

or No Party?

of Opinion as to for Restoring Good Government.

and Kootenay Cons-Federal Issues.

Postpones Its Decision Calls a Provincial Convention.

Correspondent.

March 16.—At a meeting... decision of the convention... coming elections... party... carried by 148 to 5.

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

With hardly a dissenting voice...

People Move In Politics.

Well Attended Meeting Discusses the Situation and Comes to Important Decision.

Premier Martin, the Governor and Partisanship Strongly Condemned.

(From Friday's Daily Colonist.)

"Resolved, that this meeting regards the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the premiership as fraught with danger to the best interests of the province of British Columbia, and believes the time has arrived when it is the duty of the people to elect a new government."

With hardly a dissenting voice the above resolution was passed at a largely attended citizens' meeting held last evening in the Philharmonic hall. It sets forth very clearly and succinctly the spirit of the discussion. While there were naturally some differences of opinion as to the expediency of introducing federal party action at the present time, it may be said that the temper of the audience was one of direct antagonism to Hon. Joseph Martin and his policy.

Mr. Noot—Do you think it necessary for the province to have these railways? Mr. Lugin—Yes.

Mr. Noot—Why could not the government build them as well as individuals? Mr. Lugin—For a very simple reason—the government could not raise the money if it tried. He cited the difficulty that Mr. Cotton experienced when he went to London for loans; he only wanted £200,000 and had difficulty in getting it. The point was simply this—British Columbia had not to have what could be afforded; the credit of the province was not unlimited, and the power of taxation was not unlimited.

Dr. Hanington cited the case of Australia. The country had the power of making indirect taxation, which British Columbia had not. In New Zealand and Tasmania the feeling was given to government ownership of railways; they were not paying concerns, but so far as British Columbia was concerned it was a small colony and the proposition was simply ridiculous.

Mr. Noot claimed that Mr. Lugin's speech was directed against the Governor rather than Martin, and had not explained why the people should not support him. Mr. Lugin—I can answer that in one word. You cannot vote on the Governor, but you can vote on the man that the Governor has chosen. (Loud applause.)

At this point Edward Brags was voted to the chair, and in a brief remarks outlined the scope and object of the meeting in so far as he knew it. He had noticed advertisements in the press, and these contained only notices that he had of the meeting or its objects. He had already taken great interest in the matter, and felt that every person had a perfect right to discuss questions affecting the public welfare. Recognizing the deplorable condition in which the province is at present, he urged agitation on the part of the people to put the best men in office. He did not know there was any programme. At his invitation the following gentlemen then took seats on the platform: Messrs. C. E. Lugin, W. B. Rider, W. W. C. Lugin, Clive Phillips, W. W. C. Lugin, S. Perry Mills and Gordon Hunter. The chairman then called upon Mr. Lugin to address the meeting.

Mr. Lugin—Replying to an inquiry addressed to him by Mr. Noot, who asked his reasons for not believing in condemning a man on his name, he thought the people were opposed to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the premiership, and that was the only issue. Personally he was a stickler for constitutional government; he believed in the principle that the Canadian should stand up squarely for it. As far as the Lieutenant-Governor's actions were concerned, he had condemned them openly and freely. It was not a question of persons; he had no personal animosity against the Lieutenant-Governor and was still friendly to him, but he still charged that the Governor had grossly violated constitutional practice in calling upon Mr. Martin, and that was one of the questions which the people would have to pass on. Mr. Lugin explained at length the origin of responsible government. It had started through a government of trustees. He traced the whole history of its development. Coming down to local issues, he said that when the Governor after the defeat of the Senate ministry chose Mr. Martin, a man without a following, a man rejected by his former colleagues, he violated a principle established by the hard work of centuries, and left British Columbia to-day under personal government. The entering wedge was in 1898, when Mr. Turner was dismissed. That was the beginning of personal government in British Columbia, now British Columbians saw it seriously proposed to carry on the public affairs of the province without the aid of the people's representatives. This legislature would never have voted Mr. Martin supplies, and he proved that individual should not have been chosen. (Applause.) Taking up the personnel of the government, there were two latter had never been chosen before in any public capacity. True, Mr. Lugin was a man of the aldermanic board, but that could scarcely be called political distinction. Mr. Lugin then took up the matter of Mr. Martin's platform, and in regard to the platform, he said that it was a serious document, which consisted of a number of generalities. There were really nothing but only two points worthy of serious consideration—the one the eight-

hour law, and the other government ownership of railways. In respect to the former Mr. Martin's proposed submission of that question to a popular vote ought to stamp him as an unsafe man. It was his duty to declare a policy, and accept responsibility for that policy; he had no right to throw it on the people. Mr. Martin was responsible too for the eight-hour law. It must have been placed on the table with his approval, as he was attorney-general at the time of its enactment. Then look at his action after having been called upon to form a ministry. He announced through the Colonist that the eight-hour law would not be changed, and then what happened?—In less than a week he went back on his proposition, made a complete turn-round. Mr. Hanna—For the better?

Mr. Lugin—If you want to get rid of the eight-hour law it might be, but if I stood as the workingman's candidate I would stand or fall upon that law. Why does Mr. Martin not do so? He hasn't the backbone. He shirks it.

Coming to the government ownership of railways, Mr. Lugin said this was a fine matter. Everyone was agreed that British Columbia needed railway development. The construction of two or three lines was considered an absolute necessity. Take the V.C. Vancouver & Eastern Railway. If this line were built, figuring the cost at \$40,000 per mile, the road would cost \$12,000,000, exclusive of the bridge over the Fraser. Then we must have the railway to the North, which would cost at least \$3,000,000. Then there was the Ashcroft to Barkerville road, estimated to cost \$10,000,000. This meant an aggregate of \$27,000,000; and then railway construction had only begun. Did the people of Victoria believe that the province could borrow that amount of money, involving a charge of \$1,000,000 per year for interest? Were the people of this province able to think of such a thing as that? And British Columbia would have to pay it forever. Could they afford it? It would cost \$50,000,000 for the railways needed in this province. Mr. Martin's railway plank in his policy was a catch-plank—it alone is sufficient to condemn him as a public man.

Mr. Noot—Do you think it necessary for the province to have these railways? Mr. Lugin—Yes.

Mr. Noot—Why could not the government build them as well as individuals? Mr. Lugin—For a very simple reason—the government could not raise the money if it tried. He cited the difficulty that Mr. Cotton experienced when he went to London for loans; he only wanted £200,000 and had difficulty in getting it. The point was simply this—British Columbia had not to have what could be afforded; the credit of the province was not unlimited, and the power of taxation was not unlimited.

Dr. Hanington cited the case of Australia. The country had the power of making indirect taxation, which British Columbia had not. In New Zealand and Tasmania the feeling was given to government ownership of railways; they were not paying concerns, but so far as British Columbia was concerned it was a small colony and the proposition was simply ridiculous.

Mr. Noot claimed that Mr. Lugin's speech was directed against the Governor rather than Martin, and had not explained why the people should not support him. Mr. Lugin—I can answer that in one word. You cannot vote on the Governor, but you can vote on the man that the Governor has chosen. (Loud applause.)

At this point Edward Brags was voted to the chair, and in a brief remarks outlined the scope and object of the meeting in so far as he knew it. He had noticed advertisements in the press, and these contained only notices that he had of the meeting or its objects. He had already taken great interest in the matter, and felt that every person had a perfect right to discuss questions affecting the public welfare. Recognizing the deplorable condition in which the province is at present, he urged agitation on the part of the people to put the best men in office. He did not know there was any programme. At his invitation the following gentlemen then took seats on the platform: Messrs. C. E. Lugin, W. B. Rider, W. W. C. Lugin, Clive Phillips, W. W. C. Lugin, S. Perry Mills and Gordon Hunter. The chairman then called upon Mr. Lugin to address the meeting.

Mr. Lugin—Replying to an inquiry addressed to him by Mr. Noot, who asked his reasons for not believing in condemning a man on his name, he thought the people were opposed to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the premiership, and that was the only issue. Personally he was a stickler for constitutional government; he believed in the principle that the Canadian should stand up squarely for it. As far as the Lieutenant-Governor's actions were concerned, he had condemned them openly and freely. It was not a question of persons; he had no personal animosity against the Lieutenant-Governor and was still friendly to him, but he still charged that the Governor had grossly violated constitutional practice in calling upon Mr. Martin, and that was one of the questions which the people would have to pass on. Mr. Lugin explained at length the origin of responsible government. It had started through a government of trustees. He traced the whole history of its development. Coming down to local issues, he said that when the Governor after the defeat of the Senate ministry chose Mr. Martin, a man without a following, a man rejected by his former colleagues, he violated a principle established by the hard work of centuries, and left British Columbia to-day under personal government. The entering wedge was in 1898, when Mr. Turner was dismissed. That was the beginning of personal government in British Columbia, now British Columbians saw it seriously proposed to carry on the public affairs of the province without the aid of the people's representatives. This legislature would never have voted Mr. Martin supplies, and he proved that individual should not have been chosen. (Applause.) Taking up the personnel of the government, there were two latter had never been chosen before in any public capacity. True, Mr. Lugin was a man of the aldermanic board, but that could scarcely be called political distinction. Mr. Lugin then took up the matter of Mr. Martin's platform, and in regard to the platform, he said that it was a serious document, which consisted of a number of generalities. There were really nothing but only two points worthy of serious consideration—the one the eight-

hour law, and the other government ownership of railways. In respect to the former Mr. Martin's proposed submission of that question to a popular vote ought to stamp him as an unsafe man. It was his duty to declare a policy, and accept responsibility for that policy; he had no right to throw it on the people. Mr. Martin was responsible too for the eight-hour law. It must have been placed on the table with his approval, as he was attorney-general at the time of its enactment. Then look at his action after having been called upon to form a ministry. He announced through the Colonist that the eight-hour law would not be changed, and then what happened?—In less than a week he went back on his proposition, made a complete turn-round. Mr. Hanna—For the better?

Mr. Lugin—If you want to get rid of the eight-hour law it might be, but if I stood as the workingman's candidate I would stand or fall upon that law. Why does Mr. Martin not do so? He hasn't the backbone. He shirks it.

Coming to the government ownership of railways, Mr. Lugin said this was a fine matter. Everyone was agreed that British Columbia needed railway development. The construction of two or three lines was considered an absolute necessity. Take the V.C. Vancouver & Eastern Railway. If this line were built, figuring the cost at \$40,000 per mile, the road would cost \$12,000,000, exclusive of the bridge over the Fraser. Then we must have the railway to the North, which would cost at least \$3,000,000. Then there was the Ashcroft to Barkerville road, estimated to cost \$10,000,000. This meant an aggregate of \$27,000,000; and then railway construction had only begun. Did the people of Victoria believe that the province could borrow that amount of money, involving a charge of \$1,000,000 per year for interest? Were the people of this province able to think of such a thing as that? And British Columbia would have to pay it forever. Could they afford it? It would cost \$50,000,000 for the railways needed in this province. Mr. Martin's railway plank in his policy was a catch-plank—it alone is sufficient to condemn him as a public man.

Mr. Noot—Do you think it necessary for the province to have these railways? Mr. Lugin—Yes.

Mr. Noot—Why could not the government build them as well as individuals? Mr. Lugin—For a very simple reason—the government could not raise the money if it tried. He cited the difficulty that Mr. Cotton experienced when he went to London for loans; he only wanted £200,000 and had difficulty in getting it. The point was simply this—British Columbia had not to have what could be afforded; the credit of the province was not unlimited, and the power of taxation was not unlimited.

Dr. Hanington cited the case of Australia. The country had the power of making indirect taxation, which British Columbia had not. In New Zealand and Tasmania the feeling was given to government ownership of railways; they were not paying concerns, but so far as British Columbia was concerned it was a small colony and the proposition was simply ridiculous.

Mr. Noot claimed that Mr. Lugin's speech was directed against the Governor rather than Martin, and had not explained why the people should not support him. Mr. Lugin—I can answer that in one word. You cannot vote on the Governor, but you can vote on the man that the Governor has chosen. (Loud applause.)

At this point Edward Brags was voted to the chair, and in a brief remarks outlined the scope and object of the meeting in so far as he knew it. He had noticed advertisements in the press, and these contained only notices that he had of the meeting or its objects. He had already taken great interest in the matter, and felt that every person had a perfect right to discuss questions affecting the public welfare. Recognizing the deplorable condition in which the province is at present, he urged agitation on the part of the people to put the best men in office. He did not know there was any programme. At his invitation the following gentlemen then took seats on the platform: Messrs. C. E. Lugin, W. B. Rider, W. W. C. Lugin, Clive Phillips, W. W. C. Lugin, S. Perry Mills and Gordon Hunter. The chairman then called upon Mr. Lugin to address the meeting.

Mr. Lugin—Replying to an inquiry addressed to him by Mr. Noot, who asked his reasons for not believing in condemning a man on his name, he thought the people were opposed to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the premiership, and that was the only issue. Personally he was a stickler for constitutional government; he believed in the principle that the Canadian should stand up squarely for it. As far as the Lieutenant-Governor's actions were concerned, he had condemned them openly and freely. It was not a question of persons; he had no personal animosity against the Lieutenant-Governor and was still friendly to him, but he still charged that the Governor had grossly violated constitutional practice in calling upon Mr. Martin, and that was one of the questions which the people would have to pass on. Mr. Lugin explained at length the origin of responsible government. It had started through a government of trustees. He traced the whole history of its development. Coming down to local issues, he said that when the Governor after the defeat of the Senate ministry chose Mr. Martin, a man without a following, a man rejected by his former colleagues, he violated a principle established by the hard work of centuries, and left British Columbia to-day under personal government. The entering wedge was in 1898, when Mr. Turner was dismissed. That was the beginning of personal government in British Columbia, now British Columbians saw it seriously proposed to carry on the public affairs of the province without the aid of the people's representatives. This legislature would never have voted Mr. Martin supplies, and he proved that individual should not have been chosen. (Applause.) Taking up the personnel of the government, there were two latter had never been chosen before in any public capacity. True, Mr. Lugin was a man of the aldermanic board, but that could scarcely be called political distinction. Mr. Lugin then took up the matter of Mr. Martin's platform, and in regard to the platform, he said that it was a serious document, which consisted of a number of generalities. There were really nothing but only two points worthy of serious consideration—the one the eight-

hour law, and the other government ownership of railways. In respect to the former Mr. Martin's proposed submission of that question to a popular vote ought to stamp him as an unsafe man. It was his duty to declare a policy, and accept responsibility for that policy; he had no right to throw it on the people. Mr. Martin was responsible too for the eight-hour law. It must have been placed on the table with his approval, as he was attorney-general at the time of its enactment. Then look at his action after having been called upon to form a ministry. He announced through the Colonist that the eight-hour law would not be changed, and then what happened?—In less than a week he went back on his proposition, made a complete turn-round. Mr. Hanna—For the better?

Mr. Lugin—If you want to get rid of the eight-hour law it might be, but if I stood as the workingman's candidate I would stand or fall upon that law. Why does Mr. Martin not do so? He hasn't the backbone. He shirks it.

Coming to the government ownership of railways, Mr. Lugin said this was a fine matter. Everyone was agreed that British Columbia needed railway development. The construction of two or three lines was considered an absolute necessity. Take the V.C. Vancouver & Eastern Railway. If this line were built, figuring the cost at \$40,000 per mile, the road would cost \$12,000,000, exclusive of the bridge over the Fraser. Then we must have the railway to the North, which would cost at least \$3,000,000. Then there was the Ashcroft to Barkerville road, estimated to cost \$10,000,000. This meant an aggregate of \$27,000,000; and then railway construction had only begun. Did the people of Victoria believe that the province could borrow that amount of money, involving a charge of \$1,000,000 per year for interest? Were the people of this province able to think of such a thing as that? And British Columbia would have to pay it forever. Could they afford it? It would cost \$50,000,000 for the railways needed in this province. Mr. Martin's railway plank in his policy was a catch-plank—it alone is sufficient to condemn him as a public man.

Mr. Noot—Do you think it necessary for the province to have these railways? Mr. Lugin—Yes.

Mr. Noot—Why could not the government build them as well as individuals? Mr. Lugin—For a very simple reason—the government could not raise the money if it tried. He cited the difficulty that Mr. Cotton experienced when he went to London for loans; he only wanted £200,000 and had difficulty in getting it. The point was simply this—British Columbia had not to have what could be afforded; the credit of the province was not unlimited, and the power of taxation was not unlimited.

Dr. Hanington cited the case of Australia. The country had the power of making indirect taxation, which British Columbia had not. In New Zealand and Tasmania the feeling was given to government ownership of railways; they were not paying concerns, but so far as British Columbia was concerned it was a small colony and the proposition was simply ridiculous.

Mr. Noot claimed that Mr. Lugin's speech was directed against the Governor rather than Martin, and had not explained why the people should not support him. Mr. Lugin—I can answer that in one word. You cannot vote on the Governor, but you can vote on the man that the Governor has chosen. (Loud applause.)

At this point Edward Brags was voted to the chair, and in a brief remarks outlined the scope and object of the meeting in so far as he knew it. He had noticed advertisements in the press, and these contained only notices that he had of the meeting or its objects. He had already taken great interest in the matter, and felt that every person had a perfect right to discuss questions affecting the public welfare. Recognizing the deplorable condition in which the province is at present, he urged agitation on the part of the people to put the best men in office. He did not know there was any programme. At his invitation the following gentlemen then took seats on the platform: Messrs. C. E. Lugin, W. B. Rider, W. W. C. Lugin, Clive Phillips, W. W. C. Lugin, S. Perry Mills and Gordon Hunter. The chairman then called upon Mr. Lugin to address the meeting.

Mr. Lugin—Replying to an inquiry addressed to him by Mr. Noot, who asked his reasons for not believing in condemning a man on his name, he thought the people were opposed to the action of the Lieutenant-Governor in the premiership, and that was the only issue. Personally he was a stickler for constitutional government; he believed in the principle that the Canadian should stand up squarely for it. As far as the Lieutenant-Governor's actions were concerned, he had condemned them openly and freely. It was not a question of persons; he had no personal animosity against the Lieutenant-Governor and was still friendly to him, but he still charged that the Governor had grossly violated constitutional practice in calling upon Mr. Martin, and that was one of the questions which the people would have to pass on. Mr. Lugin explained at length the origin of responsible government. It had started through a government of trustees. He traced the whole history of its development. Coming down to local issues, he said that when the Governor after the defeat of the Senate ministry chose Mr. Martin, a man without a following, a man rejected by his former colleagues, he violated a principle established by the hard work of centuries, and left British Columbia to-day under personal government. The entering wedge was in 1898, when Mr. Turner was dismissed. That was the beginning of personal government in British Columbia, now British Columbians saw it seriously proposed to carry on the public affairs of the province without the aid of the people's representatives. This legislature would never have voted Mr. Martin supplies, and he proved that individual should not have been chosen. (Applause.) Taking up the personnel of the government, there were two latter had never been chosen before in any public capacity. True, Mr. Lugin was a man of the aldermanic board, but that could scarcely be called political distinction. Mr. Lugin then took up the matter of Mr. Martin's platform, and in regard to the platform, he said that it was a serious document, which consisted of a number of generalities. There were really nothing but only two points worthy of serious consideration—the one the eight-

hour law, and the other government ownership of railways. In respect to the former Mr. Martin's proposed submission of that question to a popular vote ought to stamp him as an unsafe man. It was his duty to declare a policy, and accept responsibility for that policy; he had no right to throw it on the people. Mr. Martin was responsible too for the eight-hour law. It must have been placed on the table with his approval, as he was attorney-general at the time of its enactment. Then look at his action after having been called upon to form a ministry. He announced through the Colonist that the eight-hour law would not be changed, and then what happened?—In less than a week he went back on his proposition, made a complete turn-round. Mr. Hanna—For the better?

Mr. Lugin—If you want to get rid of the eight-hour law it might be, but if I stood as the workingman's candidate I would stand or fall upon that law. Why does Mr. Martin not do so? He hasn't the backbone. He shirks it.

Coming to the government ownership of railways, Mr. Lugin said this was a fine matter. Everyone was agreed that British Columbia needed railway development. The construction of two or three lines was considered an absolute necessity. Take the V.C. Vancouver & Eastern Railway. If this line were built, figuring the cost at \$40,000 per mile, the road would cost \$12,000,000, exclusive of the bridge over the Fraser. Then we must have the railway to the North, which would cost at least \$3,000,000. Then there was the Ashcroft to Barkerville road, estimated to cost \$10,000,000. This meant an aggregate of \$27,000,000; and then railway construction had only begun. Did the people of Victoria believe that the province could borrow that amount of money, involving a charge of \$1,000,000 per year for interest? Were the people of this province able to think of such a thing as that? And British Columbia would have to pay it forever. Could they afford it? It would cost \$50,000,000 for the railways needed in this province. Mr. Martin's railway plank in his policy was a catch-plank—it alone is sufficient to condemn him as a public man.

Mr. Noot—Do you think it necessary for the province to have these railways? Mr. Lugin—Yes.

Mr. Noot—Why could not the government build them as well as individuals? Mr. Lugin—For a very simple reason—the government could not raise the money if it tried. He cited the difficulty that Mr. Cotton experienced when he went to London for loans; he only wanted £200,000 and had difficulty in getting it. The point was simply this—British Columbia had not to have what could be afforded; the credit of the province was not unlimited, and the power of taxation was not unlimited.

Dr. Hanington cited the case of Australia. The country had the power of making indirect taxation, which British Columbia had not. In New Zealand and Tasmania the feeling was given to government ownership of railways; they were not paying concerns, but so far as British Columbia was concerned it was a small colony and the proposition was simply ridiculous.

Mr. Noot claimed that Mr. Lugin's speech was directed against the Governor rather than Martin, and had not explained why the people should not support him. Mr. Lugin—I can answer that in one word