

The City Council

Grant For Harbor Borings Deferred Awaiting Committee's Report.

Majority of the Council Take Strong Ground Regarding Shacks.

The city council had another protracted session last night, the tower clock clanging the hour of eleven before Ald. Brydon was moved to suggest an adjournment. Even the aldermen were unable to complete all the business, and the Tuesday night session, which is becoming a fixture in the municipal programme, was decided upon.

The High Level Supply. The minutes having been read and adopted, a communication was tabled from Justice Martin complaining of the inadequacy of the water supply on the high levels during the hot months of last year through the diversion of the water designed for the high level to other portions of the town. He pointed out the injustice of this course, and asked that the same course might not be adopted this year.

Ald. Williams said that the new pumping station would cover the need, and therefore moved that the letter be referred to the water committee.

In seconding, Ald. Hall emphasized the great improvement the new pumping station would be to the city. The motion was carried.

A Disinfecting Plant.

F. Elworthy, secretary of the Jubilee hospital board, drew attention to the necessity of a disinfecting plant for the hospital, especially in view of the proximity of the plague. Received and deferred for consideration with the estimates.

The Rock Bay "Swing."

The matter of the Rock Bay bridge again came up for consideration, Fell & Gregory protesting against the closing of the swing, on behalf of their clients, Lemon & Gonnason, and Taylor Mill Co. The council had proposed that the swing be closed, and that if the Dominion government decided a swing was necessary the council would construct it within six months. The writers had conferred with their clients, who refused to accede to the arrangement.

Ald. Gregory added that His Worship the Mayor had admitted that Capt. Gaudin had reported in favor of their clients and against the city.

The latter statement was promptly denied by His Worship, who was corroborated by several aldermen.

Ald. Yates—How does the bridge stand to-day, Your Worship?

His Worship (laconically)—It's open. Ald. Beckwith—Is the swing open? (Laughter).

Ald. Stewart said everyone seemed happy since the opening of the bridge, and it would be too bad to destroy their happiness.

Ald. Yates pointed out the necessity of having the city's case stated before the Dominion government. He thought that if the facts were fully stated it would materially strengthen the city's position.

It was decided to acknowledge the letter and at the same time draw the attention of the writers to its inaccuracies and also that the mayor, city solicitor and city engineer be instructed to prepare a statement.

Ald. Cameron also suggested that a telegram be sent at once to the government informing them that the city was preparing a case.

A Refund Requested. Heisterman & Co. had been paying taxes on a piece of property which they believed belonged to a client for two years, but only a portion of which they now found to be his. They therefore asked for a refund. Referred to finance committee and city solicitor for report.

The Ever-green Dispute. Rev. W. G. Ellison again drew the council's attention to the depreciation of property in Victoria through the breaking of windows, doors, etc., as witness his own property. In his case "a disorderly crowd" had burned up his fences. The people took for granted that all law and order was null and void. The children were encouraged by burn by day what their parents pulled down by night. He thought this a bad advertisement for Victoria as a residential city. Received and filed.

The Sorby Scheme. The mayor reported that at the meeting of the Sorby committee in the afternoon there had not been a quorum present, but a report had been read from the real estate committee, and Mr. Sorby's reply thereto had been tabled.

These were read as follows: Victoria, B.C., 12th March, 1900. To the Chairman Sorby Harbor Improvement Committee, Victoria: Sir—Referring to the earlier reports made by you to the real estate committee, we beg to state that that committee had not at the time of making those reports considered Mr. Sorby's scheme as a whole. They had not then fully realized the fact that the occupants of the property which it is proposed should be purchased by the harbor commissioners would be deprived of the revenue resulting from the collection of wharfage dues. In fact, as they understood the position, they were asked to report upon the present value of, and revenue derived from, the real estate fronting on the water. As to value, we still believe that Mr. Sorby's estimate for the purchase of the land in question and compensation to occupants is reasonable; but we are of opinion that tenants of such property would not be prepared under the altered conditions to pay such rents as would be necessary in order to produce the revenue Mr. Sorby has calculated upon receiving.

In the consideration of revenue, we are met with many difficulties, arising chiefly from the fact that all estimates must, to a certain extent, be speculative. The reclamation of large tracts on the water front must necessarily depreciate

by competition the revenue-bearing capacity of the wharves that are now in existence, unless we grant (which we are not prepared to do) that the increased harbor facilities will greatly stimulate our shipping trade. Further, it is quite possible that the imposition of wharfage dues may result in the removal of some of the industries now being carried on in Victoria. We refer particularly to the saw milling business.

In making an approximate calculation, we can only consider the business as it now exists, and we believe that the annual revenue derivable from the land fronting on the water would be at the least fifteen thousand dollars less than Mr. Sorby's estimate, in the event of the collection of wharfage dues—as at present paid—passing into hands other than those of the occupants.

In Mr. Sorby's estimate, credit is taken for an increase of revenue of \$30,000 per annum to be received from reclaimed land and new wharves. This we think is purely speculative, and should not be taken into consideration, depending as it does on the possibility of increased trade.

Yours faithfully, C. A. HOLLAND, JAMES FORMAN, C. F. TODD, Sub-Committee on Real Estate.

To this Mr. Sorby replied as follows: Victoria, 12th March, 1900. The Chairman Investigating Committee: Sir—With reference to the report of the real estate committee of this date, I have always stated, and the fact has been published many times, that wharves and rents receivable from properties purchased were separate and distinct sources of revenue. In fact the wharves are mostly let off separately and have no connection with the offices and warehouses between them and the adjacent streets, from which alone the real estate revenue is calculated to be derived. The committee seem to have failed to understand this, and also to make allowance for the fact that the rates named in my schedule are gross rates as now existing and are discounted "en bloc" at the end of the extent of about 33 per cent. for taxes, etc.

They have also failed to grasp the fact that the whole estate, improved, unimproved or reclaimed, is one undivided property, under one control and practically owned by the city, and of course cannot be depreciated by competition, as it might be under separate owners. With reference to saw mills, the owners at present maintain their wharves at great cost for replying and pay taxes; this cost of maintenance and taxes are assumed after purchase by the harbor trust and a wharfage of 20 cents per thousand feet is charged instead, which would in fact be a considerable saving to the mill occupier. The \$30,000 per annum calculated as receivable from reclaimed land is speculative after a period of years, as stated, and may be let out of the calculation. The logic of the committee's argument is this: That the fact of deepening and improving the harbor, so as to be accessible to modern carriers, and building broad wharves and other facilities for the expeditious handling of the trade of the port, would be to depreciate the annual value of properties abutting on the harbor from their present rentals of \$73,124 to only \$38,100, which is manifestly absurd. My estimate having been challenged, I made it my business to check my calculations by interviewing the leading importers and ascertaining for myself the wharfage actually paid. I have obtained returns from 33 of our leading importers of the nature of the land on which they demonstrate the hitherto unknown fact that the charges actually paid vary with the size and weight from 60 cents to \$2.40 per ton. A very large proportion of the imports consist of small parcels, i.e., under half a ton, and pay the higher rates. The mean of all the averages is 83 cents per ton, and the rate on export by reason of their being in smaller lots is higher still. I beg to inclose for perusal the original figures marked H., to be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years. The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

By competition the revenue-bearing capacity of the wharves that are now in existence, unless we grant (which we are not prepared to do) that the increased harbor facilities will greatly stimulate our shipping trade. Further, it is quite possible that the imposition of wharfage dues may result in the removal of some of the industries now being carried on in Victoria. We refer particularly to the saw milling business.

In making an approximate calculation, we can only consider the business as it now exists, and we believe that the annual revenue derivable from the land fronting on the water would be at the least fifteen thousand dollars less than Mr. Sorby's estimate, in the event of the collection of wharfage dues—as at present paid—passing into hands other than those of the occupants.

In Mr. Sorby's estimate, credit is taken for an increase of revenue of \$30,000 per annum to be received from reclaimed land and new wharves. This we think is purely speculative, and should not be taken into consideration, depending as it does on the possibility of increased trade.

Yours faithfully, C. A. HOLLAND, JAMES FORMAN, C. F. TODD, Sub-Committee on Real Estate.

To this Mr. Sorby replied as follows: Victoria, 12th March, 1900. The Chairman Investigating Committee: Sir—With reference to the report of the real estate committee of this date, I have always stated, and the fact has been published many times, that wharves and rents receivable from properties purchased were separate and distinct sources of revenue. In fact the wharves are mostly let off separately and have no connection with the offices and warehouses between them and the adjacent streets, from which alone the real estate revenue is calculated to be derived. The committee seem to have failed to understand this, and also to make allowance for the fact that the rates named in my schedule are gross rates as now existing and are discounted "en bloc" at the end of the extent of about 33 per cent. for taxes, etc.

They have also failed to grasp the fact that the whole estate, improved, unimproved or reclaimed, is one undivided property, under one control and practically owned by the city, and of course cannot be depreciated by competition, as it might be under separate owners. With reference to saw mills, the owners at present maintain their wharves at great cost for replying and pay taxes; this cost of maintenance and taxes are assumed after purchase by the harbor trust and a wharfage of 20 cents per thousand feet is charged instead, which would in fact be a considerable saving to the mill occupier. The \$30,000 per annum calculated as receivable from reclaimed land is speculative after a period of years, as stated, and may be let out of the calculation. The logic of the committee's argument is this: That the fact of deepening and improving the harbor, so as to be accessible to modern carriers, and building broad wharves and other facilities for the expeditious handling of the trade of the port, would be to depreciate the annual value of properties abutting on the harbor from their present rentals of \$73,124 to only \$38,100, which is manifestly absurd. My estimate having been challenged, I made it my business to check my calculations by interviewing the leading importers and ascertaining for myself the wharfage actually paid. I have obtained returns from 33 of our leading importers of the nature of the land on which they demonstrate the hitherto unknown fact that the charges actually paid vary with the size and weight from 60 cents to \$2.40 per ton. A very large proportion of the imports consist of small parcels, i.e., under half a ton, and pay the higher rates. The mean of all the averages is 83 cents per ton, and the rate on export by reason of their being in smaller lots is higher still. I beg to inclose for perusal the original figures marked H., to be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

The one thing I would like to make clear. The proposition first is that a harbor board shall be incorporated as at Montreal, Quebec, etc. 2. That the federal government shall advance to the board \$2,500,000 and be returned to me. I also submit a detailed calculation marked B. The tonnage stated cannot be disputed; it is a little over the revenue committee's figures, after correcting their obvious omission of 10,000 tons and calculating tonnage at rates varying from 10 cents to 80 cents, keeping well within the actually ascertained rates. I maintain that the revenue from this source would be \$115,916, and adding to this the revenue from real estate, even as reduced by the committee, \$37,500, the total revenue to be derived would be \$153,416. Instead of \$148,100, as before estimated. The tonnage, I may say, is based upon the custom house averages of the last three years.

ESTIMATE OF TONNAGE

Custom House Returns, Foreign Tonnage Only.

	Tons.	Tons.
Gross imports for 3 years ending June, 1899	167,811	
Average annual import	55,937	
Gross exports for 3 years ending June, 1899	83,702	
Average annual export	27,900	
Total average	83,837	
Outer wharf return	48,000	
Inner wharf return	50,000	
Balance due to these company wharves as coastwise trade, say	14,143	
Total	98,000	

ESTIMATE OF REVENUE

45,937 tons (ex. of B. & K. and Chemical Works), average of seaport freight at 70	\$32,155
27,920 tons export, at 80	22,336
14,143 coastwise trade, at 100	14,143
10,000 B. & K. and Chemical Works, at 10	1,000
21,000 local trade, at 50	10,500
10,000 local trade as schedule	1,475
10,000 parcels, etc., at 50	5,000
145,000 tons at an average of 88¢	\$128,400
Inwards Only.	
46,800 tons of coal, at 10¢	\$4,680
15,000,000 feet B. M. logs, at 20¢	3,000,000
9,870,000 feet cut lumber, at 25¢	2,467,500
10,200 cords of wood, at 20¢	2,040,000
3,000,000 bricks, at 15¢	450,000
35,000 sealskins, 10lbs. ea., 175 tons (Inwards), at 25¢	8,750
Reservation of wharves, etc., say	6,000
	\$15,916
Rents receivable (less taxes)	\$7,500
Estimated average revenue from reclamation and now vacant lands after the 4th year, say	\$30,000
Less 1.7 ground rent at tax. 4.28%	\$25,715

Total Canadian trade carried by the Amur, Alpha, Queen City, Whig, Louise, Yosemite, Hithet, Tees, Danube, Charnar and Islander. Of the 16,000 re. by B. & K. mills and the Chemical Works 10,000 is included in the above balance of the product. Private wharves as reported 20,900. Add Okell & Morris 100. Local produce, lime, building stone, hay, etc., landed on other wharves from which no return was included, say 10,000. Parcels, express matter and freight to competitive points not returned, including that carried by C. P. N. fleet and the Victorian 10,000.

The water commissioner reported adversely against extending the water main up Moss street to the foot of the hill. It would take 1,700 feet of pipe, and the cost would be \$370, which would be throwing money away.

Ald. Cameron said the wells had been closed by the health authorities and though the expenditure was rather large there was no other way out of the matter. These people had paid taxes for a long time and received no benefit from the city. He moved that the pipe be laid.

Ald. Hall seconded the motion, as the request was a perfectly reasonable one. No one else was asking for water and it was a necessary step. The motion carried.

Sewer Connection Wanted. A petition was presented from Thos. Elliott and four others residing on Mason street, asking for the extension of the sewerage system from the corner of Mason and Quadra along Mason. Referred to streets, sewers and bridges committee.

No Light. The city electrician reported adversely on the proposed light on Esquimalt road, as the circuit would not be present and it. He suggested deferring the matter. Received and adopted.

The Old Women's Home. The home committee reported that as the Home for the Aged and Infirm Women was not under the city's jurisdiction it would not be wise to recommend Mrs. Robson's armistion thereto. Adopted.

Finances. The finance committee recommended the payment of \$3,500 for current bills. Received and adopted.

A further report recommended the expenditure of \$1,630 for harbor borings was also submitted. Ald. Kinsman said this was money wasted and he would oppose it.

Harbor Borings. Ald. Cameron said they were no further ahead than ever. He wanted the matter laid over awaiting reports from the commissioners.

Ald. Beckwith reminded the aldermen that a great deal of good would result from the borings apart altogether from the Sorby matter. It had been recommended by Mr. Pearce and others. These borings were being taken to furnish data for Mr. Kennedy.

Ald. Yates moved that the report be laid on the table and the general committee informed that the money will not be voted until they passed a resolution.

Ald. Stewart had always been doubtful about the matter, and he refused to vote any money until the committee had reported. The scheme was to cost \$5,000,000 and had yet to be satisfied that the scheme was worth it.

Ald. Yates then moved that the motion be laid on the table until a general report was received.

Ald. Kinsman said that the council could not be liable for Mr. Harris's indebtedness through the matter.

Ald. Brydon said the facts were there and had been substantiated by customs returns, while on the other hand rumors and guesses were all that had been pointed out that no committee could be expected to master the scheme, as the promoter had done, and which had taken him three years to master.

In a lengthy address Ald. Brydon ridiculed the criticism which had been levelled against the scheme. He, for one would not consent to repudiation of responsibility in connection with Mr. Harris. He wouldn't follow such a course in his private business.

The mayor said that to meet a discrepancy in the committee's figures Mr. Sorby had raised the freight rate from 50 to 75 cents a ton, and would like to know how that would take with the business community.

It was pointed out by Ald. Yates and Beckwith that this was the rate paid at present.

Ald. Beckwith pointed out that as it had been charged to the figures of two commissioners overlapped, these should have been asked to investigate the matter.

The finance committee's report was laid on the table pending a report from the revenue committee, which should be notified of the fact.

party in Vancouver and asked that the matter be looked into.

Ald. Yates took occasion to say that the location of the home was undesirable and it ought to be moved.

Ald. Beckwith, chairman of the home committee, said it was the intention of the committee to take up the question of another location at once.

Ald. Kinsman pointed out that it was a dangerous principle to make a grant of money in such cases. The communication went to the home committee.

Official's Advice Disregarded. The water commissioner reported adversely against extending the water main up Moss street to the foot of the hill. It would take 1,700 feet of pipe, and the cost would be \$370, which would be throwing money away.

Ald. Cameron said the wells had been closed by the health authorities and though the expenditure was rather large there was no other way out of the matter. These people had paid taxes for a long time and received no benefit from the city. He moved that the pipe be laid.

Ald. Hall seconded the motion, as the request was a perfectly reasonable one. No one else was asking for water and it was a necessary step. The motion carried.

Sewer Connection Wanted. A petition was presented from Thos. Elliott and four others residing on Mason street, asking for the extension of the sewerage system from the corner of Mason and Quadra along Mason. Referred to streets, sewers and bridges committee.

No Light. The city electrician reported adversely on the proposed light on Esquimalt road, as the circuit would not be present and it. He suggested deferring the matter. Received and adopted.

The Old Women's Home. The home committee reported that as the Home for the Aged and Infirm Women was not under the city's jurisdiction it would not be wise to recommend Mrs. Robson's armistion thereto. Adopted.

Finances. The finance committee recommended the payment of \$3,500 for current bills. Received and adopted.

A further report recommended the expenditure of \$1,630 for harbor borings was also submitted. Ald. Kinsman said this was money wasted and he would oppose it.

Harbor Borings. Ald. Cameron said they were no further ahead than ever. He wanted the matter laid over awaiting reports from the commissioners.

Ald. Beckwith reminded the aldermen that a great deal of good would result from the borings apart altogether from the Sorby matter. It had been recommended by Mr. Pearce and others. These borings were being taken to furnish data for Mr. Kennedy.

Ald. Yates moved that the report be laid on the table and the general committee informed that the money will not be voted until they passed a resolution.

Ald. Stewart had always been doubtful about the matter, and he refused to vote any money until the committee had reported. The scheme was to cost \$5,000,000 and had yet to be satisfied that the scheme was worth it.

Ald. Yates then moved that the motion be laid on the table until a general report was received.

Ald. Kinsman said that the council could not be liable for Mr. Harris's indebtedness through the matter.

Ald. Brydon said the facts were there and had been substantiated by customs returns, while on the other hand rumors and guesses were all that had been pointed out that no committee could be expected to master the scheme, as the promoter had done, and which had taken him three years to master.

In a lengthy address Ald. Brydon ridiculed the criticism which had been levelled against the scheme. He, for one would not consent to repudiation of responsibility in connection with Mr. Harris. He wouldn't follow such a course in his private business.

The mayor said that to meet a discrepancy in the committee's figures Mr. Sorby had raised the freight rate from 50 to 75 cents a ton, and would like to know how that would take with the business community.

It was pointed out by Ald. Yates and Beckwith that this was the rate paid at present.

Ald. Beckwith pointed out that as it had been charged to the figures of two commissioners overlapped, these should have been asked to investigate the matter.

The finance committee's report was laid on the table pending a report from the revenue committee, which should be notified of the fact.

The Fire Inquiry. Ald. Yates asked what had become of the Baker fire inquiry. The Mayor replied that the inquiry had been stopped owing to the illness of Mr. Baker that "he would make some one pay for this hay."

Ald. Yates said that while he had made the motion to cease the public inquiry he intended that it should be prosecuted privately, as the council ought to know if the brigade was efficient or not.

The Chinese Shacks. When a motion looking to the removal

Look at yourself! Is your face covered with pimples? Your skin rough and blotchy? It's your liver! Ayer's Pills are liver pills. They cure constipation, biliousness, and dyspepsia. 25c. All druggists.

Want your mustache or beard a beautiful brown or rich black? Then use the BUCKINGHAM'S DYE Whiskers. Sold by all druggists.

Is Being Held This Afternoon—List of Applications.

What is CASTORIA

Cast