From The Daily Colonist, April 18.

LOCAL AND PROVINCIAL.

A Freak of Nature.

There is on view at Campbell's corner a curiosity in the shape of a young hog with two bodies, eight legs, two tails and a double neck. The curiosity came from a farm at North Saanich, and it looks very much as though the enterprising farmers in that district are trying to "double up" in the pork business.

Canners in Convention.

A meeting of the Salmon Canners' association was held here yesterday afternoon, when the recently issued regulations were thoroughly discussed. It was decided to make an effort to have the suggestions made by the canners in January last carried into effect, or else to have the operation of the new regulations deferred for one year.

James Bay Athletic Association.

A large and enthusiastic meeting of the shareholders of the James Bay Athletic club was held in the Board of Trade rooms last evening. It was decided to call for tenders for the building immediately, and another meeting will be held on Tuesday evening, when important business will be brought up. Every shareholder is requested to attend.

Hughes-Crookall.

Mr. E. D. Hughes, formerly of Toronto and now of Seattle, was united in marriage at the Pro-cathedral yesterday morning to Miss Crookall, who arrived from Berlin, Ont., on Wednesday to meet her affianced. After the marriage ceremony the happy couple were driven to the Driard house, where a sumptuous wedding breakfast was served. They leave this morning for their new home in Seattle.

Presentation.

At a recent meeting of the Victoria West church, Mr. E. Langley, who has been of great service in all recent entertainments, was made the recipient of a handsome silver bowl bearing the following inscription:

Presented to
E. LANGLEY,
by the
LADIES OF VICTORIA WEST,
Easter 1890.

Unwelcome News.

Mr. J. C. Henderson, of Chilliwhack, who came over last evening, states that owing to the extreme cold of last winter not a single acre has been sown in the district as yet, and the prospects are that a scarcity of grain will be felt in that part of the district this year. The prevailing high water is another source of alarm to the residents of the important district which Mr. Henderson makes his home.

To Pack Spring Salmon.

Westminster Truth says Mr. Alex. Ewen's cannery was to begin packing salmon yesterday. This will be the first of the spring run packed on the Fraser. In the past seasons the run of spring salmon was considered too small to justify the canners in going to the outlay of packing them, but the old fishermen say that the present spring run is the greatest they have known in the Fraser.

The Columbia and Kootenay.

A Winnipeg despatch of yesterday says: "General Superintendent Abbott of the C. P. R., Pacific division, passed through this city yesterday in his private car, on his way to Montreal. While here he gave orders to have over five hundred men sent to Revelstoke at the end of this month to work on the railway to be built between the Columbia river and Kootenay. One hundred men have already been sent out. Work on the road will commence in about a week.

The Burned Schooner.

The vessel, destroyed by fire in the Straits, on Tuesday evening, proves to have been the schooner Granger, owned by Church & Lipsett of Dungeness. She was on a trip from San Juan Island to Seattle with 300 barrels of lime. The crew pulled ashore in a small boat, landing near Point Wilson. The Granger was built in Utsalady in 1874, and was for many years owned by Mr. C. F. Clapp, who used the vessel in connection with his merchandise business there. It is understood there is no insurance. Loss of vessel and cargo will be about $8,000.

Suspended Animation.

A strange case comes from Port Angeles of suspended animation. Tuesday an order was received by a Port Townsend undertaking firm for a casket for Mrs. Goodwin, the divorced wife of E. W. Goodwin, one of the old settlers of that city. The lady, it was stated, died very suddenly. The casket was shipped on the George E. Starr Tuesday afternoon. Wednesday the casket was returned to Port Townsend with the statement that Mrs. Goodwin had been brought back to life. She, it is thought, went into a trance, and those about her supposing her to be dead, sent for the coffin.

A Seattle Firebug.

Great excitement prevails in West Seattle over the arrest of M. L. Pencil. Pencil is charged with setting fire to his own grocery in West Seattle, which was completely destroyed by the fire early Monday morning, and of also causing the destruction of Stewart's saloon, which was situated next door, and which was totally destroyed. The causes alleged for Pencil's incendiarism were not only to obtain the insurance on his stock of groceries, which amounted to $2,400, but also to cover the theft of several valuable registered mail packages, which it was thought at first were destroyed by fire, but which are now believed to have been stolen beforehand.

Carrying Off the Beaver.

The old Hudson's Bay steamer Beaver which, after sailing these waters over half a century, was wrecked in the Narrows some two years ago and abandoned on the shore, is fast disappearing. There are two agents at the work of annihilation—the water and relic-hunters—the latter of which have struck Vancouver in force, and think that they can get all they want here in their line of business in about two days. Yesterday a number of them went out in a boat, taking with them saws, files, etc., and robbed the vessel of some portions of her anatomy, including the board on which her name is gilded. It is understood a local poet has been keeping vigils over the collection and intends writing an epic, in which the Beaver's career will be graphically and soulfully told.—News-Advertiser.

Receive Him With All Honor.

Mr. J. A. Fullerton, manager of the C.P.R. steamers, who arrived over last evening from Vancouver, says that the ss. Parthia, with H. R. H. the Duke of Connaught and party on board, may be expected from Yokohama on the 22nd of May. The captain has received his instructions to anchor in Royal Roads, and there transfer his distinguished visitors to the tender which will convey them to Victoria. It having been said that the Sir James Douglas will probably be selected to bring His Royal Highness and his suite to this city, the suggestion may be in order that a far more suitable and complimentary arrangement would be to have all the warships at that time on this station perform the duty. The Amphion will be out of dock early in May, and should certainly be the honored ship; or if not her, her companion the Acorn. When H.R.H. Princess Louise arrived in Canada the flagship and all the war vessels in Halifax went out to meet her. Surely the loyalty of the West will find equally strong expression.

A gentleman reports remarkably good fishing this season in the Cowichan river, trout and salmon being of unusually large size.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE.

Fifth Parliament—Fourth Session.

FORTY-EIGHTH DAY.

Thursday, April 17.

The speaker took the chair at 2:10 p. m.

Prayers by Rev. J. E. Starr.

PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. Robson, before the first order of the day was called, said that it was not often that he rose to a question of privilege in regard to misreporting in the newspapers. In justice to others more than to himself, however, he was compelled now to refer to a portion of the report in The Colonist of Wednesday's proceedings. In discussing the question of the lien he was made to say: "The fact was that since county court judges, learned in the law, had given opinions that had assumed a wrong feeling, it might be better to get sensible, level-headed laymen to administer the act instead of those county court judges." It could not be expected that all that was said in the House would be reported; it would be unfortunate for some honorable gentlemen if their remarks were so recorded. [Hear, hear.] In the report quoted, the qualifying words which he (the premier) had used were left out, making him say what he would be very sorry to say of county court judges or any others. The most amiable relations should always be cultivated between the legislature and the judiciary, and he would have been sorry to say what he was reported as saying, without qualifying it as he had. He had said that it was not fair to take general statements that the act was not workable. He had said that it was necessary to enquire into the merits of each particular case before pronouncing the law itself bad. Two County Court judges had been quoted in the debate as saying that the act was unworkable; one of whom had said that up to the time of the appointment of the County Court judges it worked satisfactorily. He (Hon. Mr. Robson) had said that if this was so, if County Court judges could not administer the law, it would perhaps be well to get level-headed lawyers who could. This morning he was waited upon by one County Court judge who felt very sore over the matter and who denied emphatically that he ever gave his opinion that the Lien Law was either bad or unworkable. There surely was a mistake somewhere. He had no wish to make any statement, in public or private, that he would be unfair to any man, particularly a judge, as he considered is his duty to say and do those things that were calculated to maintain the influence and dignity of the bench.

Mr. Haslam enquired the name of the county court judge to whom the premier referred.

Hon. Mr. Robson—It was the county court judge of Nanaimo.

Mr. Walkem, who was rising to a question of privilege, remarked that in the debate on Wednesday he had said two county court judges, he did not mention where, had pronounced the lien law unworkable and unsatisfactory. He would now say that the county court judge of Nanaimo was the one to whom he referred. His remarks were made from the bench, and were heard by scores who could have been witnesses to them. Since that time this county court judge had informed him of his reasons for pronouncing the act unsatisfactory. These reasons he (Mr. Haslam) had given to the attorney-general, to whom he had also pointed out the defects in the act referred to by the two county court judges. Any statements that he (Mr. Haslam) had made he was prepared to prove at any time.

Mr. Cunningham said that he did not say that county court judges had said publicly that the act was unworkable. It had been said to him personally, however. His remarks were not intended as any reflection on the judges.

EDUCATIONAL MATTERS.

Mr. Cunningham moved the adoption of the report of the Education committee and took occasion to refer to the work of the committee, and the evidence received by them on which the report was based. Mr. Muir, in a letter to the Times, had stated that he was unfairly treated by the committee, and that he was not allowed to cross-examine witnesses whose evidence would be expected to prejudice his case. This letter was a tissue of falsehoods from beginning to end. He had been allowed the privilege of cross-examining and he had been allowed to produce evidence which was not in reality admissible. To say that the committee were convinced that injustice had been done him was wholly untrue. The only injustice done anyone was done to the public by the government and its leader in tolerating the man Muir as long as he had been retained as a teacher. Mr. Cunningham proceeded to go fully into each item of the report before resuming his seat.

Mr. Croft seconded the motion for the adoption of the report. Referring to the letter published in the Times by Mr. Muir, and briefly touched upon by Mr. Cunningham, the member for Cowichan said that it was an insult to the honor of the committee, as the letter was published before the committee had concluded their labors. The letter was evidently intended to impress people with the idea that Mr. Muir was unfairly dealt with. As secretary of the committee he had the fullest knowledge of the evidence submitted, and he could say that the committee had shown all the favor possible to Mr. Muir, allowing him to produce evidence that was wholly irrelevant, which might, however, indirectly benefit his case. He (Mr. Croft) blamed Mr. Muir for his ungentlemanly conduct in Miss Rutherford's case, and in the distribution of his circular No. 2, in the High School. He blamed the trustees of Wellington school for their action, and after reviewing the report thoroughly as the previous speaker had, he advised the opposition in future to adopt smokeless powder and load their guns with bullets; as their last attacks they had used powder that made plenty of smoke, and plenty of noise, but which, owing to the fact that the bullets were missing, were barren of results.

Hon. Mr. Beaven after rallying the member for Cowichan on his uniform support of the government, and reading members a lecture on parliamentary etiquette, paid a tribute to the excellent educational system of this province, under which the former dearth of teachers had been entirely removed. He then reviewed the reports and the evidence, denying that the majority report was such as should commend itself to this House. He charged that political influences had been brought to bear upon Mr. S. D. Pope to induce him to change his mind in connection with the Vancouver school. Nothing more conclusive could, he urged, have been found than in the correspondence with regard to Miss Lawrence at Nanaimo, who was thrown out of employment because she was possessed of no influence, while without one word of murmur a temporary certificate was given to Mr. Robinson, who received the appointment at Vancouver although there were five duly certificated teachers who had applied for the position. In his evidence as to the appointment of a teacher at Wellington, Mr. Pope said he wanted the trustees to appoint Mr. Muir, in order that he might come within the jurisdiction of the department, so that his certificate might be cancelled. This showed that not only was Mr. Pope under the thumb of the provincial secretary, but that he was not fit for the position that he occupied. He denied that the act gave to the department the choice of teachers, that function remaining with the trustees, all the power of the department in this regard being to see that teachers were properly certificated. It had therefore been for Mr. Pope to attend to his own business instead of dictating to the teachers whom they should employ.

Hon. Mr. Robson said there was nothing to show that Mr. Pope had ever dictated or attempted to dictate to the trustees. He did not use any means to influence the trustees.

Hon. Mr. Beaven went on to define political influence, concluding by declaring his inability to endorse the report. In the course of his remarks the hon. gentleman expressed himself in favor of depriving teachers of the right to vote.

Hon. Mr. Davie said it was manifest from the remarks of the leader of the opposition that he was supporting a case in which he did not believe, and had only taken the stand he had done for political reasons. As everyone knew Mr. Muir, who was the instigator of this matter, was an unfortunate individual whose vanity was accustomed to lead him away. He was more to be pitied than despised, and for his part he (Mr. Davie) regretted that so much time had been lost in pandering to his vanity. What Mr. Muir wanted was notoriety, which, in his ordinary vocation, he would never get. Not being able to get notoriety, he conducted himself as no one, who had not lost his wits, would think of doing. In the case of Miss Lawrence, through no fault of hers, she was unable to pass her examination. A provision of the Education Act was that school trustees might, on satisfying the education department that they could not find the teachers they required, grant temporary certificates. In the case of Miss Lawrence the superintendent found himself bound by the provisions of the law and was unable to grant a temporary certificate. The leader of the opposition had said that the young lady had been treated as she was because she had no political influence. He (Mr. Davie) was not so sure of that. She came to him (Mr. Davie) before his election and endeavored to get a certificate. He had felt that this was a deserving case, and if any political influence could have induced Mr. Pope to swerve from the provisions of the law he would in this case have done so. Mr. Pope had, however, showed him the act, and asked if there were any special reasons why he should swerve from the act. He had thus showed that Miss Lawrence had more political influence than Mr. Robinson. In the Robinson case there had been five other applications, but the trustees had formally stated that they did not consider that there was any reason why they should appoint any of the teachers who had applied, and the temporary certificate was therefore issued to Mr. Robinson.

Mr. Grant endorsed the report of Mr. Semlin. He considered the department most reprehensible for acting as they had done.

The Speaker having put the question several times, called in the members.

As they were coming in to vote,

Mr. Semlin, who had been waiting for the leader of the government to speak before taking the floor, endeavored to re-open the discussion, but was informed that the debate had been closed.

Hon. Mr. Beaven contended that until the ayes and nays had been called a member could address the House.

Mr. Semlin said it was the fault of the leader of the House that he had not spoken.

Hon. Mr. Robson—Why?

Mr. Semlin—I was waiting for the Premier to speak in order to reply.

The Speaker having ruled that Mr. Semlin was not entitled to the floor, the report of the committee on education was adopted on division, the ayes being Messrs. Semlin, Beaven, Orr and Grant.

PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. Davie said that in an interview with Judge Harrison, that gentleman had stated that he had never said, either on the bench or off, that the Lien Act was unworkable, nor had he refused to work under it. On the contrary, there had been only one case before him (Mr. Harrison), under the Act, and in that case the plaintiff had failed because he had neglected to bring himself under its provisions. Mr. Harrison also in reference to County Court Judge Bole, thought it hardly possible that he had held the act to be unworkable, as it was only a short time since that—on the occasion of going to New Westminster—he (Mr. Harrison) had found Mr. Bole trying a case under the act. Mr. Davie read a letter from Mr. Harrison. Mr. Davie then alluded to a report of his remarks of the previous evening contained in The Colonist, in relation to the consolidation of the lien act, and to section 15, wherein a reference to section 7 was found, which ought to be to section 22. What he had said on the subject was that the error was in the consolidation, and not in the original act of 1888, and that the error arose from the re-arrangement of the sections which was done by the consolidators with the view of simplyfying the act.

Mr. Haslam said he could only repeat what he had stated last night, which was only the truth and he could substantiate.

Mr. Cunningham said he would reiterate what he had said about the working of the present lien act, that if one one got into the courts under it he could not get out again.

Hon. Mr. Beaven here rose to a question of privilege, and quoted from the 8th volume of May in support of the contention that Mr. Semlin had the right to speak upon a subject until after the vote had commenced.

Hon. Mr. Robson—The Speaker always pauses long enough to enable every member to speak.

The Speaker—Rule 80 of our rules of orders says that after the members have been called in no motion can be made or discussion take place before the vote is taken.

Hon. Mr. Beaven immediately sat down and said no more about "May."

On motion of Hon. Mr. Turner, the House went into committee (Mr. Baker in the chair) and the supply bill was read a third time and passed.

Mr. Semlin moved that the House do now adjourn, announcing his intention to speak with respect to the education report, the debate on which had just been closed.

The Speaker said that before allowing the motion to be put he desired the mover to give authorities for his proposal.

Mr. Semlin said he had no special authorities to cite, but a motion to adjourn was always in order.

After some discussion the Speaker said he would look up the matter, and, if the member were in order, he would protect him in his rights.

Hon. Mr. Robson observed that this was an important matter, and he was glad the Speaker had undertaken to look it up. The point ought to be absolutely disposed of and settled.

PAYMENTS INTO COURT.

The House went into committee, Mr. Ladner in the chair, on the message of his Honor the Lieut.-Governor, enclosing the following proposed clauses to the bill relating to the payment of money into and out of court.

"9. All moneys to be paid into the treasury under the provisions of this act, and all balances for principal to the credit of any matter, suit, or proceeding, shall draw interest at the rate of three per centum per annum from the first day of the month after payment into the treasury up till the first day of the month during which such money shall be paid out, and no interest shall be paid in respect of fractions of a month.

"10. The moneys to be paid into the treasury from time to time under the provisions of this act, or of any order-in-council to be made under this act, shall be entered in a book, or books, to be kept for that purpose, in which shall be opened an account for each suit, matter, or proceeding in respect of which any money shall be received into the treasury under this act, showing in each case the particulars mentioned in section 3 of this act, and the interest aforesaid shall be calculated and paid when the principal sum is withdrawn.

The clause having been adopted and added, the bill was read a third time and passed.

The House went into committee on the following message of the Lieutenant-Governor, with the bill relating to the settlement of the graving dock claims. The message recommended the following as the enacting clauses of that measure:

"1. It shall be lawful for the lieutenant-governor in council, upon such terms and conditions as he shall think proper to impose with reference to the satisfaction by F. B. McNamee & Co. of all claims and liabilities incurred by them in this province in connection with the construction of the said dock, to pay to F. B. McNamee & Co., out of the unappropriated revenue, an amount not exceeding the sum of ten thousand dollars, with interest thereon at five per centum per annum from the 24th of February, 1880, up to the day of such payment.

"2. This act may be cited as the 'Graving Deck Settlement Act.'"

In answer to Hon. Mr. Beaven,

Hon. Mr. Robson explained that the object was to give the government power to settle with certain local creditors of McNamee & Co. within the limits of the $10,000 which had been forfeited and the interest accrued. The main idea of the government had been to endeavor to hit upon some line by which they might chiefly reach one particular case, that of Mr. John Nicholson, which had been a very hard one. Owing to unfortunate complications he had been the loser of collideable sums which he had advanced. The object was to come to his relief and to that of others. He did not know whether or not McNamee & Co. would eventually get anything. The government of which Hon. Mr. Beaven was a member had held that McNamee & Co. had no claim.

The committee rose and reported progress with the resolutions.

The following bills were read a third time and passed: Railway bill (No. 11)—Hon. Mr. Davie; Lien bill (No 75)—Mr. Cunningham.

The House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

FORTY-NINTH DAY.

Friday, April 16.

The Speaker took the chair at 2:10 p.m.

Prayers by Rev. J. E. Starr.

PRIVILEGE.

Hon. Mr. Beaven rose to deny that he had said that he favored the deprivation of teachers of the right to vote. What he did say was that he had, some years ago, supported a measure brought in by a private member depriving public officials of the right to vote. Since that time the law had been changed.

Mr. Cunningham wished it to be understood that in his remarks he did not intend to convey any reflection upon Judge Bole, of New Westminster, who had always given the utmost satisfaction in his decisions and was anxious to have a proper Lien Act.

SPEAKER'S RULING.

On the point of order raised by Mr. Semlin, whether a member, upon a motion to adjourn, can discuss a question that has been already disposed of by the House, without the consent of the House, Mr. Speaker ruled: That the senior member for Yale must state the matter of public importance he desires to discuss, and that it is for the House to say whether the discussion shall proceed, citing as his (the Speaker's) authority May, 9th edition, pages 356 and 357.

After some discussion,

Hon. Mr. Beaven said that this was not the edition of May recognized by this House.

Hon. Mr. Robson asked if it were not the duty of this enlightened body—the House—to confine itself to a dead May, instead of to a living one. Apparently the leader of the opposition wanted this house to be 1887 to a May of many years ago, since which time portions of a rumbo date had been discarded as obsolete and objectionable. No intelligent legislative assembly would be content to be tied and bound, hand and foot, by old practices, but would be governed by rules which experience had commended to the British House of Commons.

Mr. Semlin referred to the cloture in England where that practice had been inaugurated to meet special cases.

After some further discussion,

Mr. Speaker said that there had been nothing like a cloture here. He had simply applied the rules of the House and the authority which it recognized. He had always objected to applying too much to May. If he were in the next House he hoped to see one of its first works the adoption of a proper code of rules. In the meantime he had never in any way consulted the government or any member of the House, nor even the clerk.

Mr. Davie introduced a bill to further amend the Election Regulation act; also a bill to amend the Provincial Voters act.

Mr. Martin presented the report of committee on the claim of Mr. Robert Dexter on contract for the coffer-dam at Esquimalt, suggesting that, considering all the circumstances, the government take Mr. Dexter's claim into favorable consideration.

THE NORTH ARM BRIDGE.

Mr. Cunningham moved the adoption of the committee on the North Arm, Fraser River, bridges, and at some length entered into a review of the facts. He thought the government had done its utmost to meet the requirements of the case and to repair the damage which had been inflicted upon the country. He severely reflected on the San Francisco Bridge Co. and the official who had inspected the bridge.

Mr. Ladner seconded the motion. He never, he thought, saw a worse piece of work. The inspector, a land surveyor, had said he had visited the structure eleven times in four months; but if there had been proper inspection, particularly at the time of pile driving, the casualty would not have occurred. He did not blame the department so much as the inspector, who had for long been supposed to be competent to inspect the work. The San Francisco Bridge Co. had not according to the evidence which he quoted, built the bridge according to specification, and it had been sworn that when the attention of the inspector had been called to certain departures he had said, "Oh! that's all right."

Hon. Mr. Robson—The parties who were acquainted with these things might have communicated with the government.

Mr. Ladner went on to say that he had been informed that a delegation of the council had waited upon the government to make a complaint, but had been snubbed when they went there.

Mr. Robson said that he would not have believed that the deputation had been snubbed by the department even though his brother had said so.

On Mr. Ladner resuming, Hon. Mr. Davie rose to a point of order, and contended that in this report there were no recommendations. It simply presented the evidence. There was nothing to adopt, the report being a mere statement of fact. There was nothing to agree or disagree upon. He therefore submitted that the motion to adopt was out of order. Moreover, the evidence was not before the House; the members not having received the report.

Hon. Mr. Beaven said it was futile to say that the report was out of order, two days' notice of the motion to adopt having been given.

Hon. Mr. Robson was inclined to demur from the proposition of the attorney-general, that, inasmuch as there was no recommendation, there was nothing to adopt. He did not see clearly the force of that contention. The practice in other bodies was to receive reports and then they were open to discussion for adoption or otherwise. At present it was unjust and unfair to discuss the matter, but with the evidence before the House he should be in a position to show that many of the statements of the hon. member were not borne out by the evidence. The report ought not to be discussed without the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Vernon quoted May to show that without the evidence no motion could be made.

Hon. Mr. Robson said that the present discussion was like a counsel addressing the court without the evidence being before it. When the member for Westminster was speaking he wanted to see the evidence because there had occurred in his speech misstatements which he was convinced had not been made knowingly. The proper thing for the hon. gentleman to do was to move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Speaker—I should like to know where the speaker comes in. There are and have been two or three members on their feet at once.

Mr. Haslam thought that with the evidence before the members it would be conclusively shown that the expressions of Mr. Ladner were not borne out by the evidence.

Mr. Ladner moved that the debate be adjourned.

Hon. Mr. Vernon rose to a point of order. The practice here for many years had been to adopt reports, but he failed to find in May any rule for such adoption. What was meant by adoption? Was it the adoption of suggestions made in reports? He did not see that any such practice obtained in any other House except this. Supposing all the evidence was before the House; what was involved in the adoption of the report?

Mr. Semlin—A censure of the government.

Hon. Mr. Vernon—May says that the report is first brought in. Then there comes a motion to recommit or take into consideration, but here the members had nothing to vote on. The report contained nothing but what everyone knew to be correct.

Hon. Mr. Davie—May at page 431 says "Any appropriate motion can be founded on a report."

Mr. Speaker—I have made no less than seven attempts to rule on the point of order. I rule that the report is in order, but without the evidence it is for the House to decide whether it will discuss the report. The point which has been raised that in the absence of the evidence the House must refuse to entertain the report is a mistake. It is not necessary to have a recommendation. The House had itself adopted the report on education yesterday, and that contained no recommendation.

Hon. Mr. Robson said he agreed with the ruling of the Speaker. The House might have been wrong in adopting the education report, but he should like to have a ruling on the principle at issue. He hoped that Mr. Speaker had not reached his decision upon the question of the House yesterday.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved that the debate be not proceeded with in the absence of the evidence.

Hon. Mr. Robson—If it be wrong to discuss the report and go into the evidence, I hope the House will not proceed to discuss what is not before it.

Several members having arisen,

Mr. Speaker said no two members can be on the floor of the House at the same time. The member for New Westminster is in order and has the floor. When he has concluded any member can move the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Croft—I contend that the report is not properly before the House, inasmuch as the evidence has not been printed. May very distinctly says, "all of which, with the evidence, is submitted."

Mr. Speaker—The member for New Westminster must conclude his remarks, and then the House can adjourn the debate.

Hon. Mr. Davie held that if a motion was in order to adjourn the debate it was entirely wrong to allow it to proceed. The Speaker had to put the question, "shall the debate proceed in the absence of the evidence?"

Mr. Speaker—The member for New Westminster has the floor.

Hon. Mr. Davie—I rise to a point of order. You may be quite right; but the member for Cowichan has drawn attention to the fact that though the evidence was formally submitted with the report, it is not before the House.

Mr. Ladner—The leader of the government had stated that I had said what he would not have believed had his own brother said it. What I said was that a deputation of the council who had waited on the government had felt themselves snubbed.

Hon. Mr. Robson—I understand you that they had been snubbed.

Mr. Ladner said they had considered themselves snubbed. The hon. gentleman continued to review the evidence, reading a long newspaper letter.

Hon. Mr. Robson protested.

Mr. Speaker remarked that the hon. member was placing the House and the government in a very serious position by continuing the debate, but he could not stop him. He put it to his good taste whether he should continue.

Hon. Mr. Robson rose to a point of order. He might be wrong, but his impression was that a member could not read from a newspaper without permission of the House.

After some discussion the Speaker, having in the meantime looked up authority, decided that he could not find authorities for ruling the member out on the point of order.

Hon. Mr. Davie contended that there was nothing before the House to adopt, the report having made no suggestions, and that the report could not be discussed in the absence of the evidence, which formed part of it. He therefore contended that the discussion was out of order, and if overruled should take the sense of the House.

Hon. Mr. Beaven characterized this as an attempt to bulldoze the Speaker.

Mr. Speaker—If there was any attempt at that the member would get the worst of it.

Hon. Mr. Davie observed that he had spoken with all respect to Mr. Speaker, and that Hon. Mr. Beaven's remarks were beneath contempt.

The Speaker said the evidence with the report had been laid on the table. It was in the custody of the clerk and was consequently in the possession of the House. It was, however, an unfair thing, but it was not irregular, according to the opinion of May, to discuss the report and the evidence, which latter has not been printed. The hon. member had the floor and had not transcended the rules. He did not care whether or not his opinion was overruled. He had cited the law and the testimony, and he stood by them.

Hon. Mr. Davie said he had his opinion and he had the right to assert it without being subject to the charge of insulting the Hon. Mr. Speaker or anyone else. The speaker might be wrong, and he thought he was.

The Speaker said he had decided that the debate was in order. To that exception had been taken by the attorney-general. Should the chair be sustained?

On the showing of hands the Speaker said he thought the chair had not been sustained.

On the count the result was; nays 10, ayes 9.

Nays—Cowan, Smith, Nason, Davie, Vernon, Turner, Anderson, Fry, Craft, Martin—10.

Ayes—Semlin, Grant, Ladner, Orr, Beaven, Cunningham, Mason, Duck, Haslam—9.

The speaker's decision was thus overruled.

The Speaker—The House decides that the report of a committee cannot be adopted until the evidence upon which the report is based is laid before the House in printed form.

Speaking to a question of privilege, Mr. Semlin condemned the committee for unnecessarily delaying the presentation of their report.

GAME BILL.

On motion of Mr. Ladner the bill to amend the Game Protection Bill (No. 12) passed its third and final reading.

QUIETING TITLES.

Hon. Mr. Davie moved the House in to committee, Mr. Semlin in the chair, upon the Quieting Titles Bill (No. 67.) In committee the clause transmitted by message in reference to rock reservations in leases and deeds made by the Hudson's Bay Co. was incorporated in the bill, which was reported complete with amendments.

COUNTY COURTS BILL.

The House went into committee, Mr. Croft in the chair, upon the County Courts bill (Hon. Attorney-General.)

Several desirable amendments having been incorporated on motion of the introducer of the bill, the committee rose at 5:25 p.m., reporting progress.

INTESTATE ESTATES.

Wish Mr. Cunningham in the chair, the House went into committee on the bill respecting the administration of Intestate Estates.

This committee also rose reporting progress, in order that the complete report might be printed before being adopted.

The House rose at 5:45 o'clock.

EVENING SESSION.

THE CONSTITUTION AMENDMENT BILL.

On the resumption of business at 8 o'clock, Mr. Duck filling the chair during the temporary absence of the speaker,

Hon. Mr. Robson rose to move the second reading of the Constitution Act Amendment Bill.

Mr. Cunningham respectfully requested that the government refrain from pressing the second reading of the bill. The bill was one which would require careful consideration, and his constituency desired to be heard before its second reading was proceeded with. It was now late in the week, and if the government would consent to allow the measure to lie over until Monday the constituency represented by himself and by the premier could be heard from. In the interest of fair play, the people should be given a chance to express their opinion before an act of this character was passed by the House. He had assured his constituents that they need have no anxiety, as long as Hon. Mr. Robson was at the helm, as to their interests being protected in the bill. He was not of the same opinion now, and he consequently asked that the bill be postponed.

Hon. Mr. Robson said that if there was any probability or possibility of any practical end being gained by the delay asked for he would be glad to accede to the request. If the second reading was delayed in order that members from the constituencies referred to, it would not produce any practical result. Strange to say, in this case the voice of the people would not alter the condition of the bill. It was hard to see what advantage was to be gained by delay. He had received a telegram from Mayor Brown, of New Westminster, president of the Mainland Association in which it was urged that the second reading of this bill be postponed as long as possible. He was displeased to grant the request, but for the fact that he knew that no satisfactory results could be obtained from the delay. He was speaking from his inside knowledge of the facts. The measure was here and must be dealt with as it is.

Mr. Cunningham again entreated the government not to proceed with the second reading of the bill at least till Monday.

Mr. Ladner admitted that the government was very strong, but he trusted that they would not take advantage of their strength to impose upon the people an objectionable measure, such as this. He proceeded to discuss the bill, and described the feelings of the people with respect to it.

The speaker said that the premier had risen to move the second reading, and it was only on a point of order that the member could speak. The premier, who had risen to move the second reading, merely made way for Mr. Cunningham.

Mr. Ladner continued that he proposed to do his duty on behalf of the New Westminster. He feared neither for himself nor his constituency, and he asked that this bill be deferred. He had been requested by the people of the district, and the Mainland association, to send them copies of the bill. He had, he regretted, had only 70 copies given him when he had applied for the bill, and the people of the district having received the bill, desired to be heard with respect to it.

Mr. Anderson rose to the point of order that the member was reading from a paper. The bill had been brought before the house some days ago, and surely there could be no further need of delay.

Hon. Mr. Higgins here resumed the chair.

Mr. Orr said that if the second reading were deferred till Monday he should be prepared to vote for the second reading.

Hon. Mr. Davie said that redistribution was the principle of the bill; the details were another thing. If the second reading were carried, and nothing further than that could be done before night. The schedules would be discussed on Monday when the partisan affected could be heard. The House was already committed to the principle. The details were another thing and were not now in question.

Mr. Ladner said he would try and pray the government to postpone the second reading in deference to the wishes of over 2,000 voters. It would be a privilege and a very great one to the voters of New Westminster district for the bill to be held over. He did not propose to offer any fractious opposition to the government.

The Speaker said if the member had nothing more to urge he was out of order.

Hon. Mr. Beaven claimed that as the attorney-general had been heard he had the same right. The attorney-general had said that all the members had agreed to the principle of redistribution; but as to districts that was another thing. He noticed that Mr. Grant had a motion of want of confidence on the notice paper, and with every constitutional government it was the practice to settle such issues before questions of policy were disposed of. It would be good policy for the government to wait until Monday, as they must realize that advantage might be taken of their persistence in carrying out their policy in view of the vote of want of confidence.

Hon. Mr. Robson, in reply to the leader of the opposition, said that while admitting in the abstract the importance of a notice on the paper of want of confidence, he could not see that the postponement of the measure in this case would be other than child's play. If there was any reason to suppose that the House would be evenly divided on the motion referred to, or if there was the barest possibility of it carrying, the case would be different. Four or five members, or six at the very outside, would be all that would be prepared to vote for it. There was not a ghost of a chance of having the resolution carried. There was not the slightest possibility of more than five or six votes being cast for it. This measure, the government had been told, they were forcing through the House with indecent haste. If such had been their desire they could have brought forward the second reading on Wednesday. The fact was that the government had been taking their time about it. One hon. member, the member for New Westminster, had taunted the government with being afraid to wait until the people could speak upon this measure. He (the premier) could assure that honorable member that he was never more mistaken in his life. No such consideration had ever presented itself. Another speaker had taunted the leader of the government with withholding the bill until the end of the session, proposing (to quote the elegant language used by that gentleman) to ram it down the throats of the members. He (Hon. Mr. Robson) could tell the House why it had not sooner been presented. There had been the greatest difficulty in framing the measure; the government had been met with serious difficulties if it had not been for that, the measure would have been down early in the session. The government had been unwearied in endeavoring to meet every difficulty brought forward and to present something which would be just and fair to every part of the province.

Mr. Cunningham, rising to a point of explanation, denied that he had taunted the government with being afraid. He had said that the people would put that construction upon it.

Hon. Mr. Robson, continuing, said that a bill of the character of the one that the House was now asked to consider could not be expected to please every portion of the province. It could not be expected to please every member of the House, or every member of the government. Every measure submitted for the consideration of this or any other House must be in nature of a compromise. He would like to find any two men on the face of the earth whose opinions agreed upon every question. We were told that we could not find two peas alike; and the same thought applied equally well to the minute reviews of men. Therefore it went without saying that any measure agreed upon by an executive of more than one—and the executive in this case consisted of five,—might be presumed fairly to be termed a measure of compromise. One concedes to the views of the other, and thus it was that all legislation was of necessity produced. If none were prepared to make concessions, no progress could ever be made, and the executive of the government so unfortunately situated would fail. A reasonable compromise, giving and taking, was necessary to arrive at any conclusion. A constitutional measure, such as the one before this House, could not be expected to meet the views of every constituency or every community, any more than of every individual. The constituency which he had the honor to represent had most reason, perhaps, of any in the province, to complain of the present measure, and if he had been thinking only of the interests of that one constituency he certainly would not have been found consenting to a measure that might by many be considered unjust to it. He could say more with the permission of the other members of the cabinet, but he had no desire to avoid taking his share of responsibility for the redistribution bill. It would be a mistake to imagine that there had been perfect unanimity in a cabinet of five upon this measure. He wished to say one thing in the light of which this question should be considered by the country as well as by the House. This was a partial measure—not in the same sense hon. members would perhaps endeavor to infer by playing upon the word. It was a temporary measure. He (the premier) confessed that when the government announced their intention of bringing down a redistribution bill, it was in his mind that it should be of a more comprehensive character, proposing more thorough redistribution of the constituencies, the division of the various districts in such a manner that it might be made more workable—the division of some cities, even, in this manner—and more thoroughly increased according to population than was provided in the bill before the House. The conclusion finally arrived at, however, was that it would be a measure that would disturb as little as possible the existing state of affairs and lead the way for another and more statesmanlike bill. Next year the Dominion census would be taken, and it would create a proper basis on which to arrange for representation by population in the province. Now there was no such accurate basis on which to base an intelligent measure of redistribution. Every statement in reference to the population of the various cities of the province differed widely; in fact no two men in any of the cities had the same idea of the population of their own city. Some of the statements made in regard to population were so vastly exaggerated as to be extremely ridiculous. It was thought at the present time, in view of the absence of any fair and reasonable data, proper and wise to bring down this partial, or temporary, measure, giving half the loaf and reserving the other half to be given after the census had been taken next year. The hon. members of the House, and of the country, would carefully consider all the circumstances and difficulties that had to be met with. They would agree that the course taken was a wise and beneficial one. If he would think well, this was the view every hon. member would take. If, with the present state of things; if, with the abstract theory of the government power between the two sections of the province confronting them, the government had taken a further step and proposed to increase the representation more extensively, what would have been the result? Twelve new members—six upon the Mainland and six for the Island. Three members (to which he understood the city was entitled) would have been given to Vancouver, two members (to which he thought Westminster was entitled) would be given Westminster; one (which Kootenay deserved) would go to Kootenay, and one additional to Yale. Some of the districts named deserved these additional members; and with this theory of the balance of power before them, six would of necessity have to be given to the Island, leaving twelve members, or a House of thirty-nine. This would effectually shut down upon any further readjustment of representation in the near future, and a condition of affairs would be created that would be open to far more objection than this measure. Considering the question as a choice between two evils, the government had presented the redistribution bill,—and most decidedly it was the lesser of the evils that had been chosen. The hon. member for New Westminster should keep in view that by accepting this the door was left open for another measure distributing the representation on a more substantial and a more satisfactory basis. He (Hon. Mr. Robson) was aware that personally he was placed in a very embarrassing position, much more so than the member for New Westminster. It had been stated openly that his course could, and some said should, have been to have broken up the government, and gone to the country on his refusal to accept a partial measure of this kind. What would have happened then? The general elections would have been brought on upon the existing basis, and he could not submit to the gross injustice which would thereby be done Vancouver, which would thus be left without representation for another four years. True, he had been informed that such a step on his part would have made him extremely popular on the lower Fraser, but had he not been able to rise above such a paltry consideration for the good of the entire country he would have been unfit for the high position of leader of the government of this country. [Cheers.] The