

Boundary Creek and East Yale that the road would be built. The Government proposed to carry out a railway policy that was practical, and had made up its mind to clear the decks of all this old rubbish.

Did the doing away with this bogus contract mean that the road from Pentteton to Boundary Creek would not be built? No; the Government was under pledge to the people to build, but under conditions in which the rights of the people would be protected. (Cheers.)

Messrs. Mackenzie, Mann & Co. had interviewed the Government last November, and had held threats over the head of the Government. They had intimated that if the Government did not let them go on with the agreement made with the late Government no one else would be permitted to take up the contract. It was for this reason that the Government intended to repeal the acts. There was nothing in all the alleged contracts to show that the Government was in any way bound to Mackenzie & Mann. When the subsidy was repealed the Government would look into the matter of letting new contracts for the road, Mackenzie, Mann & Co., if they were better able to build the road than any other firm, and very likely they were, would have their chance then. But was that the matter that was bothering the Opposition and the people who were seeking to defeat the bill?

"No," said Hon. Mr. Cotton, "that is not the trouble at all. The trouble is that if Mackenzie & Mann do not get the contract from the present Government the syndicate behind them will not come in for its blood money. That is the reason that our lobbies are filled with men who are button-holing members of this House in every way, so that no one can go to his seat without being cross-questioned as to how he was going to vote. I have protested against that kind of thing before, I say again that it is outrageous that this sort of thing should go on in this legislature. If this bill passes—I am sure that it will pass with a big majority—these lobbyists will understand that they had better keep away from the precincts of this House." The Government, continued the Finance Minister, did not go about with a placard on its back announcing its great railroad policy, but it was a business Government and would go about its railroad work in a business way. As to this bill working an injustice to the people who had the charters, it was simply a matter of speculation with them, and they had not constructed a single mile. If men chose to speculate in railway charters and lost money, it was nobody's fault but their own. Railway promotion, as carried on in this Province had worked untold harm to the country. Mr. Cotton went on to review the history of the struggle between the Heinze faction at Ottawa and the Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern people. The late Government had given two charters to build over one piece of road, and when the rival parties went to Ottawa, the Minister of Railways had simply told the contestants that when they could settle their own quarrels they could then come back and get their charters at Ottawa. The consequence was that neither had secured the desired aid, and the line had not been built. The Vancouver, Victoria & Eastern scheme was the Fraser River & Burrard Inlet scheme under a new name, and had been brought forward to recoup those who had lost money on that scheme. The present Government would have nothing to do with these paper charters. It would clear them all away, and when the sophistries of the Opposition were made clear to the people and the full purport of the bill become known, the Government's action would be even more thoroughly endorsed by the Province. He closed by saying that the Government would be persistent in the course its members had consistently advocated in Opposition. (Loud Government cheers.)

Mr. Higgins, in moving the adjournment of the debate, said it was utterly impossible to get a complete view of the question from the correspondence at the present moment. He for one wanted more time to consider it.

NOTE.—The debate was then adjourned on the motion of Mr. Higgins.

(Colonist, February 24.)

#### THAT DELAYED RETURN.

Hon. Mr. Hume presented a return of correspondence and agreements between the Government and Mackenzie & Mann, asked for on the 30th of January last by resolution of Mr. Helmcken—this being the correspondence which the senior member for Victoria had failed to get before the debate on the Subsidy Repudiation Bill came on, and who, having privately obtained it, he had read in the House on Wednesday evening.

The return was received with Opposition laughter.

Mr. Higgins inquired as to what the return contained, and as to whether or not it would be printed?