

Provincial
Legislature

(Continued from Page Three)

It was perfectly true that the McLean Bros. had made a contract with the government, but that was a tentative agreement and to make it binding they must become an incorporated railway company. That was the reason the bill had been brought down in its present shape. There was no desire to conceal anything from the House. The McLean contract would be brought down tomorrow, and it would be found identical with the agreement in the bill before the House. There was no desire or intent to deceive the House and they would have ample opportunity to examine the contract with McLean Bros. as well as that with the Canadian Northern. It would be found that the government were acting in good faith, and in the best interests of the country, notwithstanding the denunciations of Mr. McPhillips and other members of the opposition. That gentleman would find when his record was submitted to the electors of Victoria that his course was a wrong one, even if he succeeded in defeating the government by the vote of a majority of a day of reckoning would come to him, and he would find out too late the mistake which he had made.

Mr. Murphy denied that the members of the opposition had supported Mr. Bodwell in a policy of granting a large cash and land endowment to the Canadian Northern. He argued that the province had no funds with which to subsidize the Canadian Northern. He said no reason why McLean Bros. could not enter into a contract just as well as a company. Mr. Curtis supported the amendment. He rose to speak at 11:30, and entered upon an arraignment of the government on their railway policy. He claimed the opposition represented the majority of the electors of the province, and that that fact proved the majority of the people of the province was opposed to the railway policy. He claimed that the McLean government had been returned to power, would have hundreds of miles of railway built without any cost to the country.

At midnight Mr. Curtis moved the adjournment of the debate. The government moved the adjournment, and the motion was defeated by a vote of 16 to 13.

After midnight Mr. Curtis continued to attack the government savagely on every point of policy, his eloquence being somewhat wasted from the fact that the galleries were deserted. The floor of the House thinned out to a few readers, some of whom killed time by reading, while the remainder counted the drowsy god under adverse circumstances, making the best shift possible by stretching themselves at full length in their chairs.

In the course of his remarks, Mr. Curtis denounced the people of Victoria for their selfishness in asking for the construction of the Canadian Northern at the expense of the balance of the province. He criticized in very strong terms the deputation of Victoria business men who interviewed Mr. McPhillips yesterday. He intimated that they were a disgrace to the province and a discredit to the city.

At 1 o'clock a. m. Mr. Curtis moved an amendment to the amendment, calling for all correspondence relating to the matter to be brought down at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. W. S. Smith made a point of order, which was discussed at some length, and finally was ruled out of order.

Mr. Curtis concluded by demanding that the government produce the original contract with the McLean Bros. Hon. Mr. Eberts remarked that he had already stated that the contract would be brought down at the next sitting of the House.

Mr. Curtis insisted that what he wanted was the original written contract, not the printed one.

Mr. Taylor continued the debate. He complimented Mr. McPhillips for his opposition to the Canadian Northern, and opposing the Canadian Northern contract, and went on to declare that that contract was an intrusion into the province in which none of the interests of the province were concerned. It was a matter of a stamp duty in the near future.

Mr. Hunter complained that the debate had degenerated during the night to repetitions and irrelevantities. He surprised to hear Mr. McPhillips declare himself above his constituents. He said he was responsible to them, to his constituents, and to them alone, no matter what his opinions might be on the general policy of the government. If the people of Victoria were in favor of the Canadian Northern it was his duty to support that measure, and to resign. That was the constitutional practice in such cases.

He had heard the honorable leader of the opposition make a statement in the House that he would obstruct every item of business, stating that precedent, so far as he knew, in the history of the parliamentary government under British rule.

Mr. Green rose to speak at 2 a. m. and was still speaking when the Colonel went to press at 3 o'clock.

Legislative Chamber, 3 a. m., May 7, 1902.

Mr. Hawthorthwaite called the attention of the Speaker to the fact that there was no quorum in the House. He held that it required nine members to constitute a quorum. He objected to the loose irregular method into which the House was drifting and asked the Speaker's ruling on the question.

Mr. Speaker ruled that it was not necessary that members should be at their places, so long as they were on the floor of the House, they had a right to vote.

Mr. Green continued the debate. He claimed that the Olla Copper Co. had offered to deposit \$100,000 in a bank in New York for the purpose of securing the terms of a contract of the V. & B. railway alleged to have been submitted to the government last year.

The debate was continued by Messrs. Gifford, Hawthorthwaite, Taylor, and Green, with great interest, divided his argument into 24 heads lettered from A to Z.

During the hours between 2 and 5 a. m. the House divided twice and on each case standing 18 to 12.

At 5:15 a. m. the opposition speakers appeared to have exhausted their strength and a vote was taken on themselves amendment to the motion, that the House proceed to the orders of the day, and it was defeated on the vote of 12 to 18.

Yess-Messieurs, Smith, E. O., Hawthorthwaite, Gifford, Fulton, Curtis, Phillips, Taylor and Kidd—A. W. Nays-Messieurs, McInnes, Stables, Hayward, Prentice, Dunnsmuir, Eberts, Smith, A. W., Ellison, Chisholm, Wells, Prior, Hall and Hunter—18.

The business of the House was then resumed.

had waited on the Victoria members in reference to the Canadian Northern contract, were a disgrace to the city. Hon. Mr. Eberts rose to give the exact words used by Mr. Curtis, but was reminded that such a course was out of order.

Mr. McPhillips also rose to a question of privilege. The Colonel had reported him as saying in regard to the contract: "That he (Mr. Eberts) might build the electors, but they could not build him." Mr. McPhillips said that Mr. Eberts might build the electors, but they could not build him. He said that the electors could not build him.

FORESHORE RIGHTS.

Mr. Heintzen resumed the debate on Mr. McPhillips' motion of April 29. That the conduct of the government in connection with the foreshore rights of this province is deserving of censure of this House.

Mr. Heintzen sketched the history of foreshore questions from the Union The Dominion had, with the consent of the province, exercised jurisdiction over the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

In one case, that of Mr. Gordon, a license to fish was refused on the ground that the license would carry with it the right to utilize the adjoining foreshore for the purpose of carrying on the fishing. The question of jurisdiction once settled the province should approach the granting of licenses with great caution, as much of the future success of the salmon fishing industry depended on the action. It was a question whether these licenses should be dealt with under the general Land Act, and whether the importance of the question would suggest special legislation under which it might be dealt with.

He had made a number of applications had been made for foreshore rights under the general Land Act, and the government had intimated that these would be made subject to a bill which was promised to be introduced.

The question was as to being of great importance, was difficult to deal with as there were many interests to be considered, and it was hoped that the government would be guided to some method of dealing with the matter.

While doing justice to all concerned, would conserve the interests of the province. He quoted figures to show the enormous business done in salmon fishing in Washington and argued that in order to place Canadian salmon on an equal footing with their American competitors fish traps should be allowed along our coast.

He hoped the government would make a statement of the House as to their intention in the process, as it was to all the feeling of uncertainty which those interested in the salmon industry.

One feature of the present bill was most serious and required the most careful consideration, was to grant the right of fishing grounds to the United States citizens, who were prepared to expend large sums of money to secure a monopoly of the fishery. Matters should be so arranged as to shut out all chance of our fisheries falling into the hands of aliens and handing them over to our own people. (Applause.)

Mr. Kidd was the next speaker. The British Columbia salmon industry had been injured by the establishment of traps on the United States coast, and he considered it to be a wise step on the part of the Dominion to allow traps on our side.

He regarded with disfavor the granting of licenses indiscriminately, or to irresponsible persons, and believed the fair and equitable way to dispose of these privileges would be by public competition.

He spoke at some length on the disadvantages which the Canadian fishermen suffered from United States competitors, on account of the latter having the right to trap fish in large numbers, and carry their catch and sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

He said that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased, and that the government should be allowed to sell when they pleased.

doubt but that trap fishing would have been in force years ago, and it was the duty, he felt, of the government, to remove all obstacles to such fishing. It appeared to him that they were doing so in connection with the reservation of the foreshore. He only wanted to say one more word, namely, as to his position on the House—his position.

He valued the promise of railroad development and increased facilities for the exploitation of the wealth to be found in our seas round the coast of Vancouver and clearly above party, and he trusted that as long as he had a seat on the floor of the House he would be prepared to discuss measures free from partisan feelings or the influence of purely party strife. (Applause.)

Hon. Mr. Eberts requested the resolution as a condemnation of the resolution and a vote of want of confidence, not designed to obstruct business, but as a means of obstructing business and harassing the government. The fisheries of the Dominion of Canada had been in dispute for many years, and it was only in 1898 that the Privy Council had decided in favor of the Dominion.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

He said that the Dominion had the right to regulate the fisheries and had refused to grant licenses to fish, even to those land owners whose holdings fronted on the sea, although the Dominion was directly taxing the people engaged in fisheries.

the policy of the government had been explained to the canners, who were per- haps not so much interested in the question of cancelling the notice respecting the foreshore reserve as under consideration.

Mr. Gifford moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Gifford asked leave to introduce a bill to encourage the manufacture of steel rails in Canada. The bill had been recommended by the Railway committee.

The House then adjourned till 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Hawthorthwaite called attention to an error in the votes and proceedings of Tuesday. On the division sustaining a ruling of Mr. Speaker, he recorded as having voted nay—he had voted to sustain the chair.

Hon. Mr. Prentice presented a report on taxation and draft of proposed Act for the province of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented a copy of the agreement for the construction of the Coast-Kootenay railway, and the report of the Minister of Justice, who had introduced the bill.

Hon. Mr. Eberts introduced a bill to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay railway company, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice introduced a bill to amend the Public Drying Act, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

the policy of the government had been explained to the canners, who were per- haps not so much interested in the question of cancelling the notice respecting the foreshore reserve as under consideration.

Mr. Gifford moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Gifford asked leave to introduce a bill to encourage the manufacture of steel rails in Canada. The bill had been recommended by the Railway committee.

The House then adjourned till 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Hawthorthwaite called attention to an error in the votes and proceedings of Tuesday. On the division sustaining a ruling of Mr. Speaker, he recorded as having voted nay—he had voted to sustain the chair.

Hon. Mr. Prentice presented a report on taxation and draft of proposed Act for the province of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented a copy of the agreement for the construction of the Coast-Kootenay railway, and the report of the Minister of Justice, who had introduced the bill.

Hon. Mr. Eberts introduced a bill to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay railway company, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice introduced a bill to amend the Public Drying Act, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

the policy of the government had been explained to the canners, who were per- haps not so much interested in the question of cancelling the notice respecting the foreshore reserve as under consideration.

Mr. Gifford moved the adjournment of the debate.

Mr. Gifford asked leave to introduce a bill to encourage the manufacture of steel rails in Canada. The bill had been recommended by the Railway committee.

The House then adjourned till 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Speaker took the chair at 8:30 p.m.

Mr. Hawthorthwaite called attention to an error in the votes and proceedings of Tuesday. On the division sustaining a ruling of Mr. Speaker, he recorded as having voted nay—he had voted to sustain the chair.

Hon. Mr. Prentice presented a report on taxation and draft of proposed Act for the province of British Columbia.

Hon. Mr. Wells presented a copy of the agreement for the construction of the Coast-Kootenay railway, and the report of the Minister of Justice, who had introduced the bill.

Hon. Mr. Eberts introduced a bill to incorporate the Vancouver and Coast-Kootenay railway company, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice introduced a bill to amend the Public Drying Act, which was read a first time.

Hon. Mr. Prentice moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.

Hon. Mr. Eberts moved that the House do not adjourn till 11 o'clock, and the motion was carried on a vote of 15 to 10.