Mr. Eberts Examined

Conflict of Authorities on Legality of Original C. P. R. Contract.

Contradictions and Retractions With Respect to Bill 87.

Witness Denies Conditions Were Made When Mr. Wells Went East.

(From Friday's Daily.)

The examination of Hon. D. M. Eberts by Mr. Duff, occupied all of yesterday's session of the Columbia and Western inquiry committee, not being yet concluded when that body rose for the day. In all probability the completion of Mr. Duff's examination and the cross-examination by Mr. McCaul will fill out today, the hearing of Hon. Premier Prior's testimony standing over for still another day.

A considerable part of the morning examination was devoted to bill 87 of last session. The Attorney-General said that he did not remember the bill particularly, as to its history previous to its appearance in the House, but he took full responsibility for it. This bill it will be remembered, recites in its preamble that it was introduced in pursuance of an agreement made between the Turner government in 1898 and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, by which the Railway Company abandoned its right to construct the line from Midway to Penticton, in consideration of the waiver by the government of a condition in their subsidy act by which the subsidy for a part of the line between Robson and Midway was not to become payable to the company until they had constructed a part of the line between Midway and Penticton.

While this bill was before the House, Mr. Eberts wrote a letter which was laid before the House, in which he stated that such an agreement had been made in June, 1898. The agreement was a verbal one, but the government declared themselves bound to ratify it by the introduction of this legislation. On cross-examination yesterday, Mr. Eberts admitted that if such an agreement was made, it had been abrogated by the legislation of 1901, but he stated that the effect of the arrangements was perhaps not accurately set forth in his letter, or in the preamble of the bill, and that what really was meant was that the company gave up their rights to the subsidy for the line between Midway and Penticton, retaining, however, their right to build.

He was asked to explain, if that were the case, why the government in 1901 had introduced another bill which was intended to extend the time for earning the subsidy for the line between Midway and Penticton. He then said that he thought the abandonment of the company's rights was conditional upon the building of the line between Midway and Penticton by Mackenzie & Mann, under their agreement with the government in 1898. Being pressed that if such were the case, then in 1902, as Mackenzie & Mann had not built between Midway and Penticton, the company had in reality surrendered nothing, Mr. Eberts was unable to give any further explanation than that he thought the Columbia and Western were in fairness entitled to the relief contemplated by bill 87.

The cross-examination being resumed in the afternoon, Hon. Mr. Eberts explained the processes of executive procedure—minutes of council, recommendations of ministers, etc. In the case of a matter the executive is dealing with in such a manner as to constitute a recommendation to the Lieutenant-Governor, the memoranda sent to the government would be endorsed by the presiding officer of the council, usually the Premier. The record would consist of the ministerial recommendation, signed by the presiding officer. There might be something leading up to the recommendation, such as letters attached thereto.

Referring to the transfer of blocks 4, 593 and 4,594 from the British Columbia Southern to the Columbia and Western, the Attorney-General was asked if he recollected the circumstances in connection with the cabinet meetings of July 31 and August 2, 1901. A letter from Mr. Brown pressing for settlement of subsidy matters was brought before the council; witness recalled these particular meetings as a change in the cabinet. Mr. Dunsmuir had been preparing net was at that time being considered. Mr. Dunsmuir had been preparing for a trip to Alaska, and had asked Mr. Turner to take the matter in hand. The memorandum in connection read: "Letter from George McL. Brown read, bearing date of July 31. Matter to be referred to Mr. Wells to arrange and report to the executive at an early date? This memorandum was in Mr. Prentice's handwriting, and undated. It probably referred to the decision of the 2nd of August.

Witness distinctly remembered the matter coming up. He did not think any action was taken until Mr. Wells returned. The matter appeared to have been disposed of by an order-in-council on the 10th of August, this meeting being attended by Messrs. Turner, Wells, McBride and himself. Mr. Dunsmuir having gone to Alaska, and Mr. Prentice to Rossland. The decision, upon the report of the minister would have been come to between the 2nd and the 10th of August.

Prior to the letter from Mr. Brown, witness could not remember if he had had any communication with Mr. Brown or anyone else on this subject. Witness had had no communication from Mr. Brown indicating that an arrangement for the transfer had been agreed to with Mr. Wells. He had never heard of a suggestion from the government to the company that the charge should be made. He could not say whether the subject was considered as a proposal of the government or a proposal from the company. Witness had got his knowledge from the recommendation of the minister, and information produced in executive. The saving of acreage—understood to be about 300,000 acres—was a strong point advanced in favor of the substitution. Witness had made no inquiries as to the character of the lands and their relative values. This reason as to the saving in acreage had largely influenced witness in agreeing to the change. Another reason brought forward was that both companies were virtually the same—the C. P. R. He did not know as to the departmental information as to the comparative values of the pieces of land being exchanged.

Witness had given the opinion that it was within the power of the government to make this change as a matter of policy. The order-in-council had not come to witness for drafting; he had had no knowledge whatever of the ministerial recommendation until it came before the executive, and was acted upon. Witness' recollection he did not wish to say was not consistent with Mr. Wells' statement that the recommendation was drawn subsequently to the decision of the matter by the executive. Such a course as suggested by Mr. Wells would not be consistent with business methods. This recommendation, written on the 28th of August, could not have been that upon which he acted on the 10th August. The recommendation attached to the order-in-council of the 10th August bore an accidental imprint of witness' signature. It was not the custom in any of the departments to press copy recommendations accompanying orders-in-council. This particular recommendation had evidently been press-copied and the signature "D. M. Eberts," written with a copying pencil, had adhered from some other letter in the same copy book. He did not know how this impression occurred. He was certain this recommendation had not been copied in the Attorney-General's office. He had not been in the office of Eberts and Taylor for one week during the entire time that he had been Attorney-General. There were no indelible pencils used in the office of Eberts and Taylor.

Subsequently it was explained to the satisfaction of all concerned that the press copy had been made within the past fortnight in providing Mr. Eberts with a copy of the several important documents.

Witness remembered the day previous to Mr. Wells' departure for Montreal. He had met Mr. Dunsmuir, and Mr. Wells in the latter's office on the 24th October. At that interview the whole plan was discussed and it was made clear what Mr. Wells was going to do. Mr. Dunsmuir again asked if the government had the right to grant the suggested substitution, and witness had said that as a matter of policy they could. Mr. Wells had then said that he had taken the opinion of Mr. Gordon Hunter, which was to the same effect. Mr. Dunsmuir appeared perfectly satisfied. There were no new conditions then suggested.

The building from Midway to Spence's Bridge had come up in executive, and it had been decided that Mr. Wells while East should see Sir Thomas Shaughnessy, and, if possible, secure his agreement to construct this line. Mr. Dunsmuir had up to this time been unfamiliar with the question, and Mr. Wells had been desirous that Mr. Dunsmuir should have a full understanding of the subject.

The building of the line to Spence's Bridge then came in. Mr. Eberts held that it was nonsense to suggest that the order-in-council having been passed, and the grants prepared and thoroughly authenticated, they should be taken to Montreal with him, and try and get the company to build a line that would cost $10,000,000. The matter of the grants had been disposed of, and yet it was discussed on the 24th October in order that Mr. Dunsmuir might thoroughly understand it. The construction of the Spence's Bridge line was a matter of special import since it was a rock on which the cabinet threatened to split. It was on this subject that several men in the House who had previously supported the government had voted against it.

"Several honorable gentlemen," corrected Mr. Helmcken.

The amendment was accepted. Mr. Brown, subsequent to the return of Mr. Wells, had spoken to him of the non-delivery of the grants. He in turn had spoken to Mr. Dunsmuir. Witness had said that he thought these grants should be delivered. Mr. Dunsmuir had not suggested that a guarantee of the building of the line to Spence's Bridge should be made a condition for the delivery of the grants. Witness had never discussed with Mr. Wells the non-delivery of the grants. The first explanation of the non-delivery of these grants was given witness he could not say when. He could not remember a conversation with Mr. Dunsmuir in which he said "You (Eberts) know the reason," or refer him to Mr. Wells. No such conversation had occurred. Mr. Dunsmuir told witness about some gossip being current. He had tried to find out from Mr. Dunsmuir what these stories were, and who had told them. Mr. Dunsmuir at that time had refrained from telling. The next day, being pressed by witness, with Mr. Brown present, Mr. Dunsmuir had told of Mr. Wells' report of the Taylor episode. Witness had turned to Mr. Brown and asked him to give Mr. Dunsmuir an assurance that there was no truth in the report, and Mr. Brown had given that assurance. Mr. Dunsmuir had not suggested that he (Eberts) and Brown were "in it." Witness had not mentioned the subject to Mr. Taylor, nor had he discussed it with Mr. Brown before Mr. Dunsmuir had brought up the question.

Witness had never understood that he was connected with the story. He was so thoroughly convinced that the story was absolutely untrue that he had not thought it necessary to go to Mr. Taylor about it before the cancellation order was passed. He had thought Mr. Dunsmuir took the same view of it. Mr. Dunsmuir had not suggested that any such action would be taken as cancellation of these grants.

Witness was not notified of the meeting of the executive in Mr. Wells' office when the cancellation order was passed. He had found his way to this meeting by accident. He had not been in the room two minutes when Mr. Dunsmuir said, "Now tell Eberts what you've told me"—this being addressed to Mr. Wells. Mr. Wells had stuttered and stammered——

And just here the point arose as to whether or not what transpired in executive should be disclosed, Mr. McPhillips arguing that discretion was permitted the ministers, and Chairman Clifford holding that if the proceedings of one executive meeting should be disclosed, all should be opened.

Mr. Eberts finally decided that he would not go into the point, and then discussion arose as to whether he could consistently refer to what he had told Mr. Taylor of this conversation—with the permission and authority of Hon. Mr. Wells.

The discussion of the point was still on when the hour of adjournment was reached.

(From Saturday's Daily.)

Before proceeding with the examination of Mr. Eberts yesterday morning, Mr. Duff made a brief statement fully absolving Mr. Eberts from any suggestion of association with the order-in-council or ministerial recommendations at the time of their production. The explanation had been quite satisfactory to counsel.

Mr. Bass, called, explained to the committee that the copies were made by him about the time the discussion arose in the house.

"Before this committee was appointed," said Hon. Mr. Eberts, "but after the discussion had originated in the House."

This matter was thereupon dropped—or rather took a new phase. Mr. McPhillips found fault with the Colonist for having published in connection with this subject, Mr. Eberts' explanation as "satisfactory to all concerned," whereas in effect the committee had not yet had the explanation before it.

The objection was held by Chairman Clifford to be well taken.

Hon. Mr. Eberts had also an objection to note, and a protest to record. He took exception to the headlines in the Colonist, and wanted to know if the newspapers should be permitted to publish reports of the evidence and comment thereon before the committee had completed its labors and returned its finding? It appeared strange to him that a man should be on trial before a jury such as the committee, and at the same time be convicted by the press.

"That's just what it amounts to," acquiesced Mr. McPhillips.

The committee agreed that flaring headlines in the newspapers were most objectionable.

"The headlines are all that a great many people read," said Mr. Eberts.

Mr. Clifford was inclined to the opinion that the public was getting rather tired of the evidence before the committee.

Mr. McPhillips held that the press should be compelled by the committee either to publish a full stenographic report of the evidence or no reports at all.

With this suggestion Hon. Mr. Eberts concurred. A full verbatim report only could be a satisfactory one.

Chairman Clifford held that it would be necessary to leave the whole matter to the honor of the press, or exclude the press altogether.

Mr. McPhillips complained that the Colonist was too prone to color everything to suit its political purposes, and especially this inquiry.

Mr. Smith certainly could not agree with this. He thought that all the press reports were on the whole equally fair.

So thought Mr. Green. Objection might be taken to certain headlines, but the reports in his opinion were distinctly good and fair ones.

The examination of Mr. Eberts then proceeded. He had told Mr. Taylor what Mr. Wells had said at the executive meeting—in effect that Mr. Taylor had approached him (Wells) and offered him a share or interest in a land company if he would deliver up certain grants. Witness had asked Mr. Wells, "Do you think I'm guilty of anything wrong in connection with this matter. Mr. Wells had replied, "Certainly not." Witness had said that he did not believe Mr. Taylor would be guilty of such a thing either. Mr. Taylor had been very indignant when Mr. Wells' charge was related to him, and had asked if he might not go before the executive and defend his character. Mr. Taylor at that time had made no statement to witness as to what had occurred in Montreal. Mr. Wells had on a subsequent occasion denied that he had told the story to Mr. Dunsmuir in the first instance. He could not just recall the circumstances of this conversation. It was on the 29th March that Mr. Wells had denied that he had made the statement to Mr. Dunsmuir. Mr. Wells had stated that it was Mr. Prentice.

Witness recalled Mr. Brown complaining of the recession, at a meeting of the executive. He could not recall any reasons for the cancellation being given Mr. Brown. It was a stormy session so far as Mr. Brown was concerned. He had been very vigorous in his protests. No reasons for the cancellation were given Mr. Brown. Mr. Brown read a telegram from Sir Thomas Shaughnessy on the subject of the recision, to the effect that people in public life could do what private individuals could not in respect to contracts. Brown had asked each of the ministers in turn if they believed that Sir Thomas Shaughnessy would be implicated in such a transaction as alleged in Mr. Wells' report of the Taylor incident. The ministers had said that they did not regard Sir Thomas Shaughnessy or the C. P. R. was so implicated. They either said this or said nothing at all. Witness did not remember that any promise that legislation would be introduced in 1902 under which the company could get these blocks had been made by Mr. Wells. If any such arrangement had been made, it was not within witness' recollection. The question of the recision of the grants, to witness' knowledge, came up on the 18th of March. The members of the government were aware as early as the 3rd of March, that inquiries were being made in this matter. As to Mr. Wells' statement that in a conversation with witness, he (Wells) had said that if the grants were delivered "the government would have to go," and Mr. Eberts had replied, "let us go then." Witness and Mr. Dunsmuir were pressing for the delivery of the grants; Mr. Wells did not deliver the grants. The matter of the effect upon the government, politically, of the disclosure of these facts in connection with the grants, was discussed among the members of the government. Witness would not say the government attempted to keep back the information in this matter. The return of information to the House was ordered the day after the recision order was passed. He had never heard it given as a reason for the non-delivery of the grants that the company would not agree to build the road to Spence's Bridge. He had never heard any reason given for the non-delivery of the grants. He could not say that political pressure in the House was the reason for the non-delivery. Witness could not say that cancellation of the grants had been resolved on before the 18th March. He could not say that the government had before that date, resolved that the grants could not be delivered. He understood that Mr. Wells was taking this position. He could not recall that Mr. Wells was urging political expediency. The matter was always spoken of as a completed matter until the Taylor episode came up. The construction of the Midway-Spence's Bridge road was never mentioned in connection. Witness' view of the reason for cancellation was that it was because Mr. Dunsmuir believed this story. Mr. Dunsmuir had said so. He had said he thought there was something wrong, or "something funny" about this transaction, and in consequence insisted upon cancellation. He did not believe that any of the members of the government believed him (witness) implicated in any corrupt transaction. The C. P. R. and Sir Thomas Shaughnessy had also been explicitly absolved. Asked as to his view at the time of the real reason for the non-delivery of the grants, witness declined to go into consideration of political problems of the day. He could give no explanation of the grounds on which these grants were being withheld. He could not say that the grants were held in consequence of pressure in the House for information on the subject. He had had no knowledge as to who prepared the answers to questions asked in the House in connection with these matters. Witness was not prepared to say that he had thought at the time that the questions asked in the House were not being fairly answered. He must have known that these answers were given. Witness was not prepared to say what his impression was at the time. He could not say that the answers were framed as they had been so as to withhold information regarded by Mr. Wells as dangerous politically. He did not remember any protests made by any members of the government in regard to these answers. He thought he remembered himself having protested to Mr. Dunsmuir that the answer was not very clear—that it was a very cloudy answer. He could not discuss what he believed to be his reasons for these answers being made indistinct.

As to bill 87 of last session, he did not remember having been consulted by Mr. Wells with respect to its effect. The tenor of the legislation was talked over by the government members although the bill had not been before the House. It was understood that the bill was to reinstate the company, and give them the lands earned for section 4. He did not believe that if the bill had passed the lands would have been given by the government at all events. If bill 87 had passed the lands could have been given. Bill 87 conformed to the act of 1896 insofar as the selection districts were concerned. The giving of the selection rights to the company was virtually no change. The company would, in any event, make its selection and come to the government for ratification. If under such a bill as 87 the government refused to give the lands selected, under ordinary conditions the government would be going in defiance of the direction of the legislature. If the government had thought the legislation had been improperly secured, the government might legitimately decline. He could not have felt justified, in view of what had gone before, as a member of the government, in granting unlimited power of selection in all parts of Yale and Kootenay. If the act had passed, section 4 would probably have been squared up by the Dunsmuir government. The feeling of the government was to give the lands under the general tenor of the act of 1896—independent perhaps of the statutory direction. The bill of 1902 was canvassed before its introduction. He could not say whether or not the sense of the government members had been taken on the bill after its preparation.

The history of proceedings was traced by the witness in committee with bill 87 after its presentation by message. Pressed for the reason for the withdrawal of bill 87 the witness said that it was suggested that to get through the business quickly it had better be withdrawn. It was suggested that there were not sufficient members who would support the bill to carry it through. There was a large amount of other government business on the programme, and the opposition was very active with its resolutions of want of confidence. It was concluded to withdraw the bill which was to carry out a distinct pledge of the province and the existing government. There was dissatisfaction with respect to the bill. Difficulty was anticipated as to getting support for the bill. There were various reasons operating toward the withdrawal. The government were advised that they had better withdraw the bill as sufficient support could not be secured to carry it. Some members had been so long detained that they were becoming very petulant. Witness did not remember having given Mr. Brown reasons for the withdrawal of the bill. He had probably talked with Mr. Brown on the subject.

Continuing his evidence in the afternoon, Mr. Eberts said that he had probably told Mr. Brown that the bill would have to be withdrawn, on account of the long session and the difficulty of getting support for the measure. He did not know that the bill was a matter of government policy.

"Was it not a very unusual thing to withdraw a measure of such importance?" inquired Mr. Duff.

"I have seen very important bills withdrawn," observed Mr. Eberts. He did not remember having canvassed the House or having had a report on the subject from the regular government whip. He did not think that he had ever heard a suggestion that this bill could not be put through on account of the opposition of certain members "unless there was something in it for them."

A large series of questions on this particular point followed, the position of the witness being unchanged—he did not recall having heard any such scandalous gossip said to exist as that bill could not go through because certain members would not support it unless there was some personal consideration for their advantage.

Mr. Duff then passed to examination upon the question placed on the order paper on the 15th or 16th of March, and apparently answered on the 21st of March. These questions by Mr. Curtis read:

The witness had regarded the matter of these grants as settled when Mr. Wells went East with the patents. On the 12th March last a letter had been received from Messrs. Davis, Marshall and McNeill, asking that the government intervene in certain actions that the company had taken against persons who had come upon the lands. There was another side to the matter. In December, 1902, leave was given to a certain party, a Mr. Rogers, to locate on this land. Proceedings being taken against Rogers, he had asked the government to come to his defence. The matter came before the executive. Witness could not say whether it was disposed of before the present session opened. Ultimately it had been decided to introduce bill 16 of last session. Witness' own view was favorable to intervention by the government for the purpose of testing this matter in the courts. This bill was considered by the government members before it was introduced. He had expressed no opinion as to who would be likely to win if the matter had gone to the courts. He might have expressed an opinion as to title having passed if delay of the grants had been made. He had had Mr. Wells' report that delay had not been made. Witness believed that Mr. Wells had asked Mr. McLean for an opinion as to whether title had passed. Mr. McLean had consulted witness; he held that the whole question rested upon what constituted delay. Mr. McLean's view was that the company would have a chance of succeeding, but it was a doubtful question. Witness had not reported this opinion to the government members in the House. Mr. McLean had held that the company would have had a good fighting chance if they went into the courts—it was a point if the signing and sealing of the patents did not constitute delay, independent of the actual manual delay of the grants. The matter was afterwards discussed in executive. There was a general talk among the members as to a bill of this nature, and it was originally agreed that the Premier should introduce the bill and let it lie for a time, until the inquiry reported. There was a subsequent meeting of the government supporters, the Saturday before the Monday on which the second reading of the bill was moved. At the meeting of government supporters referred to it was decided that the bill should be pressed on. Witness did not think that the opinion that the C. P. R. had a good fighting chance if the matter went into the courts was reported at the Saturday morning meeting, and led to a discussion that the bill should be pressed. The meeting was very short, and very little argument was adduced. He could not tell what reasons were advanced to produce the decision of caucus. Mr. McInnes had expressed himself at the first meeting of government supporters, unfavorably to the principle of such legislation. Witness thought that Mr. McInnes was of the opinion that the matter should be submitted to the committee. Mr. Wells had brought up the Rogers' application and had expressed the view that Mr. Rogers should be protected by the government taking up his cause in the courts in order that a final determination might be secured. Mr. McCaul had read before the supporters of the government an opinion in which witness believed the view was maintained that there had been no completed contract; the opinion was given at the first meeting of government supporters. Witness could not say that the conclusion to press the bill through was reached in consequence of his (Eberts') and Mr. McLean's opinion that the C. P. R. had a fighting chance in the courts. Witness had held that the matter should be left to the courts; that if the lands had been wrongfully granted the company could not succeed; if the lands had been wrongfully—but properly granted, it was contra to equity and justice that they should be taken away. Witness did not know what it was that had changed Col. Prior's and Mr. McInnes' view. He did not know that their view was changed. Witness had not drawn bill 16. The recital of the bill resulted in a decision by the legislature of a disputed point of law then before the courts. This recital was diametrically opposed to witness' view of the matter. If Mr. Wells' account were correct, the conditions as to the delay of the grants was imposed behind witness' back. He had no notice of the meeting of the executive at which recision was decided upon.

"If the recision was decided upon, as you suggest, in consequence of the statement that Mr. Taylor had made improper proposals to Mr. Wells with respect to the delay of the grants—if this were the real reason for cancellation, on what principle of ministerial responsibility do you explain your remaining in the cabinet?" asked Mr. Duff.

The permissibility of this question was forthwith challenged by the committee chairman and several of the members. Eventually Mr. Duff decided not to press this line of examination further, it going unduly into political matter.

As to the alleged telegram from Mr. Taylor re settlement of these subsidy matters; Mr. Taylor had never acted for the railway companies. He accepted full responsibility for saying that no such telegram as spoken of by Mr. Wells had ever been received from Mr. Taylor. He had never made such a statement at all.

"I have no recollection of such a matter at all," said Mr. Eberts, the cross-examination by Mr. McCaul beginning. He thought Mr. Wells must be mistaken.

"I would like to know if you would willingly sit in the same cabinet with a blackguard?" asked Mr. McCaul.

"The question will have to be put euphonistically," ruled the chairman.

"If you believed that there was no element of truth in Mr. Wells' statement as to what occurred between Mr. Wells and Mr. Taylor in Montreal, how do you account for remaining in the same cabinet with Mr. Wells?" asked Mr. McCaul.

The question was ruled not permissible.

At the time of negotiations for the transfer from the British Columbia Southern to the Columbia & Western, witness had no knowledge of the agreement between the British Columbia Southern and the Crow's Nest Pass Coal Co., taking it as granted that if the agreement was as stated, the transfer might open the door to fraud. If the fact had come to the knowledge of the government before the grants were made, it would be matter for grave consideration if the grants were made. Witness could not say what action should be taken if the fact as stated came to the knowledge of the government before delivery was completed.

The examination of Hon. Mr. Eberts was not completed at the time the committee rose.

(Continued on Page Five.)

The New Cable Steamer Iris

Now En Route From Sydney to Bamfield Creek---Will Lay New Cable.

Encountered a Cyclone When Steaming Through the Indian Ocean.

The cable steamer Iris, which was built as a repair cable steamer for the All-Red cable line to run between Bamfield creek and Australia, arrived at Sydney shortly before the steamer Aorangi left that port from London. The steamer was to leave Sydney within a few days of the sailing of the Canadian-Australian liner, and will make a number of calls before coming to Victoria. The Iris, which is under strict naval discipline, is conjointly owned by the Imperial government, the Dominion of Canada, the State governments of New South Wales, Queensland, and Victoria, and the government of New Zealand, all of which are represented on the Pacific Cable Board of London, which controls operations.

The Iris is now on a three years' commission, and during that time will be stationed between Brisbane and Victoria. The headquarters of the cable repairing steamers will be Fiji, but an attempt is being made to induce the authorities to select Auckland as centre. She is fitted with all the necessary gear, and carries about 400 miles of deep-sea cable. After leaving Sydney the Iris will first steam to Brisbane, where electrical stores will be landed. From there she will proceed to Norfolk Island, landing stores, etc., and will next visit Auckland, where she will be docked for an overhaul. Fiji will be the next place to call, and while there a short length of cable will be used to connect the two group of islands. Fanning Island will then be called at, and stores landed, after which the Iris proceeds direct to Bamfield creek. While at the last named port she will lay a cable, in lieu of the present land line, which is constantly being interrupted. After this work has been completed, the Iris will return to Fiji, the headquarters of the vessel.

The Iris was launched early last year, and was taken for her official speed trials in October last. She was built for the Pacific Cable Board of London by Messrs. David J. Dunlop & Co., Port Glasgow, and her principal dimensions are: Length on water line, 286ft.; breadth moulded, 40½ft.; and depth moulded to spar deck, 25ft. The vessel has been fitted with four cable tanks—two forward and two aft of the machinery space. The cable machinery consists of very heavy gear forward and a lighter gear aft, suitable for paying-out and picking-up purposes, supplied by the Telegraph Construction and Maintenance Company, Limited, of Greenwich. The propeling machinery, which consists of two sets of triple-expansion engines, was designed with a view to secure the least possible vibration. Stored in the forehold are large quantities of appliances, such as grapnels, mushrooms, etc. Four immense buoys, each weighing 31cwt., are carried on the spar deck, and are supplied with patent platforms for launching them. The accommodation throughout is excellent, and great attention has been given to the subject of ventilation, the ship having been specially constructed for hot climates. The officers and electricians' quarters are on the spar deck, and the navigating officers' quarters are on the navigating deck. The accommodation for all the officers is amidships, which is a new departure in cable ships. The petty officers are quartered aft. The quarters of the crew are situated forward, while the Chinese firemen are provided for forward. The vessel is spotlessly clean throughout.

The scratch of a pin may cause the loss of a limb, or even death when blood-poisoning results from the injury. All danger of this may be avoided, however, by promptly applying Chamberlain's Pain Balm. It is an antiseptic, and unequalled as a quick healing liniment for cuts, bruises and burns. For sale by all druggists and dealers.

NEWS OF CUMBERLAND.

Once Thriving Town Now Passing Through a Strike.

Cumberland, May 12.—Our once thriving and peaceful town is now passing through the horrors of a strike. A few weeks ago we prided ourselves that our men would never descend to any false step of mistaken duty; now, the majority of those who have left their post regret bitterly that the W. F. M. ever reached here, or that they had anything to do with it. But they allowed themselves to listen to the voice of the socialist agitator, and urged with false hopes, in spite of the fact that in many cases sick wives and large families were depending upon them for their bread, these misguided men threw away their liberty and joined the forces of the foreign gang, whose interests were not theirs, certainly not to the extent of sacrificing the welfare of their families to the bidding of men whose livelihood was not at stake in the matter. The wives and children of the engineers who stayed at their post have been insulted when they appear on the streets, simply because the husband and father has not been criminal enough to drag his family to poverty. A majority of the women will tell you that they had no complaint; the wages received by their husbands were higher than what they earned in the East or the Old Country. A great many own ranches, fairly well stocked; the children have more than the privileges of a common school education, and with all these advantages, they have flung everything to the winds, and for what? And when the climax has been reached, the unmarried men, who have been the first to take action, pack up and go away, while the family man, who has not the means to travel, must remain and bear the brunt of the burden. Perhaps after the Federation committee has dolled out its miserable pittance to the needy ones, the more ambitious will cry out at the ill-advised stand these agitators have compelled them to take, and which they had not backbone enough to resist—and make a fight for real liberty in standing by the man who has made the town, and is their true friend—in keeping starvation from their doors by not quarreling with their means of livelihood, and last, but not least, by not being ashamed to acknowledge that have been in the wrong, and saying so manfully. It is a great pity that the arm of the law cannot reach those who, when an honest, upright citizen is content to earn a respectable living, subject him to abuse, by being called by such vile epithets as "scab," etc. Such confidence workers ought to be given a turn with hard labor; and it is to be hoped that a law will be enacted making it a serious offence to molest a peaceable citizen by applying such terms to him.

TENDENCY OF THE TIMES.

The tendency of medical science is toward preventive measures. The best thought of the world is being given to the subject. It is easier and better to prevent than to cure. It has been fully demonstrated that pneumonia, one of the most dangerous diseases that medical men have to contend with, can be prevented by the use of Chamberlain's Cough Remedy. Pneumonia always results from a cold or from an attack of influenza (grip), and it has been observed that this remedy counteracts any tendency of these diseases toward pneumonia. This has been fully proven in many thousands of cases in which this remedy has been used during the great prevalence of colds and grip in recent years, and can be relied upon with implicit confidence. Pneumonia often results from a slight cold when no danger is apprehended until it is suddenly discovered that there is fever and difficulty in breathing and pains in the chest, then it is announced that the patient has pneumonia. Be on the safe side and take Chamberlain's Cough Remedy as soon as the cold is contracted. It always cures.

THE COAL TRADE.

British Columbia Strikes Give Business to Other Mines.

Notwithstanding the inroads made on the coal trade by the increase in the consumption of oil as fuel, the demand for black diamonds at the present time is keen, as the result of the strike in British Columbia mines, whence much of the local supply ordinarily comes, and the inability of the Seattle mines to furnish an adequate amount, says the San Francisco Chronicle. For the last ten days the steamer Edith has been detained at Seattle awaiting a cargo for this city. The congested conditions in the North have thrown the brunt of the whole coal business on the Seattle mines, and great difficulty is being experienced in supplying the Puget Sound consumers, outsiders being compelled to wait.

The big fleet of coal carriers from Australia is still a long way off, with only one or two vessels expected soon, and Newcastle will therefore have little opportunity to remedy conditions here. Even Japanese coal mines are being called upon, which is something out of the ordinary. Lately the Norwegian steamer Hero arrived with a large cargo from Japan, and now the British steamer Ivydene, of 2,277 tons register, and the British steamer Inverness, of 2,500 tons register, are listed as on the way with coal cargoes from Karatsu and Moji, respectively. A cessation of the strike in British Columbia may at any time, however, cause a resumption of trade with the mines there.

FOR STOMACH TROUBLES.

"I have taken a great many different medicines for stomach trouble and constipation," says Mrs. S. Geiger, of Dunkerton, Iowa, "but never had as good results from any as from Chamberlain's Stomach and Liver Tablets." For sale by all druggists and dealers.

Duly Incorporated.—The Chamber of Commerce is now a duly incorporated body. The articles, which appear in the provincial Gazette, set forth that: "The said corporation shall be known as "The Victoria Chamber of Commerce." The said corporation shall have its office and be situate at the said city of Victoria. The managing officers of the said corporation shall consist of a president, vice-president, secretary and honorary treasurer. George Carter shall be the first president. Joshua Kingham shall be the first vice-president; A. J. Morley shall be the first secretary; James Forman shall be the first honorary treasurer. The successors of the said officers shall be elected by a majority vote to be taken by ballot of the members present at a meeting or meetings thereof at the times and in the manner to be prescribed by the bylaws of the corporation. All persons engaged in trade or manufacture, or any business whatever, shall be eligible for membership. The mode and requirements of admission to membership, and all other matters relating to the admission to and retirement and expulsion from membership, shall be provided by the bylaws and regulations of the corporation."

Piles To prove to you that Dr. Chase's Ointment is a certain and absolute cure for each and every form of itching, bleeding and protruding piles, the manufacturers have guaranteed it. See testimonials in the daily press and ask your neighbors what they think of it. You can read, get your money back if not cured. 60c a box, all dealers or EDMANSON, BATES & Co., Toronto.
Dr. Chase's Ointment

Boils were so painful could not sleep at night.

APPEARED ON NECK, LEGS AND ARMS.

Burdock Blood Bitters CURED THEM.

It is well-known to all that bad blood is the direct cause of all skin diseases and it is necessary for the blood to be cleansed before the eruptions will disappear. For this purpose there is nothing to equal Burdock Blood Bitters as the thousands of testimonials we have on hand will testify.

Mr. Willard Thompson, McNeill's Mills, P.E.I., writes us as follows: "I wish to state to you what Burdock Blood Bitters has done for me. Some time ago my blood got out of order and many boils appeared on my neck, legs and arms. They were so painful that I could not sleep at night. After having tried many different remedies without any success, I finally decided, on the advice of a friend, to use Burdock Blood Bitters. Before I had quite used two bottles the boils had completely disappeared, and I wish to emphasize the fact that I think Burdock Blood Bitters the best blood purifier on the market to-day."

WHITNEY GO-CARTS ARE THE BEST

The Leaders for 40 Years.

Reclining Go-Cart, No. E 9, price $14.00 Complete with cushions, parasol top, rubber tire wheels, foot brake and enameled gears, either oak, green or maroon.

Have anti-friction wheel fasteners, no nuts to fall off. Wheels can be taken off instantly for oiling. Whitney patent foot brake, quickly adjusted by slight pressure of the foot on lever.

All are fitted with rubber tire wheels and enameled gears. Extra parts if required, supplied from our stock at once. Illustrated sheet showing 28 latest styles with prices and full descriptions from $4.50 to $28.00, mailed free on request.

WEILER BROS

Complete Furnishers,

VICTORIA, BC

FREE OUR CATALOGUE will be mailed to your address free on application.

DIXI H. ROSS & CO.

CASH GROCERS

$1.00... Per Year

The subscription price of the Semi-Weekly "Colonist" has been reduced to $1 per year to all countries in the Postal Union.

THE HICKMAN TYE HARDWARE CO.

LIMITED.

HEADQUARTERS FOR THE FOLLOWING LINES

IRON AND STEEL
BUILDERS' HARDWARE
LOGGERS' AND
MINING SUPPLIES

IRON PIPE AND FITTINGS
MECHANICS' TOOLS
LAWN MOWERS, HOSE
GARDEN TOOLS.

32 and 34 Yates Street, VICTORIA, B.C.

TELEPHONE 59 P. O. DRAWER 613.

WEAK And UNDEVELOPED PARTS of the BODY ENLARGED and STRENGTHENED!

Vigorous, Natural Conditions established and sustained. Complete, Rapid Development of Normal Functions and Size. An unfailing scientific method, perfected by experience; endorsed by highest authority. Full account of the system, with references, mailed in plain, sealed letter on request. Strictest confidence observed. Especially solicits inquiries from men who have been deceived and victimized by frauds and quacks. Address ERIE MEDICAL CO., BUFFALO, N.Y.