THE DISMISSAL CORRESPONDENCE

The Petition of Complaint Which Was Forwarded by the Late Ministry of British Columbia to Lord Aberdeen.

OBSERVATIONS BY LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR

His Honor's Exhaustive Statement of the Case to the Governor General With Copious Quotations in Support Thereof.

Following is an epitome of the lengthy petition sent by Messrs. Turner, Eberts & Pooley to Lord Aberdeen, complaining of the action of His Honor L. G. McInnes, in dismissing them from office in August, 1898. The Times has also received for publication a copy of the letter sent by His Honor to the Governor-General, commenting on the petition. This is the first time this correspondence and petition have appeared in the press of British Columbia:

To the Right Honorable Sir John Campbell Hamilton Gordon, Earl of Aberdeen, etc., etc., Governor-General of Canada:

The petition of John Herbert Turner, of the city of Victoria, merchant, late Premier and Minister of Finance, and Minister of Agriculture for the province of British Columbia; James Baker, of Cranbrook, East Kootenay, Lieut.-Colonel, late Minister of Mines of the province of British Columbia; Charles Edward Pooley, of the said city of Victoria, barrister-at-law, late member of the government of British Columbia, without portfolio, and David McEwen Eberts, of the same place, late Attorney-General of the said province, humbly sheweth:

Your petitioners were members of the government of British Columbia until the 8th day of August, A. D., 1898.

Appended to this petition is the correspondence which passed between your petitioner, John Herbert Turner and the Honorable Thomas R. McInnes, Lieutenant-Governor of the said province, relative to the dismissal of the government, of which your petitioner, John Herbert Turner, was Prime Minister.

(Petitioners here quote Todd, 2nd edition, page 37, as to governor exceeding his rightful powers, and then refer to case of governor of Mauritius, suspended in 1887 pending investigation of royal commission into charges preferred against him. Petitioners then quote despatch of Sir Michael Hicks-Beach of July 3rd, 1879, re Letellier case, from Todd, 2nd edition, page 606, quote Sir Wilfrid Laurier from Hansard, 1878, p. 1918, as follows: "It would certainly be the duty of the Dominion government to interfere in order to redress a wrong which the people cannot themselves remedy," and again from Hansard, 1879, p. 327, from Laurier on Letellier case, as follows: "Now as regards the Lieutenant-Governor under the constitution, the laws says that he shall be removable for cause; but what can a cause be? I believe that these cases of removal can well be offences of a personal character, but never offences connected with the discharge of duties of an official character. If, for instance, the Lieutenant-Governor by some grossly dishonorable conduct brings the Crown into contumely, this and similar offences might be causes for removal; but if he sticks within the circle of his functions, however tyranical his acts may be, he is not removable because he is covered by ministerial responsibility. He is amenable to the people who can set him right if they believe him wrong and undo what he had done.").

Your petitoners are not unmindful that a colonial governor may be sued in the court whether the cause of action spring from liabilities incurred in his private or public capacity, as has been decided by the judicial committee of the Privy Council. (Seen Hill vs. Biggs, 3 Moore, P. C., 465; Musgrave vs. Pulido, 5 L. R., App. 102). Nevertheless the facts hereinafter refered to, your petitioners submit, are properly the subject for royal commission.

Your petitioners invoking Your Excellency's supervision under the 59th section of the British North America Act, desires to refer to certain acts of the Lieutenant-Governor of British Columbia. In doing this they have no wish to remove from the provincial arena any purely political question arising out of their dismissal, and for which ministers of the crown can fairly be held responsible, your petitioners being well satisfied to abide by the wishes of the people of the province of British Columbia constitutionally expressed in the usual manner.

Your petitioners nevertheless feel compelled to draw Your Excellency's attention to the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of a personal character, in regard to which ordinary constitutional methods available in the province afford no adequate means for fully vindicating the personal honor of your petitioners, which has been impugned by the Lieutenant-Governor.

(Petitioners here quote Todd, 2nd edition, pages 817, 818, as to informing an incoming ministry of all reasons leading to dismissal of their predecessors.)

Your petitioners charge that the Lieutenant-Governor did not observe that candour due his ministry, but was guilty of misrepresenting the reasons which induced him to summarily and suddenly request the resignation of your petitioners.

Your petitioners further charge that the Lieutenant-Governor made and published false statements respecting the conduct and character of your petitioners.

In support of these charges reference is made to the correspondence appended hereto.

(Petitioners here quote from Lieutenant-Governor's letter of 14th July to Mr. Turner, refer to the fact that on the 8th August Mr. Turner had 17 supporters, with an assurance of two more in Cassiar, which would divide the assembly 19 to 19, then endeavors to show that the Lieutenant-Governor was acting throughout on the assumption that Mr. Turner would not have a majority in the assembly, and that it was his duty to call on some one who would have, and that it was not until after the Lieutenant-Governor perceived that Cassiar would support Mr. Turner that he shifted his ground in seeking an excuse to dismiss him, and to do so made false charges reflecting on the honor and character of the petitioners.)

Having given these reasons for his action your petitioner, John Herbert Turner, on the 9th August, deemed it his duty to send to the Lieutenant-Governor a communication of that date, appended thereto, in which he asked, for the constitutional reasons set out therein, a reconsideration on the part of the Lieutenant-Governor of his request for the resignation of your petitioners.

On the 15th August the Lieutenant-Governor, in a communication addressed to your petitoner, John H. Turner, undertook to "enter into certain details respecting the grounds" to show his "lack of confidence," and in this connection the following extracts from the said communication are made.

(Petitioners here quote from Lieutenant-Governor's letter of 15th August to Mr. Turner, in reference to lack of confidence in some of his colleagues, the matter of the blank warrants, and the Attorney-General's advice respecting issuance of warrants on his own authority.) So that the responsibility assumed by the coming government was definite and limited to the question of probable parliamentary support.

Your petitioners would first observe that this statement and the preceding statements are obviously inconsistent, and cannot all be true.

Your petitioners charge that the latter statements is maliciously false.

And first your petitoner, John Herbert Turner, for himself denies that the Lieutenant-Governor at any time expressed his want of confidence in his colleagues or in any of them.

And all your petitioners say that no explanation respecting the blank warrants was ever requested, as it could have been promptly and satisfactorily given.

Your petitioners, John Herbert Turner, David MacEwen Eberts and James Baker (the Attorney-General and Provincial Secretary referred to), deny that on the 2nd of August, or at any time, they or any of them informed the Lieutenant-Governor.

Digest of petition of Turner et al. to Governor-General.

5.

That failing his sanction the Attorney-General could have the warrant issued on the Attorney-General's recommendation without his signature.

And your petitioner, David MacEwen Eberts (the Attorney-General referred to) denies that in reading the section of the act he intimated to the Lieutenant-Governor so monstrous a proposition. (Petitions here quote the section).

Your petitioners indignantly repudiate the dishonorable insinuations contained in the paragraph above quoted.

The public press in British Columbia from such a statement very properly infer that for the dishonorable conduct suggested in this paragraph your petitioners were dismissed from office; whereas as your petitioners have shown, no such reason was given or insinuated either when they were requested to resign or when Mr. Beaven or Mr. Semlin were invited to form a cabinet.

Your petitioners therefore humbly pray that your Excellency may be pleased to be caused to be issued a royal commission of inquiry into the charges above preferred, and they are ready and anxious that the powers under such a commission may be of such a character that so far as your petitioners or their characters are concerned, the enquiry may be unlimited and unrestricted.

And your petitioners in duty bound will ever pray, etc.

J. H. TURNER.
CHAS. E. POOLEY.
D. M. EBERTS.

Government House,
Victoria, B. C.,
January 18th, 1899.

To His Excellency the Governor-General of Canada, Ottawa:

Your Excellency,—By a despatch from the Honorable the Secretary of State, dated the 13th ultimo, I was informed that a memorial from Mr. J. H. Turner of this city, and his colleagues in the late government of this province, had been addressed to your Excellency, asking that a royal commission be appointed to inquire into certain charges, which it is alleged that I made in my official capacity, reflecting upon them. The Secretary of State says: "Before considering what action, if any, it might be deemed proper to adopt, I have been requested to forward a copy of the memorial from Mr. Turner and his former colleagues, to you for any observations or comments you might think propor to make on the statements contained in the memorial referred to."

I have the honor, therefore, in compliance with the above despatch, to submit to your Excellency the following observations and comments in respect to the said memorial:

1.

The petitioners do not invoke your Excellency' supervision in regard to the constitutionality of my action in dismissing them.

2.

They express themselves as:

"Well satisfied to abide by the wishes of the people of the province of British Columbia, constitutionally expressed in the usual manner." (Memorial p. 2.)

Your petitioner, Mr. Turner has already indicated what he means by the phrase "constitutionally expressed in the usual manner," as in his letter to me of the 9th August last, appended to the memorial, he quotes with approval the language of Lord John Russell, saying the assembly "is the legitimate organ of the people, whose opinions cannot be constitutionally expressed except through their representatives in parliament." He also quotes from Todd's Parliamentary Practice in the British Colonies to the effect that "Parliament is the voice of the people."

Since my present ministry assumed office, on the 15th August last, six bye-elections have taken place for the Legislative Assembly of this province, with the result that five out of the six were favorable to the present administration, and of these five, four went by acclamation. And on the 5th day of January instant, the Legislative Assembly of this province met for the first time since the dismissal of your petitioners. A Speaker was elected without a division. On the following day the first division occurred, the occasion being the second reading of a bill introduced by the Attorney-General dealing with certain election petitions. The result of this division was that the government were sustained by a vote of nineteen to thirteen. The said bill subsequently went through committee and passed its third reading. Other bills, introduced by the government, have since passed the Assembly, and yesterday, the 17th instant, the address in reply to the Speech from the Throne was adopted without any amendment having been offered and without any division taking place. Your Excellency will therefore observe that my ministry, who assumed responsibility for my action in dismissing Mr. Turner and his colleagues, have the confidence of the Legislative Assembly of this province.

In view of the above facts, I submit, those passages of the memorial wherein controversial points are raised as to the constitutionality of my action, are, for the purposes of the memorial, clearly removed from discussion by the petitioners' statement, and are therefore irrelevant and call for no reply.

II.

Your Excellency will observe that your petitioners confine their complaint to:

"The conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of a personal character, in regard to which ordinary constitutional methods available in the province afford no adequate means for fully vidicating the personal honor of your petitioners, which has been impugned by the Lieutenant-Governor." (Memorial, p. 2.)

Your petitioners thereupon quote two passages from Todd's Parliamentary Practice in the British Colonies, the first irrelevant for the purposes of the memorial, because bearing only on the constitutional aspect of the dismissal, the second equally irrelevant, but which I here quote, as it is made the basis of one of the charges which follow:

"Upon a change of ministry it is essential that the gentlemen who may be invited by the Governor to form a new administration shall unreservedly be informed by him of the circumstances which led to the resignation or dismissal of their predecessors in office, and that they shall be willing to accept the entire responsibility to the local parliament for any act of the Governor which have been instrumental in occasioning the resignation of, or affecting the dismissal of the outgoing ministry. For it is an undoubted principle of English law that no prerogative of the crown can be constitutionally exercised unless some minister of state is ready to assume the responsibility for the same."

On this your petitioners base their first charge as follows:

"Your petitioners charge that the Lieutenant-Governor did not observe that candour due to his ministry, but was guilty of misrepresenting the reasons which induced him to summarily and suddenly request the resignation of your petitioners." (Mamorial, p. 3.)

My reply to this charge is:

1st. This charge, if true, could be made only by my ministry, and not by your petitioners.

2nd. It is not true, for I did unreservedly inform the gentlemen invited to form a new administration of the circumstances which led to the dismissal of their predecessors in office," detailing them aes they are detailed in the letter of the 15th August last to Mr. Turner, appended to the memorial, and the gentlemen so invited to form a new administration were "willing to accept the entire responsibility to the local parliament," for my action which was "instrumental in effecting the dismissal of the outgoing ministry," and I did observe that candour due my ministry, and was not guilty of misrepresenting the reasons which induced me to "summarily and suddenly request the resignation of your petitioners," and not only to my ministry, but to the gentlemen who first undertook the formation of a ministry after the dismissal of your petitioners. In proof of this I here quote from an interview with Mr. Robert Beaven, published in the Victoria Times of the 15th August last:

"Asked this morning if he could tell the public the cirqumstances leading up to his undertaking the task of forming an administration the Hon. Robert Beaven replied as follows:

"'Yes, I can. A week ago I received the following letter from His Honor the Lieutenant-Governor. (Here follows the letter of the 8th August last from myself to Mr. Beaven, appended to the memorial.) I at once made an appointment to meet His Honor, and did so. * * * It transpired that the action which resulted in the dismissal of the Turner government was of a cumulative character and that other circumstances than those referred to in His Honor's letter, more immediately connected with ministerial advice and conduct brought about a different condition of affairs, and that the delay which must have occurred from calling a session might result in great injury. This feature of the case is one upon which the press and general public are entirely in the dark. I understand that it is considered contrary to official etiquette to make known the full details at the present time. I can say this much, that in one instance alone, had the Lieutenant-Governor accepted Mr. Attorney-General Eberts's advice, and the construction of the Revenue Act, as explained to me by His Honor, an important check which the Constitution Act places on the payment of money out of the treasury would be a dead letter, and the power of the members of the government of the day over the money in the treasury would be practically unlimited. This is a power which the best of governments to my mind should not possess, and which the Constitutional Act expressly prohibits. It was very evident that the relations between the Lieutenant-Governor and the Turner administration were of a character that could not be continued. The circumstances connected with the ministerial action and advice as disclosed by the correspondence, and as related by His Honor to me, brought me to consider that prompt action was essential, and that it became a duty to endeavor if possible to assist in averting a crisis in provincial affairs."

But if, by the above charge, your petitioners mean that I did not observe candour due to them, and that I was guilty of misrepresenting to them the reasons which induced me to "summarily and suddenly" request their resignation, then:

1st. I submit that a Lieutenant-Governor is under no constiutional obligation to give all or any of his reasons for a dismissal to an outgoing ministry, but only to an incoming ministry, prepared, if called upon, to state and defend such reasons in Parliament.

2. The difference between your petitioners and myself in regard to redistribution, parliamentary support, signing of special warrants, extension of election days in Cassiar district, and issuance of warrants on the recommendation of the Attorney-General, were all discussed nevertheless, and discussed unreservedly on my part, at interviews mentioned in my letter of the 15th August last to Mr. Turner, appended to the Memorial. In the matter of the blank warrants only I did not request an interview with your petitioners, but having cut them out from among those with which they were sent to me, I awaited an inquiry. No inquiry, however, was made. Your petitioners say that had I requested an explanation respecting the blank warrants "it could have been promptly and satisfactorily given." Mr. Turner in his letter to me of the 26th August, appended to the Memorial, suggests rather than gives the explanation as follows:

"Possibly you have not made yourself acquainted with the manner of procedure with respect to what you term warrants; they are requisitions, and the system is such that if by chance, among a large number of sheets, a blank one got in, it could be of no use."

I am ready to take this explanation that it was a matter of accident, only observing that it was seven, and not one, that got in by chance, that these seven were inserted in different places, and in no respect differed from the other sheets, except that the spaces for filling in amounts were blank. In view of concurrent circumstances, and not knowing that it was a mistake, I preferred to await an inquiry, or explanation, rather than to suggest an improper motive by asking for an interview in regard to them.

III.

This brings me to the other charge, which is as follows:

"Your petitioners charge that the Lieutenant-Governor made and published false statements respecting the conduct and character of your petitioners."

In support of this Your Excellency is referred to the correspondence appended to the Memorial, which is the correspondence forwarded with my report to Your Excellency of the 19th August last, and published in the official Gazette of this province of the 26th August last, together with an additional letter addressed by Mr. Turner to myself also dated the 26th August last.

In answer to this charge I submit:

1. It is too vague to be definitely answered, and it is too vague "to draw Your Excellency's attention to the conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of a personal character." In such a serious matter as invoking Your Excellency's supervision in regard to conduct of mine of a personal character I submit that the Memorial should have definitely and unequivocally stated what the false statements were which it is alleged that I made and published concerning the conduct and character of your petitioners, as well as when and where they were made and published. I shall deal with this charge, however, as definitely as its vagueness will permit.

2. This charge is contained in a petition purporting to be the petition of John Herbert Turner, of the city of Victoria, etc., James Baker, of Cranbrook, etc., Charles Edward Pooley, and David McEwen Eberts, of the said city of Victoria. But it is not the petition of the said James Baker, inasmuch as he has not signed it, and so he is improperly made a party to it, without any apparent authority from himself, and in this respect is in no different position from Mr. George B. Martin, also a member of my late ministry, who has neither signed nor joined in the Memorial. And the said Charles Edward Pooley is no proper party to the Memorial, inasmuch as he is in no part of the said correspondence, upon which this charge is based, mentioned or referred to, nor was he present at any of the interviews mentioned in the said correspondence, and so cannot possibly be, within the purview of the Memorial, one concerning whose conduct and character I have made and published false statements.

3. Such charges as are contained in the said correspondence are there made officially to your petitioner, Mr. Turner, respecting the official conduct of himself and the colleagues therein mentioned. And the said correspondence was subsequently, on the advice of my present ministry, officially published. This I submit can in no sense be construed into "conduct of the Lieutenant-Governor of a personal character," nor was this in any sense a personal publication by me of the alleged false statements; the publication was an official act "covered by ministerial responsibility," to use the words of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, quoted by your petitioners.

4. The alleged false statements respecting the conduct and character of your petitioners are contained, if at all, in the letter of the 15th August last from myself to Mr. Turner, appended to the memorial. Now I submit to Your Excellency that nowhere in this letter is there any statement "impugning the personal honor" of your petitioners, or concerning their personal conduct or character. Although it is notorious that certain members of my late min'stry, your petitioners, were attacked in the press of Canada and Great Britain for the alleged use of their official positions in furtherance of private enterprises of a speculative character, yet neither in my interviews had with them, nor in official correspondence, nor otherwise, did I advert to it, or make any statements concerning this; nor concerning the fact that one of the members of my late ministry, one of your petitioners, acted as legal counsel to a railway corporation in this province in suits adverse to the government of which he was a member; nor concerning any other phase of the conduct or character of your petitioners of a personal nature. But I admit that my said letter of the 15th August last does contain statements reflecting on the official conduct of Mr. Turner and Mr. Eberts. Your excellency will observe that my written communications with Mr. Turner, prior to the said letter of the 15th August, make no mention of complaints on my part as to the official conduct of h'mself and colleagues, but Mr. Turner's letter to me in reply, dated the 26th August last, and appended to the memorial, clearly shows that every phase of their official conduct, of which complaint is made in my letter of August 15th, was discussed at official interviews between us, either alone or in conjunction with some of h's colleagues, with the exception of the matter of the blank warrants, and in two cases only is there any substantial variation as to the purport of the interviews. I here quote the first case:

"During several interviews with you I informed you that wh'le I had every respect for yourself personally, I had little or no confidence in some of your colleagues, and this, together with the verdict of the electorate on the 9th July last made it impossible for me to unreservedly accept the recommendations of the executive council."

Lt.-Governor to Mr. Turner, August 15th, 1898.

"Your honor may have entertained a thought of that kind, but during all my interviews your honor most carefully concealed the fact. Upon one occasion your honor did say that one or two of my colleagues were not popular, but certainly never did your honor state that you had not confidence in them. Your honor states that this, coupled with the vote of the 9th July, made it impossible for you to unreservedly accept the recommendations of the executive council. For the first time I have learned, and from a representative of the crown, that a sound sufficient reason for the ex'stence of a lack of confidence by a representative of the crown in an executive council may be that some of its members are not popular."

Mr. Turner to Lt.-Governor, August 26th, 1898.

Even these statements agree in this, that there was, at an offial interview with my chief adviser, a discussion respecting "one or two" of h's colleagues. I reaffirm that it was concerning the confidence I felt in them, that is as advisers, and not concerning their popularity. But I submit to your excellency that to issue a royal commission to inquire into the intrinsic probability of that discussion having turned on my want of confidence in, or on the popularity of, one or two of Mr. Turner's colleagues, would be futile. The other case of conflicting statements is the only serious one, and is the only case respecting which the memorial makes anything like a distinct, or specific, charge. It is that of the Attorney-General, Mr. Eberts, having informed me that in certain cases, by virtue of a section of the Revenue Act (sec. 41) he could have a warrant issued for the expenditure of money, without my signature. Referring to this your petitioners, after quoting that part of my said letter of the 15th August dealing therewith, say, at the close of the memorial:

"Your petitioners charge that the latter statement is maliciously false. Your petitioners, John Herbert Turner, David MacEwen Eberts and James Baker (the Attorney-General and Provincial Secretary referred to), deny that on the 2nd August, or at any time, they, or any of them, informed the Lieutenant-Governor that failing his sanction the Attorney-General could have the warrant issued on the Attorney-General's recommendation without his signature. And your petitioner, David MacEwen Eberts (the Attorney-General referred to) denies that in reading the section of the act he intimated to the Lieutenant-Governor so monstrous a proposition. . . . Your petitioners indignantly repudiate the dishonorable insinuations contained in the paragraph above quoted. The public press in British Columbia from such a statement very properly infer that for the dishonorable conduct suggested in this paragraph your petitioners were dismissed from office; whereas, as your petitioners have shown, no such reason was given or insinuated either when they were requested to resign or when Mr. Beaven or Mr. Semlin were invited to form a cabinet."

I would ask your excellency to observe, as points of agreement, disclosed by the above and by the said correspondence, that there was the interview on the 2nd August; that your petitioners had previously endeavored to obtain my signature to a special warrant for $15,000 to be expended in Cassiar district, prior to the elections there; that the subject matter of the said interview with the issuance of the said special warrant; that at the interview I again refused to sign the warrant, and that the Attorney-General, Mr. Eberts, then read me a section of the Revenue Act, containing the following:

"If, upon any application for a warrant, the auditor has reported that there is no parliamentary authority for issuing it, then upon the wr'tten opinion of the Attorney-General that there is such authority, citing it, the warrant may be issued, and shall be sufficient authority to the auditor to authorize the payment out of the treasury to the amount so ordered to be expended."

Mr. Eberts denies that in reading the section of the act he intimated to the Lieutenant-Governor so monstrous a proposition. But why did Mr. Eberts read me that section, as he admits he did, at that interview, and under the circumstances stated? And I would further point out to your excellency that to one not learned in law, and not recollecting certain sections of the Constitution Act of th's province, such a section very readily conveys the meaning, prima facie, that the Attorney-General has a power over the treasury in certain cases, and that his written opinion may be sufficient authority for the issuance of a warrant, and "shall be sufficient authority to the auditor to authorize the payment out of the treasury to the amount so ordered to be expended."

And so I understood Mr. Eberts' construction of the said section. Your petitioners say:

"No such reason was given or insinuated either when they were requested to resign or when Mr. Beaven or Mr. Semlin were invited to form a cab'net."

This is not true, as your excellency will observe by the above quoted interview with Mr. Beaven, published in the Victoria Times of August 15th last, wherein Mr. Beaven says that a week prior to this, upon h's waiting upon me in response to my letter of the 9th August last, the above circumstances were related to him by me. And in respect to the allegation of malice on my part, I wish to observe that so far was I from wishing to publish charges reflecting on my late ministry, even of an official character, that I refrained from inserting in official correspondence the complaints I had against them, although they had formed the subject of interviews between us and, as shown by the published statement of Mr. Beaven, they had been related to gentlemen undertaking the formation of a new administration. But the nature of Mr. Turner's letter to me of the 9th August, appended to the memorial, the insinuations therein conta'ned that I was concerned in an intrigue to secure the entrance of a relative into his cabinet, that negotiations for that purpose were still in progress, and that I had better reconsider the letter ask'ng for the resignation of himself and colleagues, left me, I considered, no alternative, in just'ce to myself but to give a detailed official statement of the complaints I had against the conduct of your petitioners. And I submit to your excellency finally that the memorial contains no spec'fic charge, nor does it cite facts in support of any charge sufficient to warrant the issuance of a royal commission of inquiry as asked by your petitioners.

I have the honor to be your excellency's obedient servant,

LIEUTENANT-GOVERNOR.

ICE BREAKING UP.

News was brought by steamer Humboldt that last Sunday the ice commenced to go out of Lake Bennett and great channels were cut through the lake's frozen surface by the action of the sun, wind and currents.

On Monday two scows, heavily loaded with supplies of various kinds supposed to be short at Dawson, left Bennett City. They got a considerable distance down the lake when the ice came together again and when the Humboldt left the scows were reported to be in a dangerous condition.

Tuesday saw another section of the lake cleared of ice. Steamboat captains expected to be able to start for White Horse to-day or to-morrow. The remainder of the water route to Dawson will be clear as soon as Lake Bennett is navigable. In fact the lower lakes, Thirty Mile river and the upper Yukon were clear of ice the first of the week.

Steamers loaded with rich Klondikers have probably left Dawson by this time. The first trip up the Yukon will doubtless be slow, as the boats will have to dodge a great deal of floating ice. Several steamers wintered at or near Dawson, so there will be no delay about commencing up river travel.

There were many rumors floating about Skagway about the drowning of certain well known Skagway men. There is nothing definite known about the matter except that all water ways are exceedingly dangerous to travel.

"She comes from the past and re-visits my room;
She looks as she did then, all beauty and bloom,
So smiling and tender, so fresh and so fair,
And yonder she sits in my cane-bottomed chair."

Many a man sits silent and alone in a home of mourning and conjures up before his eyes the face and form of the woman who was once a loving wife and a faithful helpmate. In thousands of such cases the wife might still be alive and well and happy, had the man been not only a good husband, but a wise adviser. Women shrink from the ordeal of consulting a physician. They shudder at the thought of submitting to the obnoxious examinations insisted upon by most physicians.

In the majority of cases they have none of this hesitancy about consulting their husbands. A wise man will understand at once that troubles of this description will soon break down a woman's general health. He will understand that a specialist of eminence and world wide reputation should be frankly consulted at once. Dr. R. V. Pierce, for thirty years chief consulting physician to the Invalids' Hotel and Surgical Institute, at Buffalo, N. Y., is one of the most eminent and widely-known specialists in the world. With the assistance of a staff of able physicians, he has prescribed for many thousands of ailing women. He has discovered a wonderful medicine for women, that may be used in the privacy of their homes. It is known as Dr. Pierce's Favorite Prescription. It cures surely, speedily and permanently all weakness and disease of the distinctly feminine organism. It allays inflammation, heals ulceration, soothes pain, gives rest to the tortured nerves, and checks debilitating drains.

NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given that the undersigned has applied to the Board of Licence Commissioners for the Cowichan District, for a licence under the provisions of the "Liquor Licence Act, 1899," and that the said application will be considered by the said board at the Court House, Duncans, at the hour of eleven o'clock of the forenoon of the 15th day of June, 1899.

G. B. Ordano, Columbia Hotel, Cowichan wharf, Hotel licence.

JAMES MAITLAND-DOUGALL,
Chief Licence Inspector.

Government Office, Duncans, B. C., 1899.