

Wednesday March 29th 1871

The Civil List Embroglio.

The Civil List Bill now before the Legislative Council has given rise to no little discussion, both within and without the walls of the Legislature. It has indeed, proved a welcome measure, and the senior member for Victoria hit the nail on the head when he said that the greatest unkindness the Government could inflict upon them would be to withdraw the bill. One can easily understand the opposition offered by the leader of the Triumvirate. He has boldly announced Confederation to mean a clean sweep of officialdom, root and branch, and he contends that the sole and absolute patronage of each department should be vested in its head—that to each minister should be assigned the sovereign power of employing or dismissing subordinates, so that all under him might be mere creatures of his will, holding office and emolument by the brittle tenure of the caprice of a single minister. Such a doctrine would doubtless be consonant to the genius and aspirations of him who enunciated it; but we venture to think that most ministers of refined feeling and honest intention would prefer that the relationship subsisting between themselves and their subordinates should be of a different character. Besides, it must strike the most superficial mind that, under Responsible Government, with the ministers going out and in with every change, the undesirability of individual ministerial sovereignty becomes still more objectionable. In the hands of some men it might, indeed, be practically harmless; but in the hands of others it might, and doubtless would, be abused,—made the instrument of gross injustice to individuals and of the greatest inconvenience and positive injury to the public service. The opposition to the Bill by the distinguished political acrobat who has long since resigned the leadership to able hands, is somewhat less consistent. True, his war-cry is "No more spoils in the spoils," and upon that principle he would doubtless wish that each minister should possess sovereign control of whatever "spoils" might lie within the range of his department. But, then, he has repeatedly admitted that the present Civil List is not too large, either in point of numbers or emolument. Nay, more, he has intimated that both will need to be increased under Responsible Government. He has also admitted, although in the first place he denied—that it will be quite competent for the first Legislature, at its very first session, to amend or repeal the Civil List Bill. Nay, he has done more. He has admitted that he saw little objection to the Bill; but announced his intention of voting against it for claptrap—because opposition to it would be popular outside. The admission has more of frankness than of dignity about it. It occurs to us to ask why, if the Civil List is not too large, and if the Bill does not place it beyond the reach of the people's representatives, it should be so strenuously opposed and unprovoked outrage. The conclusion is irresistible. Opposition to it is mere cant. It is popular with the people. Well, we do not grudge the member for Victoria's District such popularity. He is welcome to all he can make of it. For ourselves, we have seen no reason to change the view formed respecting the Bill upon its first appearance. Without agreeing with the member for Lillooet as to the powers with which ministers should be invested, and without thinking with the member for Victoria's District that there is no room for enlargement in the present Civil List, we have no hesitation in saying that the Bill, if not unprovokedly, is indisputable. Under full knowledge of the fact that it will be quite competent for the next Legislature to amend or repeal the Bill, we believe that it will be productive of harm. But, at the same time, we must admit that whatever injury may result from it is likely to fall less upon the public than upon those whom it professes to protect. We must regret the measure chiefly as placing in the hands of self-seeking political demagogues a bill that too well calculated to divide and mislead public opinion at the very moment when it is of the greatest importance that public opinion should be united, and should be guided in one patriotic and practical channel.

Thursday, March 23rd Legislative Council.

Wednesday, March 22nd 1871.

Council met at 1:30 p.m. Present—The hon. Speaker, hon. Attorney-General, hon. Dr. Helmecken, Mr. Humphreys, Mr. Carrall, Mr. Nathan, Mr. O'Connell, Mr. Alston, Mr. DeCosmos, Mr. Bunker, Mr. DeCosmos, hon. Dr. Carrall, Mr. Skinner. Minutes of preceding meeting read, and confirmed. A message from the Governor was read signifying his assent to the Bill regulating Elections. The hon. Speaker informed the Council that it is the intention of His Excellency the Governor to prorogue the House on Tuesday next. The House resumed, in Committee of the Whole, the consideration of the Civil List Bill commencing with the Lands and Works Department. Mr. Humphreys moved that \$8000 be substituted for \$3880 for the Chief Commissioner. Hon. Dr. Carrall seconded the motion, and would ask a recommendation of previous cases, in order that the salaries of other heads of departments might be reduced, as he considered all should be alike. He explained that he did not consider the salaries set down too high, yet he was prepared to waive his own opinion upon what he conceived to be public opinion upon the question. Mr. Humphreys thought the Colonial Secretary ought to have a higher salary than other heads of departments. The resolution was put and lost—7 to 6. Ayes—Hon. Dr. Carrall, and Messrs. Nathan, DeCosmos, Humphreys, Bunker, and Skinner. Mr. DeCosmos moved to strike out all the subordinates in the Lands and Works Department—Lost—4 to 9. SURVEYOR GENERAL. Mr. Nathan moved that the salary of the Surveyor General be \$2455, instead of \$1940, as set down in the list. Mr. Nathan said his reasons for moving an increase to this particular salary were that the office would be the principal head of the most important department in the Colony and must be a gentleman of professional knowledge. Mr. Bunker was opposed to the salary altogether. All the land sold and preempted in the Colony would not pay it. Mr. Humphreys said no officer had been so beneficial to the Colony as that of Chief Commissioner. The country had been paying that officer for doing nothing in his department. He had been there for the whole of the Governor of the Colony, instead of discharging his proper duties. The hon. Attorney General said he thought the hon. member had not well considered the subject or he would have hesitated to make such an attack upon an absent party, when the House was merely called upon to deal with officers under a new system. The member for Lillooet said that Responsible Government cannot be carried on without any heads of departments. Some hon. members appear to imagine that the present government had some personal interest in the Bill. The present government had not the slightest personal interest in the matter. It would be for a Lieutenant Governor appointed by Canada to call around him such men, in the House or outside of it, as could carry on the government, and all the ministers would be alike, some called and some responsible. The Premier was really so by name, from the mere circumstance of his having been called upon to form a Cabinet. Mr. Bunker spoke very feelingly against the Civil List, because he had the Sheriff in his house for taxes, all on account of salaries being too high. (Laughter.) Mr. DeCosmos said there were salaries in the List he would raise, others he might lower, but he would confine himself altogether to three heads of departments. Mr. Nathan said it had been found perfectly useless to try and throw out the bill; and the representative members should try to modify it. Mr. DeCosmos, who seemed much affected, said he would not go in with the member to vote for subordinates, he would only vote for heads of departments. Hon. Dr. Carrall—in other words, Mr. Chairman, he will only vote for a salary which he hopes to take himself. (Hear, hear.) Mr. DeCosmos protested against such personalities. Hon. Dr. Carrall was sorry that he had offended the hon. member, but it was quite natural if after 12 years passed on the opposition benches, he should aspire to an office. The hon. member proceeded at great length to explain his bill and his position as Executive. Mr. DeCosmos contended that the bill expressed the wish only of those in power, and claimed that the previous speaker had violated a pledge he had given on the hustings at Cariboo to vote for Responsible Government simultaneously with Union. Hon. Dr. Carrall said it was not true. He had always expressed practical measures. The hon. member always wanted something impracticable and always lost the right to do so. (DeCosmos) had opposed everything—including Confederation. Mr. DeCosmos pronounced the statement untrue and defied the hon. member to prove that he had ever opposed Confederation. Hon. Dr. Carrall—Clause by clause you voted against it. Mr. Nathan's motion was lost. The remainder of the items for the Department were passed. Attorney General—\$3880. Mr. Humphreys moved to insert \$8000, and in doing so paid a high compliment to the present incumbent of the position. Mr. Nathan supported the motion. The motion was lost and the original item was passed. Mr. Humphreys moved that all the schedule after the Attorney General be struck out. Lost—Ayes, Nathan, Skinner, Humphreys, Bunker, DeCosmos. Messrs. Bunker, Skinner, Humphreys, Nathan and DeCosmos were withdrawn to the committee room. The remaining clauses were passed without a division. Mr. Bunker moved to take \$800 from the allowance of the Chief Commissioner and add it to that of the Nanaimo constable. Lost.

The committee here rose and reported progress and the report was adopted. TELEGRAPH BILL. Mr. Alston moved that this bill be read a second time, and said if the bill went into committee certain clauses in the original bill would be struck out and amendments substituted. He maintained that all telegraph companies should be on a position to sue and be sued, that they should allow no privileges to one person over another, and that all should be charged alike. He would assume that the telegraph company had acted honorably and fairly—but they had the power to make contracts and to engage to send messages, and they could not be held responsible for those contracts or engagements. The hon. member contended that telegraph companies are common carriers and ought to come under the English Railway Act. Mr. Alston printed copies of the amendments. Hon. Attorney General—Telegraph companies are not common carriers in the same sense as railway companies. Mr. Humphreys seconded the second reading of the bill, and gave it his cordial support. The principle was a good one and some such bill ought to have been passed long ago. He was satisfied that the telegraph had not been as creditable to the colony as it ought to have been, seeing that it is subsidised. Hon. Dr. Helmecken rose to move that the bill be read this day three months, and said he was surprised to find on the table an entirely new bill which was designed to take precedence of the original one. The bill as introduced was one of the most invidious he ever knew, and its withdrawal by its introducer was an acknowledgment of its iniquity. The new bill was incomprehensible. Why should it interfere with the telegraph company at this time? Mr. DeCosmos [excitedly]—Show the iniquity. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—I don't see why you are so warm about this bill. Mr. DeCosmos denied that he was warm and said he had no other interest in the passage of this bill than any other member of the community. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—I didn't say you had. Mr. DeCosmos—The hon. gentleman has a mean, contemptible habit of— The Speaker demanded order. Hon. Dr. Helmecken saw no reason for the bill when we were about to hand over the telegraph to Canada. We had here two systems. One was a local telegraph belonging to the Government of the colony; and the other was a foreign telegraph company. The which did the bill refer to? Not to the Government—it is not a company, and surely not to the Western Union Telegraph Company, which is foreign, having a very small interest in this colony. The connection with that company had been of the utmost importance to this colony, and it would be a great misfortune to have that connection severed. The line had been conducted in the best possible manner, and complaints had been made from Vancouver Island, and telegraphic communication would not exist even now if the company had not been subsidised. It has a few miles of line in the colony, and we are going to take it away, and we are going to bring in a bill to control these few miles of line and interfere with foreign capital. Was it likely that so gigantic a corporation as the Western Union Telegraph Company would be governed by a sheet of paper issued by such a Parliament as ours? How absurd that we should attempt to control the telegraph system of North America? Why, these companies might refuse to send any press reports at all. Nay, if restricted, they might send them to some person as a private dispatch. Have we any law with regard to Express companies? No. Have we made any laws with respect to other companies? No. This bill is all on one side—it attempts to restrict this foreign company to which has been given an exclusive privilege. The law of Vancouver Island is quite sufficient to meet every emergency and necessity. The bill as introduced is the most remarkable of all. It upsets all existing contracts, so that any one who is a party to a contract with the company would be released by the passage of this bill. Mr. DeCosmos—No. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—Oh, I didn't know you knew anything about the bill. The iniquitous part of the bill is where it gives to the telegraph company—who have no special privileges—to transmit news at certain rates and allow the newspapers to pick and choose what they like and reject the rest. Did any one ever hear of such an absurdity? They sit to receive all this news and throw half of it away, and submit to an abridgement every day. The company, in his opinion, was fully competent to sue and be sued and the bill was unnecessary and ought to be thrown out. (Hear, hear.) Hon. Attorney General—in rising to second the motion of the hon. member for Victoria City I wish to dissuade all personal feeling. I do it on public grounds, because I believe the bill would interfere improperly and injuriously with rights that have been acquired, because I believe the bill would be a bill to induce the telegraph company to withdraw from the colony, and because it has been arranged to hand the telegraph system over to Canada in a short time. The Act of 1864 is still in force and the Western Union Telegraph Company having succeeded to the business of the California State Telegraph Company and preserved that title for this portion of the line, have rights and privileges under the Act and may put up lines and maintain them. Railway companies make a bargain with the Government before they lay down rails at all. Here a bill is introduced to which the telegraph company is not a party and which gives them special privileges. As the Act was originally drawn it should have fallen in my duty to oppose it with every word I was capable of doing. I can see no difference between the company and private individuals or firms. Suppose a company acquired the right to put up a line from Esquimaux to this place, they could charge what they liked so long as no exclusive privileges were asked. The Western Union Company have not asked for anything. Mr. DeCosmos—They have asked for money. Hon. Attorney General—This is a different matter; but why was the Government asked to make a bargain when the subsidy

was first suggested? The telegraph company are not simply senders, they are collectors of news and when they collect news it is as much their property as anything else. I know nothing to prohibit any person from charging what he likes for his own property. When the company collect news they have a right to do as they please with it and I see no difference in this respect between a telegraph company and a company of merchants. Railway companies have exclusive rights and are exempt to certain restrictions, but the telegraph company have no exclusive privileges and are not bound down. In the case of the Western Union Telegraph Company, they get a bill passed and extend their line to this colony, and then you turn around and claim half a dozen other things. Why not get a bill passed, saying no person shall have money from the bankers in this colony at a less rate than another? Go to the merchants and say that they may sell goods at the same price to all customers on the same terms as to credit. Such is the principle of this bill, and that is the reason why I oppose it. It has been said that similar bills have been passed in other countries, but I am not aware of their existence. The English Act refers alone to private telegrams and says that there must be no preference or favor shown—that is, that the first to bring a dispatch is entitled to have it sent off first. [The hon. gentleman here described the manner in which the Associated Press of the United States receive cable and other dispatches, and said that the bill sought to make the company send news from San Francisco to Victoria, at as low a rate as they were charged for sending from one part of San Francisco to another.] The agent of the company at San Francisco is made liable to be indicted for misdemeanor. (Laughter.) If he has not been guilty of any misdemeanor there, how in the name of patience, can he be indicted here? Companies may sue and be sued under the English law, and the case of the Dutch East India Company vs. Mose & Co and several other cases establish. Mr. Alston—in Obsequy or Common Law? Hon. Attorney General—In both. Foreign insurance companies are sued nearly every day in England. A contract broken here may be sued upon at San Francisco and all the evidence taken by commission. Now, if the Western Union Telegraph Company have made a contract to send words to one at a less rate than to another, we can't break it and if we try to do so we deprive ourselves of telegraphic communication entirely, for if the company is liable to a fine of \$1000 and imprisonment through fault of the agent, two or three times a year, they would soon shut up their office. The Government is opposed to the bill because it sought to impose duties on the company without giving it any correlative rights—because the company might deprive us of telegraphic communication—because it is a foreign company and impossible to enforce the law. Mr. DeCosmos wished it distinctly understood that he wished to see all telegraph companies doing business in this colony treat all alike and that all persons having a grievance against a telegraph company could enter the Courts of the colony and obtain redress. Beyond that he had no personal interest. It was an error to suppose that he had private feelings. He had a contract for ten years with the company—and used given service which could be collected in case of any other city in case of default. A law passed here could have no effect upon existing contracts and all he wanted to see was the power secured to sue for a violation of contract. He quoted from the English Act to show that the lines of telegraph companies must be open for all without favor or preference. He found here to day the chief adviser of the Government and the representative of the chief commercial city of the colony doing violence to the sentiment of English law play. Hon. Attorney General—I don't find any such clause in this bill. (Laughter.) The hon. gentleman has scarcely understood the scope of my argument. The English Act applies equally to sending messages without favor or preference; but there is nothing said about terms. Mr. DeCosmos maintained that he had had legal authority for the opinion that the English Act meant terms as well as the term of sending a message. The hon. gentleman proceeded to question the expressed opinions of the hon. Attorney General, and was frequently corrected by the gentleman. He denied that it meant only fair play. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—The withdrawal of the bill proves its iniquity. Mr. DeCosmos contended that if a telegraph company wished to break down a British Columbian paper and build up one in favor of annexation an annexation howl—how really they could do it. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—Particularly if that paper threatens annexation if the terms of the railway don't come to Victoria. Mr. DeCosmos continued, challenging hon. Dr. Helmecken to point out where the bill was iniquitous. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—The section that requires the company to furnish a large number of words and permits newspaper men to call the number they want and send the rest back to the company. Mr. DeCosmos—to call reports I denounce it. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—Then, why did you introduce it? Mr. DeCosmos—I didn't introduce it. I can prove by a gentleman outside that I opposed that clause. Mr. Alston—To which clause do you refer? Mr. DeCosmos—[Not answering]—I support English law, and I claim it because I've got English blood in my veins. Hon. Dr. Helmecken—Well! I haven't; (laughter) but don't you think other fair play is the same as English fair play? Mr. DeCosmos—it ought to be. The threat that the company will withdraw is idle. Under the Railway Act all persons are treated alike, and why should they not be treated alike by the telegraph company. In conclusion, the hon. gentleman again claimed that he had no interest in this measure, beyond that of a member of the community, and that the Western Union Telegraph Company in this colony had done and other again taken money from one man at one rate and charged another man another rate. Under Confederation he was satisfied an Act would be put on the statute books that would cure the evil. Mr. Humphreys said he was shocked at the extent of provincial hostility. Complaints had been notorious and he was surprised that

the hon. member for Victoria City could term the bill iniquitous. Mr. Alston replied briefly in support of the bill, denying that it was iniquitous and expressing his opinion in opposition to that of the hon. Attorney General that the company can sue and be sued. A division being taken, the motion of hon. Dr. Helmecken was carried and the bill thrown out. Council adjourned till Thursday at 1 p.m. Peace Jubilee Holiday. Yesterday the proclamation of Peace in Europe was celebrated in all parts of the civilized world and people of every nationality—particularly the Germans and their descendants—united in welcoming the "white-winged messenger." In this city the observance was quiet yet joyous. In the afternoon the stores were closed and German flags floated on the breeze from many staves. The vicinity of Alhambra Hall in the afternoon presented an animated scene. The Germans had met to drink the health of the Kaiser Wilhelm, the brave Prince, the late Chancellor and the great Commander of the German armies. The hall was hung with flags and on the walls were portraits of the Emperor, "Our Fritz," "Our Karl," Bismarck, Moltke, and scrolls bearing the honored names of Sollier, Humboldt, Kleist, Handel, Mozart, Goethe, Beethoven and other great Germans. At the head of the room stood a statue of Peace, surmounted by a dove bearing in its beak the blessed olive-branch and regarding with an approving eye the happy group that had gathered around the well-laid board arranged by the master-hand of a Piper. Mr. Weiler presided and in a speech delivered in the German tongue expressed the object of the meeting, after which the band in exquisite style played "What is the Fatherland." The first toast proposed was The German Empire, by Mr. Gerke, whose remarks were greatly appreciated. Music—Hail Dir to Lieger-Krauz, The President proposed The Queen, whose health was drunk with deafening cheers. Music—God Save the Queen. The third toast—Count Bismarck, Count Moltke and the German Heroes—was proposed by Mr. H. F. Heisterman in a patriotic and warmly-applauded address. Music—"The Wash on the Rhin." The Fallen Heroes was solemnly proposed as the fourth toast by Mr. C. A. Schmidt. Music—"How they so softly rest." The Chairman then proposed the city we live in, coupled with the name of His Worship the Mayor, A. R. Robertson, Esq. Mr. Robertson responded in a very eloquent and effective speech and complimented the German nation on their patriotism, and for moderation in the hour of victory. The speech of His Worship was enthusiastically applauded and three hearty cheers were given at its close. "God Save the Queen" was played by the band, the company singing the Anthem. The sixth toast, proposed by the Chairman, (The President of the United States), was responded to by Mr. Eckstein, U. S. Consul, in a capital speech, partly in English and partly in German. Music—"The Star Spangled Banner." The Press, was given by the Chairman, and was responded to by Mr. Seelye of the Colonist, and Mr. Long of the Standard. The "German Wives" was responded to by Mr. Stuenkel. Mr. Chase Gosman. The dinner closed pleasantly. Throughout the whole proceeding nothing was said or done to disturb the kindly feeling that pervaded the entire company. In the evening the festivities closed with a grand ball. PEGET SOUND AGRICULTURAL CLAIMS.—One item in the bill making appropriations for diplomatic and consular expenses is to pay Great Britain the second and last instalment awarded by the Commissioners under the treaty of July 1st, 1863, in satisfaction of the claims of the Hudson Bay and Peget Sound Agricultural Companies, amounting to three hundred and twenty-five thousand dollars in gold coin. Provided, That before payment shall be made of that portion of the above sum awarded to the Peget Sound Agricultural Company all taxes legally assessed upon any of the property of said company covered by said award before the same was made and still unpaid shall be extinguished by the Peget Sound Agricultural Company, or the amount of such taxes shall be withheld by the Government of the United States from the sum hereby appropriated. DEPARTURE OF THE ENTERPRISE.—The steam Enterprise sailed at 10 o'clock yesterday morning for New Westminster with 73 passengers, many of whom were for Olympia—and a full freight. Among the passengers were F. H. Lamb, Dr. Trotter, A. W. Wells, J. A. Webster, J. Harper, Thos. Spencer, John Gully, W. Sankey, G. A. Walker, Mr. Nelson and the Baron of Lillooet. JOB THE CITY MESSENGER, was yesterday presented with a season ticket of admission to Taylor and Barney's entertainments at the Alhambra, Joe having proved to the satisfaction of the proprietor that he had the longest handle to his face. PUNISHON.—The Toronto Telegraph says that the Rev. Mr. Punshon was to deliver his celebrated lecture on "Wesley and his Times" before departing for British Columbia, and that His Excellency Governor Howland would occupy the Chair on the occasion. THE OTTER.—This steamer will sail tomorrow morning. From appearance at time of writing she will have 65 passengers and a large freight for Skeena mouth. CAMOMILE PILLS. ARE CONFIDENTLY RECOMMENDED AS A simple but certain remedy for Indigestion. They act as a powerful tonic and gentle aperient; and will be their operation safe under any circumstances, and thousands of persons can now bear testimony to the results derived from their use. Sold in bottles at 1/6, 2/6, 3/6 and 1/3 each, by Chemists, Druggists and Storekeepers in all parts of the world. Orders to be made payable by London Post Office. A LULL BY

Wednesday March 29th 1871

The British Lion Awaking.

The policy of Great Britain has long been one of peace. Best of all, her experience has been in harmony with her policy. With the exception of that little affair in the Euxine, Britannia has never drawn the sword for many a long year. Her geographical position is eminently favorable to peace. It cannot be doubted that had she occupied a portion of Continental Europe, instead of the "seagirt Isles," she would have been more or less involved in European complications. As it is, she has been enabled to occupy the dignified and god-like position of the great peace-maker. It may be questioned, however, whether or not the most efficient way to live at peace is to be ever ready to fight—that is to say, to be always in efficient fighting condition. Proceeding upon this hypothesis, some will doubt whether Great Britain has been quite up to the mark whether in her protracted peace the British Lion has not fallen into a fatal slumber. Her neighbors, possibly jealous of the unruffled serenity of her existence, have hinted that the British Lion has ceased to be the terrific brute of former times. They have even spoken of it as being sans teeth, sans claws sans everything calculated to strike terror into the heart of an enemy; that even its roar has ceased to have terror in it. There are not wanting circumstances in some sort calculated to give the color of reason to this view; and it is, therefore, not without satisfaction that we see the old beast awaking, shaking its mane, and showing its teeth if for no other reason than to convince the nations that there is life and vigor in the old Lion yet, and that should occasion demand, it could be as terrific as ever. The proposition now before Parliament to abolish the purchase system in the British army, and thus remove what must be regarded as one cardinal source of weakness and inefficiency in that army is an important step in the right direction; and the earnestness with which the nation is prepared to grapple with that evil may be imagined from the fact that an intensely economic Government proposes to expend eight millions sterling towards indemnifying personal loss occasioned by such abolition a sum which Dir-a-el appears to think insufficient. But it is clear that there is much work to be done, in order to clear off the peace-moss with which the entire service would appear to have been overgrown. The statement that of the three hundred thousand barrels of gunpowder stored in Government arsenals, only eight hundred barrels are fit for use is one which ought to startle a sleeping sentinel. It is hoped that both the army and navy will undergo such a thorough overhauling and reconstruction as must insure the healthy and efficient condition of both. Great Britain has no need of a large standing army. But she wants a live army. And she must keep her powder dry. Wednesday, March 22nd. DISTRESSING SIGHT.—Yesterday we saw well dressed female in a state of feeble intoxication on one of the principal thoroughfares of this city. The advocates of "Women's Rights" may possibly claim that we have had just as good a right to get drunk and make a public exhibition of themselves as men. Be that as it may, a respectable-looking woman staggering on the public streets ought to be a potent temperance lecture. TOLL CHARTER ACT.—The object of the short Act is to remove doubts respecting the powers of the Governor to grant charters for the collection of tolls upon roads or trails in British Columbia. The Act provides that no such charter shall be granted until tenders have been invited for the work in respect of which it is proposed to levy tolls. KNOWS-COLOU.—At the bottom of the Taylor Family bills, the "paterfamilias" of the interesting circle pledges himself to present a season ticket to any man in the town who may be the fortunate possessor of a long proboscis than his. Yesterday afternoon the City Messenger called on Mr. Taylor, who honored the draft at sight. MOVING.—The spring trade has commenced in real earnest. Yesterday a great quantity of goods was taken out of bond for shipment to Olympia by the Otter an Enterprise. CHICKEN STEALING.—Several hen roosts have been robbed in the vicinity of Humberbold and Courtenay streets. In one case 22 fowls were carried off and four left behind dead. In another case 16, and in a third 15 fowls. STEAMER DEPARTURES.—The Sir James Douglas for Nanaimo, and the Leibel and Olympia for Peget Sound, sailed yesterday.