BARI OF THE MICIORIA WEEKLY COLONIST, FRIDAY, MARCH 23, 1888

<page-header><page-header><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text><text>

RANVILLE that

have reason to belie other claims which are rangement, although y allowed them." He personally investigate or three other persons good, which have be you." He then says necessary for the govern fied that it (the agreen ried out, and requests ried out, and request furnish him with the f it was the intentio that the company shot sive power to decide a the claims, why did M to review the decision ask for the evidence u 4. The contention further called in que of Mr. Gore, the sur Mr. Bichards, late of Mr. Richards, late of the office of lands whom solemnly decla did not confer arb company, but intended the decisions of the should be subject to r ernment. The chief ment in the case of H Angus says that the tion of the case "is n tion of the case "is no recommends itself to o 5. One point would the range of dispute final by all parties to date of occupation or chase lots must be sh have been prior to th Horne's first visit, t 1884. But the comm out as bad claims to plied for previous to after that date passe Nor do they deem po any case necessary to claim to a lot. Mr. that when the agreen had no knowledge of British Columbia. years' experience in and crown lands in t personal occupation is necessary, and h rule when dealing squatters and settler Notwithstanding Mr. ruling on this point ar on that ruling, it is a neither J. Miller nor on the lots respectiv yet both claims w shows that the rule least, elastic. J. B promised another linquish the one on 6. The committee fide claimants are con namely, those who to Mr. Van Horne's

to Mr. Van Horre's i them personally or 'by substantial improveme ing, slashing or buildin and those who, after had been lifted, applie we're from the govern f fed. According to d'ss of land chames fettlers was "shout haf," The area allow acres and a half out acquired from the g only ten claims out of were allowed by all Hamilton in his ev states the grounds o ful claimants were-but he is not so forth

ut he is not so, forther the section of the other claims the section of the he other claims the section of the he committee were.