

dence, improperly issued a certificate of improvements, etc."

I can hardly consider this as being "perfectly frank" with me, to say nothing of the unjust inference in regard to the gold commissioner. And in regard to this Dunlop petition, you not only withhold a free miner's right, lawfully acquired under section 30 of the Mineral Act, but you have not complied with the direction in my letter to you of the 19th inst., namely, to issue forthwith a Crown grant to the petitioner Dunlop, in accordance with section 30 of the Mineral Act.

Apart from this, I cannot ignore the fact that the Legislative Assembly has now been in session for nearly two months, and notwithstanding the confidence you expressed in your letter to me of the 2nd September last, above quoted,

you have not been able to pass a single measure, and I believe it to be now sufficiently demonstrated that the interests of the province have suffered, and are suffering, in consequence of a weak and unstable government. Therefore I now deem it my duty to consult other advisers, with a view to forming a new administration, and shall accordingly do so forthwith.

I have only to add that in so far as any permission is needed on my part you are at perfect liberty to now lay this communication before the House for its information.

I have the honor to be,

Sir, your obedient servant,

THOS. R. MINNES,
Lieutenant-Governor

Hon. Mr. Semlin to Lieut.- Gov. McInnes.

Seeing that His Honor has taken the initiative in giving publicity to his "reasons" for dismissing his advisers, I beg leave to trespass on your space with my reply, and ask only that it shall receive equal prominence.

C. A. SEMLIN.

Victoria, B.C., Feb. 28th, 1900.

To the Honorable T. R. McInnes, Esq.,
Lieut.-Governor of British Columbia.

Sir: I have the honor in replying to Your Honor's letter of the 27th, in which you state that you have no longer confidence in the advice of my colleagues and myself, to state as follows: That many of the reasons assigned seem to me to be merely matters of departmental administration, matters upon which we believed we were to advise Your Honor, rather than to be instructed by Your Honor.

1. In paragraph 1, Your Honor claims that I have not given you the benefit of a full council since the 9th of March last, and you refer me to the act of 1899 to substantiate your position. The act referred to, as quoted by Your Honor, enacts that the council shall consist of a provincial secretary, attor-

ney-general, chief commissioner of lands and works, minister of finance and agriculture, minister of mines and president of the council.

All of those positions were filled. It is true that one minister held and performed the duties of two positions, but I am not aware that Your Honor ever intimated that your council or that the country ever suffered from this cause.

2. Your Honor further refers to the assurance given by me in September last, that I did not doubt when the House met in January that I could depend upon a majority of the members to support my government. I think, sir, that the fact of the House having been in session nearly two months and the government having commanded the majority until Friday last, when, by a peculiar combination, a majority of one was for the first time recorded against it, is proof that I did not overrate the ability of the government in its relation to the Legislative Assembly.

3. In reply to the charges set forth by Your Honor in paragraph 3, I beg to quote the following, from a letter written by the Honorable Mr. Cotton, Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, on the subject: