Provincial Legislature

(Continued From Page Six.)

Legislative Assembly, June 4, 1902.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 10.30 a. m.

Mr. Kidd asked the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works:

1. What route did the Columbia & Western Railway company select for their railway between Trail creek and Penticton, under section 37 of their charter?

2. How were the six sections of the said route apportioned, and what is the mileage of the sections built?

The Hon. Mr. Wells replied as follows:

"1. Via the Columbia river, Arrow lake, Dog creek, McRae creek and Christena lake.

"2 Section one, from Rossland to a point on the Columbia river opposite Robson, now known as Castlegar; distance 33.09 miles.

"Section two, from a point near the mouth of Trail creek, in an easterly or southeasterly direction, not more than 20 miles.

"Section three, from Castlegar to Christena lake; distance, 53 miles.

"Section four, from Christena lake to Midway; distance, 45 miles.

"Sections five and six remain the same as provided for in the schedule to the Act of Incorporation.

"The total mileage of the sections built is 131.09."

BILLS DISCHARGED.

On motion of the Hon. the Attorney-General the bill respecting certain railway agreements was discharged.

The bill to authorize a land subsidy to the Queen Charlotte Islands Railway company was discharged.

Mr. Hawthornthwaite congratulated the government on withdrawing the bills, he recognized in their action a first step towards government ownership. (Laughter.)

Messrs. McPhillips and Oliver objected to the bills being withdrawn.

Mr. Gilmour observed that their protest was only another instance of opposition inconsistency. They were loud in their opposition to land grants and now, when the government withdrew these subsidy bills, they objected. The opposition did not know what they wanted, their only object was to impede the business of the House and harass the government.

COAST-KOOTENAY.

Mr. Hunter resumed the debate on the Coast-Kootenay Railway Bill. He said:

Mr. Speaker, when I moved an adjournment of the debate last evening, Sir, I was just concluding my remarks on the attack which the honorable the leader of the opposition made upon myself, and what I think most honorable members on the other side of the House and every honorable member on this side of the House found to be an answer to the honorable the leader of the opposition. Now, Sir, as far as I am concerned, that matter is at an end between us, and I wish to say, if I have said anything that hurts the honorable the leader of the opposition's feelings too much I can only say that I did not intend to do anything of the kind. I simply intended to give him an answer, and I wish to inform him that that is what he will receive from me on every necessary occasion.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I was proceeding to discuss the bill now before the House—a bill providing for the construction of what is supposed by a great many people of this country, and a few honorable members in this House, to be a very necessary railway from Victoria to Midway. At one time, Mr. Speaker, I did not consider this railway was necessary, and I am not sure that I have changed my opinion today. I believe, Sir, notwithstanding the opinions of the honorable the second member of Vancouver City, that that railway is not an absolute necessity. In fact, I believe, Sir, that of all the railways which have been proposed—the construction of which has been proposed by the government of the day—that the railway from Victoria to Midway is the least necessary of them all, but, Sir, the opinions of people outside the House; the opinions of honorable members in this House are very different from mine—I am not a Bourbon—not one of those who never change their opinions—who never believe they are wrong, and I probably think, Mr. Speaker, it would be wise for me now, Sir, to offer no objections to the construction of that railway. The grounds upon which I believe that that railway was not altogether necessary were these. We have, Sir, already competitive railways, if I may use that term—going into the Kootenay country. We have the Great Northern railway, which practically has its terminus at Victoria City today through its connection with its real terminus in Seattle; we have the Northern Pacific railway, which likewise has its terminus in Victoria under the same conditions, and we have the Canadian Pacific railway, and I believe, Sir, if a railway, and I believe, Sir, if a railway were built from Victoria to Midway tomorrow we would not get a one cent cheaper rate than we have today, because the railways running into that country would do what they do today—they would keep up the railway rates to a living figure, so under these conditions I do not think this railway was necessary; but in obedience to public opinion and in obedience to the great many honorable gentlemen this in House—on this side of the House, and in obedience to the opinions of honorable gentlemen on the other side of the House, I propose to support the second reading of this bill.

Mr. Speaker, I had intended to make a few remarks, particularly on the remarks of the honorable member for Rossland, but I must say, Sir, that that honorable gentleman has acted in a most unsatisfactory manner on the floor of this House. Now, Sir, yesterday he came here, and he delivered a very incisive, eloquent, and I might state a very clever speech on the motion now before the House; but what is the use, Mr. Speaker, in replying to any statements made in this House by that honorable gentlemen, when he will not hear them. He is not in his place, but he will come in tomorrow or the next day with reference to the arguments produced, and he will in contradicting these arguments go on and still more delay the business of this House. Now, he was here for a moment—I saw him look in the door with a large volume in his hand. He swung himself out of the door like a spinning top, and now no one knows where he is.

Mr. Hawthornthwaite—The honorable gentlemen will be here in a few moments. How can you attack an honorable gentleman when he is absent. He will be here in a minute.

Mr. Hunter—The honorable gentleman will be able to take care of himself. Notwithstanding that, I want just to say a very few words upon the question of the cost of construction of railways in British Columbia. That honorable gentleman yesterday, I think, gave use some very extraordinary information about the construction of railways, and it is a very strange thing for that honorable gentleman to pick out certain railways which never really had a location survey. Now, the honorable member for Rossland stated that the estimated cost—(Interrupted.) Now, the honorable member from Rossland wants to hear me very much I know—that is right—and I am waiting until he gets through. The honorable member for Rossland gave the cost of certain railways yesterday on the floor of this House—and he told us, Sir, that the cost of a railway from Port Simpson to Pine River Pass would cost something like from $25,000 to $30,000 a mile—I think I am right in that—and he likewise told us Sir—(Interrupted by Mr. Curtis.) He likewise told us, Mr. Speaker, that the cost of the railway on Vancouver Island—somewhere from Menzies Bay to the north end of the Island would cost $14,000 per mile. Now, Sir, he said that he was perfectly willing to take the estimate of the engineers—who he said surveyed these lines. Now, I wish to tell the honorable gentlemen that these lines were never surveyed at all, and all that was done was a preliminary survey, and although I am quite willing to take the estimate of these railway engineers as to the cost of these railways, still I want to show the honorable gentleman what the average cost of construction is on railways which have been surveyed and located in detail, and which have had the quantities properly and carefully estimated. Now, Sir, we will take the railway from Bute Inlet to Yellow Head Pass.

Mr. Curtis—Do you dispute the accuracy of Mr. Gray's figures, which I quoted last evening from Campbell river to Fort Rupert? and also of Mr. O'Guire?

Mr. Hunter—Didn't the honorable gentleman hear me say a few moments ago that I am quite willing to accept the figures of Mr. Gray and Mr. O'Guire; yet I say that no survey was made of these roads, and possibly if the survey was made, and the quantities taken out, the result will be somewhat different, but still I am quite willing to take the figures of those engineers, but I do not hold up those two railways as a sample of what the cost of railways are supposed to be in the province of British Columbia. I will take the railway from Bute Inlet to Yellow Head Pass. I will take the estimates of Mr. Marcus Smith, and Mr. H. J. Cambie, of this line, which have been made from actual surveys, and in which all the quantities were taken out in detail, and what was the estimated cost of that railway. The estimated cost of that railway was $62,250 per mile. Now, I hope the honorable gentleman, since he has taken the engineer's figures of the other two railways—will likewise be willing to take the figures of the eminent engineers I have mentioned in the other case.

Mr. Smith Curtis—I would point out to the honorable gentleman at the time that that report was made, the cost of rails was at the rate of $40 per ton, and I state that I would not accept their figures against Mr. O'Guire in the cost of the railway from Pine river to Fort Simpson.

Mr. Hunter—If the honorable gentleman intends to continue while I am speaking, of course I cannot continue. (Mr. Curtis leaves.) Mr. Speaker, I have deducted 20 per cent. from the estimated cost of the estimates I have just given, and that leaves the cost of the Bute Inlet railway $49,800—that is practically $50,000, as was stated by some of the honorable ministers. I think it was the Hon. the Attorney-General. Now, take the section of the C. P. R. from Emory's Bar to Savona—what is what is practically known as the line from Yale to Kamloops, and I have here the contract, which was actually made for the construction of that road, a road which was built under the Dominion government, and I am sorry, Sir, that the honorable the member for Rossland is not now in his place to hear these things, because this is a railway, Sir, which would certainly come under his policy—the government construction of railways. That railway was constructed by the government. The government made the surveys. The government let the contract. The government superintended the construction of that railway in every detail, and what do we find, Mr. Speaker. We find that the cost of that railway from Emory's Bar to Savona—the average cost of that railway per mile was over $70,000, and, Sir, even on the easy part of the section from Junction Flat to Savanah, a piece of country that is by no means over the average—if anything it is under the average, the amount of the contract was over $45,000 per mile. Now, Mr. Speaker, those are actual facts. Those are facts that cannot be gainsaid. If I could only get the final estimate of these different sections, it would show that the cost per mile was greater than what I have stated, because there were a good many extras, as there are always are in large works of this kind, and which cannot possibly be taken into account in the first estimate.

Mr. Oliver—Would the honorable gentleman tell us when the contract was let?

Mr. Hunter—In 1880. I might tell the honorable gentleman that he need not build his hopes on the construction of railways below this figure in the present day, on account of the fact that rails cannot be laid down in interior points in any part of Canada much under $50 per ton. He must know that the rails used at the present day are much heavier; as the rolling stock is much heavier than in those days. You have to have heavier rails, heavier roadbed, heavier fish plates, heavier rolling stock, and everything proportionately heavier, so that the honorable gentleman need not build his hopes on constructing roads cheaper now than in those days to which I have referred, and another thing is that the labor was far cheaper then than now. I have occasion to know it, Mr. Speaker, and honorable gentlemen must recollect that they could do in that day what they cannot do now. They could work Chinamen on construction, on any kind of work, and that would be impossible at the present day, because the Hon. the Attorney-General intends bringing in a bill to prevent the employment of Asiatics on public works. Of course, the honorable member from Vancouver says that such jurisdiction does not exist in this bill. I may say that I am sure it does not, because the bill would be disallowed and the Hon. the Attorney-General has told those gentlemen over and over again that he wants to prevent a disallowance of those bills, and bring in a bill which covers all requirements of honorable gentlemen on both sides of the House yet notwithstanding that, honorable gentlemen opposite will talk for hours because there is no clause put in in regard to Alien Labor in those bills.

Mr. McPhillips—Do they let them take old rails?

Mr. Hunter—I don't know whether they will or not. Possibly, if they were unwise they might, but they are business men, I presume, who know their work. Men who undertake these large contracts would be very unlikely to lay down old rails, and I may say, Mr. Spenker, when the honorable gentlemen talks of old rails he does not know what he is talking about. I may say, when I was in the City of Pittsburg not long ago, I was in want of some rails, and I could not get them from the Carnegie people, because they were busy, and I saw a large number of old rails lying there at the time, and I went to see what I could get them for, and the difference between the old rails and the new rails was so small that it would have been a very unbusinesslike proposition if I had taken them in preference to new rails.

Mr. McPhillips—The Auditor-General of Canada in the construction of the C. P. R. allowed them to lay down old rails.

Mr. Hunter—Those things are sometimes necessary, and if you make an order for rails you cannot expect to get them tomorrow, and I hope when the honorable gentleman gets a big contract with some of these railways, the building of which he is now trying to prevent—he will find out a great many things that he knows nothing about now. As the honorable gentleman, the member for Rossland has again gone away, I don't think I will mention the points of objection he takes to this bill, because I never like to speak of the honorable gentleman in his absence, and I think with these few remarks I will now close, and give place to somebody else on the floor of this House.

Mr. Martin—Mr. Speaker, I don't intend to make any lengthy remarks upon this bill, because——

Mr. McPhillips (interrupting)—Because it is so excellent, I suppose.

Mr. Martin—Because any remarks I made in committee on the other bill really applies to the whole of the railway policy of the government this session.

Mr. Oliver—Which one?

Mr. Martin—I think it was the other one (laughter)—the Canadian Northern.

Mr. McPhillips—We have had so many, you know.

Mr. Martin—The railway under consideration. A good deal has been said with regard to the position of members in this House in connection with this railway policy, and also in connection with other matters, and it has been pointed out that there has been more or less change in the attitude of different members of this House, especially in the last two sessions. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that the hon. the leader of the opposition last night, in his remarks, went very far astray indeed in undertaking to attribute improper motives in his attack on the hon. member for Cariboo, and other hon. members in this House, in connection with their position upon questions of policy here; especially in view of the fact, Mr. Speaker, that no one in the House is probably in a more awkward position with regard to the change of his policy and his position in this House than the hon. leader of the opposition. It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that it is right and proper to people outside of this House, and outside of political considerations, to have them understand the circumstances which induced members of this House to change their position. The hon. member for Cariboo would have just as much right to hunt about for the reason which induced the hon. the leader of the opposition to change his position as the hon. the leader of the opposition has with regard to them. It is, Mr. Speaker, always understood to be an evidence of the very worst kind against good taste, and evidence of the worst kind against order in the House, for one member to undertake to say that the course of another member in the House is dictated by anything except his best judgment. The hon. the leader of the opposition has not only made that suggestion, but he has come out plump and plain and stated what the other considerations were. It so happens with regard to the hon. member for Cariboo that he holds a position in connection with the railway company, of which the Hon. the Premier is president, which gives the hon. the leader of the opposition an opportunity of suggesting that that is the reason that the hon. member for Cariboo is supporting the Premier. Mr. Speaker, I say that is a very offensive thing to do, and something, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, which would not be done in any other legislature in Canada. I am sure that the leader of the Conservative party in the House at Toronto would think a long time indeed before he ventured to cast such—what might be called—villainous aspersions upon any member in the Toronto House supporting the Liberal government there, and I feel very certain, indeed, that the very courteous leader of the present opposition in the House at Ottawa would rather cut his right hand off than cast any such aspersions upon any member of the House supporting the present Liberal government there, even, Mr. Speaker, if he believed it to be true—yes, I say, Mr. Speaker, even if he believed it to be true. He, as the courteous representative of a party which he claims to be a party of gentlemen, would not make an aspersion of that nature against any member of the Liberal party, even when he undertakes to go that far, but without referring any further than that, I take happiness in stating the fact that whatever his fault may be, if he has any—whatever his position as the leader of the great party may be—I am not able to discuss, he, as the opposition leader of the Conservative party at Ottawa, feels that the interests of his party are best advanced by treating his opponents in the most courteous and most gentlemanly manner, and I feel, sir, that the hon. the leader of the opposition, in this House has not advanced his case in the House, or in the country by the very unfair and unreasonable, and at the same time, I may say, discourteous and ungentlemanly attack that he made on the hon. member for Cariboo last night, and I say that, Mr. Speaker, more especially because I ask the hon. the leader of the opposition if a change of opinion in this House is sufficient to warrant an attack of that kind? Now, I would like to know, Mr. Speaker, if the hon. member for Cariboo is supporting the present government for reasons of that kind, why was it that the hon. the leader of the opposition accepted that hon. gentleman's support when he was a member of that self-same government? Why was it that Mr. Hunter, the hon. member for Cariboo, who was not elected any more than the hon. the leader of the opposition, to support a government of which the Hon. the Premier was at the head?——

Mr. McPhillips (interrupting)—I rise to a point of order—not that I wish to interrupt the hon. gentleman, and I hope he does not think so—but I wish it to be understood that by our not taking this point of order that we shall not be able to deal with the subject that the hon. the senior member for Vancouver is discussing. I know a well known point of order was taken, and the point of order was addressed against hon. members in the debate, and I wish it to be distinctly understood that I take this point of order, and I claim the hon. gentleman is out of order.

Mr. Speaker—I claim the hon. gentleman is out of order; two or three of them are out of order, and they are transgressing the rules of order.

Mr. McPhillips—And I will have the same right?

Mr. Speaker—Yes, now that it has been started.

Mr. Martin—I had intended to make some remarks following the hon. the leader of the opposition, but I hesitate with going on with them. Yes, I hesitate, Mr. Speaker, very much with going on with them. I hesitate very much, and I am impressed with great fear of the hon. the third member for Victoria following me in my remarks and showing me up. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate very much in continuing with this subject; yet I shall, in spite of that remark of the hon. member, go on with the remarks I had in mind.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the hon. the leader of the opposition said that during the campaign this gentleman, this member for Cariboo, was very much opposed to me, and ran as a candidate opposed to me, and that therefore he could not possibly continue to support the present government unless without some very strong motive such as he has alluded to—outside of political considerations altogether. It seems to me that a complete answer has been given to that, because if that were so, then why did he, when I undertook to support the government last session in his Loan bill, why did he continue to remain a member of that government and support it. Surely he was just as much opposed in his canvass and election to the political principles that I represented and against myself personally as a politician as any candidate in this province at that election of 1900, and yet, Mr. Speaker, not only was the hon. gentleman willing to sit in the government, which could not have remained a government were it not for the support of certain members in this House, of which I was one, and which the hon. gentleman knew full well, and we have it from the Hon. the Premier that he was in a terrible state of mind when this Loan bill was in progress—he was very much disturbed as to whether or not the suggestions of support coming from this element from this side of the House would be carried out, and he was hardly in a fit state to conduct himself in a proper manner until he saw my hand going up, and that of other members in this House, which he knew full well were required to sustain the government which was in power at that time. How does the hon. gentleman discriminate between the position of himself and the position of the hon. member for Cariboo? I noticed a suggestion made by the third member for Victoria, that no such thing was in existence; there was no conspiracy against the government last session.

Mr. McPhillips—No; there was not.

Mr. Martin—There was no trouble in the caucus, nothing going on at all, and the division sheet shows this to be true, so the hon. member—the third member for Victoria—says. This division sheet shows that the government was very strong, and their only reason for not carrying out their wishes in their intention to vote against the government was that they found themselves in the position that their ideas were not accepted, and that even if they did vote against the government, they would not be able to defeat the government. Now the hon. the leader of the opposition was willing to accept our vote and our support. He remained in power through that vote—but while he was willing to accept our votes and our support, the moment the government and the Premier were willing to recognize as a member of the government, one of our party, then the gentleman was willing to oppose the government. And, Mr. Speaker, I was touched last night by the manner, the very modest manner, in which the hon. the leader of the opposition pointed out how different his conduct was from that of the hon. member for Cariboo. The hon. member for Cariboo sits in this House and supports this government—he states—because he is receiving outside of the House a money consideration from the leader of the government. The hon. the leader of the opposition told us all that; but he, the leader of the opposition was so beyond any idea or consideration of that kind that when it came to the question of his having to abandon his principles, or abandoning his office, he abandoned his office, and that declaration met with much applause from the hon. gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, and by his friends outside.

Mr. McPhillips—So it should.

Mr. Martin—So it should; I quite appreciate this fact; it is something that we do not see very often, a member of the government resigning his position and going into the cold shades of opposition, because he does not wish to abandon his principles. That has been done in the British parliament from time to time. We have had some very notable instances in the history of Canada. The most notable instance that I can think of is that of Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, when the government of which he was a member adopted a policy on the Manitoba school question—opposed to his principles—that hon. gentleman deliberately gave up his office, and showed he was bona fide in doing so by continuing to most actively oppose the government in every way—the government of which he had been a member—and kept up his position as an opponent of that party until that party struck off from its platform the idea of coercing Manitoba. Now that is an action which we all honor. The hon. the leader of the opposition has attempted to put himself in that class, and has received much applause from the members of the opposition, and from the hon. the third member for Victoria, and why not? Why not? I will tell you the reason. The reason is that he did no such thing., and no prove this to you, I shall use in evidence statements he made inside this House, and outside this House. If the hon. gentleman can think that he went and state positively to the House the government intending to give up his salary, intending to abandon his position, and intending to go into the cold shades of opposition, then he is entitled to very modest assumption he made last night. But what, Mr. Speaker, are the facts, and we have the facts from statements he has made from time to time? When he took that step—when Mr. Brown was taken into the government in the first week in September—he ran for re-election in New Westminster—three days after——

Mr. McPhillips—On the 3rd.

Mr. Martin—Then within two or three days after we had a statement from the leader of the opposition made on the platform in New Westminster—I think in the presence of the hon. the third member for Victoria—a statement made of the facts in connection with the stand he had taken. Did he tell the people that he had resigned his office in the government rather than give away his principles, and that he intended to go into the opposition? No, he told the people that he had left the government, knowing full well that it had ceased to be a government, and he told them that there were 22 men behind him who were prepared to put him back again in the government as soon as the House met. That is the meritorious action of the hon. the leader of the opposition. That is the action which he dares to compare with the actions such as Mr. Clarke Wallace. Mr. Wallace knew that the government he was opposing had a majority of 60 or 70 in the House at the time when he resigned his position. He knew there was no possibility of getting back into his position, except at the will of the people of the country, when the general election might come round, and at that time there was sometime yet to elapse, but the hon. the leader of the opposition took no such chances. No such chances. He has not attempted to make the statement that his statement was a mere political dodge, that it was only a statement to the people of Westminster for the purpose of getting the people there to elect the hon. the present member for New Westminster in place of Mr. Brown. At that time, he says, "I did have the assurance of 22 members in this House," and he says, "Unfortunately some of those members have not kept their word," and the hon. gentleman feels it bitterly that he should have been so misled, and instead, Mr. Speaker, of giving up his fat office and his salary, he was only to remain out of power a few short months until the House would have to be called in the ordinary course of events, and then these twenty-two men had given him their solemn assurance that not only he would be returned to the government, but he would return as its leader, instead of in the humble capacity of minister of mines. Now, Mr. Speaker, what is to be thought of his position at that time? What is to be thought of an hon. member in this House, who, on his own statements, has deliberately confessed to having been disloyal to his chief; to have been disloyal to his party; to have been disloyal to the principles he represents, because he had no fault to find with the government or its policy. There was no Manitoba school question there. There was no question which came up between him and his leaders, or his colleagues, which had brought about a division; no question of principle in his mind—nothing whatever. He was quite satisfied with everything in connection with the government—except that he found in the selection of Mr. Brown something the thought of which was so repugnant to the majority of the then supporters of the government that they would be willing to substitute him for the present leader of the government, as the premier of the province, if he only had the boldness to resign. Think of the boldness that he displayed, the magnificent courage of being able to step aside for a few weeks, or a few months, with the certainty, the absolute certainty, because the figures cannot be disputed, of 22 out of 38. That is what you might call, Mr. Speaker, a cinch. The hon. gentleman took no chances; he told us that he was not telling us a fib; that he said he had 22—he could get up and name 22 names of men in this House who had given him the most solemn assurance that they would stand by him.

Mr. Kidd—Did he have this assurance before he resigned?

Mr. Martin—The election took place early in September, and Mr. Brown went out on the 3rd, and the meeting was held a very few days afterwards. The hon. gentleman resigned on the 4th, and the meeting was held on the next day or two, and I was there, and the assurances were given before that. I don't know how he could get this assurance so quick; he had the assurance of 22 members of this House, and one of the strong reasons for asking the people of New Westminster to turn down Mr. Brown and return Mr. Gifford was that just as soon as the House could be brought together—it could not be kept away very long—that the hon. member for Dewdney would become the premier of this province. That is what was placed before the people at New Westminster by the hon. member for Dewdney himself, and the very best evidence of it was that a number of these gentlemen were right there to back up what he said. The hon. the third member for Victoria was there; the hon. the second member for Vancouver was there, and telegrams were read from members all over this country. He said, "What will you do about it? Why," he said, "Westminster would be crazy under these circumstances—talk about the bridge not going up, we will go on with the bridge. The Hon. the Premier has nothing to do with it. He has lost the confidence of the House, and a new government will be formed in a very few weeks, and we will carry out the same policy as the previous government." Now, Mr. Speaker, what are we to think of the position at that time? I don't know that there is a party in the country who would accept the leadership of the hon. gentleman. There is certainly a party in this House who have accepted his leadership, but whether they are going to follow him, I don't know; but we have to come to consider all this noble gentleman has done, his courageous judgment, his refusal to allow his principles to be tampered with for a moment, and is willing to give up his fat office and his high position rather than to do that for a minute—and that he should get up as the head of that party in this House—the opposition party—and deliberately throw the vilest insults against an hon. member of this House, who is making no undue pretence to virtue, no undue pretence to great courage—for him to stand up and make an attack against an hon. gentlemen of this House, on his conduct, Mr. Speaker, I venture to say since he has become a member of this House, and while he has been a member of this House, and on other occasions, has never been before attacked in such an insulting way, and intended to cast a reflection upon him in this insulting way and make these dire aspersions against his personal character, it is something which has never been heard of in parliamentary practice. This hon. gentleman making those vile aspersions, unprecedented in the legislature, and trying to place himself in the same position of men like Mr. Clarke Wallace. Why, Mr. Speaker, all the facts go to show that he never intended to give up his position, or that he never intended for a moment to sacrifice anything, but he thought the circumstances were in such a position by taking this step, and by stepping out of office for a few days, he would have $1,000 a year added to his salary and secure the position of premier. What is that with the interest—say we put it at 4 per cent—$25,000—this noble patriot was going to make; $25,000 he was going to add to his assets in taking this noble and courageous move. He has the hardihood to come here and tell us he sacrificed his interests. He has so lightly respected the intelligence of members in this House, and has so slight a respect for the intelligence of the people of British Columbia to think he could get away with a bluff like that. The hon. gentleman thought he could place himself in the category of men like Mr. Clarke Wallace, and that he was entitled in view of his own distinguished loyalty and great patriotism to do what has never been done, and I hope will never be done by any leader of the opposition in any part of Canada—to make such an unfounded attack on the hon. senior member for Cariboo.

Mr. McPhillips followed, making a gallant defence of his leader, and endeavoring to turn the tables on Messrs. Hunter and Martin. He claimed that there was no ground for the charge of treachery made against Mr. McBride, and declared that the stand taken by the opposition would command the respect and admiration of future generations of politicians. He dragged in the charges made by Mr. Martin against Mr. Carter-Cotton at a previous session, and was quoting from the journals of the House and reports from the Colonist to show that Mr. Martin, as the leader of a political party, had used the same methods against a political opponent which he now blamed Mr. McBride for adopting. He declared Mr. McBride was actuated only by the most patriotic and worthy motives in resigning his seat in the cabinet, and paid a glowing tribute to his leader's ability and tact.

Mr. McPhillips said he could not support the bill before the House. He noticed the McLean brothers continually in the corridors, and it seemed to him that it was the intention of the government to give them the Coast-Kootenay contract. They had been employed in all kinds of public works, and now they were to get the railway contract. Why, he did not know, for the McLean brothers, as far as he could learn (and he did not say it in a derogatory sense) were not men of substance, or such as could be entrusted with such an important work. A year ago, he declared, the Great Northern Railway company, through the V. V. & E., had offered to build the road on the most favorable terms, but the government had declined to treat with "the greatest railway corporation on the continent," and now contemplated dealing with irresponsible parties. After making a violent attack on Mr. Hall, he moved the adjournment of the debate, and the House adjourned at 1 o'clock until 2:30.

AFTERNOON SITTING.

Mr. Curtis moved for copies of the reports of Messrs. McGregor and Dick, on the Fernie coal mines, which was adopted.

Hon. Col. Prior said Mr. Curtis had applied at the department for copies of these reports and he had been informed that they would be brought down in the House, if moved for in the proper way. There was no objection whatever to producing these reports, and also with all available information bearing upon them. The papers would be produced as soon as possible.

Mr. McBride supported the resolution.

COAST-KOOTENAY.

Mr. McPhillips resumed the debate on the second reading of the bill to aid the Vancouver & Midway Railway. He repeated the statement that the Great Northern Railway company were prepared to build the Coast-Kootenay railway.

Mr. Hunter challenged him to prove his assertion.

Mr. McPhillips said he felt sure that the Great Northern would have built the road because Mr. Bodwell told him so. He again eulogized the Great Northern as the greatest railway system in America, and read letters from Messrs. Bodwell & Duff in an attempt to prove that J. J. Hill and the Great Northern were the real owners and backers of the V. V. & E.

Mr. McPhillips spoke for three hours, and concluded by declaring that the government could secure a better bargain with the Great Northern than under the present bill.

Mr. Kidd opposed the bill and the general railway policy of the government, on the ground that the province was not in a financial position to undertake such vast liabilities as the building of these railways would entail. He also opposed the bill because of his lack of faith in the administration. He would favor government ownership of railways if the Dominion would assume the ownership, but he did not believe in the province going into railway building. He quoted figures to show that the provincial indebtedness was about $12,000,000, and there was no hope of the revenue so increasing in the near future as to justify the assumption of any further liability. If it were shown to his satisfaction that the Coast-Kootenay road could be built as a successful commercial undertaking, he might be inclined to support the bill. He thought the government were inflicted with political insanity, or they must think the public very simple-minded. He suspected the government of intending to delay construction of this railway until the eve of the next general election, and then make a pretence of building it in order to influence the electors. He would vote against all the railway bills, although he felt that one of them—from Midway to Vernon—would be of great benefit to the country. It was the only road which, in his opinion, deserved encouragement, and he hoped the government would do all in their power to secure its construction. He did not believe any of these roads would be built until after the next election.

The House divided on Mr. Curtis' amendment to the motion for the second reading:

"Whereas there are at least two companies ready to enter into a contract for the construction of the proposed railway from Vancouver to Midway: Therefore, in the opinion of this House, it is the duty of the government to enter into a contract at once for the construction of the said proposed road as a competitive line and upon the best terms that can be secured, and to submit the said contract to this House for ratification at this session of the legislature; and further,

"This House affirms the principle that when a contract for aid is proposed to be made, it should not become effective until submitted to and approved of by the legislature. This House also affirms the urgent necessity for the beginning of the construction of the Coast to Kootenay railway during the present year."

The amendment was defeated on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. McInnes, Gilmour, Stables, Martin, Hayward, Helmcken, Prentice, Dunsmuir, Eberts, A. W. Smith, Ellison, Clifford, Wells, Prior, Hall, Rogers, Hunter, Dickie, Mounce—19.

Nays: Messrs. E. C. Smith, Oliver, Hawthornthwaite, Giscard, Garden, Fulton, Curtis, Munro, Tatlow, Green, McBride, Murphy, McPhillips, Taylor, Kidd, Neill—16.

The second reading was then carried on the following division:

Yeas: Messrs. GARDEN, McINNES, GILMOUR, STABLES, HAWYARD, HELMCKEN, MARTIN, OLIVER, PRENTICE, DUNSMUIR, EBERTS, A. W. SMITH, ELLISON, MURPHY, CLIFFORD, WELLS, PRIOR, HALL, GIFFORD, MUNRO, ROGERS, HUNTER, DICKIE, MOUNCE—24.

Nays: Messrs. E. C. Smith, Hawthornthwaite, Neill, Fulton, Curtis, Tatlow, Green, McBride, McPhillips, Taylor, Kidd—11.

MIDWAY & VERNON.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved the second reading of the bill to aid the Midway & Vernon railway. He spoke of the wonderful progress made by the country traversed by the Shuswap & Okanagan railway, which had been built under a government of which he had had the honor of being a member. Before the railway was built that magnificent country was practically shut off from the markets, and was consequently depreciated, while now it was marked by flourishing towns and a large population of prosperous farmers, miners and others. The opposition had taunted the government with losing money by the Shuswap & Okanagan, but he claimed that the annual amount paid in interest was money well invested, and would eventually be repaid to the province with interest in the increased revenue from that district. The railway proposed by this bill would open another splendid tract of country, contiguous and tributary to the Okanagan district, rich in agricultural and mineral lands, the progress of which was retarded by the lack of railway accommodation.

He read a memorial from the people of the district setting forth the great benefits which the proposed railway would confer upon the country, and concluded by recommending the bill to the favorable consideration of the House.

Mr. McBride strongly opposed the bill, declaring that the government had no intention of securing the building of the railway, as they knew quite well it could not be built on the proposed subsidy. He believed the government had information from Mr. Wood of the exact conditions under which the railway could be built, and the bill did not meet those conditions. He claimed it was the duty of the government to make known to the House all the negotiations which had taken place between them and the promoters of the railway.

At 6 o'clock he moved the adjournment of the debate.

NIGHT SESSION.

Mr. Kidd asked the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works the following questions:

1. What is the estimated cost of the reconstruction of the North Arm bridges at Eburne. What is the estimated cost of the steel draw-spans and the masonry piers for the same in the said bridges?

The Hon. Mr. Wells replied as follows:

"1. $65,000, approximate cost.

"2. $27,500, approximate cost."

Mr. Oliver asked for information regarding the land grant of the Columbia & Western railway.

Hon. Mr. Wells said he was not prepared to give the desired information at the moment.

Mr. McPhillips called the Daily Times to task for reporting him as follows:

"Coming to the bill, it seemed, he said, that Maclean Brothers seemed to have some peculiar "cinch" with the government. They got the dykes, the bridges and now the railways. He would like to see some one else get a chance. Being nearly always here, Maclean Brothers seemed to have acquired an undue influence over, if not ministers, at least over deputies and departmental officers."

He had not intended to convey the impression that the officials of the departments were unduly influenced by McLean Brothers. He had said that the officials seeing McLean Brothers about the departments all times and knowing that they were favored with many contracts, might begin to regard them as privileged parties.

MIDWAY AND VERNON.

Mr. McBride, resumed the debate on the second reading of the Midway & Vernon Railway Bill. He contended that not one mile of road would be built under the present bill, and he blamed the government for not having the provisions of the Loan Act of 1901 carried out in regard to this railway. He complained that the bill did not compel the company to begin and carry on construction in a businesslike manner.

He concluded by moving an amendment to the effect that it was not advisable to enter into a contract without the ratification of the House, and that the bill should provide for immediate construction."

Mr. Curtis seconded the amendment. He recognized the necessity and desirability of the proposed railway, but charged that the Midway and Vernon was a paper company, who were not able to build the road, and could not even make the deposit of $5,000 as security. He continued an attack upon Mr. McInnes until called to order, Mr. Speaker reminding him that he was wandering away from the question, and repeating remarks which he had made several times during the session, and that there must be a cessation of the acrimonious personal debates which had already occupied too much of the time of the House.

Mr. Curtis concluded by declaring his desire to see the railway built, but he would not support the bill in its present form.

Mr. McPhillips continued the debate in support of the amendment, speaking till 11 o'clock, when he moved the adjournment of the debate.

The government would not consent to this, and as no other member rose to speak, the division bell was rung.

Mr. McPhillips declared the division was a deliberate attempt to gag him.

Mr. Speaker said, as far as he (Mr. McPhillips) was concerned, the debate was closed.

Mr. McBride's amendment was defeated by a vote of 14 to 9. Several members were absent.

The second reading was carried on the same division.

The Premier moved the adjournment of the House till 10:30 this morning, but Mr. Curtis objected, and, according to the rule, this was fatal to the motion. The House then adjourned until 2 o'clock this afternoon.

The Hon. Mr. Wells presented the following papers:

Copy contract for railroad from Coast to Penticton.

Copy contract for railroad from Penticton to Boundary Creek.

Copy contract for railroad from Boundary Creek to Robson.

VOTERS' LEAGUE.

Discussion of Carnegie's Library and Other Topics.

About a score of people gathered at the City hall last evening to take part in the first working meeting of the Voters' league. Ex-Mayor Chas. E. Redfern presided, and after a little delay occasioned by the tardiness of some of the members in arriving, the evening's discussion was opened, the subject being the Carnegie library by-laws. These and the general question of the acceptance of Mr. Carnegie's offer were discussed informally at considerable length, as was also the question of the site. Many questions were raised regarding the conditions of the gift, and in order to obtain the fullest information the debate was adjourned to the next meeting of the league. The following subjects were suggested for discussion later one: (1) Salt water for street sprinkling, (2) bonusing of iron and other industries, and (3) the imposition of an export duty on iron ore.

SUMMER ENERGY AND ACTIVITY.

If You Are Nervous, Despondent, Sleepless, Irritable or Out-of-Sorts in June.

Paine's Celery Compound

Will Give You Nerve Force, Fresh Energy, Vigor and New Health.

June should be the banner month of the year for the enjoyment of nature and life. If men and women are not physically capable of enjoying the good things of nature and home so bountifully provided by an All-Wise Creator, the fault is their own in the majority of cases.

Our nervousness, insomnia, despondency and irritableness are continual and forcible reminders of ill health and disease. Their continuance in June means unhappiness and misery; their banishment by the use of Paine's Celery Compound means energy, activity, vigor and full ability to enjoy Heaven's best gifts. Thousands are now acquiring rugged health and buoyant spirits through the use of Paine's Celery Compound. The blessings of health, home and nature will be your portion if you wisely use the great medicine this month. It truly makes people well.

The Small of the Back

That is where some people feel weak all the time.

They are likely to be despondent and it is not natural to find them borrowing trouble as if they hadn't enough already.

The fact is their kidneys are weak, either naturally or because of sickness, exposure, worry or other influences.

"I was taken ill with a kidney trouble, writes Mrs. Thomas Louis, of Ottawa, Ont., "and because so weak I could scarcely get around. I had headache and pains in my stomach, and my food did not digest. I took medicine without benefit, and finally decided to try Hood's Sarsaparilla. After the first bottle I felt so much better I continued its use and six bottles made me a new woman."

Hood's Sarsaparilla

Promises to cure and keeps the promise. Begin treatment with Hood's today.

ABSOLUTE SECURITY.

Genuine

Carter's Little Liver Pills.

Must Bear Signature of

Brent Good

See Fac-Simile Wrapper Below.

Very small and as easy to take as sugar.

CARTER'S LITTLE LIVER PILLS. FOR HEADACHE. FOR DIZZINESS. FOR BILIOUSNESS. FOR TORPID LIVER. FOR CONSTIPATION. FOR SALLOW SKIN. FOR THE COMPLEXION. GENUINE MUST HAVE SIGNATURE. Price 25 Cents. Purely Vegetable. Brent Good

CURES SICK HEADACHE

The H. B. A. Vogel Commercial College

We teach thorough office methods entirely and use no text books or "system" for bookkeeping. We teach and place our students into positions in six months. Shorthand and typewriting. Send for illustrated prospectus.

P. O. Box 847. Vancouver, B. C.