

## Provincial Parliament

Mainland Politics Occupy Most of the Time of the Legislators.

Some Significant Questions Regarding Porcupine Appointments by Mr. Stables.

Monday, Aug. 19th.

After two days of idleness, the weary province came very much to the point of the immediate business, decided not to sit in the morning when the C.P.R. had opposed the Grand Forks & Kettle River railway with an old charter they had up their sleeve.

Mr. Oliver returned to Mr. Pooley that he favored bridges and railways in his district, but he would oppose a step giving the C. P. R. power to shut off competition; while Mr. Gilmour pointed out how the operation of the clause would kill other railway enterprises.

Mr. Oliver's amendment was voted down. The House then passed the consideration of the following amendment by Mr. Helmecken:

"That the provision of the Railway Act as to length of branch lines shall not apply to this section, notwithstanding anything contained in this act," and to add to section 30 the following words: "Save and except in the case of any conflict, inconsistency or repugnancy between the other clauses of this act and the clauses of this section, the provisions of this section shall prevail."

Mr. Martin contended that the act was impossible to tell what legislation was referred to. He insisted that the act to which objection was taken should be specified. The petition meant nothing and it was trifling with the time of the House to present it. He contended that the petition was vague and meaningless and contained alterations.

Mr. Speaker Booth—"It is quite competent for any person to petition the House, and the question is whether any relief is granted or the prayer of the petition considered, is a matter for the House to deal with."

"On the second point, I think the practice of the House has been not to enforce rule 92 strictly with regard to alterations. If the petition was otherwise objectionable, I will therefore hold the petition to be in order, and leave it to the House to say if it wishes rule 92 to be more strictly enforced in the future."

Mr. Martin drew attention to parts of the petition which had been altered. The fact that the clerk had overlooked such alterations and neglected his duty was no reason why the House should persist in this error. He appealed from the Speaker's ruling, but the chair was sustained.

The petition was received. The consideration of the resolution reported from committee of supply was then taken up and the items passed. By Mr. Eberts—"To amend the Railway Assessment Act; to amend the Provincial Election Act; to amend the Tramway Incorporation Act."

All these were read a first time. Mr. Stables moved: "That bill (No. 14) intitled 'An act to incorporate the Bennett Railway Company' be placed upon the orders of the day for second reading."

He and Mr. Curtis spoke in support of the resolution. A vote being taken it was lost on the following division: Yeas—Messrs. McInnes, Gilmour, Stables, Oliver, Brown, Curtis, R. Smith, Houston—8.

Nays—Messrs. Kidd, Neill, Green, Hall, McPhillips, Helmecken, Turner, Dunsmuir, Eberts, A. W. Smith, Ellison, Clifford, Fulton, Hayward, Garden, Prentice, Wells, McBride, Pooley, Murphy, Rogers, Hunter, Taylor, Dickie, Mounce—25.

Mr. Kidd asked the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works the following question: Is it the intention of the government to open for settlement, in small holdings, by lease or otherwise, to actual settlers, the provincial lands now under reserve in the municipalities of South Vancouver and Burnaby?

Hon. Mr. Wells replied as follows: "Up to the present time the government has not considered the advisability of opening for settlement, by lease or otherwise, the provincial lands referred to."

Mr. Tatlow asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines, the following question: Is it the intention of the government to establish a mining division with a gold commissioner resident in the city of Vancouver?

Hon. Mr. McBride replied as follows: "The government is collecting data with reference to establishment of such mining division."

A message was received from the Lieutenant-Governor transmitting an "Act to Amend the Licenses Act," and recommending its introduction. A similar message was received with reference to the Mineral Act. The bills were introduced and read a first time.

The House went into committee on the bill to provide for the settlement of disputes in the Porcupine district, with Mr. Hayward in the chair.

Mr. Stables asked if it was proposed to impose a fee of \$25 before a case could be considered, as was the case last year? It had caused hardship in some instances.

Hon. Mr. McBride replied that the matter was receiving the attention of the government.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete without amendment. It was read a third time and finally passed.

The House then went into committee on the Vancouver and Westminster Railway Company, with Mr. Kidd in the chair.

Mr. Helmecken moved the bill in charge, asked that the length of the company's branch line be increased from six to twelve miles, and that the rate of interest be reduced from six to five per cent.

Mr. Oliver protested against such a step, adding that no reason had been advanced for the power sought, and the members had that very day an illustration of the ways of the road in consideration, they having put in plans for a road for which others sought a charter.

Mr. Curtis supported Mr. Oliver's objection. Mr. Martin protested against

upsetting the decision of the railway committee unless reasons were given for the step. All the reasons that had been advanced were that the company wanted it.

Mr. Oliver moved an amendment that the road follow the north side of the Fraser river.

Mr. Pooley couldn't understand Mr. Oliver's opposition to a railway in his own district.

The leader of the opposition pointed out that to allow the C.P.R. to build branch lines twenty miles in length meant blanketing the whole district and shutting out competition.

They had a sample of the effect of such powers in the railway committee in the morning when the C.P.R. had opposed the Grand Forks & Kettle River railway with an old charter they had up their sleeve.

Mr. Oliver returned to Mr. Pooley that he favored bridges and railways in his district, but he would oppose a step giving the C. P. R. power to shut off competition; while Mr. Gilmour pointed out how the operation of the clause would kill other railway enterprises.

Mr. Oliver's amendment was voted down. The House then passed the consideration of the following amendment by Mr. Helmecken:

"That the provision of the Railway Act as to length of branch lines shall not apply to this section, notwithstanding anything contained in this act," and to add to section 30 the following words: "Save and except in the case of any conflict, inconsistency or repugnancy between the other clauses of this act and the clauses of this section, the provisions of this section shall prevail."

Mr. Martin contended that the act was impossible to tell what legislation was referred to. He insisted that the act to which objection was taken should be specified. The petition meant nothing and it was trifling with the time of the House to present it. He contended that the petition was vague and meaningless and contained alterations.

Mr. Speaker Booth—"It is quite competent for any person to petition the House, and the question is whether any relief is granted or the prayer of the petition considered, is a matter for the House to deal with."

"On the second point, I think the practice of the House has been not to enforce rule 92 strictly with regard to alterations. If the petition was otherwise objectionable, I will therefore hold the petition to be in order, and leave it to the House to say if it wishes rule 92 to be more strictly enforced in the future."

Mr. Martin drew attention to parts of the petition which had been altered. The fact that the clerk had overlooked such alterations and neglected his duty was no reason why the House should persist in this error. He appealed from the Speaker's ruling, but the chair was sustained.

The petition was received. The consideration of the resolution reported from committee of supply was then taken up and the items passed. By Mr. Eberts—"To amend the Railway Assessment Act; to amend the Provincial Election Act; to amend the Tramway Incorporation Act."

All these were read a first time. Mr. Stables moved: "That bill (No. 14) intitled 'An act to incorporate the Bennett Railway Company' be placed upon the orders of the day for second reading."

He and Mr. Curtis spoke in support of the resolution. A vote being taken it was lost on the following division: Yeas—Messrs. McInnes, Gilmour, Stables, Oliver, Brown, Curtis, R. Smith, Houston—8.

Nays—Messrs. Kidd, Neill, Green, Hall, McPhillips, Helmecken, Turner, Dunsmuir, Eberts, A. W. Smith, Ellison, Clifford, Fulton, Hayward, Garden, Prentice, Wells, McBride, Pooley, Murphy, Rogers, Hunter, Taylor, Dickie, Mounce—25.

Mr. Kidd asked the Hon. the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works the following question: Is it the intention of the government to open for settlement, in small holdings, by lease or otherwise, to actual settlers, the provincial lands now under reserve in the municipalities of South Vancouver and Burnaby?

Hon. Mr. Wells replied as follows: "Up to the present time the government has not considered the advisability of opening for settlement, by lease or otherwise, the provincial lands referred to."

Mr. Tatlow asked the Hon. the Minister of Mines, the following question: Is it the intention of the government to establish a mining division with a gold commissioner resident in the city of Vancouver?

Hon. Mr. McBride replied as follows: "The government is collecting data with reference to establishment of such mining division."

A message was received from the Lieutenant-Governor transmitting an "Act to Amend the Licenses Act," and recommending its introduction. A similar message was received with reference to the Mineral Act. The bills were introduced and read a first time.

The House went into committee on the bill to provide for the settlement of disputes in the Porcupine district, with Mr. Hayward in the chair.

Mr. Stables asked if it was proposed to impose a fee of \$25 before a case could be considered, as was the case last year? It had caused hardship in some instances.

Hon. Mr. McBride replied that the matter was receiving the attention of the government.

The committee rose and reported the bill complete without amendment. It was read a third time and finally passed.

The House then went into committee on the Vancouver and Westminster Railway Company, with Mr. Kidd in the chair.

Mr. Helmecken moved the bill in charge, asked that the length of the company's branch line be increased from six to twelve miles, and that the rate of interest be reduced from six to five per cent.

Mr. Oliver protested against such a step, adding that no reason had been advanced for the power sought, and the members had that very day an illustration of the ways of the road in consideration, they having put in plans for a road for which others sought a charter.

Mr. Curtis supported Mr. Oliver's objection. Mr. Martin protested against

a claim. Section 11 provided that where a co-owner failed to keep up his assessments his associate might, by advertising in a newspaper in the district for three months, acquire his interest.

The last two clauses in the amending bill were as follows: "Section 127 of the 'Mineral Act' as enacted by section 10 of chapter 33 of the statutes of 1898, and amended by section 14 of chapter 45 of the statutes of 1899, is hereby repealed and the following section substituted therefor:

"The owner of a mineral claim who has had his claim surveyed and has filed in the office of the Mining Recorder in the mining division in which the claim is situated, a declaration by a provincial land surveyor, stating that he has surveyed the claim as required by subsection (c) of section 30 of this act, and has delivered to the Mining Recorder a plat of the claim and a copy of the original field-notes, and delivered two copies of the plat and one copy of the field-notes to the owner, then the owner of such claim shall be entitled to have the cost of such survey, not to exceed one hundred dollars, counted as work done on the claim as required by section 24 of this act."

The schedule of fees attached to the 'Mineral Act' is hereby amended by striking out 'for a Crown grant \$10' at the end thereof, and by substituting therefor 'for a Crown grant \$25.'

Hon. Mr. McBride expressed the belief that the advance in the fee would occasion little opposition, being quite reasonable.

Mr. Curtis complained that mining companies were unfairly treated. They were obliged to pay from \$50 to \$75 for a license, while an individual miner paid only \$5. Marcus Daly, for instance, was opening up a wonderfully rich property in Keesenoot on the payment of a \$5 license, while many companies were paying \$50 for license for opening up unremunerative properties.

There were too many safeguards thrown round the co-owner in section 4. An individual owner lost his property if he failed to keep up his assessment, whereas a bona fide co-owner had to go to considerable expense to get rid of the delinquent co-owner. He should not be obliged to pay such a sum as was contemplated. It was a well known fact that the vast majority of claims were valueless, and to impose such a condition would work hardship.

With sections 5 and 6 he agreed. But section 7, where the fee for a Crown grant was raised from \$10 to \$25, was a condition that the government failed to grasp the situation in regard to mines. The metalliferous mines were taxed to death. The great bulk of revenue was derived from the mines, and it was absurd to exact a fee of \$25 for a Crown grant for 62 acres of mining land, while only \$10 was charged for a grant for 600 acres of farming land. He hoped no additional hardships would be put on the mining industry, and that this objectionable clause would be withdrawn.

Surprise was expressed by the leader of the opposition that no attention had been paid by the mining committee to the state of the mining industry as indicated in the speech from the throne. They had found defects in the law. The facts were pointed out every season, and slight changes, none of which affected the principle of the law, were made. But such being the case, what became of the suggestion that the mining law was so bad that a mining commission had to have to be issued? Why attempt to better the law when it was suggested that the members were not competent to deal with the matter, and that a commission was necessary?

He did not coincide either with the suggestion to continue the law as proposed, or with the suggestion to amend it. In the mining license fees he increased for by the desire of the government to make up the revenue lost through their subservience to the saloon dealers, and to their amending the License Act so that they lost from \$8,000 to \$10,000 a year. A Ong prospector was worth a thousand whiskey sellers. While they deliberately decreased the whiskey sellers' fees from \$200 to \$75, they increased the miners' fee from \$10 to \$25. In other words, he resented right measures for the benefit of one whiskey seller. If this amount had to be made up there were other classes in the community who could better afford to make it up than the poor and hardy prospector.

The Attorney-General was surprised at the consistency of the position leader, who lived for the poor man. Such men when the time came to stand in the breach for the poor man were wanting. His honorable friend objected to counting \$100 survey as assessment work, by which a big saving was effected to the "poor" prospector.

Mr. Curtis pointed out that under the former act if the assessment work was done soon enough, the survey was allowable to count, while Mr. Martin added that his objection lay in allowing the regulation to become a law.

Mr. Curtis also pointed out that the prospector didn't get any surface right, while the Attorney-General retorted that they were given the use of the land. The British Columbia mining law was the fairest and most generous in the world.

Mr. Martin—Why then do you want a commission to investigate it? Mr. Green complained of the wearisome song of the opposition about their regard for the workmen. The regulation in regard to co-owners was one the mining communities had long desired. He had secured the insertion of this amendment in the report of the mining committee last year, but it had been struck out on the suggestion of this Attorney-General. He (Mr. Martin) was not then so anxious about the poor prospector. The increase of fee would occasion no complaint, in view of the liberal way in which the government had treated the mining districts in regard to the workmen.

The bill passed the second reading. The bill regarding works under franchises under private acts (Mr. Helmecken) next came up for its second reading. In so moving, Mr. Helmecken said it gave him great pleasure to say that it was advanced with the consent of the government. It was in line with a policy which had already been advanced in the House. It had been fashioned on the provisions of the commonwealth bill. The Legislature undoubtedly had the right to deal with property and civil rights according to the B. N. A. Act. The bill therefore could pass criticism anywhere.

Mr. McInnes expressed his pleasure that the bill had been introduced. He himself had attempted to introduce a

similar bill in railway committee, but had been defeated. He hoped, however, that the scope of the bill would be widened. He wanted the bill to extend to firms incorporated under the Companies Act.

The general public must not, however, be misled. It was a very short distance in settling the difficulties of the act. It referred to the future. It didn't apply to works already in progress. His own bill referred to this. He hoped Mr. Helmecken would support it.

The policy of the latter's bill, the Minister of Mines said, was the policy of the government. The government favored white labor, and while opposed to revolutionary steps they were prepared to go far to safeguard that labor. He was sorry to see the member for North Nanaimo censure his colleagues in the Dominion House in regard to their attitude on the Mongolian matter.

Mr. McInnes—When did I do that? Mr. McBride—No, I did not. Mr. McInnes—No, I did not. Hon. Mr. McBride withdrew his remark. He asked the House to believe the government when they promised to work steadily toward ameliorating the conditions occasioned by competition with Chinese labor.

Mr. Curtis—What is your policy? Hon. Mr. McBride replied that the government's policy was one of bringing steady representation to bear upon the Imperial government. He complained that the government was being fought in a dastardly way by the opposition, who were sending typewritten reports of what occurred in committee all over the country, asking to put honorable gentlemen on the government side in a false light.

Mr. Martin—Were there any mistakes in these? You're ashamed of the facts. Hon. Mr. McBride—He owns up to it. Mr. Curtis—Will you tell me what your policy is, please?

Hon. Mr. McBride chided the opposition leader, with admitting sending these reports. What he said was that if there were misstatements in these letters it was very improper, but if they contained facts the Minister of Mines should not object to their publication.

Mr. McBride characterized this method of warfare as backhanded. Mr. Curtis—I am interested to find the term dastardly is parliamentary, Mr. Speaker. (Laughter.)

Hon. Mr. McBride—Well, I withdraw that. Mr. Curtis—It is equally interesting to find that backhanded is parliamentary. Hon. Mr. McBride—I withdraw that, too. (Renewed laughter.)

Continuing Mr. Curtis said the House was assured that the government did intend "from time to time" to bring down measures of relief. He would like something definite. After the discussions which had taken place he thought the government should be ready to give some outline of their policy. It was proposed to appeal to the Imperial government. The point was one phase that could be dealt with by the local House which had not been used by the government. The principle of the Natal Act would be perfectly satisfactory at Westminster and he thought the government should be ready to announce whether they would support such a measure. He loyally supported Mr. Helmecken's motion though it had gone far enough. He would like to see it apply to companies which had received incorporation from the Legislature. Its operation might be postponed for two or three years so that they could adapt themselves to the changed conditions.

Mr. McPhillips had misgivings as to the effectiveness of the bill, but being a supporter of the government which had adopted it, he would give it his support. Mr. McPhillips continued at some length, when he was interrupted by the leader of the opposition, who asked on which side of the question he was speaking.

Mr. McPhillips closed by expressing the hope that the bill would accomplish the purpose for which it was designed. Mr. Brown failed to understand Mr. McPhillips's position. He seemed to be talking against the provisions of the act and yet supported it. He himself wished to see the House go just as far as possible in checking the influx of Orientals. The great trouble with these people was that they did not become citizens of the country in which they lived.

The bill dealt with civil rights which were matters of local concern. These were entirely within the province of the Legislature and he could not see the House against admitting that the House did not possess these rights. He thought a protest should have been entered on the occasion of the disallowance of the bills last year. The government should take the position that no infringement of its rights should be allowed to pass without protest.

Ralph Smith presumed the bill was an expression of the government's policy on the question. It was well understood that certain restrictions were necessary in regard to labor in this province. He was convinced that some members of the House were not as loyal to the principle in the House as on the hustings. The junior member for Victoria, if he were perfectly candid, would oppose the principle. He considered the House should assert its authority to the fullest point and even risk something in order that something might be accomplished. He thought the House should go further than the bill. He agreed with Mr. Curtis that ample time should be given in industries affected by such legislation to adapt themselves to the conditions. It did seem to him that the one man who wanted to see the House do nothing in regard to this matter was the junior member for Victoria and he favored the principle on the hustings. It was most essential that the House should be unanimous on this matter as the dissent of one member might have an important bearing on the Dominion House.

Mr. McPhillips denied the imputation of Mr. Smith. Mr. Smith thought the introduction of the measure and the fact that he and the other Conservative member from Vancouver were supporting the measure was an answer to the remarks of the member for New Westminster that they were inconsistent. The bill embodied the principle advanced in the Conservative platform.

The motion was carried unanimously. A message was transmitted from His

Honor the Lieut-Governor, recommending to the House a bill providing for the levying of taxes on coal and coke; a bill to amend the Assessment act; a bill to amend the Land act, and an act to accelerate the incorporation of Phoenix. All these measures are first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice presented a return showing the number of ballot papers actually issued to voters in each riding of the province at the general election held on June 9th, 1900.

His Honor the Lieut-Governor here entered and assented to an act to make special provision with regard to the qualifications of the members of the council of the city of Sandon, and an act to provide for the settlement of disputes as to mining claims in the Porcupine district of the Bennett Lake mining division.

Mr. Helmecken said his bill (No. 42) had been transferred to the name of the Minister of Mines.

Mr. McInnes asked if this meant that all the private bills would be slaughtered, and that Mr. Helmecken had taken advantage of this device to save his measure. (Laughter.)

The Minister of Mines replied that there was no such intention on the government's part.

Mr. McInnes asked, then why the change? It looked as though the government had allowed the measure to remain in the hands of a private member until assured that it would meet with the support of the House, having ascertained which, they had no hesitation, brave men as they were, to undertake it. (Laughter.)

The House then went into committee on the Vancouver City Charter bill, to which a number of amendments were made, the bill being declared complete.

The Anglican Synod of the Diocese of New Westminster held a second session in the chair. It was reported complete with amendments.

The Rock Bay and Salmon River Railway bill was committed, with Mr. Oliver in the chair.

Mr. Curtis moved to add the following section: "Notwithstanding anything hereinbefore contained, the company shall not have the right to purchase, lease, or use any lands belonging to the province until it has entered into a contract with the provincial government with respect to such right, and upon such terms and in such manner as the Lieut-Governor in Council may prescribe."

Mr. Curtis said he did this on the initiative of Mr. Chas. Wilson, whose principles some of his followers in the House seemed to be forgetting. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Tatlow said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

Mr. Curtis said the government had already brought in a general bill (Mr. Helmecken's) which covered the point, and he was sure that Mr. Curtis's amendment would be forgotten. He read that gentleman's statement on the point.

## \$5,000 OUR GRAND \$5,000 Ornithological Contest

Something entirely new and interesting. Read what you are to do. You may get \$200 cash. Our contest is to see who can make the longest list of names for birds from the following list of letters:

W D O O O C K Q U I A P R T A R I O C E S P N I E L V E B R O I M W A O D H T L

We will recognize as a bird anything belonging to the feathered tribe, whether it be a Hen, Crow, Slinger or any other kind. You can use any letter as many times as you like, and you may use the same letter as often as you like. To any person who can make a list of 25 or more different names of birds, we will give absolutely FREE a beautiful Prize value \$200 or less. BIG PRIZES AWARDED DAILY.

When you have made out your list fill out the line on the bottom of this ad, and send it to us with a Stamped, Addressed envelope, then if you are awarded a prize you can use any letter as many times as you like. We shall award a prize to every person who sends the name of 25 Birds, and our gifts will be as follows: For the best list, received each day, a Gold Watch for the second best solution each day, a beautiful imported Tea Set for the seven next best solutions, each day a Diamond Ring for the next best solution a Gold Piece; and for all other correct solutions, Prizes of Good Value. These prizes will be awarded daily, you will not have to wait a long time in uncertainty before you know the result. There is no element of whether or we get your solution late or early in the day. All you need is to post this ad, to us, and on the day it reaches us, if your list is the best, YOU SHALL WIN A GOLD WATCH, or if second best the beautiful Tea Set, and so on. We guarantee that we will award you a prize. There is absolutely no opportunity for deception on our part—we cannot afford to lose.

We want to get 1,000,000 well-satisfied subscribers, and for that reason we don't want you to send any money until you know exactly what prize you have gained by answering the puzzle. As soon as you get 4 p. m. each day, as possible, the examiners will judge the lists to the best of their ability, and will designate the prize you will win to you at once nothing you win prize has been awarded you, then if you are fully satisfied you can send your subscription to The Woman's World and you will get your return of post card fully packed. To a person of narrow ideas it seems impossible that we should be able to make such a gigantic offer, but we have the money, brains, and reputation, we know exactly what we are doing, and we can legitimately gain a million subscribers by this grand idea. We know that this offer is a good one, and we can be induced to recommend the "Woman's World" to all friends, thereby building up our circulation still further. We are willing to spend \$5,000 in this contest in building up a big subscription list, and when this money is spent, we reserve the right to publish a notification that the contest has been discontinued. Don't delay until it is too late. The contest will continue until January 1st, 1901.

We give a Bonus Prize of \$500 independent of all others to the person who sends in the list gotten up in the best and handsomest manner. Our Committee will decide and award prizes daily, but the special \$500 prize will be awarded in March, 1901. Any bird's name found in the dictionaries is good.

Address: The "Woman's World," Brentford, London, England.

37, 38 and 39 be repealed. The first forbade the employment of Chinese and Japanese on the railway and this was already met with by the bill passed in the afternoon. It exposed the bill to disallowance.

Mr. McInnes said the section had already been in force for a year. It was past the stage of disallowance, and it would be most absurd, after passing such a resolution as carried in the afternoon, for the House to revoke their action by revoking that action.

Mr. McPhillips, however, was not to be abashed. He was not going to play to the galleries, etc.

Mr. Green defined his position very clearly. This legislation had stood the test. Why then, throw it out now? He would oppose such a clause in new legislation. The attempt of Mr. McPhillips was defeated, the following only voting for it: Messrs. Prentice, Pooley, Hunter, Hayward, Clifford, A. W. Smith, McPhillips, Rogers and Hall. Of the remainder Mr. Turner voted with the opposition, Premier Dunsmuir, Eberts and Mr. Murphy did not vote at all.

Those who opposed striking out the anti-Chinese clause were as follows: Messrs. Turner, Garden, Taylor, Dickie, Mounce, Helmecken, Kidd, Green, Ralph Smith, Oliver, Neill, Gilmour