expedient) any debentures, debenture stock or securities of the Company:

(17.) To sell, lease, charter, or otherwise dispose of absolutely or conditionally, or for any limited interest, the whole or any part of the undertaking, property, rights, concessions or privileges of the Company for such consideration in cash, shares or otherwise as the Company may think fit, and to abandon any part of the business for the time being of the Company, and to carry on any of the objects mentioned in this clause to the exclusion of the others:

(18.) To subscribe for, purchase or otherwise acquire the shares or stock, whether ordinary, preferred or deferred, or the debenture bonds or other securities of any company, and to accept the same in payment for any property sold, or busine-s undertaken, or services rendered by this Company, and to hold, sell or otherwise dispose of the same:

(19.) To pay for any rights or property acquired by the Company, or any services rendered to the Company, in fully or partly paid shares or stock, debentures or other securities of the Company, and to make such payments or gifts by way of bonus or otherwise, and either in money or in any other value as may from time to time be deemed expedient for information or advice given, or for services of any kind rendered to the Company, or in connection with which the Company may directly or indirectly be interested, and generally to make any payments or agree to pay any commissions, with or without any consideration moving to the Company, if it is considered by the directors in the interests or directly or indirectly to the benefit of the Company so to do:

(20.) To promote any company for the purpose of acquiring all or any part of the undertaking, property and liabilities of the Company, or for carrying on any business or doing any act or thing which may be deemed conducive to the prosperity of this Company; also, to acquire the whole or any part of the undertaking and liabilities of any now existing or future company, and to conduct, liquidate or wind up the business of any such company:

(21.) To enter into partnership or into any arrangement for sharing profits, co-operation, reciprocal concession or otherwise, with any person or company, and to remunerate any person or persons, joint stock or any other company, by fixed salary or specified remuneration, or by a share of profits present, past or future, or part one way and part the other:

(22.) To make and carry into effect or determine arrangements with British or foreign manufacturers, railway and shipping companies, proprietors or charterers of shipping, carriers, proprietors of steam or other mechanical power, and other persons of company:

(23.) To obtain any provisional order or Act of Parliament for enabling the Company to carry any of its objects into effect, or for effecting any modification of the Company's constitution, or for any other purpose which may seem expedient, and to oppose any proceedings or applications which may seem calculated directly or indirectly to prejudice the Company's interests:

(24.) To undertake and execute any trusts, the undertaking whereof may seem desirable, and either gratuitously or otherwise:

(25.) To pay any commission or brokerage for the purpose of securing the subscription of any part of the share or loan capital of this Company, or of any company promoted by this Company, or in which this Company is or intends to be interested, and generally to remunerate any persons for underwriting such capital, or for services rendered in placing or assisting to place, or guaranteeing the placing of any shares, debentures or other securities of the Company, or for promoting or guaranteeing the raising of capital for any other company:

(26.) To procure this Company to be legalised, domiciled or recognised in any foreign country or colony, and to procure its incorporation in a like character, or as a societe anonyme in any foreign country, and to carry on the business of the Company, or any part thereof, in any foreign country or colony, or dependency of the United Kingdom, or in any part of the world, under any other style or name:

(27.) To draw, accept, make, indorse, discount and negotiate bills of exchange, promissory notes, warrants and other negotiable instruments other than bank notes:

(28.) To distribute among the members in specie, any property of the Company, or any proceeds of sale or disposal of any property of the Company, but so that no distribution amounting to a reduction of capital be made, except with the sanction [if any] for the time being required by law:

(29.) To exercise the powers given by "The Companies Seals Act, 1864," and the "Companies [Colonial Registration] Act, 183?":

(30.) To do all such acts and things as are incidental or conducive to the above objects:

(31.) It is expressly declared that the intention is that the objects set forth in each of the foregoing paragraphs of this clause shall be construed in the most liberal way, and shall be in nowise limited or restricted by reference to any other paragraphs, or by any inference drawn from the terms of any other paragraph:

(32.) The word "Company" in this clause, when not applied to this Company, shall be deemed to include any partnership or other body of persons, whether incorporated or not incorporated, and whether domiciled in the United Kingdom or elsewhere, and whether now existing or hereafter to be formed.

The capital stock of the said Company is £600,000, divided into 600,000 shares of £1 each.

Given under my hand and seal of office at Victoria, Province of British Columbia, this 9th day of April, 1887.

[L.s.] S. Y. WOOTTON,
Registrar of Joint Stock Companies.

No. 467.

CERTIFICATE OF THE REGISTRATION OF A FOREIGN COMPANY.

"COMPANIES' ACT," PART IV, AND AMENDING ACTS.

"Menominee and Marinette Hydraulic Gold Mining Company" (Foreign.)

Registered on the 22nd day of April, 1897.

I HEREBY certify that I have this day registered the "Menominee & Marinette Hydraulic Gold Mining Company [Foreign], under the "Companies Act," Part IV, "Registration of Foreign Companies," and amending acts.

The head office of said company is situated at the City of Menominee, in the State of Michigan, U.S.A.

The objects for which the company is established are:

To take and hold by purchase, lease or otherwise, mining properties at any place within the U.S.A. or Dominion of Canada, especially gold placer properties: and to equip such properties with the necessary facilities for carrying on mining, and to mine and remove gold, silver and any other mineral or metal that may be found therein, and to dispose of the products thereof. The primary and especial object at the date of this organization is mining gold by the hydraulic system of mining, from claims located on the Fraser River, in British Columbia, and the procuring of claims on which said mining is to be carried on, the construction of ditches, and procuring of water rights for mining and other purposes, and leasing the same, equipping such properties with plants and machinery, and operating the same by contract or otherwise.

The capital stock of said company is Six Hundred Thousand Dollars, divided into twenty-four thousand shares of Twenty-five Dollars each.

Given under my hand and seal of office at Victoria, Province of British Columbia, this 22nd day of April, 1897.

S. Y. WOOTTON,
Registrar of Joint Stock Companies.
[SEAL.] ap26

GORDON VS. VICTORIA.

Text of the Summing Up of the Chief Justice at Vancouver.

Questions Submitted to the Jury and on Which They Based Their Verdict.

The Point Ellice case is exciting so great interest in the city and its affects to Victoria are so important that it is given here in full:

The Chief Justice in summing up said: This is an action by the widow of the late Jesse B. Gordon, on behalf of herself, two children, aged 14 and 9 respectively, and one step-son, aged 20, to recover damages against the Corporation of the City of Victoria and the Consolidated Railway Company there, on account of the death of her husband, which occurred at Victoria on the 26th of May last whilst the deceased was riding on a tramcar of the defendant company, and travelling over a bridge within the Corporation limits, under the control, power and management of the Corporation. For facility of expression I shall, as has been done during the trial, refer to the City as the Corporation, and to the Tramway Company as the Company.

It seems that the 26th May was a holiday and that large crowds were attracted to a sham fight in the neighborhood of Esquimalt, and that the Company's cars ran there from Victoria, in the course of the journey passing over two bridges—the first the Rock Bay bridge and the second Point Ellice bridge. The deceased appears to have been one of the first to enter the car and to have secured a seat when the car was standing near Campbell's corner in the principal thoroughfare of the City. Immediately afterwards the car was thronged with passengers, which caused the deceased to relinquish his seat to a female passenger. When the car started there was barely standing room, the number of passengers being estimated at 100, which number was not decreased, although some may have got on and off until the car reached Point Ellice bridge. Another car similarly loaded was just ahead of the car in question, and had emerged from the bridge just as this one commenced to cross. It was a truss bridge containing two spans, and upon reaching the first span it collapsed. The car plunged through into the water below, and fifty and more passengers, including the plaintiff's husband, Jesse B. Gordon, were drowned or killed by the falling timbers. I will deal with the cases against each defendant separately; first, that against the Corporation, then that against the Company. Although at the time of the disaster the bridge was unquestionably within the limits and under the control of the Corporation, it was not so at the time of its construction. It was built by the Government in 1885, and was then outside the City limits. The limits were extended in 1890, the extension taking effect on January 8th, 1891, so as to expressly include Point Ellice bridge. The Corporation has supreme power over the bridges within its limits under section 50 Municipal Act subsections 122, 129 and 136. The Corporation had by by-law given permission to the Tramway Company to lay tracks and operate tramways upon the streets and bridges within the limits of the City, subject to their supervision and control. This was before the extension of the limits and consequently did not include Point Ellice bridge. Section 19, subjection (a) of the Municipal Act, 1892, provides that in case an addition is made to the limits of any municipality the by-laws and resolutions of such municipality shall extend to such additional limits, and shall continue in force until altered or repealed by the Council. Whether this provision gave the Company power to run tramways over Point Ellice bridge we are not concerned to enquire, as antecedent to the extension the then tramway company had under an act of the legislature power to construct, maintain and operate their tramway over any highways or bridges between Victoria and the town of Esquimalt which would, of course, include Point Ellice bridge. That power then was subject to the supervision of the Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, but from and after the extension it is clear under section 10 of the Municipal Act, 1892, and the by-law of the City, that the power of supervision was transferred to the Corporation. This is rendered additionally clear by Cap. 63 of 1894, section 12, and its sub-sections placing the supervision and control wholly in the hands of the Corporation and their officers, and ever since the extension of the limits, the Corporation have exercised this control. In the year 1892 an accident occurred on the same bridge, to the same car, by the breaking of one of the beams, but fortunately unattended with disastrous consequences. The Corporation then repaired the bridge themselves and authorized the Tram Company to also make certain alterations, of which repairs and alterations I shall speak again directly. I refer to them in this connection as indicating the entire control and ownership which the Council exercised over the bridge. Moreover it was then replanked and the Corporation appropriated the old planking and sold it. In view of the statutes, by-laws and actions of the Council, it is idle for them now to contend that they did not control the bridge and supervise the operations of the Tramway Company. It, however, becomes necessary to still further consider the repairs and alterations made in 1892, what caused them and how they were executed, for the liability of the Corporation at least seems principally to turn on these questions.

The first thing which must have attracted their attention to the state of the bridge was a letter from a practical bridge builder, Mr. Theodore P. West, who had recently built a bridge running parallel with this one, viz: the railway bridge crossing the harbor to the south of this one. His letter is important so I shall read it in full. (Letter read.) It seems that the City Engineer minimised the danger so graphically and forcibly pointed out by Mr. West and that the Council by a majority, sustained the Engineer against the protests of Aldermen Smith and Richards, who gave evidence before you, and being both practical men, and one of them presumably conversant with the plans and specifications of the bridge, they examined the bridge, and came to the conclusion, and so reported to the Council, that the bridge was unsafe. Now I was much impressed, and I am sure you must have been too, with the clear and common sense light in which Mr. Cassidy put the action of the majority in sustaining the engineer, who had reported favorably to the bridge. His argument I am sure was unanswerable. When you have an engineer you repose confidence in him, and so long as you do so it is not for members of deliberative bodies to oppose their own professional views to his. If you have not confidence in your engineer, discharge him and get one in whom you have, but so long as he has your confidence, it can only create disorder if his opinions and advice are to be set aside. So I think the Council must be exonerated from all blame so far. But they did not act on this principle afterwards; unfortunately not. The accident of 1892 happens and Mr. Wilmot, the engineer, writes them on the 15th June, 1892, reporting the accident and its temporary repair, but that eight more beams are rotten and he recommends iron beams throughout at a cost of $1,500. Nothing seems to have been done until the 29th of June, when he writes this letter: "I beg to call your attention to the fact that tramcars and heavily loaded wagons still cross Point Ellice bridge, although that structure was reported unsafe for such traffic at a meeting of the Council on the 15th inst., and a notice to the same effect published in one of the daily newspapers. If the bridge is not closed at once a serious accident is liable to occur at any moment, as the bridge is in a decidedly dangerous condition." In response to this stirring appeal the Council authorized not iron beams at $1,500, but "wood floor beams," estimated cost $560. However I must in this connection call your attention to Mr. Wilmot's excuse for the Council, that wood beams were as good, but would not last so long. A great deal has been said against Mr. Wilmot in this case, but if his advice about the iron beams had been taken, would this calamity, in human probability have happened?

However, so far the law imposes no liability on the Corporation. They may be prosecuted by indictment for failure to repair and maintain high ways and bridges, nonfeasance as it is called, but, by personal action, not. At least for the purpose of your finding that is the law which I have to lay down. The only thing for which they are liable is some active wrongdoing or misfeasance. Whether such misfeasance is established by the fact that the running of 20-ton tram cars was permitted over a bridge intended for no such traffic may be a matter to be hereafter considered. At present, in point of law I think not, for the Legislature had given the distinct privilege of running over the bridge. What you have to turn your minds to now is the way in which the alterations and repairs were made in 1892. Was there misfeasance then—I am dealing only with the case of the Corporation, and in this connection I must tell you that the Corporation is equally liable for any wrongdoing of the Company in respect of the alteration and repairs to the bridge as they are for their own. What the Tramway Company did was under the authority and supervision of the Corporation, and was as much the work of the Corporation as if they had done it themselves. (See exhibit 11, Wilmot letter of 29th July.) Now the work done by the city was: nine new floor beams put in; the substitution of stirrups, or irons going round the beams, for yoke hangers, which were bored through the beams; and replanking the bridge diagonally. The work of the Tramway Company was the putting in of longitudinal stringers, 10x12, under each rail for the length of the bridge, and divididg the planking into sections, thus enabling them to lay their rails (T rails being substituted for flat rails) upon the stringers instead of upon the planking as theretofore.

As we all understand, the yoke hangers, or stirrups, as the case may be, are most important factors in the bridge, for by them were attached to the beams the diagonals, counters and paraphernalia which held the structure together. If one of them gives way the whole affair collapses. If these yoke hangers or stirrups at least one did break on the occasion of the disaster, and here I wish to correct a wrong impression under which I labored, and so expressed myself during the trial, as to the broken yoke hanger. I gathered from not closely enough following the evidence, that this broken hanger was one of the welded stirrups, and had broken at the weld. If so, the liability of the Corporation would have been complete. But upon reading the extension of the shorthand notes, I find I was mistaken, and that the broken hanger referred to by Mr. Yorke was one of the original yoke hangers. Yorke leaves this in doubt, but the evidence of Bell clears it up. But there is more about the substituted stirrups than this. The undisputed evidence of McIntosh, who did the 1892 Corporation repairs by day work, proves that instead of providing new irons altogether for the stirrups, he had them manufactured out of the yoke hangers, and in order to do this they had to be lengthened, and this lengthening was done by taking them to a blacksmith, and two fresh pieces of iron in each hanger, welded or spliced in between the screw thread and the rest of the iron. Thus there were four welds in each stirrup, and 16 stirrups, or four times 16 welds for the whole work. These welds were made by the blacksmith without supervision of any kind or character, and whether badly or perfectly made is wholly conjectural and you have heard the evidence as to the treacherous character of welded iron. Moreover, we have nothing to show whether any of these stirrups broke or not, or whether one of them was the first to break. In this view of the matter, the failure of the defendant Corporation to call any testimony is important, and as the whole, or nearly so, of the debris of the bridge is in their possession, the failure to produce it and satisfy you by incontrovertible evidence, viz., the production of the stirrups themselves, or at least by the evidence of those who had examined them at the first, that none of the stirrups were broken, at least at the weld, is remarkable. Mr. Bell's report upon the whole thing after sixty days' examination, and which would presumably clear the matter up, is kept from you, so far as the evidence shows, because the Corporation will not pay him for the services he has rendered. Mr. Wilson dwells upon all these things, and properly so. If a prisoner in a criminal cases declines, now that he has the privilege, to go into the witness box, a strong presumption of guilt arises against him, although in mercy to a supposed criminal, the law permits no comment or allusion to be made on his failure to go into the witness box. In a civil case, if a party withholds evidence, ocular or verbal, which would decide the case for or against him, it is the subject of the gravest comment. I am not sure that this inference against the City is not displaced in this case; whilst the wreckage is in possession of the City, it is at the garbage wharf, and the plaintiff can inspect it as well as anyone else, that is, what of it remains there; and we have also the evidence of Bell that so far as he recollects, there was only one broken yoke hanger or stirrup. But then he tells us, and this is most important again, that there was one missing yoke hanger, or stirrup. This missing stirrup, if it be one, or yoke hanger, might, and probably would, tell the whole tale. In the absence of evidence by the City, and of Mr. Bell's sixty day's investigation, which the City might have brought before you, it is for you to draw your own inferences and conclusions, whether favorable to the Corporation or unfavorable. You will also consider what effect, if any, the laying of these two stringers by the tramway company to carry the rails had on the stability of the bridge, whether it unduly increased the load, and also the effect of cutting the planking, whether the act had or had not any effect by casting the weight on the already overburdened side, where the rails were laid, instead of in some measure distributing the burden. There is also some evidence to show that the constant screwing up of the braces was injurious. These are all matters for your consideration as against the Corporation.

Now about the Tramway Company. Very little of what I have been saying can be made to apply to them. You must always bear in mind that they came into prominence only on the 1st of May, or a little over three weeks before the disaster. Their neglects or defaults date only from then, for, although Mr. Wilson was to furnish me with authorities showing that the Railway Company were responsible for the acts and defaults of their predecessors, he has not done so, and, as at present advised, I am of opinion that they are in no way responsible for the doings of any company which preceded them. It was hinted by Mr. Wilson that the change of companies was only a shuffle, but there is nothing to show that it was not bona fide, and indeed Mr. McKilligan's testimony shows it to have been so. He was appointed Receiver by the Supreme Court and continued as such until the debenture holders took charge and he became Receiver for them, and so continued until the first of May, when the new company presumably under purchase from the debenture holders, took charge, wiping the former Company altogether out of existence. From the 7th of June, 1895, until the 8th of January, '96, the property was in the hands and management of the Supreme Court, and the evidence shows the same cars and traffic were operated on the bridge as afterwards. If the accident had happened then who would have been responsible? The new company merely carried on the business in the same way as had been going on for the preceding four year. Nothing had happened to cause them to doubt the sufficiency of the bridge and in the three weeks they had had possession they could hardly be expected to have made an examination. However, they were fully responsible for the manner in which the cars were managed on the 26th of May, and if the car was overloaded and liability ensues for such overloading, they are responsible therefor. It has been urged that the unfortunate Mr. Gordon brought about his own death by voluntarily travelling in an overloaded car, was guilty of contributory negligence as it is called. I do not think that is so. Contributory negligence cannot be set up by establishing the fact that if the sufferer had taken some course or exercised some precaution or control altogether antecedent to the happenning, the accident might not have occurred. A man cannot be deemed guilty of contributory negligence if he does what 99 out of every 100 would do and not one man out of a hundred would have hesitated to have crossed Point Ellice bridge in the car that day, loaded although it was. You need not trouble yourselves about that question, that is the contributory negligence of Mr. Gordon having brought about his own death practically.

(His Lordship then put to the jury the questions numbered 1, 2 and 3 as below.) His Lordship continued: After having answered the above questions, please say whether in your belief any of the substituted stirrups put in by the Corporation broke either at the welds or otherwise. These questions, if exhaustively answered, as I have no doubt they will be, ought to decide the case. Mr. Wilson, however, has asked me to submit a number of other questions of which I allow the following: (His Lordship then put the further questions below.)

His Lordship continued: Having disposed of these questions, you will then turn your attention, if necessary, to the question of damages. Damages are entire as against both defendants if liable. In estimating them, we must discard all sentiment and feeling. They must not be vindictive or exemplary, simply because you may think the Corporation or the Company had been negligent, or even unpardonably reckless. You must remember in the case of Corporation that it is a body of innocent ratepayers who will have to foot the bill. Not the officers or members of the Corporation any further than as ratepayers. You must give Mrs. Gordon fair and reasonable compensation for her pecuniary loss, not damages for the pain and sorrow of being deprived of her husband, or the children of their father. In estimating this, you are by no means bound to calculate his life and income upon insurance principles and allow the plaintiff the capitalization of her husband's income of $125 per month during the whole of his expectant life of 21 years. To do so would be to leave wholly out of consideration the contingencies of existence and fortune. Mr. Gordon might have been earning an income of $125 this month, and the next, through no fault of his, he might have been out of employment, without any prospect of work, and his wife and children dependent upon him. Or, on the other hand, he might have been stricken with paralysis or some other disease which would render him helpless for his expectant life, even if he had lived to the last day. All such contingencies have to be taken into account. You cannot safely act the part of insurers or guarantors that for 21 years Mr. Gordon would earn $125 per month. You must take into full consideration the risks and chances of life, and return such a fair and reasonable amount as (taking also into account that, through her husband's prudence, Mrs. Gordon has already received $5,000) you think she ought fairly to receive.

The questions submitted were:

1. Q.: What was the proximate, that is to say, the immediate cause of the accident?

A.: We find the accident was caused by the breaking of a hanger. This we consider proved by the fact that one was broken, and no other strain so great could have been put upon it at the time of the accident as that caused by the cars passing over it; we further think the missing hanger strengthens this conclusion.

2. Q.: Was the Corporation blameable for such cause, and how?

A.: Yes, because having been made aware of the bad condition of the bridge, through the report of the engineer and otherwise, they attempted repairs, but the work was not done sufficiently well to strengthen the structure. In our opinion it was their duty to first ascertain the carrying capacity of the bridge before allowing such heavy cars to pass over it.

3. Q.: Was the accident due to any act or negligence on the part of the railway, and, if so, describe such act or negligence.

A.: No.

After having answered the above questions, please say whether in your belief any of the substituted stirrups put in by the Corporation broke, whether at the welds or otherwise, and how.

There is no evidence to show, in our opinion the stirrups must have broken at the welds, otherwise it would have been attached to the floor beam.

Q.: Did the Corporation, at the time of the repairs made in 1892 know the plan and design of the bridge, the method of construction, and the nature of the material employed and the capacity of the bridge?

A.: No.

Q. If not, could the Corporation have readily acquired that information, and did they refrain from so doing?

A. Yes.

Q. Did the Corporation assume entire control and management of the bridge, and if so, when?

A. Yes; January, 1891.

Q. Did the company first begin to run big cars across the bridge before or after the Corporation assumed control of the bridge?

A. After.

Q. Did the Corporation, with a view to increased traffic and the use by the company of larger cars, make any alterations in the bridge?

A. Yes.

Q. Were such alterations, if any done properly, having regard to the intended use by the company of large cars, such as the one in which the deceased was carried?

A. No.

Q.: Did the then company in 1892, with the consent of the Corporation, make any alterations in the bridge?

A.: Yes.

Q.: Were such alterations by the company proper, having regard to the intended use by the company of large cars, such as the one in which the deceased was carried?

A.: It might have been better.

Q.: Was the bridge, after the changes made by the Corporation and Company, strong enough to carry the large cars alone? Ditto, when loaded to their fullest capacity?

A.: No.

Q.: Was the car in which the deceased was carried overloaded at the time of the accident?

A.: No.

Q.: Did the Company, with the consent of the Corporation, use cars of a size and weight beyond the strength of the bridge to carry?

A.: Yes.

THE DAMAGE SUITS.

"Just what we expected," was the reply made yesterday by a number of the heaviest taxpayers who, however, did not care to see their names in print, when asked as to their opinion of the verdict in the Gordon damage suit decided against the city in Vancouver on Wednesday. Out of a dozen gentlemen why were willing to express an opinion only one took exception to the verdict, and that was on the ground that it was not fair to hold the corporation solely responsible for the accident.

"What else could be expected," said one gentleman, "when we employ a council to look after the business of the city and change them every year. What we want are commissioners whose terms of office will be during good behaviour and whose salary will be sufficiently large to make the situation an object to the very best talent. At present we have a competent enough professional staff, but we make them dependent for their bread and butter upon the good will of an irresponsible body of men whose chances for re-election depend largely upon their ability as wire pullers."

The idea which was advanced months ago by the Chief Justice that the various claims should be submitted to arbitration found seconders in every case in which an opinion was asked on this subject, and in some cases a hope was expressed that the city authorities would yet listen to reason, and if it were not too late yet that overtures should be made looking to a settlement of the pending litigation before the enormous list of costs incidental to fighting the cases had been incurred. That there was any chance of the city's winning did not seem to enter the minds of the ratepayers interviewed.

The jury's answer to the third question was a staggerer to a great many, who at first sight failed to distinguish between overloading the car and overloading the road-bed. And in this connection one gentleman thought that the Tramway company, who was making all the money through being allowed to use the bridge free of charge, was morally responsible for a share of the damages.

An alderman who was spoken to in the matter said that it was a most outrageous verdict and the Corporation intended to appeal the case and fight it to the bitter end. "We have evidence that very few seem to know about," continued the alderman, "and while the Corporation owns all the rest of the bridges within the city limits, that at Point Ellice was specially exempted. And besides this, do you know that the contractors who built that bridge advised the government at the time permission was first given the tramway to run their cars across, that the structure was not strong enough for the traffic? No, I don't think the city was treated fairly and I believe we will win the case yet."

CASTORIA

For Infants and Children.

The fac-simile signature of Chas. H. Fletcher is on every wrapper.

Mining Companies' office stationery a specialty at the COLONIST office. x

is the light that will bring a great big glow of Happiness to you. Try it you will see how strong and vigorous your now weak body can be made. Hudyan is for man. The great Hudyan is to be had only from the Hudson Medical Institute. This wonderful discovery was made by the specialists of the old famous Hudson Medical Institute. It is the strongest and most powerful vitalizer made. It is so powerful that it is simply wonderful how harmless it is. You can get it from nowhere but from the Hudson Medical Institute. Write for circulars and testimonials.

This extraordinary Rejuvenator is the most wonderful discovery of the age. It has been endorsed by the leading scientific men of Europe and America.

HUDYAN is purely vegetable.

Strengthens and invigorates and tones the entire system. It is as cheap as any other remedy.

HUDYAN cures debility, nervousness, emissions and develops and restores weak organs. Pains in the backs, losses by day or night stopped quickly. Over 2000 private indorsements.

Send for circular and testimonials.

TAINTED BLOOD—Impure blood, due to serious private disorders, carries myriads of sore-producing germs. Then comes sore throat, pimples, copper-colored spots, ulcers in mouth, old sores and falling hair. You can save a trip to Hot Springs by writing for "Blood Book" to the old physicians of the

HUDSON MEDICAL INSTITUTE,
Stockton, Market and Ellis Streets
SAN FRANCISCO, California

NO DENTIFRICE EQUALS
CALVERT'S
Carbolic Tooth Powder
6d., 1s., 1s. 6d., and 1 lb. 5s. Tins, or
Carbolic Tooth Paste
6d., 1s., and 1s. 6d. Pots,
For Preserving the Teeth and Strengthening the Gums.

Each is prepared with CALVERT'S purest Car bolic, the best antiseptic preservative. They sweeten the breath and prevent infection By inhalation.

Avoid Imitations which are Numerous and Unreliable.

From NEWTON CRANE, Esq., late United States Consul, Manchester: "Your Carbolic Tooth Powder is *the best I ever used.* In my opinion I am joined by all the members of my family."

The Largest Sale of Any Dentifrices.

F. C. CALVERT & CO., MANCHESTER.
Awarded 75 Gold and Silver Medals, &c.
AGENTS:
Langley & Henderson Bros., Victoria, B.C

PRIVATE.

Doctor Ratcliffe. MEDICAL AND Surgical Offices for the cure of all Special Diseases, Female Complaints, Men's Ailments, Nervous Debility, Acute Drains, Stricture, Blood Taints, Varicocele, Hydrocele, Blood and Skin Diseases and Diseases of the Heart, Lungs, Liver, Stomach, Kidneys and other Organs; a life-long study and practice. Perfect cures guaranteed. Office hours to 12 a.m., 2 to 5 and 7 to 8 p.m.; Sundays, 10 to 12 a.m. only.

FREE BOOK on special diseases to all describing their troubles. If you cannot call, write to the well known and reliable specialist, DR. RATCLIFFE, 713 First Avenue, Union Block, Seattle.

Men Made Manly

The new remedy "Oriental Pills," for all weakening disorders of the male sexual system, i- potency, etc, is highly endorsed by leading physicians as being the only satisfactory and reliable treatment. Remedies heretofore employed prove most discouraging to the patient. The Oriental Pills encourage from the first dose and give untold satisfaction at the finish. Securely mailed to any address for $1 Plain practical pointers for self-cure sent with each package.

ONTARIO SUPPLY CO.,
77 Victoria St. Toronto, Agents for Canada. my16

Gold is King
Plant your home claim with
Steele, Briggs
"High Grade" Seeds, sold by leading dealers.
Ask for them.
Safe investment.
GOLDEN RETURNS
CATALOGUES FREE
The Steele, Briggs Seed Co.
TORONTO, ONT.

NOTICE.

STOCK CERTIFICATES
STOCK LEDGERS,
STOCK JOURNALS
MINERS' PAY SHEETS,
MINERS' CASH ABSTRACTS
MINING REPORTS
MINING MAPS AND PLANS
SEALS.

LITHOGRAPHED LETTER PRESS

WRITE FOR SAMPLES AND PRICES TO

THE COLONIST, VICTORIA.

CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION OF A FOREIGN COMPANY.

"Companies' Act," Part IV., And Amending Acts.

"The Raven Copper and Gold Company" (Foreign).

Registered the 23rd day of March, 1897.

I HEREBY CERTIFY that I have this day registered "The Raven Copper and Gold Company" (Foreign), under the "Companies' Act," Part IV., "Registration of Foreign Companies," and amending Acts.

The head office of the said Company is situated at the City of Seattle, State of Washington, U.S.A.

The objects for which the Company is established are:—

1st. The mining, milling, smelting, or working ores by any process, or for any and all purposes;

2nd. To locate, buy, sell, lease, own, pledge, and mortgage mining claims and mill-sites, whether patented or unpatented, granted or ungranted;

3rd. To locate, buy, sell, lease, own, pledge and mortgage any other species of property, whether real or, personal, not only for the purpose of mining, but for any other purpose whatever, and for the carrying out of any business for the acquisition of gain;

4th. To appropriate or locate waters in public streams, to dig canals, ditches, flumes, aqueducts, reservoirs, dykes, dams, and bridges, not only to facilitate mining, but for any other operation of business whatever, and to buy, sell, lease, own, and mortgage any of such property for any purpose whatever;

5th. To develop mining and other kinds of property, both upon the Company's own land and upon that of others, to build roads, trails, tunnels, drifts, shafts and cross-cuts;

6th. To build, buy, sell, lease, operate, pledge, or mortgage mills, furnaces, smelters and reduction works, and all kinds of machinery, either for mining operations or for any other kinds of business whatsoever;

7th. To build, buy, sell, lease, and operate steam and sailing boats and river crafts of all kinds, and steam or electric railways, with their rolling stock, telephone and telegraph lines, electric light lines; to erect machinery for the developing of electricity for the use of railway, telephone, telegraph and electric light lines, and for use in the mines, either for light or power, and to collect tolls or compensation for the use of same;

8th. To buy, sell, and traffic in merchandise of all kinds for all purposes; to build, buy, sell, lease and operate stores and merchandise;

9th. To buy, sell, mortgage, pledge, hypothecate and generally to act as brokers in and to deal in mining stocks and bonds, or any other kind of stocks or bonds for any and all purposes;

10th. To buy, sell, pledge, or mortgage ores, bullion, concentrates, and sulphurets or any kind and all kinds and for all purposes;

11th. To operate in any and all of the aforesaid capacities in the Province of British Columbia, in so far as the laws of that Province may allow, and in conformity with the statutes respecting foreign corporations:

12th. To do any and all of the aforesaid acts and business either in the State of Washington or Province of British Columbia, or in any other State, Province, or country whatsoever:

The capital stock of the said Company is one million dollars, divided into one million shares of the value of one dollar each.

Given under my hand and seal of office at Victoria, Province of British Columbia, this 23rd day of March, 1897.

[L.s.] S. Y. WOOTTON,
Registrar of Joint Stock Companies.
ap8

NOTICE is hereby given that application will be made to the Legislative Assembly of the Province of British Columbia at its next session, for an act to incorporate a company with power to construct, equip, operate and maintain either standard or narrow guage railways, for the purpose of conveying passengers, freight and ore from a point at or near the head of steamboat navigation on Kitimaat Inlet, Douglas Channel, North West coast of British Columbia, by the most direct and feasible route along the Kitimaat Valley, about twenty-five miles more or less, thence to a point at or near Kitseilas Canyon on the Skeena river, thence along the valley of the Skeena river in a North Easterly direction to a point at or near Hazelton, thence in a North Easterly direction to a point at or near Germansen Creek, Omineca, with power to construct, equip, operate and maintain a branch connection with or extension of the same from a point at or near Hazelton, thence in a North Westerly direction by the most direct and feasible route to a point at or near Telegraph Creek on the Stickeen river, and with power to construct, equip, operate and maintain branches and all necessary roads, bridges, ways, ferries, wharves, docks and coal bunkers; and with power to build, own equip, operate and maintain steam and other vessels and boats; and with power to build, equip, operate and maintain telegraph and telephone lines in connection with the said railways and branches; and to generate electricity for the supply of light, heat and power; and with power to expropriate lands for the purposes of the company, and to acquire lands, bonuses, privileges, or other aids from any government, municipality or other persons or bodies corporate, and to make traffic or other arrangements with railway, steamboat or other companies, and with power to build wagon roads to be used in the construction of such railways and in advance of the same and to levy and collect tolls from all parties using and on all freight passing over any of such roads built by the Company, whether built before or after the passage of the Act hereby applied for, and with all other usual necessary or incidental rights, powers or privileges as may be necessary or incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objects or any of them.

Dated at the city of Victoria the 14th day of May, A.D. 1897.

HUNTER & OLIVER,
Solicitors for the Applicants.

NOTICE.

Notice is hereby given that sixty days after date I intend to apply to the Chief Commissione of Lands and Works for permission to purchase one hundred and sixty acres of pasture land in Lillooet District, commencing at a stake marked M.L.M., thence N. 40 chains to south line of Lot 15, thence W. along sea line 40 chains; thence S. 40 chains; thence E. 40 chains to initial post.

MAGNUS L. MEASON,
Lesser Dog creek,
Lillooet District, B.C.
March 17th, 1897. ap3

FOR CATARRH,
Colds, Sores and Burns.
Pure Eucalyptus Oil..... 35c. } Post Free.
Eucalyptus Salve..... 15c. }
Stamps Taken.
FLITTON Prop., Vancouver. ja9

PAINT YOUR BUGGY FOR $1.00
J. W. MELLOR
Paints, Oils, Wall Paper, Plate Glass. Fort St., above Douglas. VICTORIA.
se10-1y

B.C. STEAM DYE WORKS, 141 Yates Street, Victoria. Ladies and gent's garments and household furnishings cleaned, dyed or pressed equal to new. e12-1ydaw