CASE FOR OLIVER

HE OUTLINES HISTORY OF THE FAMOUS DEAL

His Summing Up of Evidence Against the C. P. R. and Offending Ministers.

Thursday afternoon the last of the evidence in the Columbia & Western railway subsidy inquiry was taken before the select committee of the legislature appointed for the purpose.

Premier Prior and ex-Premier Dunsmuir were the final witnesses called.

he entered the government on the 11th of March, 1902. He had nothing to do return. with the orders-in-council granting these lands to the railway company. The tive agent to Mr. Wells as Chief Comsatisfied. He also knew Wells intended question came to his attention on the missioner and marked personal, he was question came to his attention on the 14th or 15th of March. Mr. Prentice was walking over to lunch with him. and brought it to his notice. The Finance Minister told him he had heard something from Mr. Wells of what took place at Montreal. Mr. Wells, he said, had told him that when in Montreal he had been approached by Jack Taylor, of Eberts & Taylor, who told him a company was being formed to take over lands. He said that a certain number of shares were to go to members of the House, and that he also offered him a share. Premier Prior at that time did not know anything abo the subsidies whatever. Mr. Prentice explained it and he understood that they were lands given the C. P. R. in connectold him he had told Mr. Dunsmuir, and he thought something should be done.
Witness made the suggestion that they

go to Mr. Dunsmuir. They drove out together on Sunday. They saw Mr. Dunswir and Mr. Prentice told him what he had told witness. They talked the matter over. Mr. Dunsmuir agred with them that a stop should be put to it at once. It was decided then and there that the grants should be cancelled. Mr. Prentice said if they were not he would resign. They all agreed to it.

Witness said he knew something about the lands, and knowing something about coal told Mr. Dunsmuir that these lands were extremely valuable. Witness said the government had no right to grant these lands, and if anything took place like what Mr. Wells had suggested that was another reason why the grants should be cancelled.

His course was not so much dictated

strongly to-day.

Wr. Duff asked if the opinion of Mr. Eberts was taken on or before March Watness replied that he did not know that his opinion was sought, but Mr. Eberts expressed the opinion that

about it before or after the 24th of He spoke to Shaughnessy in Montreal in January, 1903, about this. He called on Sir Thomas while in Montreal, and talked over several matters. He asked Sir Thomas if there was any chance of getting the Spence's Bridge line built. He urged its importance having been through the country, and he knew there were coal measures there, and he thought it would be to the advantage of the company to build this line. Thomas, on a map, showed him lines they were building in Manitoba and the Northwest Territories, and said that in the meantime he could not think of ling any more on the British Columbia lines. He said they intended to build to Spence's Bridge some time. In a chaffing way he referred to the crown grants for section 4. Witness told him that the government, he considered, had done its duty in the course it had taken. Sir Thomas replied: "Well, we're going to get them anyway." Witness said: Well, you'll have to fight the government for all your worth." Witness also asked him if he had ever had possession of the crown grants. Sir Thomas re-plied in the negative. If he recollected correctly he thought Sir Thomas said: "I'm given to understand we had pos-session of them." Sir Thomas also told him that Mr. Wells had asked to be allowed to retain them for 30 days. He had done so expecting them returned in

Mr. Duff asked witness if he told Sir

done. Some of the ministers told him expediency of the thing at all." The grants having been prepared and cancelled until in connection with bill 16 it was disclosed. When Mr. Oliver brought the plained. It was hinted Mr. Dunsmuir explained. It was hinted Mr. Dunsmuir explained that in content of some of Mr. Witness said that he had specifically pointed out in his speech in the House that it would be possible to take the coal and oil lands contained in these the coal and oil lands contained in the coal and oil lands contained in

mentioned, he thought, by himself. He fore passing the recission order, as to thought Mr. Brown asked if they sus- whether it would cancel the grants as cted him at all. He was told they well as the previous order-in-council. did not. The report in general was true. "Well," asked Mr. Duff, "if you believed this, some member of the C. P. R. Company must have been implicated ing the presence of Mr. Eberts.

misconduct?" The Premier replied: "No, not necessarily." "Well, why punish them for it?" The when on August 2nd, 1901, it was pro-Premier replied that he did not think posed to change from the B. C. Southern that was done. They could not under- to the Columbia & Western, Mr. Eberts

stand where the C. P. R. came in. Mr. Duff asked if it was through Mr. it made no difference, as both companies Taylor's connection with the Attorney- were part of the C. P. R. Witness did General that the government thought the company had gained this advantage.

one express an opinion one way or the other. Witness was never satisfied, and The right to ask this question was could not see why it should take place.

said he did not wish to keep anything back. After some little discussion he said he thought it was the reason why the government acted. Mr. Duff asked if there were any

reasons for certain letters produced between Messrs. Brown and Wells not having been inserted in the return brought down to the House on March 3rd, 1902. The Premier said he did not see the

return. If the letters were in the de-In reply to Mr. Duff, Col. Prior said partment they should have been produced. All letters not marked private or confidential should have been in the Duff.

> asked if it should not have appeared. The Premier said he had his own opinion about these kind of letters. They back. hould never be written. The letter referred to should not have been marked personal. It should have been put on the | Dunsmuir.

ordinary file. The Premier was then asked his opin-ion of Mr. Wells's reply to questions in the House that no crown grants had been prepared and not issued. The witness said he thought it was not mislead-ing, as the grants had been cancelled. He had had a good deal of experience in this line. That answer from one party to fer of the grants, witness said that it

"I won't say that." mier, "that it is best to tell everything at the first. Sometimes they complain that I tell too much."

Mr. Eberts, he said, told the caucus what he told the House regarding the agreement between the government and Mackenzie & Mann and the C. P. R. He did not taink that under bill 87 the gov-

anywhere in Yale or Kootenay.

"Had the bill passed," asked Mr.

I said: 'See here, I won't allow it to gard further. I will cancel the grants.' Duff, "and the railway company had come and asked for the two blocks,"

"When did you hear that a "When did you hear that would you as a member of the govern-ment have refused the mandate of the legislature, as expressed in that bill?" 'Well, according to the provisions, as

His course was not so much dictated by what took place in Montreal as what he was acting. He did year, the contingence of the land. He learned after selius the act that these lands shoul have been taken contiguous to the line of railway and out of blocks reserved for that purpose. He expressed himself the grants from the story of Mr. Wells.

He should be canceried.

His course was not so much dictated by what took place in Montreal as what took place in Montreal as what took place in Montreal as what the time, but he did not know that the time, but he did not know that the time, but he did not know that the was acting. He did something to him. I made up my mind something was wrong. With the turning over of the grants from the B. C. Southern to the Columbia & Western, and with what Mr. Wells told me, I decided that the best thing to do was to cancel them and put it back to its was.

He thought then that according to the Ha thought then that according to the he what done the had took the the time, but he did not know that it eas a harwas looking for Brown, and knowing his isocial proclivities he would look there, for him.

In so far as there was any assurance the mand put it back to its was that the would go to the ever, to bring in such a bill." Price were, to bring in such a bill." It was not extend to mind there could be modified the condition that the company should be modified to spence's Bridge. Sir Thomas the work of this land there could be with the offer the province in connection with the of with the was true, as harwas looking for Brown,

Mr. Eberts expressed the opinion that the flought the government had the power to grant these. The action of the government in rescinding, was therefore in opposition to Mr. Eberts, and the power to refuse them these acquired in opposition to Mr. Eberts, and the power to refuse them these lands. In speaking of subsidies spin if this was not done the business. Mr. Pentice the feel' in with the others. The Attorney-General' had always opposed it.

He did not take Wells's explanation as sustifactory, and spoke to several the month-building of the line of the conversation given by Mr. Brown as Itaking place in the Driard was incorrect. The substance of the conversation was that a withdrawal and I did cancel it."

Mr. Oswald should have taken note of the conversation given to Spence's Bridge was the reason for the conversation was that a withdrawal and I did cancel it."

Mr. McCaul at this juncture interject that he had forgotten about the granting of the letter should be made.

Mr. McPhillips, showing the receipts, with the had forgotten about the granting of the letter should be made.

Mr. McPhillips, showing the receipts, with the had forgotten about the granting of the letter should be made.

Mr. McPhillips, showing the receipts, with the had forgotten about the granting of the letter should be made.

Mr. McPhillips, showing the receipts, with the had forgotten about the granting of the letter should be made.

Mr. McPhillips, showing the receipts, with the had forgotten about the granting of the conversation was that a withdrawal granted to the British Columbia Southern. Mr. Brown made the taken note of the conversation was that a withdrawal state of the conversation was that a withdrawal granted to the British Columbia Southern. Mr. Brown made the taken note of the conversation was that a withdrawal state of the conversation was that a withdrawal state of the conversation was the conversation was the conversation was that a withdrawal state of the conversation was that a withdrawal state of the conversation was He did not take Wells's explanation

> acting as a whip. I never asked a mem- it if he were in the government. "I aside, had not been brought down. ber to vote for this bill. I spoke to two or three members. I thought it a very not have consented to bill 87 going into brought down. curious bill. When we had talked the the House if he had know of these feacelled, and it was then shown that these
>
> "How was it that when Brown was same lands could be got under this bill, pressing for delivery you did not mention not delivered." I said to Mr. Oliver: 'I don't believe a this failure to comply with the proposal word of it.' The bill was finally with-drawn, I don't know by whom."
>
> to build to Spence's Bridge?" asked Mr.

said that bill 87 was in accordance with the Subsidy Act he did not turn it up.

Witness said Eberts did not dissent from the proposal made by Wells, He The Premier replied that if ministers added: "I thought there was something had to look up acts and bill relating to wrong. I wanted my hands clear. I that to look up acts and one reading to the ministers' departments, business felt as Premier I had a right to protect could never be carried on. They had to the province. The railway company trust to their colleagues. He was asked could take care of itself. I could see—"

Mr. Eberts was strongly against bill the withdrawal of bill 87 was not ow- and here the ex-Premier formed gyrations 16. ing to the anxiety of many of the mem- with his hands expressive of pyrotechers to get home. "I would not say nics. was the reply.

said withdrawal for witness to look to government, not of the House, who were the questioner's side of the table and say implicated. whether he saw two gentlemen who had

Thomas of the Taylor-Wells conversation in Montreal.

All Heimeken orought to his attention that the mover and seconder of the motion to discharge the bill were present.

Chief the Taylor-Wells conversation to discharge the bill were present. Witness said he had been connected

Mr. McPhillips said that as a matter

livery?' was asked.

The Premier couldn't say as to this. "You agreed to the condition Mr. Wells imposed as to the delivery of the must have heard these remarks. He had imposed as to the delivery of the must have heard these remarks. He had wells which did not attach to any other leged promise by Mr. Wells to Mr. Witness thought that the cancellation decision was come to in executive dur-Ex-Premier Dunsmuir was then

called. In reply to Mr. Duff he said that said that Mr. Brown wanted it, and that

with me." . This remarkable statement completed then discussed. The Premier, however, said he did not wish to keep anything Prentice and Wells in the latter's room. Mr. Prentice was not altogether satisfied either. They said there would be a saving of 300,000 acres. Even this did not

satisfy witness, but he said let it go.

any conditions with respect to delivering

line to Spence's Bridge

Wells said so."

take the grant to Montreal and try and on Friday. It had been the intention had afterwards secured incorporation in get better terms. He spoke of getting a to have had counsel proceed with their the Dominior, thus avoiding being sub-"Did Mr. Eberts know you were recor

to make a proposal in Montreal respecting the line to Spence's Bridge?" asked Mr. Dungmir replied that he shought said that the shought said that purchase the left Montreal in these 900 000 agrees to the said that the delivery of these proposal in Montreal respecting to make a prop eturn.

Shown one from Mr. Brown as executive agent to Mr. Wells as Chief Company as Chief Company to Mr. Wells as Chief Compa get the two crown grants.

> better terms, and if necessary bring them office on the morning of 21st. He took grants down to the effice. He then gave the grants over. Witness separated that Mr. McCaul should able to believe that he should have an address the company first this afternoon, interview with Sir Thomas and not propose that for which he went. Sir "But Mr. Eberts says he did not klow," said Mr. Duff.
>
> "But Eberts is wrong," returned Mr. these two grants in question and put dress. them in an envelope. In the evening he went back for receipts.
>
> The committee then adjourned until 2.30 this afternoon. "He was in the room when went back for receipts.
>
> The first interview took place with Sir "Mr. Eberts says he did not know of

> Thomas Shaughnessy on the afternoon of the 20th. Witness prepared the he crown grants," said Mr. Duff.
> "But I know he did," said Mr. Dunsing, and delivered it the next day. He statement at his own request. He said with Sir Thomas. muir, emphatically. "He was present when Wells said so in Prentice's room." bunched with Sir Thomas, when it was that during Mr. Eberts's evidence a few corroboration of this from an unexpect-

line. That answer from one party to another in the House was perfectly correct. He thought it was a fair answer. "Was it an answer you would give?" was Mr. Brown's proposal, whoever he acted for. When Wells went to Montroll that was a proposal of his own. Witness could not see how they could won't say that."

He coud not recan to his mind that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should be returned within 30 days. He might have said not recan to his mind that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas thinking that the grants should lead to Sir Thomas the gr thing which would lead to Sir Thomas from Rogers, in which the intervention ridiculous one. go beyond the scope of the Subsidy Act.
Mr. Eberts claimed they could. Wells got
Sir Tr

what occurred in Montreal, Mr. Brown was there. "I told him to come into Mr. Respecting Premier Prior's asking him about bill 87 conforming to the Subsidy Eberts's room. I said: 'See here, Mr. Act, witness said he had no doubt he Wells tells me that he was approached said it "should" conform to the Subsidy by Mr. Taylor in Montreal, and I told him the rest of the story. I said: 'I unhim the rest of the story. I said: 'I unhis first having this feature called to his did not taink that under bill 87 the government would be entitled to give lands derstand Mr. Eberts and you are in it.

I said: 'See here, I won't allow it to go gone to Mr. Eberts about it.

"I treated that bill as practicelly the "When did you hear that Mr. Eberts Attorney-General's biit," said Mr. Wells. Respecting the answers given in the House, witness had no doubt they were "From what Mr. Wells said I inferred they were in it. It was said that two submitted to the executive before being great extent had been fomented in the British Columbia. members of the government were in it. Both said they would not be implicated Referring to the conversation with Mr.

It was not suggested, witness con-

"No, sir, I never knew of a minister not have got these blocks, however, under stating that these blocks had been set Mr. Wells said it should have been

> Witness defended his answer to the questions asked in the House that "There were no crown grants now issued, but The grants were really destroyed. They were cancelled.
>
> Mr. McPhillips asked if these crown

drawn, I don't know by whom.

Mr. McCaul then cross-examined the "Because I did not consider that it was Premier. He asked if when Mr. Wells of any great importance."

Witness and Plant it was why did it require an act of the legislature to give effect to it? Mr. Wells said that this was made necessary by the course of the railroad company in taking action against certain

"Was not it an alomalous position tha

the legal adviser of the government In reply to Mr. Helmcken witness said should, be opposed to the Mr. Helmcken asked with respect to he understood it was two members of the government?" asked Mr. McPhillips. "Individual members of the govern ment are entitled to individual opinions, Mr. Helmcken then went into the letreplied Mr. Wells.
In reply to Mr. Helmcken as to the

ing the company subsidy for section 4. witness said that he had some nopes of 'Did you dictate that letter' asked Mr. son for retaining the grants, however. Col. Wolfenden, recalled, explained that "No I did not?" was the reply. "The the entry made in the book of the King's the Pacific Coal Company. tioned it to him. I said rumors were going around that Taylor had made proposals to Wells. He said he did not know of any company being formed, and pronounced it all nonsense."

With the Crow's Nest Coal Company for a number of years. He had not been actuated in this matter by that connected it. I knew what I was signing. I said to Mr. Eberts: 'Write out a letter and I will sign it.' The matter had been spoken to him about it.

So I did not? was the reply. The Attorney-General dictated it and I sign printer as May 22nd was, he found, the date upon which bill 87 was delivered. It was received apparently on the 15th. Smith Curtis, being sworn, explained was important to find who told the spoken to him about it.

Wells was not there to justify the government. He represented Mr. Wells, It was received apparently on the 15th. Smith Curtis, being sworn, explained. Wells or Mr. Brown? R. "How is it that these grants for these or Kootenay had not been brought to his

taking the grants to Montreal for de-livery?! was asked.

that if would be better to give the rail-livery?! was asked.

that if would be better to give the rail-livery?! Was asked.

Wells. Different persons might have "I knew that they would have to be with the exception of the mountain tops, it that Mr. Wells brought down the re- acted differently.

been surprised at the position taken by "Yes, but I thought that condition was "Tents?"

Wens which did not attach to any out the would endeavor to get that no great suspicion could be attached these two blocks for the company. Mr. not worth that," snapping his fingers.

"Did you explain to Mr. Brown that by the remembrance of the ground taken."

"Did you explain to Mr. Brown that by the remembrance of the ground taken."

"The crown grants were then prepared, "Did you explain to Mr. Brown that the Columbia of the ground taken by Mr. Martin in 1900, when he declared that the Columbia & Western had the Statisfied of the ground taken by Mr. Martin in 1900, when he declared that the Columbia & Western had the Statisfied of the ground taken by Mr. Martin in 1900, when he declared that the Columbia & Western had the Statisfied of the ground taken by Mr. Mells seemed still to be dissection of the ground taken by Mr. Wells seemed still to be dissection. Wells should go down to Montreal with the did say that

not care a bit whether the government were defeated or not. That cut no figure Martin's speech at that time, Mr. Curtis

company had forfeited their land grant. Why restore it, especially as Mr. Shaughnessy had succeeded in cutting out his competitor at Ottawa by stating that he had this up his sleeve? The road had this up his sleeve? The road had re
This remarkable statement completes.

Why restore it, especially as Mr. Shaughnessy had succeeded in cutting out his competitor at Ottawa by stating that he had been discussed, and Mr. Eberts stated that he did not know of this condition, yet interests of the province that a strong corporation like the C. P. R. should get the stated that he bridge had been discussed, and Mr. Dunsmuir was positive Mr. Eberts knew proper restrictions.

Mr. Wells's letters showed that that They met again, when witness thought Eber's came in. Wells said he would lumbia & Western subsidy matter met lumbia be would lumbia at l ation in British Columbia, while they address. Hon. Mr. Wells wished to make ject to the conditions of the Provincial some explanations in connection with the Railroad Act. It was proposed to give sidering the order-in-council of the 10th sidering the order-in-council of the 10th evidence giving during the past few days. of August, and know that Mr. Wells was Smith Curtis also made a statement belegal. The company would be non-suited evidence giving during the past few days. away ten millions of acres to a company

giving five times that amount of ordin-

Before counsel began their addresses although he was very positive of at the taking place in his previous examination. Friday afternoon in the Columbia & agreed to meet at 4 o'clock and discuss days ago he understood the Attorney-

"You would nave acquiesced "I won't say that."

Mr. Eberts claimed they could. Wells got "I won't say that."

"I always hold," continued the Premier, "that it is best to tell everything it the first. Sometimes they complain the first. Sometimes they complain the first. Sometimes they complain the first satisfactory as a said he did not blame him, he blamed the government.

Sir Thomas, when he saw him in the fall, spoke of these not being delivered. Sir Thomas said he did not blame him, he blamed the government.

When witness came over to the House shortly after Mr. Wells had told him of when Mr. McInnes brought him a letter from Davis, Marshall & McNeill saying the Crow's Nest Company was not to be debared from any rights on account of the control of the contro

quiry had been ably carried on by Mr. Oliver and his counsel Mr. Duff.

matter.

The government apparently saw that

and it made no difference to them. came from the government. Sir Thomas | Coal Company was made; on 10th | suggested that the government have made a proposition. Mr. Eberts bia & Western was made, while on 31st said that the order-in-council itself was August, 1901, letters patent were taken the chief source of his information. He out by the Pacific Coal Company. did not think that any of these statecorrect.

It was perfectly logical to believe that the negotiations were carried on personof getting this transfer made.

Looking to the question of motive

here was no reason in it, but the pass- true? ing of the matter from a legal obliga-Crow's Nest Coal Co. and the British | An analysis of his statements could only moral obligation as it was between the story in any way true these patents explanation of any just reason. The rewhether he saw two gentlemen who had a good deal to do with that, the reference being to Messrs. Smith and Helmcken. Wr. Brown, in which it was promised that legislation should be introduced giving the company subsidy for section 4. Taylor was assisting him was not known. But while Sir Thomas has even if Mr. Oswald's story were true Comi Mr. Helmcken brought to his attention that the mover and seconder of the mothat the mover and seconder of the mothey had not the slightest denial from to think that a matter of such vital im-

ernment. He represented Mr. Wells, It out Mr. Wells's contention that the Referring to Brown's report of the executive meeting, witness was asked if he would impugn its accuracy. He replied that Mr. Brown was very excited, and did not behave as he should have

"Why did you consent to Mr. Wells and Nicola, He had concluded by stating all should have taken their share in that it could be attributed to anything

"Not at all," was the reply. "I would forfeited its land grant.

Quoting from the Times report of Mr.

That was undoubtedly agreed to by Mr. Dunsmuir, Mr. Prentice and Mr. knowledge of it. Yet it was acknowl- was all he intended to consent to. edged that it was an unusual thing to take crown grants to Montreal in person. Mr. Brown knew that Mr. Wells was taking the grants, and knew of a proposition to build to Spence's Bridge. It was an easy matter to put the two things together.

What other reason could Mr. Wells have for taking these grants to Mon- a fair one, but it did not affect Mr.

With Mr. Wells going to Montreal to Witness went down to the C. P. R.

Witness went down to the C. P. R.

It was decided that Mr. McCaul should able to believe that he should have an Thomas admitted, however, in his crossexamination that there might have been reference to this in his first interview

There can be little doubt this proposimemorandum that evening or next morn- Western inquiry, Premier Prior made a tion was made at the first interview ed source, namely Mr. Taylor. The lat memorandum. He could not recall to his mind anyGeneral to say that when he got a letter proposal, and was warned that it was a

He thought that it was reasonable to suppose that the Crow's Nest Coal Witness was then Premier, and he had agreement was shown to Mr. Wells. It

that action was to be taken.

Mr. McCaul in beginning his address his honor, why should Sir Thomas seek the inquiry was undertaken. He said he inquiry was undertaken. He said he legal advice of Mr. Creelman.

It was utterly idiotic to think of Mr. separately with the transactions Wells taking the grants down to ask for He thought that there was a good deal a condition and then get down on his with the rescincing order of 1902. They in Sir Thomas Shoughnessy's remarks knees and ask permission to retain them that this was an investigation after the for, a few days. The only object which that the scope of the inquiry was to find fact, and that legislative action should Mr. Wells might have for these grants, have followed rather then preceded this according to Sir Thomas's story would investigation. Political feeling to a very be to work a fraud upon the people of

He admitted that political expediency The lands having been set aside in might to some extent enter into these what might be regarded as the ministers' may, 1891. for the British Columbia things. He was not concerned in expolitical conduct, but with their conduct "Well, according to the provisions, as they are in the bill," was the response, "I would hardly believe it should be refused. It was not the intention, however, to bring in such a bill." Price was with at the time, but he did teld Taylor, who said that if he got Wells to say that outside he would be respected by the conversation with Mr. Before the conversation Southern, was a sufficient reason for plaining these, but he was concerned in as ministers of the crown.

"Have you read Mr. Brown's report Mr. Brown to consent to the withdrawal messages between September, 1900, and use of that for the purpose of deceiving messages between Mr. Brown to consent to the withdrawal messages between September, 1900, and use of that for the purpose of deceiving the people of this province, it placed Sir and spoke to him about it. Mr. Wells said it was the language of the Subsidy Act.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the land wrote flat. He had a hard time remembering this here. He line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Act mentioned lands contiguous to the line.

The witness knew that the Subsidy Arct. He went to the withdrawal of a subsidy for the 4th section. To this Mr. Brown to consent to the withdrawal of a subsidy for the 4th section. To this Mr. Brown would into the withdrawal of a subsidy for the 4th section. To this Mr. Brown and Sir Thomas. In the latter Thomas in a very peculiar position, and It was perfectly clear that the executive reference in the people of this province, it placed Sir flowed to give these two blocks.

The witness are the people of this province, it placed Sir flowed to give these two blocks.

The people of the subsidy to give the set wo blocks.

The people of this province, it placed Sir flowed to give these two blocks.

The people of statement which was meaningless unless note of these grants being given back or

87, witness added, was never in executive when he was present. The Deputy Attorney-General generally put these bills in shape. He found the feeling of the House against the bill. He found that members on both sides favored it, and some on both sides opposed it.

The Deputy Attorney-General generally put these bills in shape. He found the feeling of the House against the bill. He found that members on both sides favored it, and some on both sides opposed it.

The Deputy Wells could not possibly have made up with that the assurance to say that he had forgotten it. These statements could scarcely be credited. He thought that usual business acumen would allow the inference that the relation between the Crow's Nest Coal Company and the British Columbia Southern Company and the British Columbia Southern Company and the British Columbia Southern Company and paining. was at the base of this change taking | Eberts believing that there was some ated it from all others for coal mining, thing in the story.

It looked reasonable that the Pacific it made no difference to the country, A | Coal Company had a great deal to do saying of acreage was to be affected, with this. On the 10th September, 1900, solicitation of the company at the hands the British Columbia Southern got a of Mr. Brown. The proposition in the order-in-council subsidy; on 13th November, 1900, the apof 10th August, 1901, Mr. Brown said plication for incorporation for the Pacific might August, 1901, the transfer to the Colum- the one suggestion that there was a

He referred to the telegrams alluded ments could be regarded as anything like to by Mr. Wells as having passed between Mr. Taylor and Mr. Eberts with respect to whether the transfer could take place from the British Columbia ally by G. McL. Brown for the purpose | Southern to the Columbia & Western. What reason could Mr. Wells have for making such a statement if it were not

With Mr. Oswald the demeanor of the ion such as was that between the witness was to be taken into account. Columbia Southern to that of merely a lead to the supposition that were his row's Nest Coal Co. and the Columbia were only left there for safe keeping whose names were connected with portance should be made known to no one but Oswald up to within a few days ago. Sir Thomas and Mr. Creelman bore told the crown grants never passed to the C. P.

But in spite of this concurrence Mr. Wells saw what they were against, and done. Some of the ministers told him so. "I never remember him mentioning expediency of the thing at all." The expediency of the thing at all." The grants having been prepared and cancelly wells have a matter two blocks came to be made out to the grants having been prepared and cancelly faction with the transaction. He called that he whole complished was somewhat unsatisfactory. Some ministers said that he decided that he would do his duty and prevent the delivery of the house whole complished was somewhat unsatisfactory. Some ministers said they consent to the duty and prevent the delivery of the house whole complished was somewhat unsatisfactory. Some ministers said that he had specifically faction with the transaction. He called the whole complished was somewhat unsatisfactory. Some ministers said they consent the delivery of the pointed out in his speech in the House whole consent to the delivery of the duty and prevent the delivery of the

government exceeding its power was He asked if advice had been taken be- senting he fell in with the executive act. and also the coal lands of Similkameen sponsibility upon Mr. Wells. He thought was a delicate one. He did not think years applications had been made for

Different persons might have

Brown in his message said that he regarded the promise with uncertainty.

if the company gave up its claim to the That was undoubtedly agreed to by Mr. 4th section altogether that he would read the following:

"Mr. Martin opposed the bill. The Spence's Bridge the grants were to be blocks. There was nothing wrong in

Mr. Wells's letters showed that that Bill 87 rested assuredly on the At-

torney-General. Mr. Wells could not draw that bill. It was the Attorney-General who should be responsible for a bill of that kind. He agreed that Mr. Wells should have been on his guard with respect to a bill of that kind. That was as a question of political criticism. Wells in a personal sense. He was not devoting his attention to the poli side of it. He was looking after Mr. Wells's honor.

He would regard that bill as a back door measure. If such a bill prepared by Mr. Brown passed the scrutiny of the Attorney-General and passed the watchful eye of such a parliamentarian as Jos. Martin Mr. Wells could hardly be blamed for not moticing its objection able features at first.

He contended that Mr. Wells's story in all its main features was the only

one which was unshaken.
"I put it to any fair-minded members no, to the fair-minded members of the committee-no-to the members of the committee, who are all fair-minded," whether the story was not substantially correct, said Mr. McCaul.

political features should not allow the committee to bring in any finding which would destroy private character unless the commit lutely sure of the grounds for it. The committee then rose until 8.30

the evening. In the evening Mr. Duff opened the ning 10th September, 1900, and closing whether ministers of the crown had been personally guilty of misdemeanor They were ministers of the crown, and as such responsible to the people therefore, did not propose to deal with

Respecting the British Columbia

that company alone being open to mine coal on it.

That change was brought about at the

The ministers who have given evidence were unable to give any agreement which Mr. Brown adduced except gain in acreage to the province. No steps were taken in any systematic way to ascertain the values of the lands

with which they were dealing. One of the blocks had a frontage on the railway of forty miles, so that that alone made it very valuable. The railroad company desiring the change was doing mething which was enormously to its advantage. The only record of any discussion on this subject was that given by Mr. Wells in which it was said that Mr,

Brown made the statement that there was a considerable saving of acreage. The alteration was made without any ommendations for which both orders-inouncil were made were signed by the Chief Commissioner of Lands and

Coming to the summer of 1901, the facts were that these lands which had become the property of the British Columbia Southern were by order-in-council of 10th August, 1901, transferred to the Columbia & Western, and the northernly lock was again vested in the British Columbia Southern. The Columbia & Western was also given alternate blocks for its line throughout the length of it. The result was that the C. P. R. re mained in possession of the solid block and got the aiternate blocks throughout

the whole length of the line. The explanations of how this was acthe same company. Others held that there was a saving in acreage. But no investigations had been made as to the

licenses in these ent must hav infinitely more tain tops along journ until Sat

The committ umbia & West morning to list the address of Mr. McCaul objected to the te was reported said that it v Eberts was no cific Coal Con nected the Att

Mr. Duff. co ferred to the Hunter. In g Hunter he judgment upon een an ac could pass to ited in the jud His judgment, strued as an or ing been made sidy Act that But there was the grant had provisions of the Premier Prior ha that he thought far as to warrant grants.

Mr. Wells con absence, from 27th that his colleagues of transferring t Wells had consulted still more strongly grams which he sai ous to this, in which the reply "Impossible Mr. Prentice says

at the council meet were passed to the r eave that had he h have voted against to these blocks bein doubts about the tra seemed to know notl was no record of w took in it. Mr. Ebe that it came in as Mr. Wells, and tha little personal atten All the ministers

recommendation see Mr. Wells, yet as in in the year 1900, t come from the outing little about it. ground that when h meeting while he was signed a recommends really a matter alread the other ministers so posed of. There was and Mr. Dunsmuir hait. Then the reco went from Mr. Wells

The ministers at the forth that the order to only an offer to t borne out. Mr. Wells ted that the settleme

The correspondence be and the government age was to the effect that t given over to the railr was unreasonable to order-in-council, which posal to the company, followed by a preparat grants and a notice to

agent that the lands ha the railroad compuny. On the 10th Septemb ernment fixed a policy not grant these land company, that was when pressing for it at the principals at Montrea ground that these iand be of exceptional value

On 19th December th change was made wi reason. 2. No minister any explanation of that the change was made no policy with respect to ter, but was carried out railroad company's inter benefit of the C. P. R. to say that the minister to serve the railroad was a fact that they be ments in carrying out t C. P. R. All the mini sponsibility. It was, hor pertaining to Mr. Wells's signed a recommendation without even informing force of it. Mr. Wells i tent to take a draft order pared by the solicitor of of a railroad company ing whether it was for th

the province. The same might be said 10th August, 1901. Chairman Clifford called of Mr. Duff to the fact there was a saving of a Mr. Duff pointed out th and Sir Thomas were change because it was the company. It was di advantage of the compa

the public.

Each minister showed a want to shed the respon others. These settleme by the railroad compan marily in the public in a peculiar absence of offi ence preceding these set Chairman Clifford th railroad company having