kennedy brothers, and authorizing the Speaker to issue a warrant to bring them before the bar of the House.

The Speaker announced that these gentlemen were now before the bar of the House. He then asked the delinquents why they did not respond to the summons?

Mr. James Kennedy asked Mr. Speaker if this was all the questions it was proposed to ask.

Mr. Speaker replied it was not. Mr. Kennedy then read the following document which he said was all the explanation or statement they proposed making:

"That previous to the 7th day of April, A.D. 1892, the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia did not possess the power of arrest with a view to adjudicate on a complaint of contempt committed out of doors."

"2. That the alleged offence (if any) was committed (if at all) previous to the 7th day of April, A.D. 1892, to wit, on the 17th day of March, A.D. 1892, at the city of New Westminster."

"3. That they have not been guilty of any contempt against your honorable House or against any committee thereof, touching any of its privileges."

"4. That they did not attend at the bar of your honorable House on the 29th day of March last past as directed in the summons firstly issued on the 22nd day of March, A.D. 1892, acting under the advice of counsel, who advised that your honorable body had no jurisdiction to punish as for contempt for the publication of an alleged libel committed out of doors."

"5. That although sufficient notice of the granting of an injunction may be given by telegram, yet service of any process issued by or with the sanction of your honorable House, directed to or against any party or parties whom it is sought to affect, disobedience to which would be followed by punishment, as for contempt, must be personal, and the original of any such process must be shown by the party serving."

"6. That at the time of the alleged service of the summons issued after the passing of the 'Legislative Assembly Privileges Act, 1892,' the original summons or process was not in the possession of the party effecting such service, nor was it in the City of New Westminster where the alleged service was attempted to be effected."

"7. That the said act, viz.: 'Legislative Assembly Privileges Act, 1892,' does not give to your honorable House jurisdiction to entertain any application in the nature of process for contempt in respect of the matter complained of herein, inasmuch as the alleged contempt was committed (if at all) before the passing of the said Act."

"8. That the said Act itself is *ultra vires* as far as punishing for libel alleged to have been published out of doors."

"9. That the said Act is not expressed to be retrospective, yet, in the proposed application of it against Messrs. Kennedy, it is construed so as to be retrospective."

"10. That should it be attempted to punish as for non-attendance, or disobedience to any summons, subpoena or warrant, Messrs. Kennedy contend that it must be as in respect of a summons, subpoena or warrant issued in a matter which this honorable House has no jurisdiction to enquire into."

"11. That they bona fide believed that no summons, subpoena or warrant had been issued, and the alleged notice by telegram of an alleged summons was not genuine, as the circumstances surrounding the proceedings in this matter from its very inception will prove what their belief was not unreasonable."

"12. That the editorial published in the *Columbian* on the 24th March last past, explains the article published in the said newspaper on the 17th day of March last past, (being the alleged libel constituting the contempt herein) and clearly demonstrates the fact that Messrs. Kennedy did not make any personal charges against any of your committee, or any members thereof, or against any member of your Honorable House."

"13. That Messrs. Kennedy believed at the time, and still do believe, that the public interests would have been better served by the grant of the charter referred to in the said article, so that the carrying of passengers between the two cities should not be a monopoly."

"14. That they believed and still do believe, that it was their duty as public journalists to criticize the action of the committee in reporting against the said Bill."

Mr. Kennedy also referred the House to an article in the *Columbian* of the 24th of March, which was read by the clerk.

Mr. Speaker asked if this was to be regarded as an explanation or apology? Mr. Kennedy replied that it was to be regarded as an explanation only.

After consulting some authorities Mr. Speaker announced to Messrs. Kennedy that they might withdraw, pending the action of the House, and they retired with their Government guard.

The Attorney-General then moved that James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy being guilty of contempt of the House, be committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-arms and be brought before the bar of the House to-morrow at 11 o'clock. In speaking on the motion the Attorney-General said he could not help thinking the defendants had been very badly advised in this matter. They had been advised to defy the authority of the House, and had chosen to take the stand that the House had no right to deal with them. He was satisfied the steps taken by the House were

properly taken. The explanation given was only an aggravation of what the parties had done on March 17th. It was every bit as bad as a libel. The fact of when or where it was written made no difference, and the parties were responsible just the same. There could be no more flagrant contempt than was shown in the article just read by the clerk. The parties had been adjudged guilty, and summoned to appear, but they did not come because they were served by telegraph. They had already found in the Supreme Court that they had been badly advised. The Attorney-General then cited a similar case which occurred in Victoria, in 1884, with reference to William Frarr. One George Dill was charged with a scandalous breach of the privileges of the House. The defendant had only notice of the order to appear before the House, and was judged guilty of contempt because he paid no attention to it. A warrant was issued for him and he was brought before the House by the sergeant-at-arms. As a punishment the defendant was placed in custody for one month. An application made for a *habeas corpus* was refused, and the action of the House was sustained on an appeal to the privy council. The case was almost similar to that before the House and the same action was taken and sustained. He offered this resolution because these gentlemen were anxious to test the power of the House. There were four judges in the city to whom they could apply. The parties were only entitled to sympathy so far as they were ill advised. If they chose to make such attacks upon the House and then pose as public martyrs this was not the fault of the House. By giving them till the morning they could satisfy themselves as to their position by applying to the Supreme Court, which had abundant jurisdiction in the matter, the decision of which court the House was willing to receive, and it would also give time to consider the additional libel. He did not propose to deal with the parties by means of a retrospective act, but by powers possessed by the House at all times. If the parties thought the House was wrong they could appeal to the Supreme Court. They were not being persecuted, but the House was simply saying it could not be libelled with impunity. He was sorry to see that some members were trying to make political capital out of it, but he was glad some had reason above this partyism. There was nothing autocratic in the action of the House. It was merely asserting that it was a deliberative body which must be respected.

The Premier seconded the motion of the Attorney-General.

Mr. Beaven said he thought experience would have taught the Attorney-General wisdom, but it seemed he was determined to push this matter until he would show that as a constitutional lawyer he (the Attorney-General) was not a success. He did not think the House would back up the Government in trying to suppress free discussion and a free press in the province. The Government had on all occasions shown a disposition to muzzle the press when an attempt was made to discuss or criticize the actions of the Government. Wherever they could find any unfortunate editor who made some statement charging it with wrong doing, action for libel was immediately instituted. In fact the policy of the Government all along was to try and bulldoze the press. Before the present Government came into office there were no actions for libel brought against the fourth estate. Here Mr. Beaven reminded Mr. Speaker, that he (Mr. Speaker) as the editor of a paper, had libelled him, (Mr. Beaven) more than any other man in the province, but he took no notice of it. Here were two men brought over from the Queen City of Westminster before the bar of the House. He had never seen such an autocratic Czarian offence committed by the House before. If the country had not a free press the grossest acts could be carried on and no one could say nay, and the papers, which the owners struggled to make attractive, would not be worth reading. He was not in favor of licensing the press, but he did not believe in bulldozing it. A hundred times worse articles had appeared in other papers in the province, and no notice was taken of them. There was absolutely nothing to justify the House in acting as it did in this matter. He thought that Edward Blake was a higher constitutional authority than the Attorney-General, and that eminent legal authority was decided in the opinion that laws passed by the other provinces similar to the Legislative Assembly Act recently passed by the House was *ultra vires*. The Acts of Ontario and Quebec were both disallowed by the Dominion Government in 1889. The matter was referred to the law officers of the Crown in England, who also pronounced them *ultra vires*, contending that local governments had no such powers. Even if the House had such powers he did not think it becoming that they should be exercised to suppress the fourth estate. If only statements made by a subsidized press were to be allowed, there would be a lamentable state of affairs. He did not think the House would take the right step if it passed the Attorney-General's motion, and he moved to amend it, by striking out all the words after "that" and inserting instead, "this House proceed no further in this matter and that James and Robert Kennedy be now discharged from custody."

Mr. Brown intimated that before the motion was put he wished to say something on the subject. He did not think the House had the powers the Attorney-General claimed, and he denied that any libel or contempt had been committed. No contempt could be committed as the House had not the power to enforce its mandates, and no scandalous libel had been committed, as the

House had just as emphatically as the article complained of in the *Columbian* condemned the action of the majority of the private bills committee and the Attorney-General, though probably the language used was not as strong. It was because of the action of the private bills committee in attempting to strangle a bill, and the interference of the Attorney-General in advising the committee that the alleged libellous utterances were made; and the article was only a reiteration of the action of the House. No attempt had been made to fix any charge, the Government being satisfied to make the blatant disclaimer, "oh they meant, so and so." The Gill case as cited by the Attorney-General as an authority, was not an analogous case. The action taken in this case was sustained by the Privy Council because the colony of Victoria was given special powers by special grant, and no such powers were granted by the B. N. A. Act, the best constitutional authorities all agreed. The Attorney-General had said the defendants had not been unfairly dealt with, but the facts of the case showed the very opposite. Some of the members of the Government in discussing the matter fairly foamed at the mouth in their judicial dignity and righteous wrath. The courts, he thought, were sufficient to prevent scandalous libel; but the Attorney-General wanted by a majority of the House representing a small minority of the electors, to entrench himself in his position, by gagging the press. Here the speaker called attention to the fact that the Premier, Attorney-General and the second member for Yale had vindictive feelings toward the *Columbian* for the manner in which it had scored them on several occasions, and they waited this opportunity to vent their spite upon it. While the Government organs dealt in innuendoes and underhand attacks, these men who were summoned to appear before the House had because vigorous Anglo-Saxon and because they were manly enough to do this, and a machine majority said their criticism was a libel, they were dragged off to prison like common felons. The whole thing was a farce notwithstanding the glory and show of the sergeant-at-arms with the mace over his shoulder walking up and down the House. While the House was allowed to exercise such power the Government would always use it tyrannically and for party purposes as in this case.

It being near six o'clock Mr. Beaven asked the House might not be required to set at night, as there was a public meeting to decide upon the celebration of the Queen's birthday which he had to attend and which he hoped other members of the House would be present at. While this was being discussed, Mr. speaker called "six o'clock" and left the chair.

EVENING SESSION.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

Mrs. Mr. Pooley, resuming the debate on Hon. Mr. Beaven's amendment, said that the Leader of the Opposition had referred to opinions expressed by Sir John McDonald and Ed. Blake as to the power of the House to punish for contempt, but these opinions had been given on statutes passed by a House which had no authority such as the Legislature of British Columbia had. The Leader of the Opposition did not dare to oppose the Attorney-General on the ground that the *Columbian's* article of March 17th was all right. The article in question was a most disgraceful one and when he (Mr. Pooley) saw the Hon. member for New Westminster city stoop so low as to applaud those men when they were brought before the bar of the House—men who had vilified and slandered members of the House and had offered not one word of explanation or apology for their conduct—he could only say that he considered the conduct of the honorable gentleman beneath contempt. He could not find stronger language in which to characterize the conduct of the member for New Westminster. Everyone who saw those men at the bar of the House must be convinced that they did not write that article and that they were merely catpaws to hide the member who really did write it. He could not believe that these men ever wrote the article. They had been used and made tools of by a certain member of this House and the Hon. member for Westminster city had tapped his desk and applauded merely to egg those men on and give them courage. As to the legality of the proceedings he agreed with what the Attorney-General had said and if the defendants thought themselves in any way injured or aggrieved they would have an opportunity of testing the constitutionality of the act and the validity of the proceedings in the highest courts of the land. Members of the Opposition had tried to fix the whole responsibility for the present proceedings on the Government, but the plain fact was that the libel was addressed not against the Government but against the private bills committee and it was the House and not the Government that had taken steps to protect its dignity and defend its members from insult. The Government was strong enough, and notwithstanding Mr. Brown's applause the House was strong enough to take care of itself and the time had not yet come in British Columbia when any corporation or any individual had succeeded in becoming so influential as to be able to set its authority at defiance. By a vote of 23 to 6 the House had declared the article to be an outrageous scandal and a high contempt of privilege. It was not a party vote. Mr. Brown's applause therefore was a slur on the 23 members who voted that it was a slander. It was said that the Attorney-General desired to gag the press. If by gagging the press was meant the prevention of libellous and scandalous statements then it was high time to gag

the press. Those who made such statements must be taught to use decent and respectful language when commenting on the actions of public men. If those men when they came here to-day, thought to intimidate the House, they made an egregious mistake. No threat could divert the Government from the course it had so far pursued. Every step had been fully considered, nothing had been done hastily, and when the House had after due deliberation decided to act as it did, it would take more power than any one person possessed to divert them from their course. He would therefore support the resolution of his friend, the Attorney-General.

Mr. Brown rose to a point of order. The President of the council had instructed that he (Mr. Brown) had written the *Columbian's* article of March 17. Does he mean it?

Hon. Mr. Robson—"He did not say so."

Hon. Mr. Pooley—"I said that these men had been made catpaws of by the man who did write the article."

Mr. Brown—Every one knew that these gentlemen had not written the article. The Premier and the Attorney-General knew perfectly well who the editor of the paper was, but they had carefully left his name out of the summons. He (Mr. Brown) had had nothing to do with the article, either directly or indirectly, but he did not say this because he was ashamed of anything it contained. [Applause.]

Mr. Semlin said the Attorney-General after ransacking all the laws of Canada had gone to Australia to get a precedent for his action. It was the first time in the history of Canada that a member of the fourth estate had been brought before the bar of the House to protect the dignity of the House. His honorable friend who had just spoken had shown that even legal gentlemen can go astray. It is well for that gentleman that he was protected by the House as the press never spoke as contemptibly about a member of the Legislature as that gentleman had spoken of the member for New Westminster. He had gone so far as to infer that Mr. Brown had either inspired or written the article complained of. The article was no doubt written when feeling in New Westminster was running very high and warm. If, as the President of the Council had said, the men before the bar were innocent the House should apologize to them, not they to the House. The Attorney-General and President of the Council had said that the action of the House was legal and therefore it was not for him to argue with them on that point, but there is just as high an authority as those two gentlemen, viz., two Ministers of Justice of Canada, both of whom claimed that it was doubtful if the House had the power to summons for contempt committed outside of the House. In the first place the Government had made a mistake in the gentlemen they had brought to the bar. The honorable gentleman opposite admitted that. Will it add to the dignity of the House to punish men who had nothing to do with the writing of the article? The honorable gentleman said the Kennedys were not capable of writing the article. Even if they were capable they might have made a mistake. The President of the Council had said that Mr. Brown had applauded men for libelling the House. Could he not just as well have said that Mr. Brown applauded them for coming to the bar? If the article is a libel there are libels in the papers every day. There are certain privileges granted to the fourth estate and as a rule the papers do not go past that privilege. His contention was that if the article complained of made the writer liable to be called before the bar of the House, almost every newspaper man in Canada would be in that position. The President of the Council admits that the press is a power. Everybody knew that and they also knew that where the press is free, there is the greatest freedom and progress. There are courts to deal with matters of this kind, and if the article was a libel the courts would let the men know the full extent of their delinquency. The press might for the public good step beyond the boundary, in writing about something they thought was wrong. The article in question had said that the Attorney-General had acted in an unjustifiable manner in going into the committee room, therefore if the Attorney-General did not act in an unjustifiable manner, the article would be a libel on him. But the Attorney-General had not spoken of that. He (Mr. Semlin)

had been a member of the House for many years and every session he had heard expressions thrown across the floor of the House that would show that some members at least did not respect the dignity of the House. He had heard both the Premier and the Attorney-General call the honorable the Leader of the Opposition some pretty hard names.

Hon. Mr. Davis. "I never did."

Mr. Semlin said if he had not used such strong language he had tried to make the members believe that Mr. Beaven was a blackguard. The honorable gentleman opposite were very anxious for the dignity of the House but they use terms wholly unjustifiable and which tended to lower the dignity of the House in the eyes of the public, but you do not hear of them being brought before the bar of the House. If an obscure journalist, however, dares to say anything he is hauled before the bar, and for what? To maintain the dignity of the House! Is it just making the House the laughing stock of the whole community? The Premier had spoken of Mr. Kellic as if he had committed one of the most despicable crimes but the Premier had not been brought before the bar of the House for doing so. The Premier overlooked his own action and had those

men brought here who were in opposition to him, men who had been born and brought up in the provinces. And just because they had written an article when public feeling was running high. As soon as they found that the article had been misunderstood they explained it. Under the present circumstances he thought the House was acting in a short-sighted way. It was in the interest of society that the press should be free in their speech. The writer of the article knew that parties had been at the House opposing a bill they were interested in and when the bill was defeated they wrote an article. They thought no doubt that it needed a strong article to draw public attention to the fact. It would have been better for the Government to let the matter rest when the explanatory article had appeared. He was of opinion that the law quoted by the gentlemen opposite could be challenged as there were legal gentlemen in the provinces who differed with them. If the House has got the power it must be given to it by the British North America Act, but the Attorney-General's law passed before confederation. If the gentlemen at the bar could not write the article they could not write the legal opinions that they had read. So there must be, at least one legal gentleman, who differed with the legal adviser of the Government. Again, if the power is possessed by the Government will it add to the dignity of the House to enforce its power in an arbitrary and harsh manner against innocent men, as the president of the council said the Kennedys are innocent. Those in power can afford to be generous and it would be more generous to overlook the offense, if any. He would support Hon. Mr. Beaven's amendment.

Hon. Mr. Davis did not doubt that the House possessed the power they had exercised. The House had been told that what had been done was the action of the Government supported by a subservient majority. Such was not the case. The article was not a libel on any one member of the Government, what had been said about him was just criticism. The action of the Government was to give the Kennedys a chance to take the matter into court. The House should be congratulated and the people be proud to have a Government bold enough to take to court papers that made vile and libellous attacks upon them. If the men had come before the bar and said that they were not responsible for what had been written the House might have let them go. As for public feeling in New Westminster, he took no stock in that. One day they will worship a man and next day hate him.

Mr. Foster said it mattered little to him what the precedent had been, he did not think it was right nor had the House the power to imprison the gentlemen nearest the bar. The House might at the case from the beginning, the Attorney-General did an unusual thing to go into the private bills committee when a bill was being considered. The Attorney-General had told the committee that it was not the policy of the Government to charter roads of the kind proposed. The action of the committee in not reporting on the bill gave it a suspicious appearance. He was not surprised that a paper out of Victoria thought there was something crooked going on. When a man enters public life his actions are opened to criticism and if the publishers have gone a little too far they are not to blame. If they have made a mistake the House has no right to go any further than to say that it was wrong. If criticism of the kind complained of is stopped there will be no criticism at all. The President of the Council reflected on Mr. Brown because he cheered and he (Mr. Foster) had done the same thing because he thought the gentlemen were being badly treated. He for one would always stand up for the freedom of the press.

Mr. Martin objected to being accused of vindictive measures as he claimed he was not vindictive. The second article published had added insult to injury. If the publishers had apologized he would have voted to accept the apology.

Dr. Milne spoke in the same strain as he did when the matter was before the House previously.

Mr. Cotton thought that any one hearing what had passed could not but come to the conclusion that Messrs. Kennedy were not on trial before the House but that the House was on trial before the people. They wrote an article both strong and warm, but then look at the circumstances and he gave them credit. A bill they were interested in was thrown out, the reason for which was said to be that there was room for but one road between the two cities named in the bill. But the fact of the matter is that a company who own the one road are now preparing to build another line. As soon as it was reported to Westminster that the House objected to the article the gentlemen disclaimed any intention of imputing personal motives, but at the same time very honorably maintained what they had said. Of course the dignity of the House and members must be protected, but is the House going the right way about it? When the Attorney-General found that there was no bill to define the action of the Government, he introduced one. He said the bill did not create a new offence, but it nevertheless created a court with powers to punish the men. The House should be jealous of the freedom of the press, as the time might come when the members would be glad to have a free press. Very few can afford to stand a prosecution of this kind, for even if a paper thinks it is right it will be afraid to speak, not wishing to be ruined. The dignity of the House would not suffer if the Kennedys were discharged.

Mr. Baker referred to the actions of Mr. Brown as disgraceful. He said he had a private interest in a bill which

was detailed and he flies to a paper that he is interested in and vilifies the committee.

Mr. Brown was shocked and astonished at what Mr. Baker had said. There was not a word of truth in what that gentleman had said. He had not one cent of interest in the *Columbian* and no gentleman would make the statements like that before finding out the truth of them. It showed contemptible tactics were being used and he supposed Mr. Baker was doing it to entitle him to the new cabinet position.

Mr. Kellic said that the House was considering one of the most important resolutions that had been brought before it this session. The Hon. Attorney-General had said some weeks ago that it would be better to pursue this case in an ordinary court of justice but almost immediately afterwards had brought in a bill defining the privileges of the House and making any breach thereof punishable by the House. This showed that at the outset the Attorney-General had taken an untenable position. Without entering into the merits of the legal aspect of the question he would merely review the circumstances that had led to the writing of the *Columbian's* article of March 17. Being a member of that committee he had an opportunity of learning all that was to be learned in regard to the matter. The Attorney-General had, contrary to precedent, appeared before the private bills committee and defined the policy of the Government, showing that it was opposed to the granting of such a charter as was applied for on the ground that it would be injurious to the public interest. It was true the company had prepared no plans or profiles and had made no surveys but was it reasonable to expect any company to expend money when they had no guarantee that they would receive a charter? The present company which had a monopoly of the traffic opposed the granting of the charter on the ground that there was not enough traffic for two companies, but when put on oath they would not swear to the truth of their statement. They opposed it on the ground that they were now running at a loss and that they could not float their bonds. The fact was that they had tried to float bonds for \$750,000, although the actual cost of the road was not more than \$250,000. Five of the members of the private bills committee decided that it was not in the public interest to grant the charter, and only two supported the application. Considering the unusual almost suspicious circumstances connected with the refusal to grant the charter, he did not wonder at the excitement in New Westminster, nor that such strong language was used in the *Columbian's* article. That article was written in the heat of excitement just as this House now accused and judged and proposed to punish those gentlemen in the heat of excitement. These men were being tried by a prejudiced jury, by a House not fit to view the offence calmly and dispassionately. If members of the private bill committee feel themselves aggrieved, let them do as the Attorney-General had done, and adopt the more dignified course of appealing to an unprejudiced jury selected at haphazard. Even if the Messrs. Kennedys had been guilty of a deliberate breach of punishment, their punishment had been severe enough already.

Mr. Baker rose to a question of privilege. He had, he said, made an accusation against Mr. Brown which he at the time believed to be true. He accepted Mr. Brown's denial and apologized to that gentleman.

Mr. Brown gladly accepted the explanation and apology of the honorable and gallant member for East Kootenay.

Mr. Grant thought that the only thing to be considered was this: Did the *Columbian* traduce the members of the private bills committee? If they did they should be made to apologize or submit to punishment, for the members of the House should be like Caesar's wife, above suspicion. (Governmental applause.)

Hon. Mr. Robson could not understand the position of Mr. Kellic. He had "turned tail" and there was no manliness or honor in the course he pursued. Messrs. Grant and Milne had the manliness, the consistency to protect members of the House but Mr. Kellic was in a most humiliating position and clearly showed that he could not rise above base political considerations. The Messrs. Kennedy had set the Legislature at defiance and they must be made to go on their knees and retract or apologize for what the House had already pronounced a gross breach of privilege.

Mr. Booth said that now it was not the private bills committee but the Legislature that was set at defiance, and how could the House retract its steps? The statement of the accused had made was but an aggravation of their offence.

Mr. Smith said he agreed with the majority. He was not vindictive and merely wanted an apology that would vindicate the honor of the House.

Mr. Kitchen said that the Premier had bestowed condemnation on Mr. Kellic and taffy on Mr. Grant, although the records showed that the latter gentleman had on this question twice turned tail, for he had voted for the Attorney-General's original resolution, then for Hon. Mr. Robt. Beaven's amendment to let the matter drop, and now he had voted round again and given his support to the Government. After reviewing legal decisions by Canadian Ministers of Justice and referring to Mr. Justice Walkem's refusal to grant a writ of *habeas corpus* and the peculiarity of the manner of service of the House's summons, Mr. Kitchen said that they had heard much about contempt and honor and dignity, but the statements of Mr. Baker and Hon. Mr. Pooley reflected far more severely on the honor and integrity of members of the House than anything that had ever been written in the *Columbian*. Other newspapers, notably the *Attorney-General's*, written squibs on honorable members which were libellous and a high contempt of privilege. If the members of the private bills committee had consciences, why did they not go to independent court and not make themselves the judges? He would not vote for punishing anyone in order that the Attorney-General might be able to prove that he was a little sound in law. The amendment was then put to the following division:

Yeas—Messrs. Beaven, Semlin, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kellic, Sword, Kellic and McKenzie—10.

Nays—Messrs. Grant, Baker, Hon. Smith, Nason, Fletcher, Hall, Anderson, Rogers, Booth, Stoddart, Hunter, Everts, Martin, Vernon, Turner, Dr. Robson, Panch and Pooley—20.

Mr. McKenzie then moved to amend the resolution by adding the words "to be then discharged from custody." The Government had wreaked vengeance on teachers and were trying to muzzle the press.

Mr. Kellic stated that the Premier and the Attorney-General appeared before the House with a desire to protect the dignity of the House, yet the Premier charged him with fraud and had the manliness to retract or apologize. The Attorney-General had been in the administration of justice and (Mr. Kellic) could produce instances of gross miscarriage of justice.

Mr. Brown would not apologize again taking up the time of the House. He was aware that the President of the Council had characterized his conduct "beneath contempt," nevertheless (Mr. Brown) would try to struggle under his denunciation. He considered himself quite as good a judge of what was right and fitting as any member of the House. Dr. Milne had quoted papers that supported the Government and especially a paper published in Vancouver City, which could be bought for \$5 to write anything that one wanted to write. The Messrs. Kennedy fighting not the House but the Government, and they were backed by citizens of New Westminster who would not knuckle down to any errand or House if they believed they were in the right. (Applause.)

Mr. Brown then proceeded to scold members of the Government and eloquently for over half an hour.

Mr. Hunter said that Mr. Brown been in political life for only two years and if he went on in this way he soon reach the very lowest depths of political infamy. Mr. Beaven too been guilty of a "large amount of mean cunning," said the Hon. member for Comox.

The amendment was then lost by vote of 10 to 19. Mr. Grant not voting. The original motion was then carried on the same vote.

The House then adjourned at 10 o'clock a.m.

mons, Mr. Kitchen said that they had heard much about contempt and honor and dignity, but the statements of Mr. Baker and Hon. Mr. Pooley reflected far more severely on the honor and integrity of members of the House than anything that had ever been written in the *Columbian*. Other newspapers, notably the *Attorney-General's*, written squibs on honorable members which were libellous and a high contempt of privilege. If the members of the private bills committee had consciences, why did they not go to independent court and not make themselves the judges? He would not vote for punishing anyone in order that the Attorney-General might be able to prove that he was a little sound in law. The amendment was then put to the following division:

Yeas—Messrs. Beaven, Semlin, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kellic, Sword, Kellic and McKenzie—10.

Nays—Messrs. Grant, Baker, Hon. Smith, Nason, Fletcher, Hall, Anderson, Rogers, Booth, Stoddart, Hunter, Everts, Martin, Vernon, Turner, Dr. Robson, Panch and Pooley—20.

Mr. McKenzie then moved to amend the resolution by adding the words "to be then discharged from custody." The Government had wreaked vengeance on teachers and were trying to muzzle the press.

Mr. Kellic stated that the Premier and the Attorney-General appeared before the House with a desire to protect the dignity of the House, yet the Premier charged him with fraud and had the manliness to retract or apologize. The Attorney-General had been in the administration of justice and (Mr. Kellic) could produce instances of gross miscarriage of justice.

Mr. Brown would not apologize again taking up the time of the House. He was aware that the President of the Council had characterized his conduct "beneath contempt," nevertheless (Mr. Brown) would try to struggle under his denunciation. He considered himself quite as good a judge of what was right and fitting as any member of the House. Dr. Milne had quoted papers that supported the Government and especially a paper published in Vancouver City, which could be bought for \$5 to write anything that one wanted to write. The Messrs. Kennedy fighting not the House but the Government, and they were backed by citizens of New Westminster who would not knuckle down to any errand or House if they believed they were in the right. (Applause.)

Mr. Brown then proceeded to scold members of the Government and eloquently for over half an hour.

Mr. Hunter said that Mr. Brown been in political life for only two years and if he went on in this way he soon reach the very lowest depths of political infamy. Mr. Beaven too been guilty of a "large amount of mean cunning," said the Hon. member for Comox.

The amendment was then lost by vote of 10 to 19. Mr. Grant not voting. The original motion was then carried on the same vote.

The House then adjourned at 10 o'clock a.m.

tested and he flies to a
at he is interested in and vil-
committee.
town was shocked and astonish-
at Mr. Baker had said. There
a word of truth in what that
an had said. He had not one
interest in the Columbian and
man would make the state-
that before finding out the
them. It showed clearly on
of the House contemptible
were being used and he sup-
r. Baker was doing it to en-
to the new cabinet position.
bly said that the House was
ing one of the most important
as that had been brought be-
his session. The Hon. Ator-
eral had said some weeks ago
could be better to pursue this
n ordinary court of justice but
immediately afterwards had
in a bill defining the privileges
use and making any breach
unpunishable by the House. This
hat at the outset the Attorney-
had taken an untenable posi-
without entering into the moral
aspect of the question he
erely review the circumstances
led to the writing of the Co-
article of March 17. Being a
of that committee he had an
ity of learning all that was to
ed in regard to the matter. The
-General had, contrary to pre-
appeared before the private
committee and defined the policy
overnment, showing that it was
to the granting of such a char-
as applied for on the ground
could be injurious to the public
It was true the company had
no plans or profiles and had
surveys but was it reasonable
et any company to expend
when they had no guar-
that they would receive
r? The present company which
onopoly of the traffic opposed
ning of the charter on the
that there was not enough
or two companies, but when put
they would not swear to the
their statement. They opposed
ground that they were now
at a loss and that they could
their bonds. The fact was
y had tried to float those bonds
000, although the actual cost of
was not more than \$250,000.
the members of the private bill
ee decided that it was not in
e interest to grant the charter,
y two supported the application.
ring the unusual, almost sus-
circumstances connected with
sal to grant the charter, he did
der at the outset the Attorney-
nester, not that such strong lan-
was used in the Columbian's
That article was written in
t of excitement just as this
ow accused and judged and
to punish those gentlemen in
of excitement. These men
ring tried by a prejudiced jury,
use not it to defend the offence
and dispassionately. If mem-
the private bill committee feel
aggravated, let them do as
rney-General had done, and
e more dignified course of ap-
to an unprejudiced jury select-
phazard. Even if the Messrs.
ys had been guilty of a delibera-
of punishment, their punish-
ed been severe enough already.
Baker rose to a question of priv-
He had, he said, made an accus-
against Mr. Brown which he at
believed to be true. He ac-
Mr. Brown's denial and apolo-
that gentleman.
rown gladly accepted the ex-
ant and apology of the honorable
member for East Kootenay,
rant thought that the only thing
sidered was this: Did the Co-
trafruce the members of the
bills committee? If they did
ould be made to apologize or
punishment, for the members
House should be like Caesar's
ove suspicion. (Governmental
2.)
Mr. Robson could not under-
e position of Mr. Keith. He
rned tail" and there was no
as or honor in the course he
Messrs. Grant and Milne had
liness, the consistency to pro-
members of the House but Mr.
as is a most humiliating posi-
clearly showed that he could
above base political considera-
The Messrs. Kennedy had set
lature at defiance and they
made to go on their knees and
or apologize for what the House
ady pronounced a gross breach
ege.
Sword said that the Premier
e the last man in the world to
at "turning tail." The Premier
hat it was to turn, although,
it took him a little longer to
both said that now it was not
rate bills committee but the
ure that was set at defiance,
could the House retrace its
The statement of the accused had
as but an aggravation of their
mith said he agreed with the
7. He was not vindictive and
wanted an apology that would
be the honor of the House.
itchen said that the Premier
towed condemnation on Mr.
ad taffy on Mr. Grant, although
rds showed that the latter gen-
had on this question twice
tail, for he had voted for
rney-General's original
on, then for Hon. Mr.
Beaven's amendment to let
er drop, and now he had veer-
d again and given his support
Government. After reviewing
itions by Canadian Ministers
and referring to Mr. Justice
s refusal to grant a writ of
erpus and the peculiarity of the
of service of the House's sum-

mons. Mr. Kitchen said that they had
heard much about contempt and honor
and dignity, but the statements of Col.
Baker and Hon. Mr. Pooley reflected
far more severely on the honor and in-
tegrity of members of the House than
anything that had ever been written in
the Columbian. Other newspapers,
notably the Attorney-General's, had
written squibs on honorable members
which were libellous and a high con-
tempt of privilege. If the members of
the private bills committee had clear
consciences, why did they not go to an
independent court and not make them-
selves the judges? He would not vote
for punishing anyone in order that the
Attorney-General might be able to
prove that he was a little sound in law.
The amendment was then put and
lost on the following division:
Yeas—Messrs. Beaven, Semlin,
Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kitchen,
Sword, Kellie and McKenzie—10.
Nays—Messrs. Grant, Baker, Horne,
Smith, Nason, Fletcher, Hall, Anderson,
Rogers, Booth, Stoddart, Hunter, Eb-
erts, Martin, Vernon, Turner, Davis,
Robson, Pynch and Pooley—20.
Mr. McKenzie then moved to amend
the resolution by adding the words
"to be then discharged from custody."
The Government had wreaked their
vengeance on teachers and were now
trying to muzzle the press.
Mr. Kellie stated that the Premier
and the Attorney-General appeared im-
bued with a desire to protect the dig-
nity of the House, yet the Premier had
charged him with fraud and had not
the malignance to retract or apologize.
The Attorney-General had been remis-
s in the administration of justice and he
(Mr. Keith) could produce instances of
gross miscarriage of justice.
Mr. Brown would not apologize for
again taking up the time of the House.
He was aware that the President of the
Council had characterized his conduct as
"beneath contempt," nevertheless he
(Mr. Brown) would try to struggle on
under his denunciation. He considered
himself quite as good a judge of what
was right and fitting as any member of
the House. Dr. Milne had quoted from
papers that supported the Government,
and especially a paper published in
Vancouver City, which could be bought
for \$5 to write anything that one wished
it to write. The Messrs. Kennedy were
fighting not the House but the Govern-
ment, and they were backed by 1000
citizens of New Westminster who
would not knuckle down to any Gov-
ernment or House if they believed
they were in the right. (Applause.)
Mr. Brown then proceeded to score the
members of the Government and spoke
eloquently for over half an hour.
Mr. Hunter said that Mr. Brown had
been in political life for only two years
and if he went on in this way he would
soon reach the very lowest depth of
political infamy. Mr. Beaven too had
been guilty of a "large amount of low
mean cunning," said the Hon. member
for Comox.
The amendment was then lost on a
vote of 10 to 19. Mr. Grant not voting.
The original motion was then carried
on the same vote.
The House then adjourned at one
o'clock a.m.

THE PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Mr. Beaven Takes the Attorney-Gen-
eral to Task for Lowering the
Dignity of the House.

The Municipal Bill Again Amended
and the Consolidated Bill
Finally Passed.

The House Finishes Business Last
Night—Prorogation Takes
Place To-day.

FRIDAY, April 22, 1902.

(Continued from yesterday.)

In moving that the House do now
adjourn, after the disposal of the Ken-
nedy motion, Mr. Beaven said he wish-
ed to refer to the extraordinary con-
duct of the House, and also to that of
the member for the Islands in moving
to shut off debate on a subject which
was of vital interest to the country, the
people of the province and the status of
the Assembly. Honorable members
said the unusual course had been taken
to maintain the dignity of the House.
The President of the Council expressed
the opinion that this House had greater
powers than those of other provinces,
and had practically the same powers as
the British House of Commons. If this
was so the House had power to prevent
the courts interfering in the matter. If
the House had all this power the Ator-
ney-General would not satisfy himself
with persecuting the publishers of the
Columbian. The next thing he would
be doing would be to impeach the
judiciary, which would be a novel
sight. It would appear that the Ator-
ney-General wanted to silence judges.
He had bulldozed the press, even going
so far as to bring an action for libel
against the Government organ, and he
would only have to take one step further
to silence the judiciary. They should
have the whole thing or nothing. He
expressed surprise at the remark of the
President of the Council, who was re-
ported in the Colonist as charging him
with applauding when the Kennedy
brothers were brought before the bar
of the House.

Hon. Mr. Pooley rose and said he had
made no such statement.
Mr. Beaven accepted this disclaimer,
and proceeding said he had felt humil-
iated at the Government's exhibition of
a little brief authority in bringing the
Kennedy brothers before the bar of the
House. The House in doing this made
itself the object of ridicule all over the
continent. If any one should be im-
peached for lowering the dignity of the
House, it should be the Attorney-Gen-
eral, who had brought disgrace upon
the House by his vindictive action in
this matter. If he were as vindictive
as the Attorney-General he would move
to have him impeached, but he would
not lower and disgrace himself to humi-
liate anyone. He also referred to the
remarks of the Premier and the "gen-
tlemanly and genial" member for
Comox, who had charged him with
shirking the vote when the matter was
first brought up. The reason why he
had refrained from voting
was simply because he thought
the Government was about to take a
false step, and he was not prepared to
vote without investigating the charges,
and reading the article complained of.
The proper course for the House to
have taken, if it wished to uphold its
dignity, would have been to take no
notice of the publications. In forcibly
bringing the publishers of the Colum-
bian before the bar of the House, these
men were made famous as martyrs
throughout the civilized world. They
were champions of the liberty of the
press, and their actions contrasted
strongly with the star chamber proceed-
ings of the House. It was absurd to
say the House was the highest court in
the land, when the principles of British
justice were violated, and men convict-
ed without receiving a hearing. If
members thought a libel had been com-
mitted the matter should be tried in the
courts, and no fair minded man could
expect justice to be done before such a
political and partisan organization as
the House. He remarked sarcastically
that he hoped the Attorney-General
would go as far as he could to main-
tain the dignity of the House
and not allow the courts to interfere.
The honor of the House depended
upon the manner in which it conducted
itself, and he did not think the action
taken in this frivolous matter would
add to its honor and dignity, or win for
it the respect of the province or the
world. The result of this, he prophes-
ied, would be that at the next elec-
tion they would see one or two of the
Kennedys sitting in the House as mem-
bers, while the present Government
would be removed from positions of
authority.

Mr. Speaker stated that Mr. Beave's
remarks were not in order, but as he
did not wish to be too harsh or be con-
sidered unjust he had allowed him to
proceed. No further remarks on the
libel question would be allowed.
QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.
Hon. Mr. Pooley rose to a question
of privilege. He took objection to a
report in the Colonist which made him
comment on Mr. Beaven for applauding
yesterday. He had used no such words
as were attributed to him.
TO APPROPRIATE MONEY.
The Bill to appropriate money for
public service of the province, on re-
port was adopted, and read a third time
and passed.
LAND REGISTRY BILL.
The above bill was also adopted on
report, and finally passed.
C. W. C. AND C. N. RAILWAY.
The House went into committee on
the Canada Western Central and Cana-

da Northern Railway Bill. Mr. Horne
in the chair. At the request of Mr.
Rogers an amendment was made to the
bill, requiring that in the event of any
agreement for the construction of a
main line road, a provision shall be in-
serted for connecting with the town of
Barkerville.

The committee rose and reported the
bill complete.
The House then rose for recess.

AFTERNOON SESSION.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 3
o'clock.

VICTORIA AND SIDNEY RAILWAY.

The above railway subsidy bill on
motion of the Finance Minister was
given its second reading, and
The House then went into committee

to consider the bill, Mr. Sword in the
chair.

Hon. Mr. Davis proposed to add a
new section, exempting the company
from taxation for 10 years after the
completion of the railway.

Mr. Beaven objected to this amend-
ment making the terms more favorable
to the company could not be made
without a message from the Lieutenant-
Governor, or a Minister giving notice
that the Crown had given consent to
the change in the bill.

The Chairman declared the amend-
ment out of order.

On motion of Mr. Eberts the commit-
tee rose to ask the Speaker's opinion
on the question.

Mr. Speaker ruled that the objection
could not be taken in committee, and
the chairman was obliged to put the
amendment. It was for the House to
guard the rights of the crown, not the
committee.

The House went into committee
again and the amendment was carried.

The committee rose and reported the
bill complete, but on the suggestion of
the Speaker the adoption of the report
was held over till the consent of the
crown was obtained.

ANOTHER SUBSIDY.

The Kaslo and Slocan Railway sub-
sidy bill was also read a second time
on motion of Hon. Mr. Turner.

The House went into committee to
consider the bill, which was reported
complete to the House. The report
was adopted and the bill read a third
time and passed.

MUNICIPAL BILL.

Mr. Beaven's Municipal Bill was
taken up on report.

Mr. Grant moved the following
amendment:

"Notwithstanding anything con-
tained in the 'Municipal Act, 1891,' or
any amendments thereto, any applicant
for a license to sell wines, spirits, beer,
or other fermented or intoxicating li-
quors in any hotel, or building intend-
ed for a hotel, containing not less than
thirty rooms, used or to be used for hotel
purposes, shall not be required to
obtain a petition or requisition signed
by lot owners or householders, or the
wives of either, for the granting of
such license, but application shall be
made direct to the Board of Licensing
Commissioners not less than thirty
days before the sitting of said Board;
notice of such application shall be published
in some newspaper circulating in the
municipality where such application is
made for a space of at least thirty days
before the sitting of said Board, and
the Board of Licensing Commissioners
shall have power to grant such license
for the term of one year, or to renew
the same upon the expiration thereof,
if, in the opinion of a majority of the
Board then present, such grant or re-
newal is in the public interest."

Mr. Beaven raised the point of order
that the amendment was the same as
one already voted down and should not
be considered.

Mr. Speaker thought it was materi-
ally the same, but the *modus operandi*
was different. He asked the House to
decide whether the amendment should
be considered.

The House by a vote of 16 to 13 de-
cided to consider the amendment.

Mr. Turner moved as an amendment
that a notice should be posted on the
building seeking a license. This
amendment to the amendment was
passed.

The amendment was also resolved in
the affirmative on the following divi-
sion:

Ayes—Messrs. Turner, Martin, Rog-
ers, Anderson, Fletcher, Davis, Vernon,
Eberts, Stoddart, Nason, Horne, Smith,
Pynch, Sword, McKenzie, Grant—16.
Nays—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Brown,
Keith, Forster, Cotton, Kitchen, Semlin,
Booth, Hunter—10.

The following new section was added
on motion of Mr. Beaven:

"Where the election of a municipal
council, or of any member thereof, has
been avoided by the courts, no by-law,
contract, or other proceeding entered
into, passed, or taken by the council
prior to such avoidance of its election,
or of the election of a member thereof,
shall, if otherwise within the jurisdic-
tion and powers of such council, be in-
validated or in any manner attacked by
reason only of such avoidance of an
election as aforesaid."

The following was inserted as section
146a:

"When debentures have been issued
by a municipal council under a by-law,
and such by-law has not been ques-
tioned in a court of competent jurisdic-
tion for a period of six months next
after the passage of the same, the by-
law and the debentures issued there-
under, or such thereof as may yet be
unpaid, shall be valid and binding on
the corporation, and shall not be
quashed or set aside on any ground
whatever."

The report as amended was adopted.
By consent of the House the standing
orders were suspended to permit of the
introduction of the Municipal Bill con-
solidated up to date. The bill was
read a first and second time. Mr. Be-

ven explaining the changes he had
made.

The House went into committee, the
bill being taken as read, and reported
complete to the House. The report was
adopted and the bill read a third time
and passed.

THE HOUSE THEN ROSE FOR RECESS.

EVENING SESSION.

House resumed business at 8 p.m.
Hon. Mr. Beaven gravely returned
thanks to some benevolent mem-
bers who had kindly placed a bag full of
particularly sticky candy in his desk.
Some member accused the hon. member
from Comox. Hon. Mr. Pooley said it
was without precedent that a Govern-
ment member should attempt to "taffy"
the hon. Leader of the Opposition.
(Governmental laughter and grim Op-
position smiles.)

Mr. Grant asked the Premier the fol-
lowing question: If the Dominion
House of Commons refuse to grant a
charter, during this session, to the
"Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway
Company," will this Government pro-
tect the rights conferred upon said
company by the Legislature during the
present sitting of the House?

Hon. Mr. Robson—Certainly, the
Government will in every way protect
the rights of the company as granted
under their charter.

THE WATER RIGHTS QUESTION.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved on consid-
eration of the report on bill (No. 35a) in-
titled "An Act to amend the 'Corpor-
ation of Victoria Water Works Act,
1873,'"

or on the motion to read the
bill a third time, to leave out clause 14,
as inserted in the bill on 12th April,
1902, on the motion of the honorable
member for Cowichan, Mr. Croft.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said that he had
been requested by the City Council to
express their view on this question.
The opinions of the council were pub-
lished in the daily press after the meet-
ing held in the City Hall last Saturday
evening.

Hon. Mr. Davis said that it had been
agreed that the Esquimalt water works
were to furnish a good supply of water
to Victoria West at all times. There
was one thing wanting in the bill and
that was the lack of a provision in case
of fire. Unless something were put in
the bill to meet this requirement he
would have to support the motion of
the hon. leader of the Opposition.

Mr. Grant said he wanted to deal
fairly with corporations in all respects;
he thought the Esquimalt Water Com-
pany could furnish water to these hyd-
rants just as the city would if they were
supplying the water. He then read
from the statute regarding the question
and argued the injustice of allowing the
city to have the exclusive water privi-
leges in Victoria West. He thought
the corporation of Victoria had tres-
passed upon private rights. He did
not think the proposition of Messrs.
Beaven, Milne and Davis a fair and
equitable one. He would never be a
party to any injustice to any one, be he
Siwash, Chinaman or white man. He
believed he could put himself in the
other man's place in an argument as
well as any man in this House, and un-
less a man could do that he could not
properly judge the case.

Dr. Milne said Mr. Grant should have
stood up for the rights of Victoria. He
did not want to deprive any company
of its rights if it had a right to these
rights. Victoria was extending its
wings on every side and had been act-
ing well within her powers. The whole
object of this clause was to enhance
the revenues of this private company;
they were encroaching upon the city
limits.

Hon. Mr. Pooley said he never heard
anything so totally foolish or display-
ing more ignorance than the speech of
Dr. Milne.

Dr. Milne—Thanks. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. Pooley then said the city
had done nothing to help the growth
of Esquimalt district, but when the
Esquimalt Water Works Company pro-
posed to supply this portion of Esqui-
malt district the city stepped in and
wanted to extend their system. He had
lived 21 years in Esquimalt district and
knew what he was talking about. When-
ever there was anything to gain the
city was always ready to step in. He
ridiculed the action of the council in
leaving the matter to the mayor to do
as he pleased.

Hon. Mr. Beaven objected to Mr.
Pooley misrepresenting him and ex-
plained his position.

Mr. Pooley said he had based his re-
marks upon what he had seen in the
press. The Esquimalt Water Works
Company had taxes to pay, the corpora-
tion of Victoria none, the latter could
fight with the taxpayers' money and
use as much or as little as they choose.
It was not a fair fight.

Hon. Mr. Turner said as a member
for the city of Victoria he agreed with
Messrs. Beaven and Milne, but in pro-
tecting the city's right they should be
careful not to do any injustice to any
company. The city of Victoria had her
work cut out to supply the eastern por-
tion, let alone the west. In some mea-
sure they were under a debt to the
Esquimalt Water Works Company for
coming forward as it had. The com-
pany could supply Victoria West with
as good if not better water than was
obtainable in Victoria city, at a lower
price and more of it; greater pressure.
The people of Victoria West wanted it
also, therefore he could not support the
motion.

Mr. Hunter argued that there was no
appreciable difference between corpora-
tions. Corporate powers were always
the same. He then gave statistics re-
garding water, prices of supply, etc.
The citizens of Victoria were paying
just 1/2 now for water to what they had
paid before the construction of the
waterworks. The Esquimalt Water
works Company had begun work at
ready and inside of two years the city
of Victoria West and the Esquimalt

peninsula would be supplied with the purest water obtainable.

Hon. Mr. Davie offered an amendment making it compulsory for the Esquimalt Waterworks Company to supply a stated number of fire hydrants free of charge for the water.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said he should prefer to see the clause struck out altogether.

Mr. Booth could not see that the city of Victoria was being hardly dealt with in the matter. He thought the clause should stand as it was for the benefit of the people.

The amendment carried; the original amendment of course falling to the ground.

Hon. Mr. Beaven moved to amend clause one to read 1892 instead of 1891. He felt himself at a loss what to do in regard to the withdrawal of the bill, which had been left at his discretion by the council. Many of the speakers did not understand the question clearly. Finally he moved the adoption of the report, which was carried. The bill was read a third time and passed.

CANADA WESTERN RAILWAY.

The report of the Canadian Western Railway bill was proposed adopted, but Hon. Mr. Beaven called a halt on this swift procedure as he had an amendment to offer.

Hon. Mr. Robson—"Oh, what's the use of taking up time like this?"

Hon. Mr. Beaven—"Ah, I'm certain the hon. gentleman will support this. (Laughter.) The Chinese clause was then produced, Mr. Beaven saying the people of this city did not wish the infliction of hordes of Chinese such as swarmed in while the C.P.R. was being built. The amendment was put and lost, 17 to 10. The report was adopted, the bill read a third time and passed.

FROM HIS HONOR.

Hon. Mr. Davie presented a message from the Lieutenant-Governor with the following bills:

Recommending the passage of an act to grant certain lands to the city of Victoria.

Returning for consideration an act entitled the British Columbia Railway Act and recommending some changes in the wording.

Returning for reconsideration the Companies Act.

Returning for reconsideration the Coal Mines Act.

Returning for reconsideration the Nelson Electric Light Company's Act.

Returning for reconsideration the Juries Act.

Returning for reconsideration the Sumas Water Works Company's Act.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved that the bill re lands to the city of Victoria be referred to a committee of the whole. The House went into committee on the act, Mr. Martin in the chair. Committee rose and reported the act. Leave was granted to introduce the bill, it was read a first and second time, committed, read a third time and passed.

The order of the third reading of the Companies Act was discharged, that some amendments might be inserted, after which the bill was read a third time and passed.

The B. C. Railway Act followed the same course. The amendments were offered by the Attorney-General. Mr. Brown thought there was not the shadow of reason in the reasons advanced by the Attorney-General for these amendments. He thought the Attorney-General was working in the interests of certain gentlemen in whom he had taken a good deal of interest lately, namely, the Kennedy Brothers. (Laughter.)

Mr. Kitchen said a number of private interests would be seriously affected if these amendments were allowed to pass. The amendments were read a second time and put through the usual stages.

The other bills sent down by the Lieutenant-Governor took the same course.

THE LAST KICK.

Hon. Mr. Robson moved a question of privilege on the TIMES regarding the assertion that he had used the expression "going on their knees." He denied the reporter's remark and could not understand how it could have been put in his mouth. He had always contended that a simple apology was all that was necessary. It was unfair and unjust to make him state otherwise.

BUSINESS FINISHED.

The Premier announced that all the business being finished he would move that the House adjourn until 3 o'clock to-morrow afternoon, when the Lieutenant-Governor would prorogue the House.

A P R

1892

until such times as people learned that the province was one whole and indivisible.

Mr. SMITH expressed himself in favor of the amendment. The best way to keep down sectional feeling was by providing fairly for both Mainland and Island.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON drew attention to the fact that the University bill had been introduced as a public bill. If a number of gentlemen wished to meet together and make up their minds and decide upon a certain course of action and bring their views before the House in the shape of a bill, they had a perfect right to do so; but this action on their part did not debar the members of the House from their privilege or their duty of making what amendments they saw fit. He (Mr. Robson) conceived that the amendment was in the interests of education in the province and such being the case he proposed to use his

utmost endeavors to have it inserted in the bill (applause.)

Mr. HUNTER claimed that unless the clause proposed was inserted the Mainland would swamp the Island in the future as they had done in the past. The law now provided for twenty-one members of the Senate, and of these the Mainland had fourteen, and the Island seven.

Mr. BROWN urged a postponement of the debate so as to discuss the matter with members of Convocation or else, he said, there would be a breach of faith.

Mr. HUNTER wanted to know with whom the breach of faith would be, and between what parties. No one had any authority to pledge the House to any particular course of action and there would be no breach of faith in the House making any amendments it saw fit.

Hon. Mr. BRAVEN thought the subject of a British Columbia University was a difficult question enough without any sectional feeling being brought in. For his part he recognized no division of the province, and to introduce such an amendment as was proposed would be to recognize a principle that was decidedly wrong and against the best interests of the province and the university. He charged that the real sectional feeling and difficulty arose out of clause five in the original act, which provides for the vesting of the management of the university in graduates of universities outside the province. He thought the vote should not be taken hastily, and therefore moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

The motion was defeated.

After further remarks by Mr. Brown, Mr. SEMLIN moved that the committee rise, report progress, and ask leave to sit again. Carried.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS introduced the following bills, viz: (1) An act to regulate travelling on public highways and bridges; (2) an act to amend the Juries Act; (3) an act to amend the Supreme Court Act; (4) an act to amend the Sheriff's Act.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

THIRTY-NINTH DAY.

THURSDAY, March 31, 1892.

The Speaker took the Chair at 2 o'clock.

THE M'LEOD COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON stated that early in the present session a select committee of the House had been appointed to enquire into the circumstances connected with the cancellation of the certificate to teach, formerly held by Mr. John P. McLeod, and, as it was now getting late in the session, he (Mr. Robson) would like to know how soon a report might be expected. He might say, without any breach of confidence, that he had repeatedly urged the members of that committee to get their work done as soon as possible, as it was not desirable to let the thing hang fire.

COL. BAKER, as chairman of the committee, said that the majority report was ready for presentation, but there were to be two minority reports as well, and the members of the committee who were to make the minority reports, seemed to find great difficulty in doing so.

Mr. KITCHEN said that the reason a minority report was not presented, was that he had been busy.

CLAIMS OF JOHN CROSS.

Mr. KITCHEN presented a report from a select committee of the House appointed to enquire into the petition of John Cross. Report laid over.

RE DEEP-SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. HORN presented a petition from the British Columbia Fishing and Trading Co., asking that in the passage of bills 61 and 62 their rights be protected. Read and received.

QUESTIONS BY MEMBERS.

Mr. SEMLIN asked the Hon. the Finance Minister if all the papers in connection with the deep-sea fisheries bill had been laid before the House? He was especially desirous of seeing a copy of the proposed agreement to be entered into between the Government of British Columbia and the mercantile company.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS replied that this matter had been very fully gone into the other day. The agreement would be between the Imperial Government and the company, and this being the case it was impossible to submit even a draft of the agreement. Hon. members might, however, rest assured that the interests of the fishermen and of the province would be well protected. This was a guarantee, he said, that the rights of the settlers would be protected, as the Imperial Government would not be a party to any agreement which would not serve this end.

Dr. MILNE said he had intended to ask the same question. Unless the fullest information were given there would probably be a great and prolonged debate.

THE OATHS BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Oaths Bill, Mr. Nelson in the chair. Committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

BREEDING STOCK ACT.

Mr. ROBSON introduced a bill to amend the Breeding Stock Act. Read a first time; second reading Monday.

OFFICIAL STENOGRAPHERS ACT.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS moved the second reading of a bill to amend "an act to provide an official stenographer for the Supreme and County Courts." He explained that the new system was to enable the official stenographer to be paid by salary and fees as well, and it would then be necessary for him to have a staff that would be able to handle any case that might come up. In short, the change was to enable the adoption of a scheme of stenographic court reporting that would meet the growing needs of the province.

The bill was read a second time; to be committed on Friday.

SALT SPRING AGRICULTURAL SOCIETY BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Salt Spring Agricultural Society Bill. Reported complete without amendments. Read a third time and passed.

DEEP SEA FISHERIES.

Mr. SEMLIN resumed the adjourned debate on bill No. 61, re settlement of fishermen on the seaboard of British Columbia. He still complained that the Government had not yet placed sufficient information before the House, at any rate not as much information as the House was entitled to. The scheme was, he said, put forward by the promoters in glowing terms, and it was apparent from what had been said that the Government had not taken into consideration any such idea as that of failure. He (Mr. Semlin) would be pleased and gratified to see the seaboard of the province settled by a loyal people, and also would like to see the deep sea fisheries developed. But there was a great chance of failure. He was free to admit that, if the scheme was the great success it was hoped by members of the Government it would be, there would be great cause for gratification; but, on the other hand, should the scheme turn out a failure, the very reverse would be the case. If a calamitous failure resulted, the present Legislature would be looked upon as anything but shrewd and far-sighted. Failure would mean a heavy drag upon the province in years to come. He wanted further to know who would be responsible for the colonists, who would build schools for them, supply them with doctors, etc. Would the Colonists be compelled to deal with the Commercial company entirely, and be compelled to buy and sell from that concern? Certainly the object of the Commercial Co. was to make money, and, if they did not make it out of the Colonists, who would they make it out of? Another objection he had was to assisted emigration, which was never successful. The pioneer who succeeded was the one who was self-reliant, and would not give in to ordinary difficulties. On the whole, the scheme was a dangerous one to the province. He would like to see the agreement brought down to the House. Without this, further discussion should be deferred.

COL. BAKER said that he regarded the

scheme as one of preeminent importance, as he believed it was the first time in the history of British Columbia that the Legislature had been called upon to deal with the subject of assisted emigration. If the present scheme should prove to be a failure that would be urged for all time to come as a reason why similar schemes should not be considered. Under the bills at present before the House it was objectively the object of the Government to develop the deep sea fisheries, and subjectively to do this by means of the employment of a combination of capital and labor. The capital was to be produced by means of a loan from the Imperial Government of £150,000, which sum was to be supplemented by a further sum of £1,000,000 sterling, which was to be the capital of the company or syndicate that was to take the project in hand. The total aggregate of capital thus commanded would amount to £1,150,000, and, he said,

it must be apparent that the very fact that this amount of money was to be spent in the province, and in developing its resources, would be of great benefit to the province and to the people. He went fully into the proposition of the Imperial Government to make a loan to the Government of British Columbia, and traced the progress of the money until it would be loaned out to the settlers in sums of £150, each family. This money and interest was to be repaid by the settlers, in annual instalments of \$50. But what was to be the security of the Government that they would get the money back? He had to confess that the security was simply a personal bond of the individual fisherman, but there was more than that, too, there was the collateral security, so to speak, furnished by the syndicate. This syndicate was to undertake to supply the individual fishermen with boats and tackle, etc., and it will do so on the condition that the Government will hand over to them a grant of land amounting to 500,000 acres. It must be borne in mind, too, that all of this 500,000 acres of land did not go to the syndicate, but a great portion of it would be given to the colonists themselves. And the whole of this land was not handed over at once to the syndicate, but would be handed over to the syndicate as a success. This being the case, it was at once apparent that the suitability and characteristics of the emigrants must be a very important factor, for these emigrants, being the security to a greater or less extent for the loan to them by the Government, must be selected with a view to fitness and desirability, so that they might be reasonably expected to fulfil their share of the obligation. So far as the objections that had been raised that the word Crofter had been dropped from the scheme was concerned, he (Col. Baker) did not think this was any loss, for he happened to know some of the facts in connection with some of the Crofters in the Old Country, and he did not think they would be the most desirable class of settlers to bring out here. The fact that the Government was able to go where it liked, into any part of the British Isles and select its settlers, was the best evidence that the Government would succeed in getting the best kind of people to come out here. The fact that the Provincial Government was to be so far as British Columbia was concerned, responsible for the success of the project now under discussion, made it a matter of the greatest importance that the Government should have some control over the syndicate so that the syndicate should not be masters. And it was necessary, in order to carry out the details of this scheme and to allow the Government to do the best it could, that it should have placed in its hands the fullest latitude to carry on the future negotiations. It was quite right and necessary that this power should be given the Government, for the simple reason that under the circumstances it would be impossible for the House to lay down the fullest rules, regulations, etc., for the Government to go by. It was, therefore, necessary to give a free hand to the Government and, in view of past actions, this might be done with the fullest confidence that the best interests of the country would be conserved. If the present scheme led to a successful issue, as every member of the House must hope that it would, one result would probably be that there would be more measures before the House at a subsequent period to further assist emigration to settle up the vast tracts of good agricultural lands in the interior of the province. There were, he said, a large class of people in England in the thickly settled districts who would only be too glad to come out to this country if they only had the capital, and just as it was now proposed to assist emigration from a certain quarter and class for the purpose of developing one particular industry, it may later on be found desirable to use endeavors to get into this province more of that class of men who had been really instrumental in civilizing more than one-sixth of the whole world. There might, in fact, be built up in this province a new England which, he trusted, would have the same sterling characteristics as the mother-land (applause).

Mr. HUNTER said that it became his duty to relieve the apparent apprehensions of two hon. members of the House—one of them the hon. member for East Kootenay, who had just taken his seat, and the other one, the junior member for Yale, who had taken part in the debate earlier in the day. But these gentlemen were politicians of a totally different stripe, and to the first one he could only say that he was sure he had spoken as he did, not in order to mislead the House, but simply because of his being unacquainted with the matter of which he was speaking. He (Mr. Hunter) then read the following extracts from a report of Her Majesty's Commissioners of Inquiry into the condition of the Crofters and Cottars of the Highlands and Islands of Scotland in 1885, viz:—"When it is true that the physical conditions of life in the remoter parts of the districts in question, and the possibility of utilizing the means of modern progress, are far behind those of the more favored parts of our country, it is pleasing to know that the general character of the inhabitants is not so by any means. It may be said, on the contrary, that in no part of your Majesty's Dominions are there to be found among the humbler ranks of society more intelligence, better manners, purer morals, than in the remotest districts of the Highlands and Islands from Mull of Kintyre, in

Argyllshire, to the Skaw of Unst, in Scotland." And in another place: "The Crofters and Cottars, with whom we are here concerned, are in truth, of no great significance in respect to mere numbers,—all told, they probably do not comprise more than 40,000 families, or 200,000 souls, the population of a single manufacturing town of the first class. They do, however, possess in their occupations and capabilities certain distinctive features which, in the opinion of many, entitle them to such exceptional attention and protection as has been granted to other special interests. These people take a considerable part in the fishing industry, a branch of national production, not of the first magnitude, but still of material value, and which should not be allowed to pass into other hands. This industry has, hitherto, depended more on the hardy breeding, hereditary aptitudes, and spontaneous association of the common people, acting with the help of local traders, and less on the direction and support of the large capitalists, than any other department of labor and traffic in the country. It is susceptible of more perfect organization and of immense extension, but these developments must be the results of time, study, intelligent direction, and financial aid. Meanwhile, the dispersion of the fishing population, the indispensable instruments of the craft, would be a loss that could scarcely be repaired. It would be difficult to replace them by another race of equal ability and worth. It is not only in regard to fishing that the Crofter and Cottar population have a peculiar value. They constitute a natural basis for the naval defence of the country, a sort of defence, which cannot be extemporized, and the value of which, in possible emergencies, can hardly be overrated. The seafaring people of the Highlands and

Islands contribute at this moment 4,381 men to the Royal Naval Reserve, a number equivalent to the crews of seven armored war vessels of the first class, and which, with commensurate inducements, could be greatly increased. It may be added, that most of the men incorporated in the corps of militia and volunteers would be able to serve ashore and aloft with equal efficiency." Also this passage, "The Crofting and Cottar population of the Highlands and Islands, small though it be, is a nursery of good workers and good citizens for the whole Empire. In this respect the stock is exceptionally valuable. By sound physical constitution, native intelligence, and good moral training, it is particularly fitted to recruit the people of our industrial centres, who without such help from wholesome sources in rural districts, would degenerate under the influence of bad lodging, unhealthy occupations, and enervating habits. It cannot be indifferent to the whole nation, constituted as the nation now is, to possess within its borders a people, hardy, skilful, intelligent, and prolific, as an overflowing fountain of renovating life." He thought that after reading the extracts above quoted that it was quite unnecessary for him to say anything more, but he would just say a word for the hon. junior member for Yale, before sitting down. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Semlin) seemed to be afraid that the scheme now under discussion would be a success. He (Mr. Semlin) seemed to think that the present Government was doomed, and he wanted to keep the scheme back until such times as he (Mr. Semlin) and his friends were occupying the Government benches—when that unhappy time came, and the member for Yale should get into power, he would then adopt the scheme which he now claimed to be such an ill-advised one. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Hunter) blamed the hon. gentlemen opposite because they did not deal with this question as a patriotic rather than as a political measure, as they were doing. He was sorry they could not rise above their party lines and see things in a little different light sometimes, at least. In conclusion, he denied that assisted emigration had been a failure, and said that if it had been so in Canada, the United States, Australia and elsewhere, it rested with the hon. member who had made such a bold and sweeping charge to bring forward some proof of his statements (applause).

COL. BAKER stated that he would refer the hon. member who had just spoken (Mr. Hunter) for further information re Crofters to Sir James Matheson's Crofter Improvement report, which would bear out all that he (Col. Baker) had said about them.

Mr. BROWN wanted to know where the security of the Government for the loans made to the colonists would go, if a number of these same colonists were drowned? This was a contingency that must be looked for. Where would the security go?

Mr. ENNERS—Sinking fund. (Laughter.)

Mr. BROWN continued that he had not treated the matter as a political one at all, but as a patriotic one. The two bills were a sort of Siamese twins, and must be considered together. He believed in the marvellous work of the deep sea fisheries, but thought it funny that when there was anything good to be grabbed, some English syndicate or some one else was always on hand to grab it. If the syndicate had such a good thing, why would it need a bonus? Divorce the two schemes and there would be no opposition to the scheme of settling fishermen on the northern shore. The fact of the matter was, however, that the Government hoped the colonization scheme would be such a good one as to act as a sugar coating for the syndicate pill. He suggested the scheme would be, "no syndicate, no colonists—no colonists, no grab." The interests of the syndicate were to be first, and those of the colonists afterwards. The whole thing was of a sort of "thimble rigging" style—now you see it and now you don't. He wanted to know if the syndicate would be masters of the colonists or not. How would the settlers be brought out? Who would be boss? And would the pickings and commissions begin at once, as soon as these poor people had packed their bundles? He again wished to emphasize and repeat that any well considered scheme to bring out a number of families would receive his support. But he must oppose the present scheme, which was a shameless proposition to give away to a foreign syndicate a part of our territory and contingent advantages, which would enable them to crush out any private

endeavors. The syndicate would ing but an enormous monopoly, a further reduce the colonists to the level of serfs. It would also snuff out the Hudson's Bay Co. H there was a little question of the the syndicate; but under no circumstances could the scheme be a success for vince. He would therefore oppose now and at every stage of its progress. Mr. ANDERSON announced that posed to support the bill as a means to be conducive to the welfare country and to the men as well, w be brought out to assist in reapin vantages that would accrue. H moreover, that it would not be time that the House would have sider a scheme to bring out to thi the redundant population of the land. The present was a step in direction, and might very well be ed by every member of the Hou thought that the colonists it was to bring out under the present b start under the most favorable aus able, provided the commercial scheme were carried out to a completion, for not only would the men find their market immediately their product, but they also would harvest at hand ripe and ready sickle, so to speak. This was a n ter prospect than most agricultural land, for they had first to clear the plow it and put in their seed, and down and wait for the crops to g sometimes, even then, the crops to good, whereas, here, these were going to a place where the the sea was practically unbounded (plause.)

Hon. Mr. POOLEY on rising to received with applause. He said was needless for him to state he posed to warmly support the bill in the House. That part of the s has reference to the settlement of on the shores of the province under the consideration of the Go for the past two years, and had thoroughly examined into and before it was placed before the H he was in a position to say that the would never have been placed House but for the formation of a known as the Vancouver Island ment Syndicate, which had rec much notice at the hands of members of the House. It was thing to bring out a number of settlers upon the land without m further provision for them. It w be senseless to put a number settlers on difficult parts of the I leave them to scratch for themse out money and without means would be practically a failure. He to. For the £150 that w allotted to each settler would provide for transportation, and the time the settlers and their fa on the land they would have ver the money left. Did the Govern any such scheme as the one now by some hon. member of this H the Legislature they would be de ish thing, indeed, for were not vision made so that these settlers come self-supporting and indepen would speedily leave the land th been placed upon and would come the settled parts of the island land, and eventually come to with a class of people at present i vince. The measure now under would not have been brought for had the Government not seen it to place these settlers in such a v earn their livelihood without co competition with any class of peo present. (Applause.) He defi sion of the Government in u to bonus by way of a land grant that had come forward and to invest its capital in the s. Nowadays, he said, investors di their money into schemes that nothing about, unless some guar made that the project would be with a class of people at present i company that would go into a this kind, and would spend its the province, in a venture ent the province in asking that it sh some security. They were liable great loss, and it is quite rig should have a certain measure tion against a portion of this. the same old cry that had been years. When he (Mr. Pooley) c province as a boy, 30 years ago, the same great confidence in the wealth of the province that th and the same assurances that marvelous resources that parti even to-day, little had been do these resources. And why? S cause there was not the capital and if, in the present instance, of the Legislature sat down qui their hands in their pockets, and themselves with talking about hidden wealth, that great hid would, in all probability, remain it was, he said, the duty of the Government that wanted to c country, to endeavor to get the money to come in and use it vantage of the province. (Appl present scheme had been violent in the House, and the more it h posed the more convinced was he and the more confidence he ha that it was a step in the right and in the true interests of the (applause.) He could not unde the hon. member from Westmi (Mr. Brown) could support the bring out the settlers, if the o table an agreement to be ma committee were divorced from reason was that were any su handed scheme to be adopted it tainly prove an abject failure fro start. It would be impossible e enterprise to provide the m means that the company of w proposed to supply, and in ear or less there would be noth ult of the labors of the provinc of starving settlers. In lid, the co-existence of th ate scheme with that of t the fishermen was essential. can be asked the support of the the measure which he predicted shown, by subsequent experie

Argyle, to the Skaw of Unst, in Scotland. And in another place: "The Crofters and Cottars, with whom we are concerned, are in truth of no great importance in respect to mere numbers, but told, they probably do not comprise more than 40,000 families, or 200,000 souls, the population of a single manufacturing town of the first class. They do, however, possess in their occupations and capabilities certain distinctive features which, in the opinion of many, entitle them to such exceptional attention and protection as has been granted to other special interests. These people make a considerable part in the fishing industry, a branch of national production, of the first magnitude, but still of material value, and which should not be allowed to pass into other hands. This industry, hitherto, depended more on the hardy breeding, hereditary aptitudes, and spontaneous association of the common people, aided with the help of local traders, and less on the direction and support of the large capitalists, than any other department of labor and traffic in the country. It is susceptible of more perfect organization and of immense extension, but these developments must be the results of time, study, intelligent direction, and financial aid. Meanwhile, the dispersion of the fishing population, the indispensable instruments of the craft, would be a loss that could scarcely be repaired. It would be difficult to replace them by another race of equal ability and worth. It is not only in regard to fishing that the Crofters and Cottars population have a peculiar value. They constitute a natural basis for the naval defence of the country, sort of defence which cannot be extemporized, and the value of which, in possible emergencies, can hardly be overrated. The seafaring people of the Highlands and

Islands contribute at this moment 4,431 men to the Royal Naval Reserve, a number equivalent to the crews of seven armored war vessels of the first-class, and which, with commensurate inducements, could be greatly increased. It may be added, that most of the men incorporated in the corps of militia and volunteers would be able to serve ashore and afloat with equal efficiency." Also this passage, "The Crofting and Cottar population of the Highlands and Islands, small though it be, is a nursery of good workers and good citizens for the whole Empire. In this respect the stock is exceptionally valuable. By sound physical constitution, native intelligence, and good moral training, it is particularly fitted to recruit the people of our industrial centres, who without such help from wholesome sources in rural districts, would degenerate under the influence of bad lodging, unhealthy occupations and enervating habits. It cannot be indifferent to the whole nation, constituted as the nation now is, to possess within its borders a people, hardy, skilful, intelligent, and prolific, as an overflowing fountain of renovating life." He thought that after reading the extracts above quoted that it was quite unnecessary for him to say anything, more but he would just say a few words. Junior member for Yale, before sitting down. That hon. gentleman (Mr. Semlin) seemed to be afraid that the scheme now under discussion would be a success. He (Mr. Semlin) seemed to think that the present Government was doomed, and he wanted to keep the scheme back until such times as he (Mr. Semlin) and his friends were occupying the Government benches—when that unhappy time came, and the member for Yale should get into power, he would then adopt the scheme which he now claimed to be such an ill-advised one. (Laughter.) He (Mr. Hunter) blamed the hon. gentlemen opposite because they did not deal with this question as a patriotic rather than a political measure, as they were doing. He was sorry they could not rise above their party lines and see things in a little different light sometimes, at least. In conclusion, he denied that assisted emigration had been a failure, and said that if it had been so in Canada, the United States, Australia and elsewhere, it rested with the hon. member who had made such a bold and sweeping charge to bring forward some proof of his statements (applause).

COL. BAKER stated that he would refer the hon. member who had just spoken (Mr. Hunter) for further information re. Crofters to Sir James Matheson's Crofter Improvement report, which would bear out all that he (Col. Baker) had said about them. Mr. BROWN wanted to know where the security of the Government for the loans made to the colonists would go, if a number of these same colonists were drowned? This was a contingency that must be looked for. Where would the security go?

MR. EBERTS—Sinking fund. (Laughter.) MR. BROWN continued that he had not treated the matter as a political one at all, but as a patriotic one. The two bills were a sort of Siamese twins, and must be considered together. He believed in the marvelous value of the deep sea fisheries, but thought it funny that when there was anything good to be grabbed, some English syndicate or some one else was always on hand to grab it. If the syndicate had such a good thing, why would it need a bonus? Divorce the two schemes and there would be no opposition to the scheme of settling fishermen on the northern shores. The fact of the matter was, however, that the Government hoped the colonization scheme would be such a good one as to act as a sugar coating for the syndicate pill. He suggested the scheme would be, "no syndicate, no colonists—no colonists, no grab." The interests of the syndicate were to be first, and those of the colonists afterwards. The whole thing was of a sort of "thimble rigging" style—now you see it and now you don't. He wanted to know if the syndicate would be masters of the colonists or not. How would the settlers be brought out? Who would be boss? And would the pickings and commissions begin at once, as soon as these poor people had packed their bundles? He again wished to emphasize and repeat that a well considered scheme to bring out a number of families would receive his support. But he must oppose the present scheme, which was a shameless proposition to give away to a foreign syndicate a part of our territory and contingent advantages, which would enable them to crush out any private

endeavors. The syndicate would be nothing but an enormous monopoly, and would further reduce the colonists to the position of serfs. It would also snuff out and swallow up the Hudson's Bay Co. He thought there was little question of the success of the syndicate, but under no circumstances could the scheme be a success for the province. He would therefore oppose the bill now and at every stage of its progress.

MR. ANDERSON announced that he proposed to support the bill as a measure likely to be conducive to the welfare of the country and to the men as well, who would be brought out to assist in reaping the advantages that would accrue. He hoped, moreover, that it would not be the last time that the House would have to consider a scheme to bring out to this country the redundant population of the Mother land. The present was a step in the right direction, and might very well be supported by every member of the House. He thought that the syndicate it was proposed to bring out under the present bill would start under the most favorable auspices possible, provided the commercial company scheme were carried out to a successful completion, for not only would these fishermen find their market immediately for their product, but they also would find the harvest at hand ripe and ready for the sickle, so to speak. This was a much better prospect than most agricultural settlers had, for they had first to clear the land and plow it and put in their seed, and then sit down and wait for the crops to grow, and sometimes, even then, the crop was none too good, whereas, here, these fishermen were going to a place where the wealth of the sea was practically unbounded. (Applause.)

HON. MR. POOLEY on rising to speak was received with applause. He said that it was needless for him to state that he proposed to warmly support the bill now before the House. That part of the scheme that has reference to the settlement of fishermen on the shores of the province had been under the consideration of the Government for the past two years, and had been most thoroughly examined into and digested before it was placed before the House, and he was in a position to say that this scheme would never have been placed before the House but for the formation of a syndicate known as the Vancouver Island Improvement Syndicate, which had received so much notice at the hands of some hon. members of the House. It was no small thing to bring out a number of settlers and put them upon the land without making any further provision for them. It would indeed be senseless to put a number of these settlers on difficult parts of the Island and leave them to scratch for themselves without money and without means, for that would be practically what it would amount to. For the £160 that would be allotted to each settler would have to provide for transportation, and really by the time the settlers and their families got on the land they would have very little of the money left. Did the Government put any such scheme as the one now advocated by some hon. member of this House before the Legislature they would be doing a foolish thing, indeed, for were not some provision made so that these settlers would become self-supporting and independent, they would speedily leave the land that they had been placed upon and would come down into the settled parts of the Island and Mainland, and eventually come into competition with a class of people at present in the province. The measure now under discussion would not have been brought forward at all had the Government not seen its way clear to place these settlers in such a way as to earn their livelihood without coming into competition with any class of people here at present. (Applause.) He defended the action of the Government in undertaking to bonus by way of a land grant the company that had come forward and was going to invest its capital in the enterprise. Nowadays, he said, investors did not put their money into schemes that they knew nothing about, unless some guarantee were made that the project would be successful, and would prove a good investment. The company that would go into a scheme of this kind, and would spend its money in the province, in a venture entirely new, was right in asking that it should have some security. They were liable to suffer great loss, and it is quite right that they should have a certain measure of protection against a portion of this. This was the same old cry that had been raised for years. When he (Mr. Pooley) came to the province as a boy, 30 years ago, there was the same great confidence in the mineral wealth of the province that there is now and the same assurances that there were marvelous resources that particular, but, even to-day, little had been done to develop these resources. And why? Simply because there was not the capital at hand, and if, in the present instance, the members of the Legislature sat down quietly, with their hands in their pockets, and contented themselves with talking about the great hidden wealth, that great hidden wealth would, in all probability, remain there still. It was, he said, the duty of the men and the Government that wanted to develop the country, to endeavor to get those who have the money to come in and use it to the advantage of the province. (Applause.) The present scheme had been violently opposed in the House, and the more it had been opposed the more convinced was he of its utility and the more confidence he had in the fact that it was a step in the right direction and in the true interests of the province (applause.) He could not understand how the hon. member from Westminster City (Mr. Brown) could support the one bill to bring out the settlers, if the other bill, that would enable an agreement to be made with the committee were divorced from it; and the reason was that were any such a single stranded scheme to be adopted it would certainly prove an abject failure from the very start. It would be impossible to get private enterprise to provide the market and means that the company or syndicate now proposed to supply, and in course of a year or less there would be nothing as a result of the labors of the province, but a lot of starving settlers. In short, he said, the co-existence of the syndicate scheme with that of bringing out the fishermen was essential. In conclusion he asked the support of the House for the measure which he predicted would be shown, by subsequent experience, to have

been the courageous policy of a Government that was to be given every credit for its foresight and judgment of the prospects and capabilities of the province (applause).

DR. MILNE spoke at some length. He explained that it would be found, in this case, as it had been found in every other case, that assisted emigration was a failure. MR. SWORN claimed that the House and Independent members of the House should not be charged with being opposed to the bill for the simple reason that they had not before them sufficient information to enable them to support it.

The second reading of the bill was carried upon the following division, viz.—AYES—Messrs. Horne, Eberts, Stoddart, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Baker and Smith—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie, Sword, Kitchen, Cotton, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Forster—9.

ARCHITECTS' BILL. MR. SPEAKER gave his ruling on the question raised as to whether the Architects' Bill (Mr. Cotton) was a public bill or not, that the bill being a public bill was properly before the House.

RE WESTMINSTER LANDS. MR. SPEAKER read a message from His Honor the Lieut. Governor transmitting a bill re certain lands in New Westminster.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Robson, it was decided to consider the message of His Honor in committee next sitting of the House.

BILL NO. 62. HON. MR. TURNER moved the second reading of Bill No. 62, which is in connection with the one which had been under discussion all day.

It being six o'clock, the Speaker left the chair.

EVENING SESSION. The Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES. MR. SPEAKER ruled that the report of the Select Committee re. claim of John Cross of Chilliwack, was in order. The report was therefore received.

NELSON & FORT SHEPPARD RAILWAY. MR. KELLIE moved the suspension of the standing orders for the purpose of moving the following resolution, viz.:—Moved by MR. KELLIE, seconded by MR. BROWN:

"Whereas a company known as the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Co. has applied to the Parliament of Canada for a charter for a railway from a point on the outlet of Kootenay Lake, near the town of Nelson, thence to a point at or near Fort Sheppard by way of the valley of Cottonwood, Smith Creek and the Salmon River.

"And, whereas, the construction of such a line would be very advantageous to the interests of the province, and would at all seasons of the year allow direct communication between the Kootenay Lake district and the boundary of the province near Fort Sheppard, thereby being a great benefit to trade.

"And, whereas, it is understood that strenuous opposition, not in the interest of the province, is being offered in order to defeat the passing of the bill for the said charter through the Dominion House.

"Therefore, be it resolved that an humble address be presented to the Lieutenant-Governor, praying him without prejudice to provincial rights, to immediately move the Dominion Government that the charter applied for by the Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company may be granted, and that a copy of the purport of this resolution be at once transmitted by telegraph to the Dominion Government.

After remarks by Hon. Mr. Beaven the Standing Orders were suspended and the motion was moved.

MR. KELLIE, in support of his resolution, said it was impossible for people not living in the interior to understand the disadvantages felt by those in the Kootenay country. He could not understand why the C.P.R. should not forward such exertions to cripple a small section of the country. If the C.P.R. themselves would build through the Crows' Nest Pass he could understand why they opposed the present scheme, but this they would not do. All they had done was to build a short line from Robson to Sproat which could only be voted for a certain time during the summer months each year. Railway communication with the outside world was an essential thing for the Kootenay country, and he hoped the Legislature would pass the resolution in the interests of the present bill before the Dominion House.

MR. BROWN seconded the resolution and supported it briefly.

COL. BAKER said that there was a mistake in going to the Dominion Legislature, and the late Premier of the Dominion, Sir John A. Macdonald, had told him there was no need to do so. He (Col. Baker) thought it was time full communication with the United States was opened up by railways running South. The argument now being used at Ottawa against the charter was that it would interfere with the trade of Victoria and Vancouver. Such was not the case, as a cheaper freight would be built up the trade rather than diminish it.

HON. MR. BEAVEN said he would vote against the resolution, as the charter applied for to the Dominion House was already granted by the Legislature of British Columbia, and the Dominion had nothing whatever to do with it. It would be suicidal for the province by thus passing such a resolution to give up its rights.

HON. MR. DAVIE said that the provincial rights would not be sacrificed by passing any such resolution. No matter what would be done here, it was not competent for the province to add to or diminish the rights of the Dominion. He thought it was wise and prudent for the promoters of the railway mentioned to apply to the Dominion Government for a charter.

After remarks by Hon. Mr. Beaven and Col. Baker, the debate was adjourned.

DEEP SEA FISHERIES.

HON. MR. BEAVEN resumed the discussion of Bill No. 62. He claimed that the men who ought to be given a chance to develop the deep sea fisheries were the men now engaged in sealing in Behring Sea, who, he said, would in all probability be excluded from the Behring Sea, this year.

MESSRS. CROFT, Kitchen and Hon. Mr. Robson continued the debate, the latter speaking at great length and going fully into the question.

The second reading of the bill was, after much discussion, carried on the following division, viz.:—

AYES—Messrs. Grant, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Baker and Smith—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kellie, Kitchen, Sword, McKenzie and Semlin—11.

The House adjourned at 1 o'clock a.m.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTIETH DAY.

FRIDAY, April 1, 1892.

The Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

COL. BAKER presented a report from the select committee appointed to enquire into the circumstances connected with the cancellation of the certificate to teach formerly held by Mr. John P. McLeod. A minority report was also presented.

MR. COTTON moved that the minority report be received.

MR. MARTIN read from Bourinot on parliamentary practices in Canada, to show that a minority report was not in order.

HON. MR. ROBSON said that the conclusion of the majority of a select committee ought to be the conclusion of the committee in the same way as the decision of a majority of the House was the decision of the House. Minority reports were bad innovations, and were placing a premium on political clap-trap. So far as the present minority report was concerned he had no objections to it except on the principle that minority reports should not be received.

MR. SPEAKER said that according to the custom of the House, the minority report was in order. According to strict rules the minority report should not be presented.

COL. BAKER moved the adoption of the reports, both majority and minority. Carried.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

HON. MR. ROBSON rose to a question of privilege. He read an article from the Times newspaper, headed "The Honest John Enquiry," referring to the report of the select committee to enquire into the McLeod case. He (Mr. Robson) did not object to the slangy and offensive heading of the article, or to the suggestion that he wrote the report for the McLeod Committee, as no member of the House who was acquainted with the chairman of that committee (Col. Baker) would have any doubts as to his (Col. Baker's) competency to write the report for himself, as well as to his honesty in repelling any attempt that might be made to even suggest to him what the report should contain. But what he (Mr. Robson) objected to was that he should be represented as casting any slur on the committee which had done its work well, even if there had been a little delay in presenting the report. He thought it a great pity that a representative of the press should, for party purposes, put words in his mouth. As a rule the Times reporter had reported him (Mr. Robson) correctly, so that when there was an incorrect report of this kind it could hardly be inadvertent.

COL. BAKER confirmed what the hon. premier had said. He did not know that it was necessary to say anything, but lest any silence should have a chance to say that "silence gives consent" he would state that he wrote the report of the committee as presented to the House entirely himself, of his own ideas and without any suggestions or advice from anyone. The report was presented to the committee and accepted by the majority.

CHINESE IMMIGRATION.

MR. KEITH moved, seconded by Mr. Forster, the following resolution, viz., "Whereas the 'Chinese Immigration Act of Canada' has proven, in a great measure, beneficial, but in some respects defective, more especially as the fifth section permits vessels to carry one Chinese immigrant to any part of Canada for every fifty tons of its tonnage; but we are of opinion that a much larger restriction should be imposed, and fewer Chinese carried on each vessel, or their importation prohibited; and, whereas, the eighth section imposes only an entrance duty of fifty dollars on every person of Chinese origin entering Canada who has been hundred dollars in, in our opinion, the lowest entrance duty that should be charged, if Chinese are allowed to enter Canada at all; and, whereas, the fourth sub-section of the eighth section provides that the entrance duty of fifty dollars shall not apply to any Chinese person who resided or was within Canada on 1st January, 1886; and the thirteenth section authorizes the issuance of a certificate of leave to depart and return to Canada; but, in our opinion, the entrance duty should apply to all Chinese other than those mentioned in sub-sections (a) and (b) of section 8, and the issuance of the above-mentioned certificates should be entirely abolished; be it, therefore, resolved, that a respectful address be presented to His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, requesting him to move the Dominion Government to cause the 'Chinese Immigration Act of Canada' to be made more restrictive in the manner indicated."

MR. KEITH spoke three-quarters of an hour in support of his motion.

After remarks by Messrs. Forster, Booth and Hon. Mr. Robson,

MR. CROFT moved the previous question, which was carried.

The resolution was then negatived on the following division, viz.:—

AYES—Messrs. Milne, Beaven, Horne, Brown, Forster, Keith, Semlin, McKenzie, Cotton, Kellie, Davie, Stoddart and Fletcher—13.

NAYS—Messrs. Sword, Baker, Robson, Vernon, Eberts, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter and Anderson—14.

NELSON AND FORT SHEPPARD R. R.

HON. MR. DAVIE announced that he had made certain amendments to a resolution moved, last evening, by Mr. Kellie. He therefore moved: "Whereas a Company known as 'The Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company,' has applied to the Parliament of Canada for a charter for a railway from a point on the outlet of Kootenay Lake near the town of Nelson; thence to a point at or near Fort Sheppard, by way of the valley of Cottonwood-Smith Creek and the Salmon River;

And whereas the construction of such a line would be very advantageous to the interests of this Province, and would at all seasons of the year allow direct communication

between the Kootenay Lake District and the boundary of the Province near Fort Sheppard, thereby being a great benefit to the Province, be it resolved, That an humble address be presented to His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor, praying that His Honor will move the Dominion Government that the charter applied for by 'The Nelson and Fort Sheppard Railway Company' may be granted, and that a copy of this Resolution be at once transmitted by telegraph to the Dominion Government."

The resolution was carried.
HON. MR. BRAVEN objecting on the ground of "interference with provincial rights."

THE OATHS' BILL.

The report of the Committee of the Whole on the Oaths Bill was adopted, and the bill read a third time and passed.

THE STENOGRAPHERS ACT.

The Stenographers Act was put through Committee of the Whole, read a third time and passed.

RE EMIGRATION.

Bill No. 61, an Act to authorize an agreement with Her Majesty's Government for the settling of fishermen and others in British Columbia was committed, Mr. Booth in the chair. The committee reported the bill complete with amendments.

DEEP SEA FISHERIES.

Bill No. 62, an Act to develop deep sea fisheries, was committed, Mr. Martin in the chair.

On the discussion of clause 2, Mr. Brown moved an amendment to the effect that the grant of land should be so much per family settled on the seaboard.

The amendment was defeated.
Mr. Brown then moved that Clause 2 be struck out. He made this motion, he said, in order to get his views before the committee. As it was plainly evident the Government were endeavoring to force the bill through just as it was, he wished to say that he washed his hands of the whole business, and would not be responsible for any portion of it.

HON. MR. DAVIE—Who said you would be? (Laughter.)

The clause stood, and the bill passed without further opposition.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

COAL MINES ACT.

HON. MR. VERNON'S bill to amend the Coal Mines Act was put through committee, read a third time, and passed.

RE WESTMINSTER LANDS.

The House went into Committee of the Whole to consider a message of His Honor, the Lieutenant-Governor, transmitting an act to provide for a grant to the corporation of the city of New Westminster of certain lands in the city of New Westminster.

HON. MR. BRAVEN raised the question as to whether the Government intended to convey to the city of Victoria what rights they had to certain lands near James Bay. He held that the province had certain rights which should be transferred to the city.

HON. MR. DAVIE promised to take the matter into consideration.

Committee rose and reported the bill, which was then reported, and, on motion of HON. MR. ROBSON, was read a first time; second reading next session of the House.

INFERIOR COURTS ACT.

House went into committee of the whole on the Inferior Courts Act. Bill reported with amendments.

It being 6 o'clock the Speaker left the chair.

EVENING SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

VICTORIA AND SYDNEY RAILWAY BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Victoria and Sydney Railway Company's bill, Mr. Semlin in the chair. Bill reported complete, without amendments.

THE GAME ACT.

On consideration of the Game Act, Mr. HUNTER moved to add a sub-section, so that bull wipiti, or moose, shall not be killed for three years after the date of the passage of this Act.

The amendment was carried.

Mr. CROFT had an amendment inserted, making it unlawful for anyone to discharge firearms inside Victoria harbor.

COT. BAKER moved to insert an amendment to clause 17, making it legal for any free miner or cattle rancher, to kill deer or any other game at any time for his own use, east of the Cascade range. In support of his resolution, he said that it might, perhaps, appear to be a little superfluous to put a clause of this kind in the bill, but the fact of the matter was that in the upper country, there were to be found all sorts and conditions of men, and the chances were that almost any miner or cattle rancher would kill game or deer for his own use, no matter what the game laws were.

But there was also the case of a man who, although he would kill all sorts of game out of season for his own food and use, would watch other people and have them up for offending against the law. The present amendment was to guard against that sort of thing.

As the law at present stood, he said, the miner who wanted to kill deer out of season for food was prevented from so doing, and he thought the law should be so amended as to prevent some other man coming along and playing the spy on him. It was only in the upper district that such a law was necessary, and he hoped it would pass.

After further discussion the amendment was carried.

The committee reported the bill complete with amendments.

COQUITLAM ELECTRIC CO.

The House went into Committee of the Whole to consider the Coquitlam Electric Company's bill. Committee reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

RE LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY.

HON. MR. DAVIE introduced a bill respecting the Legislative Assembly. Read a first time, second reading Monday.

EXECUTION ACT.

HON. MR. DAVIE introduced a bill to amend the Execution Act. Read a first time, second reading Monday.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.

HON. MR. DAVIE introduced an act to amend the Employers' Liability Act. Read a first time, second reading Monday.

On the motion to adopt the report of the committee on the Railway Bill,

HON. MR. DAVIE enquired whether the hon. member for Westminster City (Mr. Brown) would have any objections to the Westminster Southern Railway Co. being omitted from the operation of the bill.

Mr. BROWN explained that the reason he had introduced the amendment was at the request of the solicitor for the Westminster Southern. He (Mr. Brown) had taken the solicitor's word for it, and presumed it was all right.

HON. MR. DAVIE explained that the operation of the clause as amended would enable the Westminster Southern to get out of a heavy liability they had now incurred. He did not suppose the hon. gentleman for Westminster (Mr. Brown) would wilfully be a party to such a scheme, but presumed he had been made a mere tool of (laughter).

The report was allowed to stand until Monday, to enable a clause to be prepared restricting the operation of the clause.

VANCOUVER CITY BILL.

The report of the committee on the Vancouver City Bill was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

The House adjourned at 11:40 o'clock.

What Hon. Jno. Robson had to say to the Opponents of the Colonist Scheme.

Owing to the fact that the following speech on the colonist scheme for developing the deep sea fisheries of the province, was delivered at a late hour on Thursday evening in the Legislature, it has been impossible until to-day to spare space for a full report. The Premier's speech was reported as follows:—

HON. MR. ROBSON on rising to speak was received with applause. He said: After the prolonged discussion that has already taken place on this bill and after all that has been said by various members of both sides of the House, there is not much more for me to add; still I cannot let the opportunity pass without having something to say, for the reason that I think it will be found that the measure now before the House, and the one that we discussed this afternoon, will mark by their passage the greatest event in the history of British Columbia, and the greatest event besides in the history of the party of progress now in power in this Province. Let me say, sir, at the outset, that I regret exceedingly that this debate has shown that a number of hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House are not able, under any circumstances to rise above the bare political party view, and look at even a question like this from a broader and more liberal standpoint. True enough, sir, they say 'oh, no, we do not belong to any party or follow any leader,' but it is a most extraordinary thing that with one accord their thumbs go up as regularly as clock-work at the beck and call of the hon. leader of the Opposition. (Laughter.)

I was not so much surprised at the action of the so-called Independents in the House in this respect, but I was, I must confess, greatly surprised at the language used during this debate, by several hon. gentlemen, more particularly by the leader of the Opposition himself. That gentleman, sir, said, 'why bring in foreign settlers and colonists and new capital and new ships, when we have a fleet of sealers, complete with their rigging, and ready for the work, that will answer the same purpose.' Why, he said, bring in foreign capital and new people and 'show our own people to the wall'! Is it possible that we have enough capital and enough men and enough money in our province now that we are to build a Chinese wall around our borders and bid all who come near to stay without? Surely not. We have still plenty of room for all, and we want, and will want for many years to come, every assistance in the way of both money and men that we can get. Another thing I want to know too, is why that hon. gentleman (Mr. Beaven) should deem it right to refer to British capital and British population as foreign? Why, sir, it was only the other day that, upon the floor of this House, and within the hearing of every member, he was boasting about his loyalty, and of how he loved the mother land; and now what can he mean when he talks about our brothers and sisters and cousins and relations in the old country as foreigners, and when he alludes to British capital as foreign? I was astonished and extremely disappointed to have to listen to such remarks made in this House, and my only hope was that our reporters would see their way clear to omit those remarks from the published reports because I should be indeed ashamed to see them go abroad as the utterances of a gentleman who occupies such an honorable position as leader of the Opposition in this House. (Applause.)

But even were British capital foreign capital we are not going to refuse it on that account, for I think that to assist us in developing the vast resources of our province, we want all the capital we can all the enterprise we can get, whether it be foreign or otherwise. And above all things, sir, we are not going to put ourselves in the unfortunate position of saying that we are going to refuse to bring within our shores when opportunity offers as in the present instance, both British capital and a British population. The very things that we want here most are, first capital and second population, and I for one one and this Government as well will say that we will always welcome to our midst our brothers and sisters in blood from the British Isles, for we want to build up here on this northern part of the American continent, a nation that shall be truly the greater Britain, and that, sir, I believe we shall do in time. (Applause.)

That object can be accomplished, and, what is more, it will be done if we are true to ourselves, true to our country and keep alive a spirited faith in our future, showing our foresight and confidence in our resources by adopting just such large, gigantic schemes as the present one which will make this fair province of British Columbia take its true position amongst the provinces which go to make up our great Dominion and form a part of the most magnificent Empire the world has known. (Applause.)

With regard to these sealers now engaged with their schooners in Behring Sea, let me say for the information of the hon. gentleman opposite, if he does not already know it, that these boats are not adapted for the deep sea fisheries nor are they fitted up for such work as this syndicate proposes to undertake. The company or syndicate with whom this Government is to be empowered to treat, proposes to bring into operation in their enterprise here, the gigantic capital of £1,000,000 sterling, and I fancy I am right in saying that I don't think the sealers of this Province could begin to go into a business with this amount of capital required, even if they had the will, so to do. That syndicate, sir, proposes to build and equip in this province a fleet of steamers with cold storage compartments, for the purpose of taking the fresh fish away from the fishermen right at their boats

and conveying these fish by a system of cold storage warehouses to the point where navigation ends and rail transportation begins, and then bringing their full project into operation will convey the fish to the markets of the continent, delivering them to the consumers in practically the same condition as when caught. Now surely no hon. gentleman on the opposite side of the House would be foolish enough to make the statement that these sealing schooners referred to would be fit for the purposes of this work. In the first place they are not propelled by steam and even if they were they are not fitted up with cold storage compartments, and I fancy it would not be feasible to fit them up that way. The hon. leader of the Opposition said, moreover that not only were the sealers with their 60 schooners able and willing at the present time to go into the work of developing the deep sea fisheries, but that these men knew now from following the seals where the best fishing banks were located. He could not have considered what he said or else he would never have made such a rash statement or else I am forced to the conclusion, that he knew nothing whatever of what he was talking about. Where and how did those sealers obtain that valuable information and under what circumstances? Perhaps the hon. gentleman opposite who knows so much about it will tell this House. Perhaps he will say as he hinted that the seals went to the cod banks to fish, and the sealers followed them there. But there is no truth in any such theory for in the first place the seals do not indulge in deep sea fishing at all and in the second place they do not visit the cod banks and eat cod-fish. They eat salmon and small fish that are found nearer the surface and in towards the shore, and so the House will see how much there is in that theory. I really felt sorry to hear that hon. gentleman use it. I felt that in dealing with a national project of this kind which involves not only the province of British Columbia but as well has to do with the progress and prosperity of the Dominion, and the future happiness of thousands of people and which involves besides all this the certain benefit of our own people, I say sir that I felt it was a great mistake for the Opposition in this House to deal as they have done with such a project, such a statesmanlike scheme as we have proposed, and have outlined in the bills now before the House. I tell you, sir, that until the parties opposite find a leader who will not make such mistakes as this, and who can grasp the importance of such a scheme as this, they can never hope to slough the reins of power (applause). I am told by the way that there are two or three aspirants for the position of leader of the 'hosts' of the Opposition, but I have never been able to find out just why those gentlemen have not come forward and taken front seats and endeavored to lead the shattered and staggering wreck onward to victory (laughter). True enough I have never been able to find out what goes on in their caucus, but I am given to understand that the hon. senior member for Vancouver, is one of the applicants or aspirants for the position (renewed laughter) and I think moreover that he was a perfect right to aspire—he has, I say, a perfect right to push forward and endeavor to take his position, his proper position as leader (laughter). Then again we have the hon. member for Westminster city (laughter). He, sir, is a gentleman of large experience and great ability, and over powering eloquence (laughter) and it is his duty as I am sure he and every other member of the House will immediately recognize to rush in and rescue the party from such an ill advised policy as the one they have now adopted. I am given to understand that our friends on the other side of the House have had a great many quarrels in their caucuses over that vexed question and it puzzles me to know why in the name of goodness they don't get together and fight the whole battle out and decide who shall be leader. (Laughter and applause.)

The gentleman who is the nominal leader of the Opposition party did a most unpardonable act to-night when he said that if we bring these colonists out here and spend our money on them, we will have them all going over the border to the United States. What does such a statement as that mean? It means, if anything at all, a good deal more than appears upon the face of it. It is a positive and gross vilification of

our own country. Is it to go forth to the world that the leader of Her Majesty's loyal Opposition in this Legislature has no faith in our own province, and that he thinks that if we bring the best people from the mother land here, that they will all go over across the border and join the people in the United States. Such a remark contains a frightful reflection upon our own country. We talk about our glorious climate, our marvellous natural resources, our wealth of forest, stream and mine, and yet after all, he infers that this is such a dreadful bad place to bring settlers that when we have picked out the best men and their families in the United Kingdom and brought them here, they will refuse to remain. It is an astonishing thing that the hon. leader of the Opposition would make such a statement, and the only justification I can advance for such language from him is that the policy those gentlemen have been pursuing for some years past has been such that the people know at what price to value what they say and nothing that they can say can very much damage the country. And then, sir, those gentlemen go further and they enquire with a look of the blandest simplicity 'What does the syndicate or company want the land for?' They have such an enormous idea of what the land is to be valued at! What does the company want with the land! What does any company, a railway company for instance, want with a land grant from either the province or the Dominion? Not for right of way and station houses, depots, sidings, etc., because that would only require a small proportion of the land they get. Yes; what does a railway company want land for? This House has been asked on several occasions and has expressed its willingness to grant large areas of land to different railway schemes. Why here just the other day there was a miserable, measly little railway only 28 miles long proposed to be built, and this House was asked to give a land grant of more than twice the area

city asked for for this syndicate scheme of colonization; and why does the company want the land except for the same reason that other people want it, for big enterprises, and that is to enable them to finance the scheme, and the hon. members opposite know that as well as I do, if they would only stop and consider a little and not make such rash statements off hand. Without this land grant it would be unwise for the company to go in to finance a scheme of this magnitude, for we all know how difficult it is to manage the first scheme for settlement of this kind. And what is the land good for anyway? Well, now, I think most of us have some idea of what that land is worth, and how much of it is good for settlement, and how much of it is valuable for economic purposes as some of the hon. gentlemen opposite would say. Those who have gone into this syndicate scheme have a large project on hand, and they must have this land in order to finance their scheme, and to get the necessary amount of capital in order to go to work. That is a plain and simple proposition, and it is directly on that basis that the land grant is asked. (Applause.) Now I come to some of the remarks made by the hon. junior member for Victoria city (Dr. Milne) who spent a long time and a great deal of exertion discussing bill No. 61, an act to authorize us to make an agreement with Her Majesty's Government for the purpose of settling certain fishermen and others in the province. He (Dr. Milne) spoke at great length about a bill which I am convinced he never read at all. Such deplorable carelessness and ignorance I cannot understand at all, and I think the least we in this House can ask is that hon. gentlemen will read the bills and try and find out what they are talking about. Those hon. members, sir, are all the time complaining and shouting for more information and further details. Why in the name of goodness don't they read the bills before them first and understand what those bills contain before they ask for more information. They claim to be actuated by the highest motives and to be burning with an intense zeal to 'know it all,' and yet when it comes down to the fine point it turns out that they don't even know the conditions and terms contained in that very short bill No. 61. Sir, this Government has been accused with being slow and we have been taunted with being too slow and too quiet. Hon. gentlemen opposite have shouted loudly that we have no dash and no vigor, and that we have attempted no big schemes to push the country ahead and make—

Mr. CORROD: Hear, hear.

HON. MR. ROBSON: Yes; it is all very well for that hon. gentleman to shout hear, hear, but I will deal with him before I get through and show that he belongs to a race of mossbacks who sit around silent and moody and grumbling, waiting Micawber-like for something to turn up but never making a move to turn it up. (Laughter and applause.)

This Government comes forward to-day with this large colonization scheme, as it has come forward in the past with other schemes—plans, sir, for instance of placing the finances of the province on a sound basis so as to send our credit up amongst the best and highest in the money markets of the world. (Applause.)

This country is still going forward daily, and as we advance and progress our credit increases and it behoves us as a government to keep step with the rapid development of the country and to assist and encourage that development as much as we can. We do not stand still under circumstances of this kind, with our hands in our pockets, but we keep on the move

—we keep our eyes open for every able means to assist the province of British Columbia, and when forward such energetic statesmen as the one we have posed, we wish it to understand we will use our best endeavors to make a complete success. Is our hon. friends across of this House are doing? I deem, it is not. They take an insane delight in doing they must know to be in the vein. And when we bring forward a scheme like the present one, they like cayuses against it as if it were very much afraid it would be successful. Why Sir, they don't even know what the scheme is as it is enunciated by the House. The remarks those gentlemen made about the land grant, the necessity that existed that the government should have compensated the land, shows how little they the extent and scope of the project venture to say, Sir, and I say feeling of pride that no Government this province has at any time in the history of British Columbia brought forward a scheme of such enormous importance, and which such benefit may be derived from it! We are to have spent the province over a million pounds of money, and are to have upon what is now our wild and desolate land, no less than 1200 most thrifty and most healthy independent families of the United Kingdom. You want us with incurring an obligation of £150,000 sterling, to place 1200 families of this class in our province and in a position where they can earn a living, and where the instrumental in developing the fisheries and utilizing the enormous wealth of what we are so proud to call our great sea? What are the facts of the case? Hon. gentlemen know that in the States every adult male is estimated being worth \$1000 in hard cash individual state, and this being so how valuable would whole families of the land be?

DR. MILNE: How much are they worth?

HON. MR. TURNER: If the States valuation of its adult males for the estimation of the worth of the land, I say, sir, that if we have one single cent of the £150,000 expending these 1,200 families out would still be a large sum of money good. (Applause.) But if those hon. members only look at this matter from a purely honest, and without bias, and one to understand that the apportionment of these bills range matters that no safer or more reliable security could be asked or

by any reasonable person. The Opposition members have declared rowdy viages and a prophetic vision when these people come out or are put, we have no guarantee that they will remain in the province, under the arrangements we propose, and under the agreement that we have made of these two bills we will most positive assurance that they will stay where we put them, but they will be so strong that they would go anywhere else to get that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

being considered, I say that it is a purely financial standpoint, where the whole of the money we borrow these fishermen out, and were to land grant beside, we would be sure that I know of, where they would be well treated or so properly and quietly provided for. (Applause.)

country. Is it to go forth to the leader of Her Majesty's position in this Legislature has in our own province, and that he mother land here, that they will across the border and join the United States. Such a contains a frightful reflection upon our country. We talk about our climate, our marvellous natural wealth of forest, stream, and yet after all, he infers that such a dreadful bad place to live in when we have picked men and their families in the kingdom and brought them here, refuse to remain. It is an as-thing that the hon. leader of tion would make such a state-ment, the only justification I can see for such language is that the policy those years past has been such people know at what price to get. Yes; what does a rail-ay can very much damage the And then, sir, those gentlemen and they enquire with a look of simplicity "What does the company want the land for? such an enormous idea of what to be valued at! What does company, a railway company for want with a land grant from province or the Dominion? of way and station houses, ings, etc., because that would be a small portion of the get. Yes; what does a rail-ay want land for? This has been asked on several oc- has expressed its willingness ge areas of land to different emes. Why here just the there was a miserable, measly way only 28 miles sed to be built, and this asked to give a land more than twice the an- for for this syndicate scheme tion; and why does the com- the land except for the same other people want it, for big, and that is to enable them a scheme, and the hon. mem- know that as well as I do, ould only stop and consider a not make such rash statements. Without this land grant, I amwise for the company to go ce a scheme of this magnitude, know how difficult it is to man- scheme for settlement of this and what is the land good for? Well, now, I think most of us idea of what that land is worth, much of it is good for settle- how much of it is valuable for purposes as some of the hon. opposite would say. Those gone into this syndicate scheme ge project on hand, and they e this land in order to finance come, and to get the necessary capital in order to go to work. plain and simple proposition. directly on that basis that the it is asked. (Applause.) Now I one of the remarks made by the or member for Victoria city (Dr. no spent a long time and a great ortion discussing bill No. 61, an- thorize us to make an agreement Majesty's Government for the of settling certain fishermen ers in the province. He line) spoke at great length bill which I am convinced read at all. Such deplorable ss and ignorance I cannot un- at all, and I think the least we ouse can ask is that hon. gentle- read the bills and try and find they are talking about. Those bers, sir, are all the time com- and shouting for more informa- further details. Why in the goodness don't they read the re them first and understand se bills contain before they ask information. They claim to be by the highest motives and to be with an intense zeal to 'know ad yet when it come down to the it turns out that they don't w the conditions and terms con- that very short bill No. 61. Government has been taunted w too slow and too quiet. Hon. n opposite have shouted loudly have no dash and no vigor, and have attempted no big schemes the country ahead and make- TOTTON: Hear, hear.

MR. ROBSON: Yes, it is all very that hon. gentleman to shout ar, but I will deal with him be- through and show that he be- a race of mossbacks who sit silent and moody and grumbling, Micawber-like for something to but never making a move to turn (Laughter and applause.) This ent comes forward to-day with e colonization scheme, as it has reward in the past with other -plane, sir, for instance of plac- inances of the province on a as so as to send our credit up the best and highest in the markets of the world. (Applause.) ntry is still going forward daily, we advance and progress our acres and it behoves us as a ent to keep step with the rapid ment of the country and to assist ourage that development as much n. We do not stand still under ances of this kind with our hands ckets, but we keep on the move

—we keep our eyes open for every avail-able means to assist the progress of British Columbia, and when we being forward such energetic statesmanlike schemes as the one we have now pro-posed, we wish it to understand that we will use our best endeavors to make that scheme a complete success. Is this what our hon. friends across the floor of this House are doing? No, in- deed, it is not. They seem to take an insane delight in doing what they must know to be in the very op-posite. And when we bring forward a scheme like the present one, they buck like cayuses against it as if indeed they were very much afraid it would be suc-cessful. Why Sir, they don't even know what the scheme is as it is enunciated in those two bills that were brought before the House. The remarks those hon. gentlemen made about the land grant, and the necessity that existed that the Government should have compensation for this land, shows how little they realize the extent and scope of the project. I venture to say, Sir, and I say it with a feeling of pride that no Government of this province has at any time in the history of British Columbia, brought forward a scheme of such enormous importance, and from which such benefit may be derived. Just think of it! We are to have spent within the province over a million pounds ster-ling of money, and are to have settled upon what is now our wild and unpro-ductive land, no less than 1200 of the most thrifty and most healthy and in- dependent families of the United Kingdom. You taunt us with incurring a financial obligation of £150,000 sterling in order to place 1200 families of this class within our province and in a position where they can earn a living, and where they will be instrumental in developing the deep sea fisheries and utilizing the enormous latent wealth of what we are so proud on occasions to call our great sea farm. What are the facts of the case? Do those hon. gentlemen know that in the United States every adult male is estimated as being worth \$1000 in hard cash? The individual state, and this being the case, how valuable would whole families or the flower of the land be?

DR. MILNE: How much are the women worth.

HON. MR. TURNER: If the men are worth \$1000, women will be worth double that—\$2000. (Applause and laughter.)

HON. MR. ROBSON:—If we take the United States valuation of its adult males as a basis for the estimation of the worth of our fam-ilies, I say, sir, that if we never got back one single cent of the £150,000 expended in bringing these 1200 families out here, we would still be a large sum of money to the good. (Applause.) But if those hon. mem-bers will only look at this matter thor-oughly and honestly, and without bias, they will come to understand that the agreement which will grow out of these bills will so stamp matters that no safer or more fa-vorable security could be asked or demand-

ed by any reasonable person. True, sir, Opposition members have declared with- out proof and a prophetic voice, that when these people come out or are brought out, we have no guarantee that they will remain on the land allotted to them, or even that they will remain in the province. But, sir, under the arrangements we propose to make, and under the agreement which will grow out of these two bills we will have the most positive assurance that they will re-main. Why, sir, the inducements for them to stay where we shall put them will be so strong that they would be fools, indeed, if they left, for they could not go anywhere else under the sun, that I know of, where they would be so well treated or so properly and ade-quately provided for. (Applause.) All this being considered, I say that if we, from a purely financial standpoint, were to lose the whole of the money we borrow to bring these fishermen out, and were to lose our land grant besides, we would be still money ahead if we got those permanent settlers in the province. But, as is shown in the brief memorandum of the Vancouver Island De-velopment Syndicate, which has been dis-tributed amongst the members, the invest-ment and re-investment of the money loaned guards us against loss. Those are facts and figures that cannot be combated. As I have said before, a most careful cal-culation has been made by able actuaries and men of experience in handling large finan-cial schemes, and the Government knows what it is undertaking to do. Every cent, I think I can safely say, will be paid back, and not only will we clear ourselves on the investment, but, when the whole thing is completed, the loan al-repaid and the books balanced, it will be found that there is something to the good, for, as is shown in the tabulated statements, we are working on a margin of twelve and one-half per cent. Opposition members tell us that there may be deaths and unforeseen expenses, and, in reply, I can tell those hon. gentlemen that we have taken all that into consideration, and are prepared to save ourselves, notwithstanding any reasonable contingencies of the kind arising. (Ap-plause.) I think, now, I have done with the so called arguments, but, in reality, carping quibbles, advanced by the hon. leader of the Opposition; but before I close my remarks I must pay some little atten-tion to some statements that have been made by my hon. friend from Westminster district (Mr. Kitchen). That gentleman, sir, has said that this great scheme, this gigantic monopoly, this enormous enterprise will clash with private industry, and injure private means already invested. It appears that there is already one little company in Vancouver at work "developing the deep sea fisheries," and doing its best to get along with its limited capital, and, from what my hon. friend has to say, it would seem that he is afraid this big concern which we are going to encourage will come down and crush that company to the wall. Has that hon. gen-tleman considered that our great sea farm is a farm of magnificent proportions? There is

an enormous acreage of arable land, so to speak, say two and a half millions of acres, for argument's sake, or throw off the half million and make it two millions in round numbers.

HON. MR. BEAVER:—Why not take in the whole of the Pacific Ocean?

HON. MR. ROBSON:—Well perhaps I would not be wrong did I do so, for the whole ocean is open to us, but two millions will serve for present purposes. Now that por-tion of this great sea farm which that little company can cultivate must be a most in-finitesimal portion. This grand scheme of our country is not a few thousands of private industry with a few thousands of dollars at its back? I see before my eyes our great sea farm of, say, two million acres. I picture to myself one lonely man, almost a mere spot upon the horizon, stand-ing away out on the far corner with a hoe and hoeing away with might and main! And how many thousand years of that kind of work will it take to cultivate the farm? How many years of scratching and scraping with the old appliances and the old tools and the old hoe? I tell you private capital and single effort are totally incapable of undertaking the work. But now suppose that instead of leaving that one man with a hoe standing away out there on the corner of the farm, like a fly speck that you might see only with a microscope, we who own and have control of the farm open our eyes and see what great possibilities there are in a proper cultivation. What are we going to do about it? I will tell you. We are going to rush in the latest inventions of all kinds for cultivation. Look at those long rows after rows of gang plows with steam motive power, our new harrows and all the incidentals of a first class farm, and the most improved means of cultivation. Even with all these appliances I do not say that we are going to complete our work or accomplish our object in any one single year, but we will do so within a reasonable time, certainly within an ordinary lifetime. And now I want those hon. gentlemen op-posite to tell me, is it the true policy of the Government that that little sea man, with his single hoe, plucky and courageous as he is, is all that is to be considered in the de-velopment of our farm? and are we not, be-cause of his prior presence on the scene, to bring in our latest appliances when we have an opportunity? I think there is room enough for all, and the big company can afford to go ahead, and the little private in-dividual need never bother it at all. Dear me! Talk about an unprogressive govern-ment, and a government that is too slow and does not bring forward any big schemes! Why if hon. gentlemen opposite could only see themselves as contented and unpre-judiced people must see them, with their six inches deep growing on their backs, we would hear no more of such twaddle from them (Laughter and applause). The country can see now what a fatal policy it would have been to have elected to power those gen-tlemen opposite who cannot see further than their noses. The country can see now what it did when it put a party like ours into power, progressive and enterprising and able and willing to devise plans and pursue a statesmanlike policy that will lift our fair province up and send it rushing ahead. That's what that party has done to-day is doing, and the country can see at once in what way and by what means the gen-temen opposite are endeavoring to defeat us. (Laughter and applause.) But the most ridiculous thing the hon. member for West-minster district had to say in opposition to the land grant was, however, that we were going to give to this great syndicate, to this enormous corporation, a few hundred or a few thousand acres of coal lands! Why should we not give such a company as this coal lands? I say it is far better to give a big syndicate, like the Vancouver Island Development Co., these lands, than to let them lie idle. These large companies will have the energy and the capital to go to work and develop those coal beds. It is a mistake to suppose that we value coal lands at the price we sell them at. We don't do anything of the kind, but when these lands are thrown open, and are developed then we get five cents for every ton of coal that is taken out. Don't let any hon. gentleman be bold enough to say that because we are to give away some coal lands, that the scheme should be condemned. The fact of the matter is that having a company that has the means to develop the coal beds, is a recommendation to the scheme. It is, as I said, a recommendation instead of an ob-jection. (Applause.) Our friends also on the other side of the House, have com-plaind bitterly because the word Crofters was not to be found in the bills now before the House. Oh, yes, I can see through, and hon. members can see through their hollows. When the scheme was first suggested they had prepared all sorts of objections. They were going to prove that the Crofters would not be a desirable class of settlers, and that it would be a gross mis-take on our own part to attempt to colonize our coast with such people. And, sir, when the bills, No. 61 and 62, came down to the House, you must have seen how their countenances fell, and how their faces be-came elongated, when they found that the Crofters were not an essential part of the scheme, and the hon. member for West-minster district (Mr. Kitchen) rushed around to his mental censor and political adviser, the hon. member for West-minster city (Mr. Brown) and with ex-tended face and blazing eyes, begged to know, "What shall we do, what shall we do?" (Laughter.) And, sir, what was the cause of that dolorous aspect of counte-nance? Why, it was nothing more or less than because their imagined grievance was gone, and the very thing they had pro-posed to make their chief cause of complaint to the bill was taken away. (Applause.) The very ground had been knocked from under their feet, and as a matter of course, they didn't know what to do. About these very same Crofters, let me say that I was especially gratified to hear my hon. friend from Comox (Mr. Hunter) read the extracts he did from the report of the Royal Com-mission, appointed to enquire into the con-dition of the Crofters in the Islands, and Highlands of Scotland; and I presume the hon. member (Mr. Kitchen) will say that he knows better. Let me ask him has he had as good an opportunity of making an enquiry and of finding out the facts for himself? Let me tell him that

that report was prepared by a Royal Commission appointed by the British House of Commons, and the fullest and fairest en-quiry possible was made into the matter, and I can assure the hon. gentleman op-posite (Mr. Kitchen) that he can take for granted any statement contained in the findings of that report, and can stake his very existence upon the correctness of its conclusions. (Applause.) But, sir, I am not going to admit that if the Crofter fea-ture of the scheme had been retained it would have been disastrous. Nothing of the kind, but what we considered was how we could get the greatest possible efficiency and the best settlers obtainable. I know as well as any one does what a false step it would be for us to shove indiscriminately into ships, and bring out here, families of fishermen from England, Ireland, or Scot-land. Such a move would be simply suicidal, and nothing of the kind will be done. The most careful selection will be made amongst the Crofters and the other fishermen, in order to get the most in-dependent and self-reliant of them all. One of the most important factors in the success of the whole scheme is that the ones we want should be most carefully selected. This is a scheme which has three parties to it, and of those three parties the most interested in seeing that we get the right class of settlers are the Provincial Government of British Columbia and the syndicate people themselves. I believe my-self, as I have said, that the fundamental basis of the success of this emigration and colonization scheme depends upon a wise and careful selection of those we are to transplant, so to speak, and the Imperial Government, the Provincial Government, and the syndicate may be depended upon to leave no stone unturned and no means unused to have none but the best and most desirable class brought out. (Ap-plause.) Nor does it follow, as has been sug-gested, that all volunteers to come will be accepted, or that no one but volunteers will be selected for the best of them, the most self-reliant of those who wish to come, only will be taken, and the whole scheme will be so explained to them that they will fully understand it, and I venture to say that we will get those who are most desir-able for our purposes, and the others, the poorer class, those lower in the scale so to speak, less self-reliant and less independent, will stay at home and suck their thumbs. When the full particulars are explained to these people, some of them will say whether they will come or not, and then we will make up our minds if we will take them. Its all very well for the hon. member for Westminster district to say that he knows or professes to know more about the Crofters than the Royal Commission, to whose re-port I have referred, and I venture to say that his ignorance in this respect is only equal to his ignorance as to the naval reserve. But, sir, those gentlemen on the Opposite side of the House are character-istic in their ignorance and in their narrow-ness. It is needless for me to say again that this is a proposition broader than the province we inhabit, broader, in fact, than the whole Dominion. Can those hon. gentlemen realize what a grand thing it would be for us to establish not only a naval reserve, within our own province, but a first-class coastguard, ready at all times for loss from without and within? If no other reason look at the influence such a class of colonists would have in inducing and assisting settlement up the coast, and then if there was any danger of trouble from the Indians, such as we have in the past had rumors of, how comforting a thing it would be to know that these men were there! It would place the Indians in that position that if they were not well intentioned there would be no need for us to fear. I say, too, and say it without hesitation, that the set-tlement of these fishermen along our sea-board will, in course of time, providing the scheme turns out as successful as I hope it will, revolutionize the whole of British Columbia, and give an impetus to our industries of every kind and class. It would be the greatest civilization we could adopt. It is a scheme calculated to bring into operation even the smallest atom of patriotism possessed by those hon. mem-bers who oppose this bill, and yet those gen-tlemen cannot rise above party lines and see things on a broader scale. They say, and they say as though it was a great argu-ment, that the colonists who would be brought out under the auspices of this scheme would be practically reduced to a state of serfdom. Can anything be more palpably absurd! Would it not be, even from a bare monetary standpoint, much more in the interests of the syndicate to keep those fishermen working for them and thus to keep their scheme in operation, and sir, to do so, does any reasonable man sup-pose they would treat them in anything but a fair and honorable manner? I say, sir, the whole statement or insinuation of anything in the way of serfdom is absurd. It would be suicidal, it would be fatal, it would be idiotic. If the company is to grind down these people, as has been suggested, and will have no mercy on them, how in the world can they get them to work for them? But suppose they did grind them down and oppress them, as the hon. member for Westminster city (Mr. Brown) suggests. What would be the result? Would not the settlers re-fuse to work, and the boats of the syndi-cate would become idle, and their business would come to a standstill? And does any sane man suppose the colonists would be allowed to starve? Not much. Their labor would still be utilized, and other syndicates would come forward, and other companies would come into competition, and the origi-nal company would be ruined. Sir, those hon. members seem to lose sight of the fact that this syndicate is to be composed of business men, with business knowledge and business interests, and they will see that the right men are selected to have charge of the operations for them, men, too, who will not abuse the trust confided in them. But these gentlemen opposite who are raising these bugaboos could go on all night creating and building up men of straw that they could then battle with and knock down. They could not conceive a single scheme if they tried where capital and labor have to be concerned where they could not make just the same objections, in the building of our public railroads, in our public works, in fact in any enterprise whatever. And yet they say these things? Why, the man or com-

pany who would treat employees as they suggest would first have to be a fool and also a villain, for no one else would allow any such thing to occur. (Applause.) Hon. gentlemen opposite say there is nothing in these bills to show how much land these settlers are each going to get, whether it is to be 20, or 40, or 60, or 80 acres for each family. Sure enough there is nothing in the bills to show that, for it is one of the details which must be settled in the agreement. Hon. gentlemen must re-member that this is to be a triple agree-ment. We pass the bills here, enabling this Government to enter into an arrangement to enable further arrangements to be made by the Imperial Parliament. And then, when all the preliminaries are arranged, representatives of the three parties will come together and will formulate an agree-ment, and you all may be sure that Her Majesty's Government will not assent to any plan that will place the settlers, who are to be practically wards of the Govern-ment, at the mercy and under the control of any company or syndicate. (Applause.) As to the area of the land to be granted to each settler, I would say that this will greatly depend upon where the land is, and what kind it is. This gigantic scheme is to be carried out step by step. You can't draw out a cast-iron agreement and say, here you must stick to that. These matters will all have to be arranged later on, and the agreement that will be made by this Government will have to be reported to this House and approved by the Legislature. (Applause.)

Now, with regard to the remarks of the hon. member for Westminster district (Mr. Kitchen), to the effect that no bonus should be given this company because a bonus was ever given to the promoters of the sal-mon canning industry, does that hon. gentleman know what he is talking about or does he not? I can't believe that he con-sidered what he said or he would never have made such a statement. The differ-ence between the salmon canning industry and the development of the deep-sea fisher-ies has been ably explained by the hon. member for Cowichan (Mr. Grot), and I might say in addition, for the information of the hon. member for Westminster district (Mr. Kitchen), who seems to be in a bit of a hurry in this matter, that the syndicate is going to do far more than merely to catch fish for canning. They will go into the fishing industry in all its branches, and I venture to predict that should the project meet with the success we hope for, within five years our export trade in fish and fish products will amount to over six millions of dollars annually, and I think that will be found to be a very moderate calculation. This deep sea fish-ery scheme is entirely different from an inland industry, and I think that it is reasonable to presume that within five years the ex-ports will exceed the sum I have named. It will not take us long to catch up to Newfoundland, of whose fisheries we have of late heard so much, but we have a great advantage over Newfoundland in that we have our fishing ground all to ourselves, and further the Newfoundland fish all have to be dried before being marketed, whereas our fish will go into the market of the continent in practically the same condition as they are in when caught, as they will be preserved by freezing. The syndicate is going to catch fish of every kind within the waters of the Pacific, they are going into the manufacture of fish products, such as fish oils, guano, etc., and will not throw away a single scrap that can by any manner or means be turned into a merchantable commodity, and they are going to carry on the whole plan of operation on such lines that they will re-quire to have a million pounds sterling capital. I say, sir, that if we have any re-gard for the prosperity of our country and the development of our resources now lying dormant and beyond reach, if we have a desire to see this province advance and pro-gress, let us discard party lines and consider this scheme in the broad, patriotic, yes, and even business-like way in which it pre-sents itself. If we want to push forward our province and make it occupy the proud position it should attain, surely we cannot afford to waste a valuable opportunity of this kind. (Applause.) No scheme that I know of, sir, could be undertaken that would be better calculated to solve the Chinese problem, which agitates so much our honorable friends. When we get these Crofters here we will be able to get their daughters for domestics and for household assistance, and their sons in our canneries, etc., and will thus drive out the Chinese labor now used in these ways. The best method of keeping the Chinese out of the country is to place our-selves in a position to do without them, and if we can succeed in bringing into this country a class of people of our own race and blood who can do the work for which we are now employing the Chinese, we can shut the latter out. In conclusion, sir, let me say that when those hon. members of this House who oppose these bills go back to their constituents and are asked to ex-plain their course of action, what can they say, what will they say? Their plea that they wanted more infor-mation, more details, more agreements, more everything, will not be accepted when it is seen, as it will be seen, that this Govern-ment has used every precaution and taken every possible care to ensure that no un-worthy population will be brought out under the provisions of these bills, and that the greatest care will be taken to see that the interests of the province are protected and promoted. And, sir, we will hear from every portion of the country the verdict of the people, "Well done!" and will, when the scheme is completed and in operation even extort from our unwilling opponents the admission that we have done well. (Pro-longed applause.)

VINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTY-SECOND DAY.

TUESDAY, April 5, 1892.
Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

QUESTIONS OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. DAVIS rose to a question of privilege. He produced a copy of the COLONIST of April 5, in which he had to have been misreported in two matters. He said it would only be that he should read the references, which he complained, in order that the should be condemned as incorrect by hon. gentlemen who was in the house at the time he spoke on the question. The cause of complaint was during the time House was in committee of the whole on the Municipal Bill. Referring to an amendment the hon. leader of the Opposition moved he (Mr. Davis) was represented as having said "he had not known anything about it until yesterday, Sunday morning, when reading the COLONIST he noticed a reference to it." He begged to say that he never used those words, neither did he utter words which could in any way be understood. The second cause of complaint was on page eight of the COLONIST of the evening session of the House, where (Mr. Davis) was reported as follows: "said there was no hope of another Supreme Court Judge being appointed by the Governor General of the Dominion." He had not so expressed himself. What he said was that no occasion, whatever, for the appointment of an additional judge in British Columbia, and that the of the country required no additional Supreme Court judges. That was a very different statement to the complexion put on it.

Mr. BEAVER said it was a serious matter to be made against the Attorney-General, to say that he read the COLONIST.

Mr. DAVIS said that this would be a serious matter contrary to his principles of morality for to lie and read in bed was a waste of time; and therefore an encouragement of idleness.

N. & F. S. LAND GRANT.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the Message of His Honor, the Governor, on Bill (No. 74), an Act to provide for the granting of a certain land sub-division and in aid of the Nelson and Fort St. John railway.

Mr. BEAVER asked for further explanation, and was briefly replied to by Mr. Tupper.

The Committee rose and reported the bill introduced and read a first time.

FALSE CREEK LANDS.

Mr. HORN moved the following resolution: "Whereas, by an Act entitled 'An Act authorizing the transfer of certain public property to the Provincial Government,' passed in the 54th and 55th Victoria, the Governor in Council may by such instrument as he may think fit, transfer, with-secundary consideration to the Province of British Columbia, all the interests of Her Majesty in the rights of Canada in the shore and bed of every or any stream, lake, harbor, bay, open sea, or other territorial waters of Canada within the limits of this province; and whereas, the Corporation of the City of Vancouver is extremely desirous of obtaining for public purposes, all that portion of False Creek lying to the east of Westminster Avenue, and the City of Vancouver, together with the lands of the same, and the right to drain the said portion of False Creek; be it therefore resolved, that a respectful address be presented to His Honor, the Governor in Council, praying His Honor to take such steps as he may deem necessary to have that portion of False Creek referred to transferred to the Province of British Columbia for the purpose of being sold land conveyed to the Corporation of the City of Vancouver." He supported his resolution in a brief speech.

Mr. MARTIN opposed the resolution. He said that he thought there was any value in the property it should be sold for the benefit of the province, and not given free to any city or corporation.

Mr. MILNE supported the resolution, explaining fully how the land in question was situated and its circumstances.

Mr. Mr. ROBSON said he hoped the resolution would carry, and thought the City of Vancouver should be allowed to get possession of this piece of property so as to improve it. He thought if they reclaimed it they would be entitled to it. The case was about the same as that of the city of Victoria with reference to a portion of the Bay, and he hoped the difficulties at present appeared to be in the way of completion of the work would not be insurmountable.

After remarks by Mr. Cotton and Mr. Tupper the resolution passed.

Mr. GRANT moved "That an Order of the House be granted for a printed return of all correspondence which have passed between Mr. J. Vantreight and the Provincial Secretary, or any officer of Government, with reference to educational matters."

Mr. Mr. ROBSON said the papers referred to would be brought down in due season.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Mr. Mr. ROBSON rose to a question of privilege. He said he had in his hand a clipping from a newspaper published in Vancouver, called the News-Advertiser, which contained what purported to be a reproduction of a speech made by Mr. Brown, on Friday night, at a public meeting held in Westminster. That speech contained the following clause: "That while the Government were informing the Bishop that lands were under reserve, they were selling lots right there by private sale, to the parties." That statement, Mr. ROBSON continued, was incorrect. He did not know where Mr. Brown got his information. He (Mr. ROBSON) was not aware the Government had sold land within the area claimed by the Bishop of Westminster, to private individuals, or to any one else.

Mr. SPEAKER told the Premier he must produce the newspaper.

HON. Mr. ROBSON—I have a fragment of it here.

Mr. SPEAKER—A fragment will not do.

HON. Mr. ROBSON—It is but a fragment at the best. (Laughter).

Mr. BROWN explained that the report was merely a reporter's understanding of what he had said. What he did say was that lots in the vicinity covered by the same reserve had been sold.

REDISTRIBUTION.

Mr. BROWN asked the Premier: "Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a redistribution bill during the present session of the Legislature?"

HON. Mr. ROBSON replied no.

MUNICIPAL BILLS.

The House went into committee of the whole on the municipal bill, Mr. McKenzie in the chair.

On the consideration of section 83 of bills 21 and 27.

HON. Mr. BEAVER moved—"To strike out in sub-section (c) of section 83, the following words:—'but after the re-building or improvement of the formerly licensed premises has been completed, the license shall be issued in the name of the owner (if a suitable person), or of any suitable person satisfactory to the owner, such suitability to be established to the satisfaction of the License Board.'"

HON. Mr. DAVIS claimed that this would be a most unjust clause.

HON. Mr. BEAVER replied that unless this amendment were introduced, the bill would create a vested right in the license, and the owner of the property would have absolute ownership.

Mr. HUNTER argued in favor of the bill as it was at present, and on a division after a prolonged discussion, the amendment was lost by 20 to 9.

HON. Mr. DAVIS had the following clause inserted: "Notwithstanding anything contained in the 'Municipal Act, 1891,' or any amendments thereto, any applicant for a license to sell wine, spirits, beer, or other fermented or intoxicating liquor in any hotel containing not less than thirty rooms, used for hotel purposes, shall not be required to obtain a petition or requisition signed by lot owners or householders for the granting of such license, but application for such license shall be made direct to the Board of Licensing Commissioners not less than thirty days before the sitting of said Board, and the Board of Licensing Commissioners shall have power to grant such license for the term of one year, or to renew the same upon the expiration thereof, in the opinion of a majority of the Board then present, such grant or renewal is in the public interest."

Committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

THE MINERAL ACT.

HON. Mr. DAVIS moved the second reading of bill No. 38, an act to amend the Mineral Act. Read a second time, to be committed to-morrow.

NEW WESTMINSTER LANDS.

The House went into Committee of the Whole to consider an act re conveyance of certain lands to the corporation of the city of New Westminster, Mr. Hunter in the chair.

Committee rose and reported bill complete with amendments.

SUPREME COURT BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Supreme Court bill, Mr. Semlin in the chair.

Bill was reported complete with amendments.

THE PREMIER announced that there would be no night sitting.

The House adjourned at 5:45 o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATION

Second Session of the
ment.

Forty-fourth

THURSDAY, A
The Speaker took the cha
UNIVERSITY BI

The House went into Co
Whole on the E.C. Univer
ment Bill, Mr. Kitchen is t

The first bone of cont
amendment proposed by M
clause 3, providing that thr
the Senate shall be resident
and four of them bona fide
Mainland.

Mr. Brown resumed the
ing his regret that the quest
and Island should have been
all. He claimed that the
introduced was a breach of
from a letter he had receive
ber of convocation who had
the meeting when the subj
the bill was agreed upon,
claim. This letter stated t
House was not legally bou
bill as presented, it was mo
do so.

Mr. HUNTER said that n
anything that had been s
was not going to take back
had said, or withdraw a singl
had used against the bill as
So far as sectionalism went
know who the hon. mem
minster city (Mr. Brown) wa
this House and talk abou
Was he (Mr. Brown) not the
front of that sectional asso
as the Mainland Association.

(Mr. Brown) been setting f
months on that egg, and had
out the Mainland Association
representatives in the House,
lot of roosters they were, too!
tion referred to, was one of
sectional factions in the provi
represented the Mainland, h
sare so much; but as
fact, it simply represente
state of the Fraser
the fishing village of New
To talk about sectionalism
this kind, was just so much
trap to draw a herring across
the fact still remained that t
the Island must be protected.

Mr. EBERTS stated that
waited upon by five gentlem
the Mainland and one from th
had asked him to bring in o
ments to the bill, and he had

Hon. Mr. ROBSON hoped th
would carry, as the best wa
sectionalism was to render it
any one party to swamp a w
The hon. member for West
(Mr. Brown) had stated that
breach of faith for the House
such amendment as was propo
Robson) took issue with him
ment. Had the Government
been represented at the meetin
agreed to bring this bill in, the
been some excuse for such a cl
the circumstances, there was
reclude the House from put
amendment it saw fit, and th
necessary in the public inte
his matter was before the H
non. member for Westminst
Brown) had taunted the Gov
appointing on the Senate tw
the Island to one from the M
the time that statement was n
Robson) had not been posit
facts of the case, but he had
the matter up, and was now in
say that the Government had
of the kind. There were five
be appointed, and when the
made the appointments, three
selected were residents of the I
two of the Island. The Gov
endeavored to recognize the
parties, and he (Mr. Robson) w
he was correct in saying th
done so.

Mr. BOOTH thought that the
legislation in this matter shoul
off the statute books until such
province was able to have
university.

After considerable discussi
mittee rose, without reportin
which was therefore killed.

WORK ESTATE MINING C

DR. MILNE asked the Chief
of Lands and Works the followi
to which the answers attached
1. "On what grounds were the
of J. C. Blackett and others
claims on the Work Estate r
Do the Government intend t
applicants to submit the case
Ans. 1. On the ground that
Estate is apparently not land
right to enter and mine for gol
has been reserved to the Crow
because it is questionable wheth
of the Mineral Act would s
the limits of the city of Victori
The Government will interpose
to any legal steps which the app
be entitled to take.

RE WESTMINSTER LAN

The report of the committee o
on an act to provide for a gran
poration of the city of New We
ertain lands in the city of
minster, was adopted; bill re
here and passed.

SUPREME COURT BILL

On the motion to consider t
the committee of the whole on t
Court bill.

Mr. HORNE moved to strike
words in clause eight, by which
said that the act should no
force until it was proclaimed by
governor. He said that if this
allowed to stand it would practi
the object of the bill.
The amendment carried, and
read a third time and passed.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTY-FOURTH DAY.

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 1892.

The Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

UNIVERSITY BILL.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the B.C. University Act Amendment Bill, Mr. Kitchen in the chair.

The first bone of contention was the amendment proposed by Mr. McKenzie to clause 3, providing that three members of the Senate shall be residents on the Island, and four of them *bona fide* residents on the Mainland.

Mr. BROWN resumed the debates expressing his regret that the question of Mainland and Island should have been introduced at all. He claimed that the amendment as introduced was a breach of faith, and read from a letter he had received from a member of convocation who had been present at the meeting when the subject matter of the bill was agreed upon, to bear out his claim. This letter stated that, while the House was not legally bound to pass the bill as presented, it was morally bound to do so.

Mr. HUNTER said that notwithstanding anything that had been said, to-day, he was not going to take back one word he had said, or withdraw a single argument he had used against the bill as it now stood. So far as sectionalism went, he wanted to know who the hon. member for Westminster city (Mr. Brown) was, to come to this House and talk about sectionalism? Was he (Mr. Brown) not the very head and front of that sectional association, known as the Mainland Association. Had not he (Mr. Brown) been setting for months and months on that egg, and had at last hatched out the Mainland Association and its representatives in the House, and a pretty lot of rosters they were, too! The association referred to, was one of the bitterest sectional factions in the province, and, if it represented the Mainland, he would not care so much; but as a matter of fact, it simply represented the mud flats of the Fraser valley, and the fishing village of New Westminster. To talk about sectionalism in a matter of this kind, was just so much political clap-trap to draw a herring across the scent; but the fact still remained that the interests of the Island must be protected.

Mr. EBERTS stated that he had been waited upon by five gentlemen, four from the Mainland and one from the Island, who had asked him to bring in certain amendments to the bill, and he had done so.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON hoped the amendment would carry, as the best way to keep out sectionalism was to render it impossible for any one party to swamp a weak party. The hon. member for Westminster city (Mr. Brown) had stated that it would be a breach of faith for the House to put in any such amendment as was proposed. He (Mr. Robson) took issue with him on that statement. Had the Government or the House been represented at the meeting when it was agreed to bring this bill in, there might have been some excuse for such a claim, but under the circumstances, there was nothing to preclude the House from putting in any amendment it saw fit, and thought to be necessary in the public interests. When his matter was before the House last, the hon. member for Westminster city (Mr. Brown) had taunted the Government with appointing on the Senate two men from the Island to one from the Mainland. At the time that statement was made he (Mr. Robson) had not been positive as to the facts of the case, but he had since looked the matter up, and was now in a position to say that the Government had done nothing of the kind. There were five Senators to be appointed, and when the Government made the appointments, three of the men selected were residents of the Mainland and two of the Island. The Government had endeavored to recognize the claims of all parties, and he (Mr. Robson) was confident he was correct in saying that they had done so.

Mr. BOOTH thought that the whole of the legislation in this matter should be wiped off the statute books until such time as the province was able to have a creditable university.

After considerable discussion, the committee rose, without reporting the bill, which was therefore killed.

WORK ESTATE MINING CLAIMS.

DR. MILNE asked the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works the following questions, to which the answers attached were given: 1. "On what grounds were the application of J. C. Blackett and others for mining claims on the Work Estate refused?" 2. "Do the Government intend to allow the applicants to submit the case for trial?" Ans. 1: On the ground that the Work Estate is apparently not land whereon the right to enter and mine for gold and silver has been reserved to the Crown, and also because it is questionable whether section 10 of the Mineral Act would apply within the limits of the city of Victoria. Ans. 2: The Government will interpose no obstacle to any legal steps which the applicants may be entitled to take.

RE WESTMINSTER LANDS.

The report of the committee of the whole on an act to provide for a grant to the corporation of the city of New Westminster of certain lands in the city of New Westminster, was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

SUPREME COURT BILL.

On the motion to consider the report of the committee of the whole on the Supreme Court bill,

Mr. HORN moved to strike out certain words in clause eight, by which it was provided that the act should not come into force until it was proclaimed by the Lieutenant-Governor. He said that if this clause was allowed to stand it would practically defeat the object of the bill.

The amendment carried, and the bill was read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Highways Bill, Mr. Semlin in the chair. Bill reported complete without amendments.

LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLY BILL.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the bill defining the privileges and immunities of the Legislative Assembly, Mr. Kellie in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the bill complete, without amendments. Bill read a third time and passed.

EMPLOYERS' LIABILITY ACT.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the bill to amend the Employers' Liability Act, Mr. Hall in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the bill complete, without amendments. Bill read a third time and passed.

EXECUTION ACT.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the Execution Act amendment bill, Mr. Rogers in the chair.

Bill reported complete with amendments.

LAND SUBSIDY BILL.

Hon. Mr. TURNER moved the second reading of the Land Subsidy Bill re Nelson and Fort Sheppard railway.

Mr. BROWN and Mr. COTTON opposed the bill, the latter advising that a commission should be appointed to find out where railways should be built, and then the Government should devise some means of having the work done. He also said he thought that there should be a fifth portfolio so that there might be a Minister of Railways, who would be able to give matters of this kind more attention.

The second reading of the Bill was carried on the following division, viz:

AYES—Messrs. Kellie, Horne, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davies, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson and Fletcher—19.

NAYS—Messrs. McKenzie, Sward, Kitchen, Punch, Cotton, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Forster and Keith—10.

Mr. GRANT, who came into the House while the vote was being taken, expressed his regret that he was not on hand to vote. He would have cast his vote in favor of the land grant (applause).

THE ARCHITECTS BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Architects' Bill, Mr. Fletcher in the chair.

The committee rose at 6 o'clock, and asked leave to sit again.

EVENING SESSION.

After recess the House went into committee and resumed the discussion of the Architects' Bill.

Mr. KITCHEN, member for New Westminster district, moved that clause 20 be struck out, and the motion being put was lost on a vote of 12 to 11.

Clauses 22 and 23 provided for the punishment of persons guilty of misrepresentation, there being no option of a fine. Twelve months' imprisonment was set down as the penalty. It was agreed to amend these clauses by giving an option of fine—250.

Mr. KITCHEN moved an additional clause: "Notwithstanding anything in this Act contained, the board of examiners shall be appointed by the Lieut.-Governor in council."

The proposal was rejected.

The committee rose and reported the bill as amended.

The Inferior Courts Practitioner Bill passed its third reading.

House went into committee on the Mineral Bill (No. 58.) Mr. Fletcher in the chair.

The Attorney-General suggested that the consideration of the bill be postponed, so as to afford an opportunity of introducing certain amendments.

Mr. MILNE said he understood that it was the wish of those interested that the bill should remain as at present, this year.

Several members protested, holding that it was most essential that the amendments should be introduced, and that the bill should be dealt with.

The committee rose and asked leave to sit again.

BILLS ADVANCED.

The Railway Bill (No. 52) passed its third reading.

The Breeding Stock Bill passed its second reading.

E. AND N. R. R. AND GRAVING DOCK.

MR. MCKENZIE moved the second reading of the Island Railway and Graving Dock Act Amendment Bill. He argued at considerable length that it was an injustice to exempt railway companies and such large corporations from taxation. The company who had the line from Esquimalt to Nanaimo had too soft a bargain. The land was free from taxation as long as it was in the hands of the company, and they, therefore, had no incentive to sell it to settlers. Not alone did they get one and a half million acres, but a grant of \$750,000 in cash. They now kept all the best of the land, worth \$50,000,000, having no taxation to pay.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON said that, looking back to the time the arrangement was made with the company, he was bound to admit that the terms were very liberal—a give away, in fact. A million and a half acres was, no doubt, a large land grant for the railway, and such a one as the present Government would not be likely to give. But the country, at the time, was red-hot for the railway, and the terms secured by the company were then considered fair enough. As to the lands being locked up, and worth \$50,000,000, that was a most absurd statement. These lands were now in the market, and could be bought at from \$1 to \$3 an acre. The agreement was entered into, however, and the railway company were entitled to have it respected. The bill introduced by the hon. gentleman was not worth the paper it was written on—it was not constitutional.

Hon. Mr. POOLEY hoped the House would not, by the passage of this bill, repudiate a solemn contract entered into.

The second reading was rejected by an

overwhelming majority.

The Canadian Northern Railway Bill (No. 50) was introduced by Mr. Eberts.

Mr. BEAVEN moved to strike out section 42 and insert in lieu thereof the following: 42. The main terminus of the railway, the terminal workshops and other structures, works, docks, and equipments, suitable for the terminus of a transcontinental railway, shall be erected in the immediate vicinity of the harbor of Victoria or Esquimalt.

Mr. BEAVEN also moved the insertion of the Chinese clause, which was lost, and the bill was read a third time.

DRAINAGE, DYKING AND IRRIGATION.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the Drainage, Dyking and Irrigation Bill (No. 63) with Mr. Cotton in the chair.

The committee rose and reported the bill passed with amendments.

THE GAME BILL.

The House went into committee of the whole, Mr. Stoddart in the chair, on the Game Bill.

Mr. CROFT proceeded to move certain amendments to clause 3.

Mr. HORN thought too much time had been spent in discussing this bill. It ought to be laid over altogether, and he therefore moved that the "committee now rise." (Laughter.)

Several members clamored for the motion.

Hon. Mr. VERNON pointed out that if the motion was adopted the bill would be killed. It was re-committed for a specific purpose, and this was not the time to kill it. The motion was, after this explanation, withdrawn.

Mr. CROFT argued that the bill was intended to protect the game of B.C. A great many visitors came to this country—English sportsmen—who really advertised the country, and while it spent a good deal of money.

Mr. HUNTER defended the Government in their efforts to protect the elk, and said that there appeared to be a great deal of lobbying going on on the part of these so-called English sportsmen.

These men were not the true English sportsmen, but young fellows who come to this country and tried to pass as sportsmen. These sportsmen invariably dressed in a most outlandish style, wearing their inner garments outside their breeches, and their vests outside their coats (laughter). So far from their being men with money, they brought very little of that commodity into the country; while their borrowing capabilities were immense (laughter). He proceeded to quote from a newspaper a letter written by what he supposed to be one of the English sportsmen. This gentleman spoke of shooting 400 head, including 75 horns and 100 wapiti in Wyoming. If the truth were known the writer was a trader who tried to pass as a sport—a regular Shoreditch Jew.

After a good deal of discussion the bill was killed on report.

VICTORIA AND SYDNEY RAILWAY.

The bill to incorporate the Victoria and Sydney Railway Company, was introduced and read a third time, a motion by Hon. Mr. Beaven to have the Chinese clause introduced, being lost.

SUNDAY CLOSING.

MR. MASON moved the second reading of "The Liquor License Regulation Amendment Act." The bill proposed to amend section 4 of the "Liquor License Regulation Act, 1891," by striking out all the words after "eleven," in the fifth line of said section, to and inclusive of "thereafter," in the sixth line thereof, and substituting therefor the words: "twelve of the clock on Saturday night till seven of the clock on Sunday morning thereafter, nor during the following hours on every Sunday, namely: from or after the hour of ten of the clock in the morning till one of the clock in the afternoon, nor from or after the hour of six of the clock in the afternoon till nine of the clock in the evening."

The hon. gentleman argued that in many districts, especially in the mining country, it was a hardship to close the saloons altogether on Sundays.

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN opposed the bill, and asked that the Liquor Bill be given at least a fair trial, for say one year. It had given the greatest satisfaction, and no one should desire to see it repealed. In the Police Court of Victoria, for the two months previous to the operation of the Act, there were 30 cases of drunkenness on the Monday morning, while for the two months after the bill was put into force, the number was reduced to thirteen. It was absurd to suppose that the saloons should be closed only during church hours on Sunday. The bill was giving satisfaction and ought not to be interfered with.

The second reading was lost on the following vote:

AYES—Messrs. Punch, Davies, Vernon, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner and Martin—8.

NAYS—Messrs. McKenzie, Sward, Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Milne, Beaven, Horne, Smith, Brown, Forster, Keith, Baker, Robson, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher—22.

The House adjourned at 12 o'clock until 2 p.m., to-day.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTY-FIFTH DAY.

FRIDAY, APRIL 8th, 1892.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 2 o'clock.

RETURN BROUGHT DOWN.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON presented a return to an order of the House for a printed return of all papers and correspondence which have passed between Mr. J. Vantrigh and the Hon. Provincial Secretary or any officer of the Government, with reference to educational matters.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON said he thought it would not be advisable to have this return printed as it contained matter which would not benefit anyone, and might do some harm.

SELECT COMMITTEE REPORT.

MR. BROWN reported from the Select committee to enquire into the circumstances connected with the refusal of the application of the Bishop of New Westminster to purchase a piece of crown land in the suburban block XII, New Westminster city. The report was simply a summary of the evidence.

NELSON AND FORT SHEPPARD RAILWAY.

The House went into Committee of the whole on an act to authorize the granting of a certain land subsidy for and in aid of the Nelson and Fort Sheppard railway, Mr. Keith in the chair.

An effort was made to strike out the clause granting immunity from taxation to the company for ten years, Mr. McKenzie and Mr. Semlin arguing against the principle.

MR. GRANT defended the principle of giving land grants to develop the province and of freeing the same from taxation for a limited period.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON and Hon. Mr. VERNON also defended the principle.

The amendment was lost and the bill reported complete without amendments, read a third time and passed.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN rose to a question of privilege. He was reported as speaking in opposition to the Liquor License Amendment Bill introduced by Mr. Nason. He (Mr. Beaven) had never had an opportunity of saying a word. He hoped the error would be corrected. He had voted against the second reading of the bill to amend the Liquor License law, but wished to say that he was not satisfied with the law as at present. He was informed, whether correctly or incorrectly, that the saloons in the suburbs of Victoria did a rushing business on Sundays.

Hon. Mr. DAVIE said that, no matter what his own views on the subject were, he could state, that so long as the present law was on the statute books, it would be enforced as far as the limited strength in numbers of the Provincial police would permit. He (Mr. Davie) would do his utmost to see the law enforced, and thought the hon. leader of the Opposition was badly informed as to the facts of the sale, or alleged sale, of liquor in suburban saloons. He (Mr. Davie) had only been informed of two breaches of the law, and in each case information had been laid.

THE MINERAL ACT.

The House went into Committee of the whole on the Mineral Act, Mr. Booth in the chair.

MR. KELLIE objected to the legislation as ill-advised and ill-considered. He moved that the committee rise.

COL. BAKER considered that the provisions of the bill were in the interests of the mining community. He had been urged by his constituents to have some of these amendments put in the Act, and he was sure the Mining Committee of the House had fully considered the matter, or they would not have reported the bill as presented.

After remarks by Hon. Mr. Davie,

MR. SMITH stated that when the bill was before the Mining committee, the fullest evidence was taken and the most careful consideration given to every amendment proposed. He thought the bill could not be much improved upon. The committee had been unanimous in its report to the House.

MR. KELLIE thought there were some good clauses in the bill, but there were other clauses which would paralyze prospecting and put a damper on the work.

After some further discussion,

Hon. Mr. ROBSON announced that His Honor, the Lieut.-Governor, was in attendance. He moved that the committee rise.

BILLS ASSSENTED TO.

His Honor, the Lieut.-Governor, being in attendance, was pleased to assent, in the name of Her Majesty, to the following bills, viz:

Crofters' bill (No. 61).
Deep Sea Fisheries bill (No. 62).
Legislative Assembly bill (No. 71).
Land Subsidy bill (No. 74).

THE MINERAL ACT.

The House went into committee of the whole again on the Mineral Act, Mr. Booth in the chair.

There was considerable discussion on clause 10 of the bill, which proposed to amend clause 26 of the Minerals Act, 1891, so as to read as follows: "No free miner shall be entitled to hold either in his own name or in the name of any other person, more than one mineral claim on the same vein or lode, except by purchase, but a free miner shall be entitled to locate and record additional claims on separate veins or lodes, in each mining division, provided, always, that he shall obtain and record a certificate of work for each prior located claim in such mining division before locating another claim."

MR. KELLIE led the discussion against the amendment which he claimed would tend to keep the country from being developed. He recommended that the law be left as at present.

After a protracted debate the clause was carried.

The various clauses of the bill passed and the committee rose reporting it complete with amendments.

THE HIGHWAYS BILL.

The Highways Bill was read a third time and passed.

THE GAME ACT.

Mr. KITCHEN asked Mr. Speaker to rule whether the fact that the motion to adopt the report of the Committee of the Whole on the Game Bill was negative, would kill the bill.

Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the bill had properly disappeared from the orders of the day.

SURREY DEBENTURES BILL.

Mr. HOBBS moved the adoption of the report of the Committee of the Whole on the Surrey Municipality Debentures Bill. Bill read a third time and passed.

ESQUIMALT WATERWORKS BILL.

The report of committee on the Esquimalt Waterworks company's bill was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

VANCOUVER SHORT LINE RAILWAY.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the act to amend the Vancouver and Westminster short line railway bill.

Mr. DAVIS proposed an amendment restricting the railway to the use of steam for operating the road. This was, he explained, to confine the promoters of this bill to their express promises made before the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. BROWN objected. He said it did not make any difference to this House whether the railway was run by steam or anything else.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS said that had he not known of the reputation of the hon. gentleman for New Westminster as a church-goer, etc., he would be compelled to put him (Mr. Brown) down as a mere trickster, but the circumstances being as they are, he (Mr. DAVIS) would assume that the member for Westminster was a tool in the hands of the tricksters. He proceeded to go into details of the bill to prove that there was some trickery going on, and the amendment he (Mr. DAVIS) proposed was simply to keep the promoters of the short line railway within their promises.

Mr. BROWN replied warmly. He said he would hand back with the utmost contempt the language used by the Attorney-General about trickery and tricksters. He (Mr. DAVIS) had no right to use any such language.

Mr. SEMLIN advised the hon. Attorney-General to be very careful in his use of the words trickster and trickery, as there might be other members of the House to whom such words would apply.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS denied that he had called the hon. member for Westminster City (Mr. Brown) a trickster or accused him of trickery. What he (Mr. DAVIS) had said was that the hon. member referred to had been made a tool of, or, in other words, had simply been victimized.

Mr. HUNTER said he would be sorry indeed to think that any language used by the Attorney-General about trickery or tricksters should be thought to apply to the hon. member for Westminster district, as he was sure the Attorney-General had no such intention. The hon. member for Westminster city (Mr. Brown) reminded him (Mr. Hunter) of a character in one of Dickens' most famous novels, Dombey and Son—a man who was said to be a devilish sly (laughter). But he (Mr. Hunter) did not think anyone could, with justice, accuse Mr. Brown of trickery.

After further discussion the amendment carried, and the various clauses were then passed.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

SATURDAY SESSION.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON announced that a session would be held to-morrow (Saturday). It being 6 o'clock the House rose.

EVENING SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock.

VICTORIA CITY BILL.

On the motion to adopt the report of committee on the Victoria City Bill, several minor amendments were inserted and further consideration was postponed.

SUMAS RECLAMATION CO.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the bill to incorporate the Sumas Reclamation Co., Mr. Semlin in the chair. The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

LAND SURVEYORS' BILL.

Mr. MARTIN moved the second reading of the Land Surveyors' bill.

Hon. Mr. BEAVER objected to the provision of the bill limiting the surveyors to being British subjects.

Hon. Mr. VERNON hoped the bill would pass, as it would facilitate his department in endeavoring to get first class men whose field notes could be depended upon. With reference to the clause providing that surveyors shall be British subjects, he said this could be amended in Committee, if the House thought fit, but the idea was that any one working for the Government here should be a British subject.

The second reading carried.

BREEDING STOCK ACT.

The House went into committee of the whole on the Breeding Stock Act, Mr. Hunter in the chair.

Committee rose, reported progress and asked leave to sit again.

COLUMBIA & KOOTENAY RAILWAY.

The House went into committee of the whole on the bill to amend the Columbia & Kootenay Railway and Navigation Act, 1890, Mr. Sward in the chair.

Clause 2 of the bill was proposed to be amended (on Hon. Mr. DAVIS' amendment) so as to read as follows: "2. Section 14 of the said Act is hereby amended by inserting after the word 'Columbia' in the sixth line thereof the following words: 'and a line of Railway from a point at or near where the aforesaid Columbia & Kootenay Railway crosses the Slokan River and making a junction therewith, thence along the bank of the Slokan River and the shore of Slokan Lake to a point at or near the North end of Upper Arrow Lake at or near the mouth of the Na-Kusp Creek and from there to Nelson.'"

Mr. GRANT objected to the proposed amendment which, he said, had not been before the Private Bills Committee.

Cor. BAKER explained that, under their Dominion charter, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, had power to build

branch lines away from their main road, and all that was now asked was power to build from the upper country into the road.

After remarks by Mr. Hunter, Mr. GRANT moved that the committee rise, ask Mr. Speaker's ruling on the point of order, and also ask leave to sit again.

The committee rose.

Mr. SPEAKER on the point of order being explained to him, inclined to the opinion that it was well taken, but asked for more time to consider it.

After some further discussion it was decided to hold the matter over until Monday.

THE SHERIFFS' BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Sheriff's bill, Mr. Nason in the chair.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

THE JURORS' BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Jurors' bill, with Mr. Rogers in the chair.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

The House adjourned at 11.25 o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTY-SIXTH DAY.

SATURDAY, APRIL 9, 1892.

The Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock.

THE GAME ACT.

Hon. Mr. TURNER moved that Bill No. 35 (Game Act) be placed on the orders of the day for consideration of report on Monday next. Carried.

THE JURORS' ACT.

Report of the Committee of the Whole on the Jurors' Act was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

HARRISON RIVER MUNICIPALITY.

Mr. SEMLIN moved, "That in the opinion of this House the application of A. St. G. Hamersley for the incorporation of a Municipality near the mouth of Harrison river be granted; provided, that the limits of the proposed Municipality do not extend beyond the boundary of New Westminster district; further that the necessary steps have been in accordance with the Municipal Act."

Hon. Mr. ROBSON thought this would be an unnecessary and almost absurd resolution. Municipalities were created under the Municipal Act, and the Government was always most careful in seeing that the provisions of that act were complied with. Further, the whole subject matter of the resolution had been before the Government for some time, and the hon. second member for Yale (Mr. Martin) had had the whole thing in hand, and had been urging the views of his constituents upon the Government. He (Mr. Robson) thought the motion was quite unnecessary, as it was absurd to suppose first, that the Government would not see that the provisions of the law were observed, and second, that the Government proposed to force a Municipality upon people who did not want it. The Government would do nothing of the kind, but would see that, in any move that was made, the views of the interested parties would be consulted.

After remarks by Messrs. Kitchen, Booth and Semlin, the motion was withdrawn.

THE COLUMBIAN LIBEL.

Hon. Mr. POOLEY presented the following report from a select committee of the House, viz:

Mr. SPEAKER:—Your committee to whom the matter of the scandalous libel and contempt of James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy was referred, have the honor to report that having enquired into the matter, they recommend that the House proceed against the said James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, for the said scandalous libel and contempt.

Mr. FORSTER asked leave to explain his position as a member of the committee. He had agreed with the report in order to place the matter again before the House, but thought now that it was again before the House, it should be dropped.

The report was received.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS moved the following resolution, viz:

Be it resolved in pursuance of the recommendation of a Select Committee of this House, that James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, both of the city of New Westminster, be summoned to personally appear at the bar of this House, on Tuesday, the 12th day of April instant, at the hour of 2.30 o'clock p.m., to answer as to a certain article appearing in the 17th of March, 1892, in the Daily Columbian newspaper, (whereof it is stated that the said Robert Kennedy and James M. Kennedy are the publishers) entitled, "An Outrageous Presumption," which article is a scandalous libel upon certain members of this House.

Hon. Mr. BEAVER claimed that as the motion referred to the report of a committee, notice would have to be given of it. He also argued that before the matter could be dealt with, the report of the committee would have to be adopted, and two days' notice would be necessary in order to adopt the report. On these grounds he claimed the motion was out of order.

Mr. SPEAKER held that according to the rules of the House questions of privilege had precedence over all other business, and no notice of motion was necessary.

Hon. Mr. BEAVER replied that this was a motion, not a question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON said that this was simply one step in the succession of steps necessary in dealing with the question of privilege.

Hon. Mr. BEAVER—The question of privilege was withdrawn.

After further discussion on rules of order, Mr. SPEAKER ruled that the motion was perfectly in order.

Mr. GRANT said that he was of opinion that when the first summons had been issued, if the publishers of the paper which contained the alleged scandalous and libellous article had appeared before the Bar of the House and stated that they had no intention of saying anything that would reflect upon the character of any hon. gentleman of this House, they would have been acting in their own interests. This, too, even if they were of the opinion that the House had no power to summon them. He (Mr. Grant) wished to know, however, if the law defining the powers, privileges and immunities of the House, passed a few days ago, and assented to yesterday by his honor, the Lieut. Governor, would be retroactive. He was not in accord with any project to deal severely with the offenders, but thought that the (Kennedy Bros.) should be made to understand that when they went beyond certain lines of fair criticism in matters of such a nature, they were going outside their rights, and would be dealt with by the House. (Applause.)

Mr. BROWN claimed that the present motion offered a complete surrender of the position taken by the Government, when this matter was up before the House a short time ago. He thought the whole question of privilege should be gone into from the first, and that the House should not take up the matter where it has left off. The language used in the article was not outrageous—it was simply a matter of taste—and there had been made next day in the Columbian what was almost a practical apology. (Laughter.) He defended the language used on the ground that the excitement in New Westminster ran high, and that the Private Bills Com-

mittee had not acted in a judicious manner in dealing with the application for the charter for the Twin Cities Railway Company. The fact of the matter was that public interests had been sacrificed for private individuals. He called upon every hon. member who had due regard for the liberty of the subject to vote against the motion and defeat it.

Mr. MARTIN said that when every hon. member of the House was elected, he laid himself open to fair and honest criticism, but there was a limit to this, and he, for one, objected most strenuously to any such mean, cowardly, dirty, underhand attacks, such as had been made against hon. members of the Private Bills committee. He had no wish or desire to punish the publishers of that libel severely, but had they made an apology, or said that they had no intention of casting such scandalous reflections upon members of the House, he (Mr. Martin) would have, like any other gentleman, been most happy to have accepted the apology.

Dr. MINIE asked the Attorney-General if the bill defining the powers, privileges and immunities of the Legislative Assembly would be retroactive in scope.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS replied that it was not competent for the House to pass retroactive legislation. He stated that the House had abundant authority for its action, irrespective of any legislation that might have been passed since. But in matters of this kind it was well to have the powers of this House established. Although it was not necessary, he inclined to the opinion that the provisions of the Legislative Assembly bill could be made to apply. His reason for this was that by the Legislative Assembly bill, no new offence had been created. It was one thing to create a new offence, and another thing to invest a tribunal with power to try a case. Matters of procedure were always retroactive. For instance, suppose a law should be passed that all debts up to \$200 should be recovered before a justice of the peace, this law would clothe the justices of the peace with power to try and sit in judgement on debts contracted before the law came into force. Under the statute (Legislature Bill) a court of extraordinary jurisdiction was created, but there was no reason for assuming that the creation of the new court would have any effect whatever upon the legal status of the defendant's case. This was a good case to find out what powers the House had, inasmuch as the defendants were willing to be made martyrs of. In reply to the statement of the hon. member for Westminster city that the defendants had practically made an apology for the article complained of, he (Mr. DAVIS) said he thought every other hon. member with a right sense of duty—only looked upon the alleged apology as a gross aggravation of the offence. As it was now, the committee having reported that the case should be gone on with, he (Mr. DAVIS) thought it would be fair to give the defendants a chance to apologize for the wrong they had committed.

Mr. SEMLIN advanced the theory that the publishers of the Columbian should not be punished for expressing honest opinions, however erroneous those opinions should be. Supposing, or admitting, that those publishers had been guilty of an error of judgment, what good would be done in summoning them to the bar? Provided the House had a legal power to do what was now proposed, it would be an act of tyranny to exercise this power to its fullest extent. The House would not add to its dignity in any way, but would be making its members supremely ridiculous in the eyes of all sensible people in the province. He claimed that the publishers of the Columbian had apologized for anything libellous they had said.

Mr. COTTON reviewed the circumstances of the case, and claimed that to act as it was now proposed to act would be to place the House in a false position. To carry out the course proposed would not add to the dignity of the House. He would not say that the House had not been aggrieved; but thought the present action was wrong. Every dispassionate man must feel that bill No. 71, defining the powers of privileges and immunities of the Legislative Assembly had been passed simply for the purpose of dealing with this special case. The matter should be let drop just where it was now.

Mr. HALL expressed the surprise he felt at the position taken by the hon. members who wished to see the matter dropped. He thought it should be carried right to the end—not out of vindictiveness, but out of honor and simple justice to itself.

Mr. SWORN moved the adjournment of the debate.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON claimed that this was a move to shirk the whole thing, as pro rogation was so near at hand—that if there was an adjournment to be made, it would simply stop the whole proceedings.

After remarks by Hon. Mr. Beaver, the motion to adjourn the debate was lost on the following division, viz:

AYES—Messrs. Beaver, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kellie, Kitchen, Sward, Semlin—9.

NAYS—Messrs. Robson, DAVIS, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Horne, Smith, Baker, Milne, Grant, Punch—22.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON said that this question had now come down to a straight party question, so far as the Opposition was concerned, except for two noble examples, who stood out as they had started. But for hon. members of this House to go back and talk about the question of whether there had been a libel or not, was idle, that question having been settled by the House long ago. Furthermore, the House had proceeded regularly and according to all parliamentary authorities, and now it was proposed to take a further step which was in perfect harmony with what had been done in the past. He argued that the bill passed this session defining the powers, privileges and immunities of the Legislative Assembly made practically no difference in the case, as the power had previously existed under the Constitution Act, otherwise how could the Legislature define something which never existed? The proper place, he said, for an apology to be made for the libel that had been perpetrated was at the Bar of the House, and to say, as the hon. member for Westminster City had said, that the newspaper which had offended had

apologized was incorrect, used was to the effect that the committee had been correct did that mean except that bought? That was the logic any one would come to from words. And yet the hon. Westminster city thought this was offered in the following (Columbian, March 24th):—

The language certainly was strong, but after all that had done in the matter, and taking the irregularly and obviously unhanded action in the premises, Attorney-General and the Private Bills Committee—scanned by the audacious attack and bury the bill with indecent an unwarranted manner—strong impressions, if not extreme, at the least, excusable, circumstances.

It was ridiculous, continued to imagine that any such apology as this could be accepted.

Mr. BROWN rose to a point had not stated that this was a hon. member for Westminster used, which had been to the newspaper had made an apology, and was no apology at all, a repetition of the charge.

Mr. BROWN—I did not quote the article.

Hon. Mr. ROBSON—But hon. gentleman through you, that he did use the words I have not gone back on my statement (Robson) continued that it was though, what the hon. member city said, or if he had the House at all, or as a man if he had no existence—verse—the facts were that the House had all the documents before it, and could judge was now proposed to bring of the defamatory article before the House, and it was perhaps early to say what then would (Mr. Robson's) impression, that all that would be required would be an apology, and if the publishers were gentlemen, they would make that apology, and the press them to make it, was at the House.

Mr. HUNTER said that he pointed out what he never did would move the previous question.

The previous question was carried, on the following division: AYES—Messrs. Robson, DAVIS, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Rogers, Anderson, Fletcher, Horne, Smith, Baker, Milne and Punch—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Semlin, Sward, Cotton, Kellie, Beaver, Brown, Keith—9.

MESSAGES FROM THE LIEUT. GOV. Hon. Mr. DAVIS presented from His Honor the Lieut. Governor: Returning the Vancouver for amendment; enclosing a Canada Western Railway and Northern Railway company; a bill re the Upper Columbia T.

On motion it was decided that the should go into Committee of the Monday to consider these bills.

LAND RECLAMATION SCHEMES Hon. Mr. VERNON presented an order of the House for copies correspondence between Mr. W. G. Grohman and the government, in a reclamation scheme.

QUESTION OF PRIVILEGE Hon. Mr. ROBSON rose to a privilege, producing a copy of Daily Times of April 8, 1892, plained of some words that were mouth in an editorial article head Give Away." He had compared of his remarks in the news paper, and had not anything of, as that was a fair representation editorial was decidedly unfair, tained a good many words marks purporting to be quotations (Mr. Robson's) speech. He put any such words being put into Reports of the press were in the privileges, and were supposed correctly, and in most cases, and having reported the speeches was most inexcusable for the paper to resort to such disrespect to put words in a member's mouth only had he never uttered, their own reporter (for Times reported, and for which it must ent, the editor drew on his imagination.

COUNTY COURTS ACT. Hon. Mr. DAVIS moved the second time; to be committed to Nelson Waterworks Bill.

The report of the committee whole on the Nelson Waterworks bill was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

VICTORIA CITY BILL. Report of Committee of the W. Victoria City Bill was adopted, a third time and passed.

KOOTENAY POWER CO. Report of Committee of the W. Kootenay Power Company's bill was adopted; bill read a third time and passed.

BROWN RIGHTS. Hon. Mr. DAVIS introduced a confirm to the Crown all unappropriated water and water for the province, and for other purposes.

THE ARCHITECTS' BILL. Mr. COTTON moved the adoption of the Committee of the Whole Architects' Bill.

The motion was lost on the following division, viz: AYES—Messrs. Pooley, Turner, Hunter, DAVIS, Eberts, Baker, Brown, Cotton and Grant—11.

NAYS—Messrs. Semlin, Sward, Punch, Beaver, Smith, Rogers, Robson, Hall, Nason and Fletcher. The bill is, therefore, killed.

I think the proceedings were in accordance with parliamentary practice; but I doubt the power of a Committee of the Whole to make so extensive and sweeping a change in a Bill except on petition, which should reach the House in the customary manner. May, page 788, says: "If, after the introduction of a private bill, any additional provision should be made in the bill in respect of matters to which the Standing Orders are applicable, a petition for that purpose should be presented to the House, with a printed copy of the proposed clauses annexed. The petition will be referred to the Examiners of petitions for private bills, who are to be given at least two clear days' notice of the day on which it will be examined. . . . After hearing the parties in the same manner as in the case of the original petition on the bill, the examiner reports to the House whether the Standing Orders have been complied with or not, or whether any be applicable to the petition for additional provision." (The committee on Standing Orders and Private Bills stand in the relation of Examiners to this House). Rule No. 66 of this House requires two days' notice of any important amendment to any Private Bill in a Committee of the Whole House; but I am of opinion that that rule cannot be held to apply to the amendment moved, as Rule C requires that the attention of the House shall be specially called to any provision that does not appear to have been contemplated in the notice for the same day by petition. Committee on Standing Orders. If amendment of the nature moved can be proposed at this stage of the Bill, what would be the value of the notices or petitions in which the line was first defined, or how would parties whose interests might be affected by the amendment be made aware of the contemplated extension? I rule that the amendment can only come before the House in the usual way, by petition.

D. W. HIGGINS.

It being 6 o'clock, the House rose.

EVENING SESSION.

The SPEAKER took the chair at 8 o'clock.

MUNICIPAL BILLS.

On the further consideration of the report of Committee of the Whole on the Municipal Acts.

HON. MR. BEAVER moved the following amendments, viz:

To strike out sub-section (9a) of section 130 and substitute therefor:

"(9a). The Council may pass by-laws to assess, levy and collect by means of a special rate as aforesaid, and otherwise to provide for the construction of branch sewers to connect any real property with a common sewer, and for connecting all buildings with the branch sewers, and for making all necessary house or building connections with such sewer, and in cases where a vacant space intervenes between a line of a street and the building into which or under which the sewer pipe is to be taken, the Council may also provide in such by-law for laying the sewer pipe across such vacant space and under such building. In all such cases the cost of the same shall be payable and paid by the owner of such real property so connected with the sewer, and shall be a charge on such real property. If any damage be done to this portion of the sewer, or its connections, or its fittings, either by neglect or otherwise, the Council may authorize and have made the repair of the same, and the cost of the same shall be paid by the owner of the real property, and shall be a charge as aforesaid."

To add sub-section 15b: "No such local improvement as aforesaid, except branch sewers and the work provided for in sub-section (9a) of this section, shall be undertaken by the Council if the majority of the owners of such real property representing at least one half in value thereof petition the Council against such assessment within 15 days after the Council shall have published a notice signifying its intention of making such assessment in one newspaper published in such municipality; any leaseholder, the term of whose lease (including any renewals therein provided for) is not less than 21 years, shall be deemed an owner within the meaning of this sub-section, if the lessee has therein covenanted to pay all municipal taxes on the demised property during the term of the said lease."

After a number of minor amendments, Hon. MR. DAVIE asked that further consideration of the report be held over.

THE GAME BILL.

HON. MR. TURNER moved that the Game bill as amended on report be adopted.

The motion was carried.

HON. MR. TURNER moved the third reading of the bill.

MR. SEMLIN moved the six months' hoist.

The motion was lost.

The bill was read a third time and passed.

NORTH VANCOUVER ELECTRIC CO.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the bill to incorporate the North Vancouver Electric Co., Mr. Anderson in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

MORNING SESSION.

HON. MR. ROBSON moved that when this House adjourns it shall stand adjourned until 11 o'clock to-morrow morning. Carried.

NELSON ELECTRIC LIGHT CO.

The report of the committee on the Nelson Electric Light Company's bill was adopted, bill read a third time and passed.

The House adjourned at 12:40 o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FORTY-EIGHTH DAY.

TUESDAY, April 12th, 1892.

In the absence of the Speaker at 11 o'clock this morning,

HON. MR. ROBSON moved that Mr. Martin take the chair.

The motion was carried.

CANADIAN WESTERN AND NORTHERN.

The House went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Hunter in the chair, to consider the message of the Lieutenant-Governor transmitting an act respecting the Canadian Western Central Railway company and the Canadian Northern Railway company.

Committee rose and reported the bill, which was then introduced and read a first time.

U. C. N. AND T. CO'S SUBSIDY.

HON. MR. ROBSON moved the second reading of the Upper Columbia Navigation and Tramway Land Subsidy Bill. He explained what the object of the tramway was. It would enable a road to be built to overcome the difficulties of a non-navigable piece of the Columbia river, and would thereby reduce the freight rate by about one half, and enable the coast cities to command the trade of the Interior.

MR. KELLIE wanted the land granted in alternate blocks.

MR. SWORD moved the six months' hoist.

The motion was lost.

The bill was then read a second time.

WATER RESERVATION BILL.

The House then went into Committee of the Whole, Mr. Kellie in the chair, to consider the Water Reservation bill.

Committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

VICTORIA CITY BILL.

On consideration of the report on the Victoria City bill (No. 30, re waterworks),

MR. CROFT moved the following amendment as clause 14, viz: "Notwithstanding anything contained in this Act, for in the Corporation of Victoria Water Works Act, 1873, the Corporation of Victoria shall not distribute water within the areas where the Esquimalt Water Works Company have the right to distribute water under this Act, unless the said company shall fail to furnish an adequate supply, or shall demand a rate in excess of those charged by the Corporation of the City of Victoria."

HON. MR. BEAVER objected strenuously to this amendment, which he said would practically mean, if carried, confiscation of the rights of the city of Victoria. If the House thought fit to put the clause in, it would then be a question with him if it would not be advisable to withdraw the bill at its third reading.

HON. MR. POOLEY thought this was a very proper clause to insert in the bill. If the city of Victoria had all the powers the hon. leader of the Opposition claimed, then why put this clause in it at all? The hon. leader of the Opposition talked about withdrawing his bill. Let him do so if he saw fit, but any threat of that kind should have no influence upon the House.

MR. SEMLIN thought the clause would take away a valuable privilege of the city of Victoria, and would tend to create a monopoly.

MR. HUNTER could not see why there should be any opposition to this clause. Here the Esquimalt company had in the past been allowed to go ahead and spend their money, in endeavoring to provide a waterworks system for certain people, and now the hon. leader of the Opposition wanted to have the power to confiscate their system.

MR. GRANT claimed that it was the duty of the Legislature to deal fairly with all people, and said that he for one was not going to lay himself open to do an injustice to anyone. Unless such a clause was passed, there would be an unfair opportunity given to the City of Victoria to take away the privileges granted to the Esquimalt Co.

DR. MILNE thought the passage of the present clause would mean the confiscation of the rights of the City of Victoria. It was just one of the levers used by the company to compel the city to buy them out.

MR. SPEAKER'S DECISION.

MR. SPEAKER gave his ruling as to the constitutionality of Bill No. 6 re Esquimalt Waterworks Co. After citing his authorities, etc., Mr. Speaker said: "It follows, therefore, that unless it be shown that the Victoria Waterworks Act, of 1873, conveyed the waters of Goldstream to the City of Victoria, or that sub-sec. (36) of sec. 8, of the Interpretation Act, 1872, as cited by the Hon. Member for Victoria City (Mr. Beaver), is binding, the waters of Goldstream within the railway belt, not having been excepted, went to the Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company with the grant of the belt, and is not now and has not been, since the issue of the Crown grant, Crown property. The solution of this difficult problem must be left to the legal advisers of the Crown; but I think sufficient has been developed in the Supreme Court case quoted to demonstrate the importance, nay, the necessity, of precautionary legislation, that will place the proprietorship of water covered by Crown grants beyond a doubt."

AFTERNOON SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 2:30 o'clock.

THE COLUMBIAN LIBEL.

MR. SPEAKER instructed the Sergeant-at-arms to call three times outside the House for James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, who were summoned to appear at the bar to answer for libel on the Private Bills committee.

The Sergeant-at-arms replied that the parties named were not in attendance.

VICTORIA CITY BILL.

HON. MR. DAVIE resumed the debate on the Victoria City bill. He thought the House would not be doing justice as between the company and the city if it did not insert the clause proposed, and he, therefore, supported the clause.

After remarks by Messrs. Booth, Brown and Keith, the amendment was carried on the following division, viz:

AYES—Messrs. Grant, Kellie, Keith, Smith, Robson, Baker, Davie, Vernon, Stoddart, Booth, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson, and Fletcher—19.

NAYS—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie, Kitchen, Sword, Cotton, Milne, Beaver, Brown, and Forster—9.

Further consideration of the report was deferred until to-morrow.

LAND SURVEYORS' BILL.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the Land Surveyors' Bill, Mr. Forster in the chair.

Committee rose and reported bill complete with amendments.

FREE TRADE IN RAILWAYS.

MR. KELLIE moved the second reading of bill No. 9, re incorporation, under a general act, of railway, tramway, and telephone companies.

HON. MR. ROBSON thought the time had not yet arrived when this bill should become law. The principle of free trade in railways, etc., had been adopted across the line in certain sections of the United States, but he thought the time had hardly come for British Columbia to take it up.

HON. MR. BEAVER suggested that the hon. member withdraw his bill, as the principle was good, and he thought it would be a mistake to have it voted down. He (Mr. Beaver) could understand why the Government would oppose the bill, which dealt with the right of eminent domain, and such legislation would have to come from the Government.

The motion to read the bill a second time was negatived on the following vote, viz:

AYES: Messrs. Semlin, Grant, McKenzie, Sword, Aiken, Punch, Cotton, Kellie, Milne, Beaver, Brown, Foster, Keith and Rogers—14.

NAYS: Messrs. Horne, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson and Fletcher—18.

BREEDING STOCK ACT.

Report of Committee of the Whole on the Breeding Stock Act was adopted, bill read a third time and passed.

DYKING BILL.

Report of Committee of the Whole on the Drainage, Dyking and Irrigation Bill was adopted, bill read a third time and passed.

COQUITLAM ELECTRIC CO.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on the bill to incorporate the Coquitlam Electric Co., Mr. Croft in the chair.

Committee rose and reported the bill complete with amendments.

THE COLUMBIAN LIBEL.

HON. MR. DAVIE moved the following resolution, viz:

"Be it resolved that James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy having been summoned to attend this House this day, and not attending in obedience to such summons, are guilty of a contempt, and that they be sent for in the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms, and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly."

MR. MARTIN moved the previous question.

The previous question was carried, and the original motion was then put and carried on the following division, viz:

AYES—Messrs. Milne, Horne, Smith, Baker, Robson, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Booth, Hall, Nason, Pooley, Turner, Martin, Croft, Hunter, Rogers, Anderson and Fletcher—20.

NAYS—Messrs. Semlin, McKenzie, Sword, Kitchen, Cotton, Kellie, Beaver, Brown, Forster and Keith—10.

COLUMBIA AND KOOTENAY RAILWAY.

The House went into Committee of the Whole on an Act to Amend the Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company Act, 1890, Mr. Sword in the chair.

Committee rose and reported bill complete with amendments.

THE COMPANIES ACT.

HON. MR. DAVIE introduced a bill to amend the Companies Act. Read a first time; second reading on Tuesday next.

LAND REGISTRY ACT.

HON. MR. DAVIE introduced an act to amend the Land Registry Act. Read a first time; second reading Tuesday next.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock until Tuesday at 2 p.m.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FIFTIETH DAY.

WEDNESDAY, April 20.

The Speaker took the chair at 2 o'clock and announced that hereafter the proceeding of the House would be regulated by the new rules.

A POINT OF ORDER.

Mr. COTTON, rising to a point of order, asked the chair if the bill dealing with the Canadian Western and Canadian Northern Railway Companies, was or was not in order. It proposed to deal with a company incorporated on April 6, 1889, and whose charter contained as one provision a clause providing for the commencement of construction within three years. As yet nothing had been done, and—

The hon. Premier here requested the senior member for Vancouver to defer his question until the legal members of the Cabinet were in their places.

The matter was allowed to remain in abeyance.

THE ESTIMATES.

On the motion to go into Supply,

Mr. BROWN proceeded to travel over a wide range of subjects previously discussed during the earlier days of the session. The intention of the Government to provide for the appointment of a crown solicitor at a salary of over \$2,000 per annum was briefly touched upon; if such an office was needed, he (Mr. Brown) was not one to object to a good salary being paid, but he did not wish to see the legitimate work of the Attorney-General shifted to the Crown solicitor. The remainder of the hon. gentleman's speech, which occupied over an hour of the time of the House, was devoted to the discussion of the redistribution measure, promised "when the census shall have shown a preponderance of population necessitating the step." He held the Government blameable for not having brought down a redistribution measure during the session, and pronounced the review of the so-called Dominion census prepared by the Provincial Government, a collection of figures simply and solely intended to postpone "the evil day." The Provincial Government's criticism of the Dominion enumeration he considered ill-advised, inaccurate and uncalled for, and thought the enumeration made by the Ottawa authorities a proper one upon which to proceed with the promised redistribution.

Mr. KIRKUP advocated the creation of a Minister of Railways, and the formulation of a railway policy beneficial to the people, not as in the past, to the railway monopolists alone. He urged "justice for Nanaimo," and protested against the neglect of the Government to provide in the estimates for a new and much-needed school building in Nanaimo. An early redistribution of the seats in the House was urged, as "simple justice to the people."

Dr. MILNE rebuked the members of the Government for vacating their seats when he rose to discuss the questions of the day. To-day was a field day, and the remarks of all members of the House were, at least, entitled to respect. He pointed to the recent Dominion census as showing that British Columbia was retrograding under the present government, and instanced the Crofter scheme as an example of how the government gave away thousands of acres of the people's land for what they themselves admitted was at best an experiment. He referred to the rumor that two vacancies were likely to occur in the Cabinet, and called upon the government to take the House into their confidence in this respect.

Mr. SEMLIN also urged the government to give the House information in regard to the proposed Cabinet changes, and charged that the supplementaries had been withheld—that they were all ready and could have been presented prior to the Easter adjournment.

Mr. FORSTER devoted himself particularly to the practice of granting taxation exemptions for an indefinite period to railway companies; this was unjust, and the will of the people was that these exemptions should be abolished altogether. The numerous railway land grants recently made by the Government very much resembled a mighty potlatch given by some Indian chief, who felt his hold upon power becoming shaky and insecure.

Mr. MCKENZIE followed, devoting himself chiefly to educational matters, and charging that many of the schools were so infrequently inspected as to gain no benefit whatever from the official visitations. When he was Superintendent of Education, things were very different; he watched the teachers all the time, and would allow them to do nothing unless by his direction.

Mr. KIRKUP proposed to have his "little share of grumble." He claimed that the country districts had been grievously ill-treated in the distribution of appropriations. The Fraser valley was prospering despite the neglect of the Government, but the prosperity would be far more rapid and more pronounced if better roads, streets and bridges were provided. Taking the estimates themselves, he objected to the creation of such an officer as a Crown Solicitor, and to the expenditure of \$17,000 more on surveys. The money could much more advantageously be expended on the public roads.

Mr. SWORD also complained that his district had been unfairly treated in the distribution of appropriations. In amendment to the motion that Mr. Speaker do now leave the chair, he moved, seconded by Mr. Punch, that in the opinion of the House a fairer system of representation should be introduced by the Government.

The amendment was lost on the following division:

YAYS—Messrs. Kellie, Cotton, Punch, Kitchen, Brown, Keith, Milne, Beaven, Semlin, Sword and McKenzie—11.

NAYS—Messrs. Horne, Smith, Baker, Nason, Fletcher, Hall, Anderson, Rogers, Booth, Hunter, Stoddart, Eberts, Martin, Vernon, Davie, Turner, Pooley and Robson—18.

The motion that the House go into Committee of Supply was carried.

Mr. COTTON asked for the ruling of the Speaker upon the competency of the Government to introduce such a bill as that

dealing with the Canadian Western and Canadian Northern Railway companies, reviving powers that had lapsed and granting a charter, which in reality no one had applied for to the House, the only body competent to give the charter.

Mr. SPEAKER promised a ruling in the evening, and the House went into committee. Mr. Martin in the chair.

The committee rose on the strike of 6, reporting progress.

EVENING SESSION.

On the House resuming at 8 o'clock, Mr. MARTIN took the chair and the House returned to Committee of the Whole on Ways and Means.

Objection was taken to vote 158A, \$1,000 for rebuilding the dam at Mission Creek, Okanagan.

Hon. Mr. VERNON explained that the creek in the locality in question had been overflowing the lands of a number of poor settlers who had resided in the province for many years, and it was to protect these deserving residents that the appropriation was made.

Mr. KEITH and Mr. KITCHEN opposed the vote, on the ground that the principle was threatened of the Government undertaking reclamation works for the benefit of private persons. If the lands along Mission creek were to be dyked by the Government, why not lands on the Fraser or in Nanaimo district, requiring the same attention?

On vote 246 I, \$1,286 expenses, Victoria City Royal commission,

Mr. KITCHEN and Mr. MCKENZIE rose for information.

Hon. Mr. TERSER explained that the item had been paid by the Province, to be refunded by the city.

Hon. Mr. DAVIE informed the House that the total expense of the commission was estimated at about \$4,000; the \$1,286 covered payment of the commissioners, stenographer, and clerk, stationery, etc. Of course, counsel employed by the city and the petitioners would have to be paid by the city.

Item 144 F, \$30,000 for "expropriation of land for public purposes, elicited several enquiries for information, and

The Chief Commissioner explained that the land required was the strip extending up Bird Cage Walk, and between this highway and the Government grounds. This strip would be required when the construction of the new land registry office was undertaken.

The consideration of the estimates was concluded at 10:45, and the committee reported to the House.

The House adjourned to sit again at 11 a.m., to-morrow.

aid that the leader of the Opposition had gone over the ground he had chosen very thoroughly and fully, relieving him of much he would otherwise have felt bound to say. He (Mr. Brown) would speak more particularly of other aspects of the question than those touched on by the last speaker. He denied that the House had the power that was here sought to be exercised; he denied that any libel had been published; and he denied that any contempt had been committed. If the House had no power to make the order which was treated with contempt, where was the contempt? Certain members of the House insisted on calling the article published in the *Columbian* of the 17th of March, "a scandalous libel," and this before any investigation had been made. The House itself had already condemned the actions of the Attorney-General and the Committee which were referred to in the articles about which so much fuss was being made—though perhaps not in the same way as so strongly as the paper. Steps taken by the Attorney-General and the Committee had, however, been rejected by the House, and it was a criticism of these very things contained in the House, that formed these very articles for which the Messrs. Kennedy were taken to task. Their articles were simply a reiteration of the expressed opinion of the House. It was certainly very bad taste on the part of the Attorney-General to say that the Kennedys had been badly advised. The Attorney-General, too, said that the article of March 24 was "as bad as the other." How could this be fairly said? He (Mr. Brown) did not see how a criticism of the public acts of certain public men, members of the House, could be any intelligent man taken as an insult to the House. The publishers of the *Columbian* had distinctly stated that they never intended to make any imputation of personal wrong-doing, corruption or bribery. No attempt had been made to show that the *Columbian* was not justified; no attempt had been made to prove that their articles meant more than honest criticism. There had been no argument in this direction; only blatant assertion. While appreciating the Attorney-General's ability as a lawyer, he (Mr. Brown) could not take as gospel all he said. In fact he was never sure when the Attorney-General gave an opinion to the House whether it was an honest opinion, or one dexterously framed to mislead the House. Supposing for a moment that the legislation in this matter be *intra vires*, by its mere passage, the Attorney-General admitted that the House didn't possess the power before. For an example: supposing that all duties were removed, and there was free trade in tobacco and cigars. A Victoria gentleman goes over the "Sound and sings back a box of good cigars. It is duty to say. Then the Government passes a tariff law, placing a duty, and proceeds to arrest, or smuggling, all who have brought goods during the free trade regime. Would this be fair or right? The Attorney-General said that the act created no crime; certainly not. The thing, in the case of all, instanced by the Attorney-General, the Legislature had power by express grant the Crown—power not possessed by this Legislature. The Attorney-General's action in this matter had from the first been anything but judicial, anything but calm, anything but the conduct to be looked for in a person sitting in judgment upon other men. The truth was that the Attorney-General by means of a small majority of followers at the back of him and his colleagues, thought to trench himself in a position that he or they might not be able to get out of. The voice of the people could be properly heard. This was the object in attempting to muzzle the press. In regard to the *Columbian*, it was a paper against which the premier had his special grudge. So had the attorney-general, whose conduct had been severely criticised in the columns, and he had the second member for Yale. These were the leaders in the present matter, so it would be seen that personal feeling played an important part. It was said at the press had to be taught respect for the House. Surely the innocuous and calm tone of a certain paper supposed to enjoy the confidence of the Government are infinitely more objectionable to decent men than plain, Anglo-Saxon denunciation wrong-doing wherever seen. The House is nothing more than a big Municipal Council; to say that it should have the power the Attorney-General wished to give was absolutely ridiculous. What were the facts? The Kennedys had yet to see original summons, and because they did not obey a telegram, which might or might not have possessed any authority, they were arrested and dragged to jail like common felons. If this sort of thing was tolerated, no journalist could criticise the act of a majority of the House without fear of being arrested like a thief, and dragged from home to the bar of the House. The bar of the English House such a power would be used calmly and intelligently; here it would be used vindictively, for party purposes and for purposes of little personal spite. The debate was adjourned until evening, House rising at 6 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

The Speaker took the chair at 8 o'clock. Mr. POOLEY said that he had heard nothing to cause him to change his opinion on the question now before the House, since the matter had been discussed on the three previous occasions. The Hon. Leader of Opposition had referred to legal opinions issued by Hon. Edward Blake and Sir Macdonald, but it should be remembered that these opinions had been given on the basis of a House which had not authority of the British Columbia Legislature. When those unfortunate had come to the bar of the House after the afternoon, what had the Hon. Leader of the Opposition done? He had said his best, and otherwise applied to a man who had defamed every member of the House. It was the greatest insult to a man in the position of the leader of the Opposition should have gone out of his way to signify his approval of the acts of his fellow members. It was a disgrace, and what should he do? The act of the hon. member for New West-

minster City? It was absolutely beneath contempt. No other term could possibly be used in characterizing his conduct which had been most abominable and unwarranted. And what did the applause of these two members and one or two others prove? It proved beyond a shadow of doubt that those two unfortunate men who had appeared before the House were mere cats-paws. They were working men. They had not written the libellous article. They were not capable of writing it. They were simply brought forward to shelter the real writer of the article the man who had applauded their appearance so loudly and so disgracefully. As far as the legal aspect of the case was concerned he fully agreed with the opinion of the Attorney-General, to the effect that the House had full power to deal with the contempt shown it. If the men so dealt with felt themselves aggrieved in any way they had their redress by an application to the judges, who would soon set the matter right. The judges could only interpret the law as passed by the Legislature of the Province. The speaker did not think that there was much in the argument brought forward by Hon. Mr. Beaven, but on thing he had referred to needed clearing up once and for all. The leader of the Opposition had stated that "the Government were attempting to interfere with men who were peacefully pursuing their ordinary avocation." Now, no man need ever have any fear of molestation when pursuing his ordinary avocation, but when he went beyond that—when he attempted to steal away the characters of honorable men, then it was time that a power higher than himself should step in and interfere. The article in the *Columbian* of the 17th inst. was not directed, as some hon. members seemed to imagine, against the Government of the province, but against a committee of the House, composed of members of every party. It then became the duty of the Government acting as men with a sense of their responsibilities to uphold the dignity and honor of the House. The Government itself had not been slandered. They were not defending themselves in the matter. They were simply defending the hon. members of the whole House, no matter whether they were friendly to the Government or not. (Hear, hear.) The hon. member for New Westminster City had that day lowered himself in the estimation of everybody by his contemptible actions. They were told that the vote, summoning the Kennedy Brothers to the bar of the House, was a party vote. It was nothing whatever of the kind. The vote stood 22 to 6, and the members for New Westminster had cast a slur on 22 of his fellow members when he acted in such a disgraceful manner and applauded the actions of the men who had tried to cast the gravest charges on the characters of his fellow members. It had been said that the Government were attempting to gag the press. He didn't know how the press were being gagged in the matter before the House. If gagging the press was stopping a newspaper from printing grave untruths affecting personal honesty, then he would say let the press be gagged. He would not attempt to interfere with the great work of the press, or its high duties, for its duties were of the very highest order. But if the proprietors of the *Columbian* had wished to censure the Private Bills Committee they could have done it in a very different way. Any man of common sense or education could write an article quite as strong and just as much to the point, but couched in respectful, decent language. The duty of the Private Bills Committee was a very difficult one, at best, to perform satisfactorily, and if they did their work honorably and well they should get the credit of it, but if they incurred the enmity of private individuals simply because they chose to throw out certain bills, were they to be shamefully abused and vilified? The conduct of the men who sat in their places in the House and applauded such actions bore its own condemnation. The resolution of the Attorney-General went to this extent, that the House should take some reasonable time to consider what they thought to be a proper punishment for the Kennedy brothers under the circumstances. These men had come forward and simply defied the authority of the House, and objected to tender any apology for their action. If they were depending on any statements or threats of certain members having the effect of deterring the Government from any action it saw fit to take, they were making a very great mistake. The Government would not be swayed one bit from the right course in this matter, and that course having been decided on they would carry it out regardless of threats or accusations from whatever source they came. The honor of the House was going to be protected, and the members of the House had, he was confident, sufficient honor among themselves to support the honor of the House as a body. He would vote for the resolution.

Mr. BROWN—I rise to a point of order. Does Mr. Pooley say that I wrote that article in the *Columbian*?

Hon. Mr. ROSSON—He didn't say so.

Hon. Mr. POOLEY—What I said was that neither of those unfortunate men who were brought to the bar of the House to-day wrote it, but that they were being made merely the cats-paws for the man who did.

Mr. BROWN—Well I declare here that the article was neither inspired or written by me.

Mr. SEMLIN said that the Attorney-General, in support of his resolution had to go, for a parallel example of what he proposed to do, to Australia, and even that instance happened 24 years ago. The hon. member for Yale then went on to say that the article in question had no doubt been written when the people of New Westminster felt very warm over the question at issue. The men who had been called to the bar of the House had, he understood, been born and brought up in the province, and had reached the position they had attained through sheer pluck and energy. They felt the matter deeply, and surely could be excused for writing as they felt. The House was strong, and they ought to be magnanimous as well. It would be far more befitting the dignity of the Assembly, and far more to their credit, if now that the men were before them, they ordered their release and allowed the matter to drop. The speaker then followed up the remarks of the leader of the opposition concerning the legal aspect

of the case, going over the same line of argument. He had seen, only a few days ago, in the *Hamilton Spectator*, the Dominion "thieves," and still that honorable body had not felt themselves entitled to take any notice of the accusation. If what the *Columbian* had stated was a libel then hundreds of papers throughout the Dominion were guilty of libel every day in the week. This referred not only to the leading journals but minor ones as well, and some not so prominent. It would be much more gracious, now that the Kennedys had been so humbled, to be humane and let them go. They had been dragged from their homes some distance away, and surely that should be enough.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS said that in implementing what remarks on the subject he had already made he didn't intend to follow the line of argument offered by the last speaker. He supported the remarks of Mr. Pooley concerning the absolute unfairness of designing the matter before the House as a party question. The Government had no grievance specially on the subject. They took up no direct charge against themselves, for none was made. What they did take up was the gross attack and charge of personal corruption against certain members of the Private Bills Committee. When the matter had been brought to the notice of the Government, though several of the men attacked were their foes, they took it up and determined to do justice to everybody concerned, friends or foes, and to uphold the rights of the House. He had very little respect for the public feeling that was said to run so high in New Westminster. A portion of the Westminster public was very excitable; they lionized a man one day, and hanged him in effigy the next. The resolution was a merciful one, which would give the defendants every opportunity to test the legality of their contentions.

Mr. ROSSON devoted himself to the right of the Legislature to summon any man before the bar of the House. He did not care for precedents; they could be found for any action, and if the House could imprison these men for a year for having dared to criticise the Government, the fact that they had the power would not make such action just and right. It had been said by some that the publishers of the *Columbian* had "gone a little too far." Who was to draw the line between legitimate criticism and "a little too far"? To cut off the liberty of the press to comment upon the public acts of public men, was to destroy one of the most effective means of ensuring good Government. Even if the Messrs. Kennedy did go a little too far, lack of discretion was their most serious offence; the House, too, was going too far in persecuting men who were standing out as (Mr. Forster) always would for the freedom of the press.

Mr. MAURIS, as chairman of the Private Bills Committee, explained that the attorney-general appeared before the committee in his official capacity to say that it was not in the public interest to have a parallel train line to the one under discussion constructed. As to the Kennedys, he felt no malice toward them. All were liable to make mistakes, and if the Kennedy Brothers had acknowledged their error, he would have been the first to move that their apology be accepted. As matters stood, he felt bound to support the motion of the Attorney-General.

Dr. MILNE promised to support the resolution. If members of the committee were to be libelled as they had been in the *Columbian*, he proposed to resign his seat. The conduct of the Kennedys in writing the article just to give offence, and the subsequent publications, showed a studied contempt of the House, which could not be allowed to pass unattended to. The actions of the Messrs. Kennedy, and their statement read to the House were fresh insults, of which the House was in duty bound to take cognizance. The hon. member proceeded to explain in detail the transactions of the Private Bills Committee, which were referred to in the objectionable articles, and to comment upon the published "libels," paragraph by paragraph. As to the power of the House to deal with the case of the publishers of the *Columbian*, he read from Bourne, and other authorities. He insisted that the Messrs. Kennedy be compelled to apologize at the bar, and announced his intention of voting for the motion, which he considered very lenient indeed—named giving the express purpose of giving the culprits another chance.

Mr. COTTON demanded the case of the Messrs. Kennedy, and reviewed the "evidence" upon which the House was called upon to conduct the trial. He argued for a free press, not because he was a member of the profession himself, but because the time might come when the House and the country would feel the need of newspapers which condemn the wrong and stand up for the right. The tendency everywhere was for a great portion of the press to become subservient to the powers that be.

Col. BAKER accused the member for New Westminster City with having an interest in a private bill before the House; also with having an interest in a newspaper in that city, and with stirring up an agitation among the people of the Province when he undertook to advance his own interest in a private bill. All this was to gratify his own vanity. After the restoration of the character of the people of New Westminster City which had been given by the Attorney-General, here was some consolation in looking forward to the time when the population would burn the hon. gentleman now representing them in effigy. (Laughter.)

Mr. BROWN found it difficult to confine himself to parliamentary language and at the same time to give a proper denial to the statements of a member for Kootenay.

Col. BAKER—Have you any interest directly or indirectly in the *Columbian* newspaper?

Mr. BROWN—I have not one cent of interest directly or indirectly in the *Columbian* newspaper.

Mr. KERR endorsed the amendment and defended a free press for a free people. He did not think the members of the Private Bills Committee should remain in the House while the House sat in judgment upon the Kennedy brothers.

Col. BAKER accepted the denial of the hon. member for Westminster City, of the accusations made by him (Col. Baker) in the full belief of their truth. He accepted the denial, and frankly apologized.

Mr. BROWN accepted the apology with pleasure that he would not be compelled to change his good opinion of the gallant Colonel.

Mr. GRANT referred to the impression created abroad, in regard to the Legislature of British Columbia, by the publication of such articles as those appearing in the *Columbian*, and regretted that the Messrs. Kennedy had not come to the House when first summoned. The man who stole character, a hard thing to recover, should, at least, apologize or be punished. While he thought the Messrs. Kennedy had traduced the members of the House, and should be punished, he counseled leniency.

Hon. Mr. ROSSON referred to the extraordinary position of his territory occupied by the hon. member for Nanaimo City. When the House was considering the first step toward bringing the culprits to the bar this said hon. member called upon the House to stand as one man, sinking party feelings altogether, in maintaining the honor of the House. He (Hon. Mr. Robson) could not understand how this hon. gentleman had turned tail upon his own position, abandoning those who had followed his lead in dealing with the traducers of the House. The hon. Premier contradicted emphatically the false statement that the proceedings against the publishers were initiated on account of personal spite on the Government side of the House, and denied that any attempt was being made to interfere with the liberty of the press—it was license not liberty that was being dealt with. The House owed it to itself to vindicate its honor; there was no disposition to persecute the Messrs. Kennedy, but the House could not now do anything else but compel the publishers of the grossly libellous articles complained of to apologize.

Mr. SWORN did not think anyone could interpret the articles in question as insinuating any dishonesty among the members of the Private Bills Committee.

Mr. BOOTH said the question, whatever it originally had been, was now, in this House, to be set at defiance with impunity by any newspaper that may choose to libel it? There was no course open but to proceed with the resolution; all that was wanted from the Messrs. Kennedy was an apology such as any honorable man would make to another on finding himself in the wrong.

Mr. SMITH would support any measure having for its purpose the vindication of the honor of the House.

Mr. KITCHEN said that the Premier took very good care not to summon to the House the responsible editor of the *Columbian*, while bringing down the responsible heads of the paper, who happened to work in the mechanical department. He did not think there was any fairness in creating a court of accusers to try the accused, as had been done in the present case. The House divided on the amendment, Yeas—Messrs. Beaven, Semlin, Brown, Forster, Keith, Cotton, Kitchen, Sword, Kellie and McKenzie—10.

NAYS—Messrs. Grant, Baker, Horne, Smith, Nason, Fletcher, Hall, Anderson, Rogers, Booth, Stoddart, Hunter, Eberts, Martin, Vernon, Turner, Davie, Robson, Punch and Pooley—20.

Mr. McKENZIE moved, seconded by Mr. Kellie, that the Messrs. Kennedy be now taken from custody. This would give them the opportunity to set themselves right before the House.

Mr. KELLIE launched into a criticism of the Attorney-General's conduct in dealing with the case of a Chinese slave girl in Victoria, but was called to order by the Chair, and informed that the present was not the time to give the particulars of the matter of which he complained to the House.

Mr. BROWN, at 12.15, again proceeded to review the circumstances of the case. He spoke for over half an hour.

Mr. HUNTER followed, devoting himself to the hon. member for Westminster City, and the part he had played in dealing with the *Columbian* incident.

The amendment was lost on division of Yeas—Messrs. Semlin, Beaven, Kitchen, McKenzie, Sword, Cotton, Forster, Keith, Brown and Kellie—10.

NAYS—Messrs. Punch, Smith, Horne, Baker, Nason, Fletcher, Anderson, Rogers, Hall, Booth, Hunter, Stoddart, Eberts, Martin, Vernon, Davie, Turner, Pooley and Robson—19.

The original motion carried, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Second Session of the Sixth Parliament.

FIFTY-SECOND DAY.

APRIL 22, 1892.

The Speaker took the chair at 11 a. m.

RULES AND REGULATIONS.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS moved that the following resolution of this House, passed on the 19th April, 1892, viz.: "That the addition to Rule 64, as printed on page 67 of the Journals of the House for the year 1894, be added as sub-section (b) of Rule 74, as reported from the Select Committee on 19th February, 1892, and that the report as thus amended be now adopted," be amended by striking out the words "and that the report as thus amended be now adopted." The hon. gentleman explained that the House had not yet had time to make themselves acquainted with the rules, which no doubt contained much that was valuable, but which should not govern the proceedings of the House until thoroughly understood by the hon. members.

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN said that if the Attorney-General wished to undo what the House had done, he was taking an improper and unconstitutional course to reach his object.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS said that the matter was a personal one entirely—not one of Government concern. As the hon. leader of the Opposition wished it so much, he would withdraw the resolutions.

The necessary leave was granted.

REPORT FROM THE BAR OF THE HOUSE.

Messrs. James M. and Robert Kennedy having been again brought to the Bar of the House, the resolution passed by the House on Thursday night was read as follows: "That James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy having been guilty of a contempt of this House, they be committed to the custody of the Sergeant-at-Arms of the Legislative Assembly, and be brought to the Bar of the House, to-morrow, Friday, the 22nd of April, 1892, at 11 o'clock a.m."

Mr. SPEAKER—It is my duty to inform the Messrs. Kennedy that the House, last evening, passed the resolution in its amended form. Have you any further statement to make in explanation, or any apology to offer for the course you have pursued.

Mr. JAMES M. KENNEDY—Nothing, sir.

Mr. ROBERT KENNEDY—Nothing whatever.

Mr. SPEAKER—Sergeant-at-Arms, you will please remove these gentlemen.

The publishers of the *Columbian* were removed, and

Hon. Mr. DAVIS said that the matter of the contempt against the House by the parties who had just been brought before the bar having already been so fully discussed, it was not necessary for him to make any further and lengthy reference to it. Every opportunity had been given the Messrs. Kennedy to make reparation for what they had done, and they had not chosen to avail themselves of the privilege. The fullest opportunity had also been given them to test their rights and the rights of the House by legal process. The course which he (Hon. Mr. Davie) now proposed to adopt would not interfere in any way with their exercise of these legal rights. He moved, seconded by Hon. Mr. Vernon, "That James M. Kennedy and Robert Kennedy, having been guilty of a contempt of this House and being brought to the bar in custody of the sergeant-at-arms, be, for their said offence, committed to the custody of the sergeant-at-arms attending the Legislative Assembly, and that Mr. Speaker do issue his warrant accordingly."

Mr. BOOTH moved that the question be now put.

Mr. SEMLIN took a point of order. He did not think the motion of the hon. member for the Islands could be made; a question of privilege, such as the case before the House, was debatable at all times.

Mr. SPEAKER thought that the question of privilege had already been fully discussed—to the exclusion of all other business, in fact—and that the resolution of the hon. member for the Islands was quite in order.

Mr. COTTON asked the Attorney-General upon what date the alleged contempt was committed.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS replied that the orders of the House would give the information sought.

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN moved the adjournment of the House. He considered the course pursued in reference to the case.

Hon. Mr. DAVIS (to a point of order) contended that, with Mr. Booth's resolution before the House, no other motion was in order.

Mr. SPEAKER held that the point was well taken, and that the motion to adjourn was not in order.

Mr. BOOTH's resolution was then put, and affirmed on the following division.

Yeas—Messrs. Milne, Punch, Horne, Smith, Baker, Nason, Fletcher, Anderson, Booth, Rogers, Eberts, Stoddart, Martin, Davie, Vernon, Pooley, Turner and Robson.

NAYS—Messrs. Kellie, Cotton, Kitchen, Forster, Sword, Beaven, McKenzie, Brown, Keith and Semlin—10.

The vote having been recorded,

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN again moved that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. SPEAKER—The House has already decided that the question be now put, and put it will have to be. I rule that no further amendment is in order.

The resolution of the Attorney-General was then adopted, on the following vote:

Yeas—Messrs. Milne, Grant, Punch, Horne, Smith, Baker, Nason, Fletcher, Anderson, Hall, Hunter, Booth, Rogers, Eberts, Stoddart, Martin, Vernon, Davie, Turner, Pooley and Robson—21.

NAYS—Messrs. Kellie, Cotton, Kitchen, Forster, Sword, Brown, McKenzie, Beaven, Semlin and Keith—10.

Hon. Mr. BEAVEN moved the adjournment of the House, and proceeded to review the action of the House in dealing with the case of the Messrs. Kennedy. There seemed to be a difference of opinion existing as to the power of the House in the matter between the President of the Council and the Attorney-General—both good

lawyers. The former gentleman contended that the House possessed similar powers to those enjoyed by the British House of Commons in dealing with a question of this character. If this was the fact the House could prevent the courts hearing the appeal of the Messrs. Kennedy from its decision. The Attorney-General, on the other hand, thought that the appeal could be taken to the House of Lords. That gentleman (Hon. Mr. Davie) it was, no doubt, who inspired the vindictive course taken by the House in dealing with the publishers of the Westminster daily. Perhaps the hon. Attorney-General was looking forward to impeaching the judiciary at the event of their daring to override the decision of the House. The Attorney-General had won considerable notoriety already by his efforts to bulldoze the press—he had only recently instituted libel proceedings against his own organ, and he had only to go the one step further and impeach the judiciary. He (Hon. Mr. Beaven) was sorry to have seen the petty exhibition of brief authority that the House had been dragged into giving by the Attorney-General. Instead of maintaining its dignity, the House was simply making itself ridiculous all over the continent; if anyone should be brought to the bar of the House, it was the Attorney-General. The hon. leader of the Opposition referred briefly to the remarks of the hon. President of the Council on Thursday night, as reported in the Colonist, and in the course of which reference was made to his (Hon. Mr. Beaven) having applauded, by tapping upon his desk, when the Messrs. Kennedy were brought to the bar of the House. This he had not done. He concluded his remarks by expressing the opinion that, at the first opportunity given them, the electors of New Westminster would show their opinion of the action of the Messrs. Kennedy and of the action of the House by electing one or both of the former to legislative honors.

HON. MR. POOLEY, rising to a question of privilege, assured the hon. leader of the Opposition that he had not been correctly reported in the matter referred to; it was the hon. member for Westminster City, not the hon. leader of the Opposition that he had referred to as applauding the arrival of the Messrs. Kennedy at the bar. He had been speaking of the hon. leader of the Opposition the moment before, so it was easy to see how the error had arisen.

The House then proceeded to the Orders of the Day.

SUPPLY BILL.
The formal bill for granting "certain supplies to Her Majesty" was passed through committee, and read a second time.

LAND REGISTRY.
The report of the Land Registry bill was adopted, and the bill passed its final reading.

C. W. AND C. N. R. Y.
The House again went into committee, Mr. Horne in the chair, upon the Canadian Western and Northern railway aid bill. The bill was reported complete, with amendments, and the House adjourned for luncheon.

The Speaker again took the chair at 3 o'clock.

VICTORIA AND SYDNEY RAILWAY.
HON. MR. TURNER moved the second reading of the bill to aid the Victoria and Sydney Railway Company. It was proposed, he said, not to guarantee the bonds of the company, but the interest upon those bonds, and it was thought that this assistance, with that given by the city of Victoria, would enable the company to get to work at once, and construct a line, which, though short, would greatly benefit the city of Victoria, and indirectly the entire province.

MR. COTTON asked if the bonds proposed to be guaranteed, would be first mortgage—a first charge on the road.

The FINANCIAL MINISTER replied that the bonds were similar to those of the Shuswap and Okanagan, which could not be a first charge on the road.

The bill passed its second reading, and went into Committee, with Mr. Sword, chairman.

In Committee, HON. MR. DAVIE proposed to add as a new section, one enabling the Lieut. Governor-in-Council to exempt the road from taxation for a period of ten years.

HON. MR. BEAVEN did not think the section could be introduced unless transmitted by message from the Lieut. Governor.

The point of order was held to be well taken by the Chairman, the amendment being ruled to be inadvisable.

By request of Mr. Eberts, the Committee rose, to ask Mr. Speaker's opinion as to the point taken and the ruling thereon.

HON. MR. BEAVEN explained that the contention was that a material change in a bill transmitted by message could not be made, except by message.

HON. MR. ROBSON observed that a minister of the Crown had informed the House that in this case the Crown consented to the introduction of the amendment.

MR. SPEAKER ruled the amendment in order, the Crown having given consent through a member of the ministry. He referred to page 509 of May's Parliamentary Practice.

The bill was again taken up in committee, and reported complete with amendments.

KASLO-SLOCAN RAILWAY.
The bill to grant aid to the Kaslo-Slocan railway, to be built from the town of Kaslo to or near Slocan lake (Hon. Mr. Turner) passed its second reading and went into committee with Mr. Fletcher in the chair.

The bill was reported without amendments and finally passed.

MUNICIPAL BILL.
MR. GRANT moved, on consideration of the report on bills Nos. 21 and 27 (Municipal Act) to strike out section 107, with subsections, and insert in lieu thereof the following:

"Notwithstanding anything contained in the Municipal Act, 1891, or any amendments thereto, any applicant for a license to sell wines, spirits, beer, or other fermented or intoxicating liquor in any hotel, or building intended for a hotel, containing not less than thirty rooms, used or to be used for hotel purposes, shall not be required to obtain a petition or requisition signed by the owners or householders, or the wives of

either, for the granting of such license, but application for such license, shall be made direct to the Board of Licensing Commissioners not less than thirty days before the sitting of said Board; through the Clerk of said Board; notice of such application shall be published in some newspaper circulating in the municipality where such application is made for a space of at least thirty days before the sitting of said Board, and the Board of Licensing Commissioners shall have power to grant such license for the term of one year, or to renew the same upon the expiration thereof, if, in the opinion of a majority of the Board then present, such grant or renewal is in the public interest.

HON. MR. BEAVEN objected to the mutilation of the Municipal Bill, in the manner proposed, after the time and trouble he had taken in going through and perfecting the measure. If the section was struck out as proposed, many other clauses would be most disadvantageously affected.

DR. MILNE pronounced the amendment altogether unnecessary, and opposed its passage by the House.

MR. BROWN did not think there was any necessity for smoothing the way by which hotel licenses are acquired. He looked upon the move as simply a step backward—in favor of the undesirable liquor traffic.

MR. HUNTER, Mr. Booth, and Mr. Kitchen disagreed with the amendment, which they considered both unnecessary and unwise.

HON. MR. TURNER introduced an amendment to the amendment, having for its object the giving of greater publicity to the applications for license privileges. This amendment to the amendment was carried, and the amendment was also adopted, the division being:

YEAS: Messrs. Grant, McKenzie, Sword, Punch, Horne, Smith, Davie, Vernon, Eberts, Stoddart, Nason, Turner, Martin, Rogers, Anderson, and Fletcher—16.

NAYS: Messrs. Semlin, Kitchen, Cotton, Milne, Beaven, Brown, Forster, Keith, Booth, and Hunter—10.

Several other less important amendments having been incorporated in the bill,

HON. MR. BEAVEN moved the adoption of the report.

HON. MR. DAVIE said that he had proposed to insert a clause making it obligatory upon the city of Victoria to pay all expenses in connection with the recent Royal Commission. As the hon. leader of the Opposition had given his assurance that the money would be paid, the clause would be unnecessary. He preferred not to introduce the clause.

HON. MR. BEAVEN said that he could not guarantee the decision of the Council, of which he was only one, although he had no idea that the Council would not provide for the Royal Commission.

The ATTORNEY-GENERAL decided not to introduce the clause he had suggested.

The report was adopted, and the Consolidated Municipal Act was explained by HON. MR. BEAVEN. This bill was read a second time and committed, with Mr. McKenzie in the chair. The committee rose, reporting the bill complete with amendments, and the bill received its final reading, amid cheers from both sides of the House.

HON. MR. BEAVEN wished it distinctly placed upon record that he was not in any way responsible for the amendment introduced by Mr. Grant.

The House rose at 5.45.

EVENING SESSION.
On business being once more taken up, and the order for report on the Victoria City Bill called,

HON. MR. BEAVEN urged the House to leave out clause 14, and moved in that direction. He said that the Council would almost prefer to have the bill withdrawn in entirety than to have it passed containing this section.

HON. MR. DAVIE explained that the object of this clause was to give the Esquimalt Water company power to distribute water at all times, at a charge not more than that made by the city. There was something wanting, no doubt, in the section; something to bind the company to furnish hydrants at a fair price and sufficient water in cases of fire, free of any charge. Unless such a provision was incorporated in the bill, he felt bound to support the hon. leader of the Opposition.

MR. GRANT did not consider the proposition a fair and equitable one, and could not countenance an injustice to company or individual.

DR. MILNE supported the stand taken by the hon. leader of the Opposition.

HON. MR. POOLEY argued contra. He thought the clause a proper and a just one.

HON. MR. TURNER believed in justice and fairness to all. The Esquimalt Waterworks Company had supplied a great want, and done very much towards the building up of Victoria West. The company was supplying better water than Victoria city, at a better pressure, and at a moderate price. The hydrants were coming very shortly and he felt bound to support the retention of the clause.

MR. HUNTER thought the bill as it stood, with the clause, would give entire satisfaction to all.

MR. SPEAKER rang in the members, and was about to take the voice of the House, when

HON. MR. DAVIE moved to insert a clause making it compulsory on the company to supply fire hydrants.

The amendment carried.

Having adopted the report, the House passed the third reading of the bill.

C. W. AND C. N. RAILWAY.
On the report of the C. W. and C. N. Railway aid bill,

HON. MR. BEAVEN introduced his anti-Chinese clauses, which he asked the House to incorporate in the bill.

The clauses were lost on a division of 17 to 10.

The bill was read finally.

BY MESSAGE.
HON. MR. DAVIE presented messages from the Lieut. Governor, transmitting a bill to grant certain lands to the City of Victoria, and returning for amendment the B. C. Railway Act, the Companies Act, the Coal Mines Act, the Act incorporating the Nelson Electric Light Co., the Jurors' Act

Amendment Act, and the Act incorporating the Consumers' Water Works Co. Y.

LANDS GRANTED TO VICTORIA.
The bill transmitted by message, having for its object the granting to Victoria city of the lands commonly known as the James Bay flats, was reported to the house by Committee of the Whole, introduced, passed through first and second readings, committed, reported, read a third time and passed.

COMPANIES ACT.
HON. MR. DAVIE moved for the discharge of the order for the third reading of the bill to amend the Companies Act. This was done, the bill was amended as suggested in His Honor's message, and the bill passed its final reading.

The same course was pursued in connection with the Consumers' Water Works Bill, the Railway Aid Act Amendment Bill, the Jurors' Act Amendment Bill, the Coal Mines Act, and the Nelson Electric Light Co. Bill.

VICTORIA AND SYDNEY RAILWAY.
The report on this bill was adopted and the bill passed.

PRIVILEGE.
HON. MR. ROBSON rose to a question of privilege, complaining of having been misreported in the Times, which made him say, in speaking of the Kennedy case, that they should go down on their knees before the House. On the contrary, he had said from the first that a simple apology was all that the House required.

The list of business being exhausted, the House adjourned until 3 o'clock Saturday, when His Honor will prorogue the legislature.

PARLIAMENT PROROGUED.

Close of the Second Session of the Sixth Parliament of British Columbia.

List of Bills Receiving the Royal Assent—The Kennedy Brothers No Longer Detained.

The formal termination of the second session of the sixth Parliament of British Columbia, yesterday afternoon, was an eminently business-like ceremony. There was no band—no guard of honor—no decoration of any kind.

Nor was the attendance of citizens as large as on other prorogation days. There were on the floor of the House a few representatives of the bench, the bar, the clergy and the other learned professions, with a fair sprinkling of ladies, radiant in fashionable spring attire, brought forth, no doubt, by the glorious sunshine of the day. The galleries were well filled, and all the spectators exhibited the utmost interest in the proceedings.

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock, and prayers were read by Rt. Rev. Bishop Cridge, of the Reformed Episcopal Church. A few minutes later, His Honor the Lieut. Governor entered, preceded by the Sergeant-at-Arms bearing the mace, and attended by Mr. Herbert Stanton, private secretary, and his staff, composed of Colonel Holmes, R.C.A., Captain Blair, R.N., Captain Wood, R.N., Captain Benson, R.C.A., Dr. Jones, R.N., and Lieut. Lampton, R.N.

Being seated, His Honor formally assented to the following bills of the Legislature passed during the session of fifty-two days' duration:

(No. 1) An Act respecting the unauthorized use of the Provincial Coat of Arms.
(No. 2) An Act to amend the "Esquimalt Water Works Act, 1885."

(No. 3) An Act to regulate the law with regard to Conditional Sales of Goods and Chattels.

(No. 4) An Act to incorporate the Consumers' Water Works Company, limited.

(No. 5) An Act to incorporate the Nelson Electric Light Company, limited.

(No. 6) An Act to amend the "Public School Act, 1891."

(No. 7) An Act to incorporate the Kaslo and Slocan Railway Company.

(No. 8) An Act to amend the "Pharmacy Act, 1891."

(No. 9) An Act to amend the "Victoria and Esquimalt Telephone Company Act, 1890."

(No. 10) An Act to incorporate the Association of the Sisters of Charity of Providence in British Columbia.

(No. 11) An Act to incorporate the Sisters of St. Ann in the Province of British Columbia.

(No. 12) An Act to create the Roman Catholic Bishop of Vancouver Island, and his successors in office, a Corporation Sole.

(No. 13) An Act to amend the "Cattle Ranges Act," and the "Cattle Ranges Amendment Act, 1891."

(No. 14) An Act to authorize the Kootenay Power Company, limited, to construct Tramways and Electrical and other works in the vicinity of Nelson.

(No. 15) An Act to enable the Corporation of the City of Victoria to borrow certain sums of money, and for other purposes.

(No. 16) An Act to amend the "Corporation of Victoria Water Works Act, 1872."

(No. 17) An Act to incorporate the Victoria and Sidney Railway Company.

(No. 18) An Act to incorporate the Coquitlam Electric Company, limited.

(No. 19) An Act to incorporate the North Vancouver Electric Company, limited.

(No. 20) An Act to amend and consolidate the Acts for the protection of certain Animals, Birds, and Fishes.

(No. 21) An Act to amend the "Mineral Act, 1891."

(No. 22) An Act to amend the "Agricultural Societies' Incorporation Act."

(No. 23) An Act to amend the "County Courts Act."

(No. 24) An Act to limit the operations of the "Interior Courts Practitioners' Act."

(No. 25) An Act to amend the "Columbia and Kootenay Railway and Navigation Company Act, 1890."

(No. 26) An Act to amend the "Westminster and Vancouver Short Line Railway Act."

(No. 27) An Act to incorporate the Sumas Reclamation Company.

(No. 28) An Act relating to certain Public Works in the District of Surrey.

(No. 29) An Act to amend the "Vancouver Incorporation Act, 1886," and amendments thereto.

(No. 30) An Act to amend and consolidate the Law with respect to Affidavits and Declarations.

(No. 31) An Act to incorporate the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

(No. 32) An Act to amend "An Act to provide an Official Stamp for the Supreme and County Courts."

(No. 33) An Act to further amend the "British Columbia Railway Act, 1891."

(No. 34) An Act respecting the Cowichan and Salt Spring Island Agricultural Society.

(No. 35) An Act to amend the "Provincial Land Surveyors' Act, 1891."

(No. 36) An Act to amend the "Marriage Act."

(No. 37) An Act to amend the "Coal Mines Act."

(No. 38) An Act to create a Provincial Board of Horticulture.

(No. 39) An Act to amend the "Bills of Sale Act."

(No. 40) An Act to Amend the "Drainage, Drying, and Irrigation Act."

(No. 41) An Act to amend the "Supreme Court Act."

(No. 42) An Act to amend the "Sheriffs' Act."

(No. 43) An Act to amend the "Jurors' Act."

(No. 44) An Act to regulate travelling on Public Highways and Bridges.

(No. 45) An Act to amend the "Breeding Stock Act."

(No. 46) An Act to provide for a grant to the Corporation of the City of New Westminster of certain lands in the City of New Westminster.

(No. 47) An Act to Amend the "Employers' Liability Act, 1891."

(No. 48) An Act to amend the "Execution Act."

(No. 49) An Act to confirm to the Crown all unappropriated and unappropriated Water and Water Power in the Province, and for other purposes.

(No. 50) An Act respecting the Canadian Western Central Railway Company and the Canadian Northern Railway Company.

(No. 51) An Act to authorize the granting of a certain Land Subsidy for and in aid of the Kaslo and Slocan Railway.

(No. 52) An Act to grant certain lands to the Corporation of the City of Victoria.

(No. 53) The Municipal Act, 1892.

An Act for granting certain sums of money for the public service.

His Honor, in proroguing the House, then addressed the Speaker and members of the Assembly, in the following words:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Assembly:

It affords me pleasure to re-appear before you, and to thank you for the public service during the closing.

Amongst the numerous measures have passed, I regard as of especial interest those having reference to the the Deep-Sea Fisheries of the the people will doubtless watch the various steps necessary to schemes—which I hope will meet the result of the legislation for the consolidation and con Public Deb't, has been most sat- ing placed the credit of the market.

It is to be hoped that the life you have offered will result in the up of important sections of by railway construction.

I thank you for the liberal service of the ensuing year assure you, be expended with economy and the public interest.

In now taking leave of you, I d-ron of my best wishes for your- congratulate you upon retir- arduous labors of a protracted consciousness of having, at a sacrifice, rendered valuable ser- vices.

The Governor and his staff and the House adjourned, up- the Premier.

As soon as the end of the unannounced, a messenger was Warden John of the Province arm him of the close of the hat the Messrs. Kennedy, of ere no longer to be detained

PARLIAMENT PROROGUED.

se of the Second Session of the
Sixth Parliament of British
Columbia.

t of Bills Receiving the Royal As-
sent—The Kennedy Brothers
No Longer Detained.

the formal termination of the second ses-
sion of the sixth Parliament of British
Columbia, yesterday afternoon, was an
exactly business-like ceremony. There
was no band—no guard of honor—no cere-
mony of any kind.
The attendance of citizens at large
on other prorogation days. There were
on the floor of the House a few representa-
tives of the bench, the bar, the clergy and
other learned professions, with a fair
number of ladies, radiant in fashionable
spring attire, brought forth, no doubt, by
the glorious sunshine of the day. The gal-
lery was well filled, and all the spectators
followed the utmost interest in the proceed-

The Speaker took the chair at 3 o'clock,
prayers were read by Rt. Rev. Bishop
Gibson, of the Reformed Episcopal Church.
A few minutes later, His Honor the Lieut.-
Governor entered, preceded by the Sergeant-
at-Arms bearing the mace, and attended by
Herbert Stanton, private secretary, and
Haff, composed of Colonel Holmes,
A. Captain Blair, R.N., Captain
Blair, R.N., Captain Benson, R.C.A., Dr.
R.N., and Lieut. Lampton, R.N.
After seating, His Honor formally assented
to the following bills of the Legislature
passed during the session of fifty-two days:

- 1) An Act respecting the unauthorized
the Provincial Coat of Arms.
- 2) An Act to amend the "Esquimalt
Works Act 1885."
- 3) An Act to regulate the law with re-
spect to Conditional Sales of Goods and Chattels.
- 4) An Act to incorporate the Consum-
er Works Company, Limited.
- 5) An Act to incorporate the Nelson
Light Company, Limited.
- 6) An Act to amend the "Public School
Act."
- 7) An Act to incorporate the Kaslo and
Nelson Railway Company.
- 8) An Act to amend the "Pharmacy
Act."
- 9) An Act to amend the "Victoria and
Nelson Telephone Company Act, 1880."
- 10) An Act to incorporate the Associa-
tion of the Sisters of Charity of Providence in
British Columbia.
- 11) An Act to incorporate the Sisters of
Charity in the Province of British Columbia.
- 12) An Act to create the Roman Catholic
Diocese of Vancouver Island, and his successors,
a Corporation Sole.
- 13) An Act to amend the "Cattle Ranges
and the Cattle Ranges Amendment Act."
- 14) An Act to authorize the Kootenay
Company, Limited, to construct Tram-
way, Electrical and other works in the
City of Nelson.
- 15) An Act to enable the Corporation of
Victoria to borrow certain sums of
money for other purposes.
- 16) An Act to amend the "Corporation
of Victoria Water Works Act, 1873."
- 17) An Act to incorporate the Victoria
Nelson Railway Company.
- 18) An Act to incorporate the Coquitlam
Company, Limited.
- 19) An Act to incorporate the North Van-
couver Electric Company, Limited.
- 20) An Act to amend and consolidate the
Acts relating to the protection of certain Animals,
and Fishes.
- 21) An Act to amend the "Mineral Act."
- 22) An Act to amend the "Agricultural
Incorporation Act."
- 23) An Act to amend the "County Courts
Act."
- 24) An Act to limit the operations of the
County Practitioners' Act."
- 25) An Act to amend the "Columbia and
Nelson Railway and Navigation Company
Act."
- 26) An Act to amend the "Westminster
Nelson Short Line Railway Act."
- 27) An Act to incorporate the Sumas Ro-
adway Company.
- 28) An Act relating to certain Public
Works in the District of Surrey.
- 29) An Act to amend the "Vancouver
Island Act, 1888," and amendments
therein.
- 30) An Act to amend and consolidate the
Acts relating to Affidavits and Declara-
tions.
- 31) An Act to incorporate the Canadian
Nelson Railway Company.
- 32) An Act to amend "An Act to provide
for a Stenographer for the Supreme and
County Courts."
- 33) An Act to further amend the "British
Columbia Railway Act, 1880."
- 34) An Act respecting the Cowichan and
Nelson Island Agricultural Society.
- 35) An Act to amend the "Provincial
Surveyors Act, 1891."
- 36) An Act to Amend the "Marriage
Act."
- 37) An Act to amend the "Coal Mines
Act."
- 38) An Act to create a Provincial Board
of Agriculture.
- 39) An Act to amend the "Bills of Sale
Act."
- 40) An Act to Amend the "Drainage,
and Irrigation Act."
- 41) An Act to amend the "Supreme
Court Act."
- 42) An Act to amend the "Sheriffs' Act."
- 43) An Act to amend the "Jurors' Act."
- 44) An Act to regulate travelling on
Highways and Bridges.
- 45) An Act to amend the "Breeding
Act."
- 46) An Act to provide for a grant to the
City of New Westminster for the purchase
of lands in the City of New West-
- 47) An Act to Amend the "Employers'
Act, 1891."
- 48) An Act to amend the "Execution
Act."
- 49) An Act to confirm to the Crown all
rights and unappropriated Water and
Land in the Province, and for other
purposes.
- 50) An Act respecting the Canadian
Central Railway Company and the
Northern Railway Company.
- 51) An Act to authorize the granting of
aid and Subsidy for and in aid of the
Columbia Navigation and Tramway
Company.
- 52) An Act to amend the "Companies
Act."
- 53) An Act to amend the "Land Regis-
tration Act."
- 54) An Act in aid of the Victoria and
Nelson Railway.
- 55) An Act to authorize the granting of
aid and Subsidy for and in aid of the
Nelson Railway.
- 56) An Act to grant certain lands to the
City of Victoria.
- 57) An Act to amend the "Municipal Act, 1892,"
granting certain sums of money
in service.

After, in proroguing the House, then
the Speaker and members of the
House in the following words:

Mr. Speaker and Gentlemen of the Legisla-
tive Assembly.

It affords me pleasure to relieve you from
further attendance upon your legislative
duties, and to thank you for the patient zeal
with which you have devoted yourselves to
the public service during the Session now
closing.

Amongst the numerous measures which you
have passed, I regard as of especial importance
those having reference to the development of
the Deep-Sea Fisheries of the Province; and
the people will doubtless watch with interest
the various steps necessary to carry out these
schemes—which I hope will meet with success.

The result of the legislation of last Session
for the consolidation and conversion of the
Public Debt, has been most satisfactory, hav-
ing placed the credit of the Province in a
favorable position in the English money
market.

It is to be hoped that the liberal assistance
you have offered will result in the early open-
ing up of important sections of the Province
by railway construction.

I thank you for the liberal grants made for
the service of the ensuing year, which will I
assure you, be expended with due regard to
economy and the public interest.

Am now taking leave of you, I desire to assure
you of my best wishes for your welfare; and I
congratulate you upon retiring from the
arduous labors of a protracted Session with a
consciousness of having, at great personal
sacrifice, rendered valuable service to your
country.

The Governor and his staff then retired,
and the House adjourned, upon motion of
the Premier.

As soon as the end of the session was
announced, a messenger was dispatched to
Varden John of the Provincial Jail, to in-
form him of the close of the session, and
that the Messrs. Kennedy, of Westminster,
were no longer to be detained in custody.