

SCHOOL TRUSTEES DISAGREE

Teacher Heath Confronted With Evidence of the Scholars of His Class.

By Three to Two the Trustees Refer the Subject to Council of Instruction.

At the Central School this afternoon the Heath investigation took place before a special meeting of the school board. There were present all members of the board. Principal Paul and Mr. Heath, the accused, were also present. Chairman Hayward asked Mr. Heath if he wished to make any statement. He replied that he had nothing to add to his letter. He took the wafer from the Catholic priest at the church of the Madeleine as a matter of curiosity. He had no idea of detaining the Catholic religion, and he was prepared to give the board the name of the man and all circumstances connected therewith. He had nothing to screen.

The letter of Mr. Heath was then read. Trustee Marchant asked what was there different in the doctrine of the Catholic church then and now. Why feeded it explanation? Mr. Heath replied it was the opinion held then and now. There had been a great change in public opinion. Trustee Marchant said the Madeleine church instance did not help the lesson, it was ridiculous.

Mr. Heath—No, sir. I throw ridicule on no creed. I admit that the Catholic children might have thought it ridiculous, but I did not so intend it. Trustee Marchant asked what he did say at the history lesson. He asked for a quotation of what he said. Mr. Heath replied that he could not quote the words he said. Chairman Hayward asked did he say that the priest guzzled up the wine or drank it? Mr. Heath replied he did not. He thought it was a fact that the priest got all the wine.

What were your words? That the communicants got the bread and the priest the wine. Trustee Lewis asked did the law allow Mr. Heath to explain the wine transubstantiation without prejudice to any religion. Trustee Marchant replied in the negative. Trustee Saunders asked if Mr. Heath purchased the wafer. He paid the man (the Catholic) to get it; he gave two francs for it. Chairman Hayward—Did you say you purchased a ticket for communion? Mr. Heath said no. He asked that school children after being examined should be sent home.

The chair replied that had been arranged. No communication between children would be allowed. Winifred Creech, aged 16, said what ever Mr. Heath said about religion was not to interfere with any scholar's religion. How did he explain transubstantiation? Mr. Heath asked if the class understood it. Then he explained it. He said he was in Paris and received the wafer in the Roman Catholic church at the time of communion; put it in his pocket. I think. After the lesson was over she did not understand what he meant. Mr. Heath said the Roman Catholic people believed it to be part of the body of Jesus Christ.

Trustee Glover—Was there a reference to the body being of prodigious size? No. Trustee Marchant asked was it talked of in a jocular way? No, he did not. He was saying what the Roman Catholics believed then and that now they were on the same footing as other persons. Was there ridicule? No. Were the scholars annoyed? The Roman Catholics in the room did not like it. The chairman said the scholar was hardly a fit judge, not knowing what transubstantiation was. Chairman Hayward asked what was said about bread and wine. Mr. Heath said the priest drank the wine and not the people; the wafer was given to the people.

Trustee Marchant asked had she read the papers? Yes, but it was her opinion. Chairman Hayward asked did Mr. Heath use the word "guzzled"? No. Alice Eveline Dalby had heard Mr. Heath say he was at communion in the Catholic church and they gave him a wafer. He took communion, but instead of putting the wafer in his mouth he put it in his pocket. He said he meant no offence. Trustee Marchant asked did Mr. Heath say he took communion or went to communion? He took communion. Trustee Marchant asked was there ridicule? No, I think not. Did he say priests got the wine and communicants the bread? That is it. Did you read it in the papers? Yes, I read it last night. Did you know the meaning of transubstantiation? Yes, I think so. Did Mr. Heath say that the body of Christ must be large to supply to the world bread all these years? I cannot say that he did or did not.

From Saturday's Daily. The Neil Heath charges have been investigated; the school trustees have expressed disapproval of his language in alluding to the Roman Catholic doctrine of transubstantiation, but have suspended judgment pending action by the council of public instruction. At least, this

was the opinion of three of the board, Trustees Marchant, Glover and Lewis. Trustee Saunders and Lovell were for dismissal. Chairman Hayward, under the new regulations of the board, had no vote. He was with the minority. Evidence was continued Friday afternoon. Alice Doran, aged 16, said: Mr. Heath said the Catholics took the wafer was the body and blood of Christ, but the Protestants did not. He said he bought a ticket and went to communion at a church in Paris. The priest must be bloodthirsty drinking all the wine and giving the people none. Trustee Lewis asked did she know what was transubstantiation? It means the change at the sacrifice of mass of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ.

Trustee Marchant asked did Mr. Heath use the word "bloodthirsty"? Yes, sir. I am certain. Chairman Hayward—You are taught to pay respect to the Host and a devoted Catholic would not take it from the mouth. That is it, sir. Trustee Lewis asked for an explanation. He knew nothing about transubstantiation. Chairman Hayward gave the explanation. Did he make fun of the Catholic religion? Yes, sir. Trustee Lewis asked did Mr. Heath use the word "guzzling"? I am not certain. Trustee Lovell asked the words of Mr. Heath. Christ must have had a very large body to feed the Catholics for all these years.

Trustee Saunders—Was he making fun? I was surprised at it. As soon as recess was out all the scholars were talking about it. Miss McGraw agreed with me that Mr. Heath used offensive words. Trustee Glover asked did Mr. Heath give his own views. No. Trustee Marchant asked did witness know what faith he (Mr. Heath) believed in. Yes, he said he belonged to the English church. Mr. Heath asked did he not say he did not wish to attack any religion. Yes. May Duncan, aged 15, said: Mr. Heath said he was in a cathedral in Paris. He paid to receive communion and he put it in his pocket. He said the body of Christ must be large to supply people all these years. Mr. Heath did not speak disrespectful of the Catholic religion. He said the priests drank all the wine and gave the communicants the wafer.

Plorence Jackson, aged 14, said: Mr. Heath went into the church of the Madeleine and got communion from the priests. Christ's body was very large to supply the world. I am a Presbyterian. I have not read the papers. He said it respectfully. Cora Helena Loat, aged 15, testified: Mr. Heath said when he was in Paris he paid for a ticket to go to communion and got a wafer, which he placed in his pocket. He compared the wafer with the body of Christ and said it must be awfully large. The priests drank all the wine. I do not understand what transubstantiation means. Margaret Murray, aged 16, a Presbyterian, said Mr. Heath told us the priest changed the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ. He went into a Catholic church and took the communion and was given a wafer but did not get any wine. He put the wafer in his pocket. He did not think the body of Christ was so large. Chairman Hayward asked did Mr. Heath speak respectfully of Christ in his opinion? He did not speak very nice. Trustee Lovell—We do not want impressions, we want facts. Trustee Marchant—Oh, you do. Lillian Sutherland, aged 16, a Presbyterian, said, Mr. Heath said he purchased a ticket for communion and was given a wafer by the priest. To Catholics it was the body of Christ. Christ must have had a very large body to feed the Catholics. The priest must have been very bloodthirsty. Dr. Pope did not ask the question about using the word "bloodthirsty," also I would have told him. Mr. Heath spoke disrespectfully and if I belonged to the Catholic church I would not have liked it. Mr. Heath asked what sort of memory had she? I have as good a memory as many, Mr. Heath.

What memory have I found you to have? Trustee Marchant said the question was improper. Beatrice Jones Tobin, aged 17, Church of England, said: Mr. Heath told us he was in Paris, and for a small sum of money he was admitted to communion and received a wafer and put it in his pocket. The priests drank the wine. Christ's body must have been very large to supply communion to the world. That was the statement. Priests drank the wine and believed it to be the blood of Christ. The priests were bloodthirsty men. I am not sure that was the exact meaning. His remarks were disrespectful. Mary McGraw, aged 15, Church of England: Mr. Heath said he got a wafer in a Catholic church in Paris, and put it in his pocket. He was explaining transubstantiation. The wafer was the body of Christ and the wine the blood. Christ must have had a large body to feed the Catholics all these years. He spoke disrespectfully of the Catholics. What Mr. Heath said would be taken as disrespectful by a member of the Church of England. It could have been explained otherwise. Trustee Marchant said he did not see blasphemy or disrespect in the words of Mr. Heath. Trustee Lovell agreed there was no blasphemy. Trustee Marchant said Mr. Heath dealt with the logic of the subject. Annie Cathcart, aged 15, Presbyterian

said: Mr. Heath obtained a ticket to get a wafer in a church in Paris. He put it in his pocket. He did not get any wine. The priest drank all the wine. What bloodthirsty fellows they must be! The bread at the communion was not cooked, it was in the form of dough. The body of Christ must have been large to have fed so many Catholics. The lesson did not impress me as quite right. It was offensive to Roman Catholics. Cecil Berkeley, aged 14, Church of England, said: He went to Paris to a Catholic cathedral and paid money and received a small wafer which he put in his pocket. He expected to have wine but the priest drank it. The bread was supposed to be Christ's body. There must be a good lot of the body of Christ because there were so many wafers. He thought the people in the olden times would have thought it unfair that they did not get any wine. Witness laughed about it at the time and thought it a good joke. Kenneth Wollaston, aged 13, Church of England: Mr. Heath went to a church in Paris and was given a wafer made of dough and he put it in his pocket. The priest drank the wine. He did not get any wine and he paid for it and it was not fair. If transubstantiation was true Christ must have a very large body. I did not hear him use the word "bloodthirsty," but did not pay particular attention to the lesson. He did not think it was quite the right thing. It need not have been mentioned. Alexander Dow, Presbyterian, aged 14: Transubstantiation was that the bread and wine was the real body and blood. He got a wafer and put it in his pocket. The priests got the wine. The body of Christ must be pretty big. Charles Steers, aged 14, was called: He lived at the same house as Mr. Heath and was excused. Ernest Greenfield, aged 15, Church of England, said: Mr. Heath said if transubstantiation was true Christ would have to have a very large body. He said he went to a church in Paris, but I forget what he said. Mr. Heath was talking of public opinion in these days. He did not use the word "bloodthirsty." Maurice Thomas, aged 13, Methodist, said: Mr. Heath was explaining the Test act and said Christ's body must have been large to supply bread all these years. The priest drank all the wine and the sacrament I thought it was not the proper thing. I do not know whether he meant to ridicule the subject. I would not say Mr. Heath did not use the word bloodthirsty. Chairman Hayward asked did he know what was transubstantiation. I cannot explain it. I do not understand it. Thomas Hickey, aged 17, said: Mr. Heath said he went to communion at the Roman Catholic church. He got a wafer and put it in his pocket. I did not hear him say anything about the wine. Chairman Hayward—Do you understand what transubstantiation means. No. You are the largest boy in the class? Yes, I was not paying attention. The wafer was supposed to be the blood of Christ. Did he say anything about the size of Christ's body? No. He made no remarks about the priest? No, sir. Trustee Glover—Did he say the body of Christ was large enough to supply the world? No. Trustee Saunders—The lecture did not make any impression on you? He did not give any lecture. The board then discussed the evidence. It was growing dark and lights were sent for. Trustee Marchant said there was no doubt in his mind that Mr. Heath had been indiscreet. The Paris incident was borne out, but not the word "bloodthirsty." Trustee Lewis—That word is a concoction. Trustee Lovell was of opinion that the reference to the body of Christ had been borne out. The word "bloodthirsty" was not used. Trustee Glover remarked that the whole thing hinged whether article 16 of the Rules and Regulations had been violated. Had Mr. Heath taught or advanced any dogma or creed in the school? Chairman Hayward replied that by ridiculing Catholicism he had negatively put up Protestantism to be preferable. Trustee Lewis said it was after six and time to go to supper. Trustee Marchant—I agree that he used the remarks about the size of the body of Christ. Trustee Lovell—No question about it. Trustee Saunders—And I believe he used the word "bloodthirsty." Trustee Marchant again rose. A light had been brought. Trustee Glover asked Mr. Marchant not to be long-winded. Trustee Marchant replied that the subject was an important one and he could not discuss it with a few words. Mr. Heath had been indiscreet but he did not use language that could be said to be offensive to the Catholic church. He did not ridicule the character of the priests. He questioned the correctness of the testimony of the children; in many particulars they did not agree by any means. If Mr. Heath taught the subject in a disrespectful way he was deserving of censure; but should the board be judges? The board had nothing to do with the studies of teachers; the education department had charge of those matters. Secretary Williams then read Clause 16: "The highest morality shall be inculcated but no religious dogma or creed shall be taught. The Lord's Prayer may be used in opening and closing the schools." Chairman Hayward then read from another part of the regulations to the effect that school trustees shall see that the regulations are carried into effect. Trustee Marchant argued that the board could not change the limit table nor any of the class books used. It was

for the Council of Public Instruction to suspend Mr. Heath's certificate or exonerate him. The department had first commenced the enquiry. Chairman Hayward said the Council of Public Instruction would perhaps take action if the board showed itself inconsistent to deal with the subject; then the board would take it for a snub. Trustee Marchant pleaded that the certificate of John N. Muir had been cancelled by the council of public instruction and that the same body had refused to grant a temporary certificate to Miss Armstrong. They could also deal with this subject, which was on a level with those named. There was no man living who advocated religious freedom with more ardor than he; his forefathers had fought and bled for liberty. But were the words used by Mr. Heath disrespectful to the Catholic church? Could history be taught without making an allusion to some church or other? Could a teacher help saying something against the Church of England in referring to the Covenanters of Scotland? It was difficult to teach English history wisely. The offence committed by Mr. Heath was of a character to be marked by distinct disapproval by the board. Mr. Heath had in fact been teaching special dogma? No. He affirmed he had no intention of throwing ridicule on any religion. Was it fair to summarily remove him from office? Was it just to send him forth in the world with a stigma on his name? He thought

Trustee Glover had come to the meeting with prejudice against Mr. Heath, but after listening to the testimony of the scholars his views had considerably changed. Mr. Heath was exceedingly indignant, but he failed to see that he had committed the fault for which they were trying him, violation of article 16. If the charge was that he had used offensive language, then it was clear. He had used offensive language. Had he been teaching special dogma? No. He was deserving of censure, but nothing more. Chairman Hayward maintained that Mr. Heath had violated article 16 in a wilful manner. Mr. Heath had attacked the Roman Catholic church and had attacked it with a most powerful weapon—the weapon of ridicule. He was advocating the creeds of those who did not believe in transubstantiation. Trustee Marchant—The scholars said he did not make fun. Chairman Hayward replied it was too serious a matter for fun. He had ridiculed one of the great dogmas of the Roman Catholic religion. Trustee Marchant retorted that it was quite a different thing to explain and to throw ridicule upon. The doctrine of immersion could be logically argued against; a man might endeavor to prove that there was not water enough for immersion in many places. That would not be logical, but logical argument. To say that Christ's body was very large was not ridicule, it was a natural inference, a logical argument that led to a disapproval of the dogma. Chairman Hayward—What better argument could be put forward to shake the belief of children? Trustee Saunders said Mr. Heath did ridicule the Roman Catholic religion, and he should be punished as he deserved. Trustee Lewis said Mr. Heath had made a mistake in relating the Paris incident. Was it possible for a man to get a wafer? The expression regarding the body of Christ had been proved, but the statements relating to the priests being bloodthirsty men, he did not believe had been proved. The girls had worked that. He did not wish to do the dirty work of the Council of Public Instruction. He wanted no odium on the school board. The Council of Public Instruction could take away Mr. Heath's certificate. Why did not Dr. Pope say what conclusion he had arrived at? There was not a shadow of evidence on which to discharge Mr. Heath. He should be severely admonished. Trustee Lovell said the Paris incident had been proved, likewise the drinking of wine statement, but not the reference to being bloodthirsty. The reference to the size of Christ's body was out of the way. Transubstantiation was a subject that could not be comprehended by children. Great men could only explain it by the spiritual influence. Very few people believed in it. These people did not believe in everyday miracles. The board should be united in saying that Mr. Heath had violated the regulations. The difficulty was about the punishment that should be meted out to him. Trustee Glover said it would not do to say he had violated the regulations. How and wherein had he violated them? If this could be shown he would vote for the instant expulsion of Mr. Heath. Chairman Hayward again remarked that to assail transubstantiation was to preach Protestant doctrine. A general and unconnected discussion followed on the correspondence which was read. Trustee Marchant then moved, seconded by Trustee Glover: "Whereas the Council of Public Instruction maintains the exclusive right of regulating and controlling the studies of our schools; and whereas the certificates of teaching qualification and standing held by our teachers are granted by the government; and whereas this board deprecates any interference with the religious scruples of any and all pupils attending our schools and emphatically expresses its disapproval of the teaching of religious dogma or creed and repudiates any attempt to cast ridicule upon any form of religion; be it therefore resolved, that this board awaits the action of the Council of Public Instruction upon the Neil Heath case before passing any judgment thereon." Trustee Saunders moved an amendment the dismissal of Mr. Heath. Chairman Hayward said the resolution proposed was a most impotent conclusion, and would be regarded so by every intelligent person. He was satisfied that it would be generally read as he would paraphrase it: "Whereas the public

school act, section 48, makes it incumbent on the school trustees to see that the schools are conducted according to the authorized regulations; and whereas the serious charge against Mr. Heath as contained in Principal Paul's letter, the article 16 of the authorized regulations requires 'that the highest morality shall be inculcated, but no religious dogma or creed shall be taught'; and whereas the charges against Mr. Heath as contained in Principal Paul's letter, the examination been clearly proved, and on which we are unanimously agreed; and whereas we are lacking in the necessary backbone to give force and effect to our opinions by rendering a verdict; therefore, be it resolved, that this board agree to an abstract resolution, having no practical application to the question at issue, and they humbly wait upon the Council of Public Instruction kindly to relieve us of the unpleasant but clearly defined duty." The motion was put, the amendment having no seconder, and was carried by three to two. Trustee Marchant, Glover and Lewis—3. Nays—Trustees Saunders and Lovell. Chairman Hayward had no vote, but intimated that it would have been cast with the negative if he had.

ANOTHER TRAIN ROBBERY. Ten Thousand Dollars Stolen from the Express Car. Phoenix, Ariz., Jan. 31.—The Southern Pacific westbound train No. 3 was held up six miles this side of Wilcox that night by masked men. They separated the express car from the train, hauled it five miles west, and with six shots of dynamite blew the safe open. It contained ten thousand dollars in Mexican silver which was removed. The trail of the robbers is marked by a profuse scattering in Sulphur Springs valley of Mexican dollars. San Francisco, Jan. 31.—The Southern Pacific and Wells Fargo companies have offered a joint reward to-day of \$500 for each of the men implicated in the Arizona train robbery.

A WOMAN'S HEART. ONE DISEASE THAT Baffles THE PHYSICIAN. The Story of a Woman Who Suffered for Nine Years—How She Was Cured. From the Newark News. Valvular disease of the heart has always been considered incurable. The following interview therefore, will interest the medical profession since it describes the successful use of a new treatment for the disease. The patient is Mrs. George Archer, of Clifton, N.J. All physicians consulted pronounced the patient suffering with valvular disease of the heart and treated her without the slightest relief. Mrs. Archer said: "I could not walk across the floor; neither could I go up stairs without stopping to let pain in my chest and left arm ease. I felt an awful constriction about my arms and chest as though I were tied with ropes. Then there was a terrible noise in my right ear like the labored breathing of some great animal. I have often turned expecting to see some creature at my side. 'Last July,' continued Mrs. Archer, 'I was at Springfield, Mass., visiting, and my mother showed me an account in the Springfield Examiner telling of the wonderful cures effected by the use of Dr. Williams' Pink Pills for Pale People. My mother urged me to try the pills and on November 25th last I bought a box and began taking them, and I have taken them ever since except for a short interval. After beginning on the second box, to my wonder, the noise in my ear ceased. I kept right on, and the distress that I used to feel in my chest and arms gradually disappeared. The blood has returned to my face, lips and ears which were entirely devoid of color and I feel well and strong again. 'My son, too, had been troubled with gastritis and I induced him to try the Pink Pills with great benefit. I feel that every body ought to know of my wonderful cure, and I bless God that I have found something that has given me this great relief.'"

COAL SHIPMENTS. Export by the New Vancouver Coal Company During January. The foreign shipments of coal by the New Vancouver Coal Company during January were as follows:

Table with 2 columns: Ship Name, Tons. Includes entries like 1-Str. Pioneer, Port Townsend... 44, 2-Ship L. J. Morse, San Francisco... 2,086, etc.

Hood's Sarsaparilla, acting through the blood, reaches every part of the system, and in this way positively cures catarrh.

When Baby was sick, we gave her Castoria. When she was a Child, she cried for Castoria. When she became Miss, she clung to Castoria. When she had Children, she gave them Castoria.

PROVINCIAL LEGISLATURE

Mr. McGregor's Mines Bill Passes Its Second Reading Yesterday.

Further Adjournment on the Motion of Mr. Kennedy's Surrender Bill.

Forty-fourth Day. Thursday.

The speaker took the chair at 10. Prayers by Rev. P. McF. Mr. Bryden presented a petition from 770 miners of Wellington of coal mines regulation bill. Mr. Kitchen moved for a resolution that the government should issue from Jan. 1 to the end of 1894, showing of the grantee, the acreage acquired by purchase or pre-emption in the district in which the grant was made. Motion agreed to. Mr. Martin continued the discussion of the Sunday observance bill contended went too far. He believed in forcing ideas down the throats of those who do not believe in the Sabbath, but he did not want to go as far as the bill intended. A number of gentlemen in the subject being absent he adjournment of the debate, motion was adopted. The house adjourned on Mr. Seward's drainage, dyking and reclamation bill. Reported complete wafers.

Mr. McGregor moved the suspension of the coal mines regulation bill which was to do dangerous classes of men in the professions were protected. Miners should be similarly protected. He knew from experience that the men who worked underground given them. Something done to make them feel more while underground. Mr. Bryden said the bill was three miners a roving commission see what they could. Many provisions were already on the books, while others were in the air. The miners were that their safety was already provided for. There were overseers and officials in a mine who could competent man from working. Mr. Walker contended that was not a dangerous one. The first honest legislation that he introduced in the house for the miners. All previous bills had introduced to influence a few. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down, as a was to be considered before a mine was unsafe if it was not a fit person to work in a mine should be shut down. The bill was in favor of both owners and the miners. The were to be referred to arbitration. This was introduced for the general good of the province. A mine was found to be dangerous should be shut down