still available for settlement within three miles of railways in this province, cannot be correct because 20 out of the 29 assessors in the province did not report any land suitable and available for agricultural purposes within 20 miles of a railway or waggon road throughout the whole province. Now, I want to frankly admit that the actual wording we have used on page 4, has, quite unconsciously on our part, been left open to objection, and has provided Mr. Bowser with a loop hole out of which he squirms adroitly to cloud the actual fact. But on page 26 we have stated the fact clearly and correctly, and Mr. Bowser himself confirms the statement. It is not verbally accurate to say that 20 out of 29 actually reported no such lands left in their districts, but the actual fact is that **20 out of 29 did not report any** land suitable and available for cultivation, within 20 miles of a railroad or waggon road in their districts. The fact that certain small acreages may have been preempted since in three of these districts does not refute our statement or diminish its value as proof of the main charge. **Here are the abstracts made direct from the original returns sent in to the commission,** and they prove absolutely what we state on page 26 of "The Crisis"—that in the year 1913, **only 9** out of 29 provincial assessors reported any land available for settlement within 20 miles of a railroad or waggon road in the whole of British Columbia. (Loud applause.) Also they give as their total estimate of land suitable for agriculture within that radius only 824,654 acres. That is our reason for saying that Mr. Ross' estimates of 4,500,000 within three miles of railways is entirely without foundation. (Applause.) Here are the abstracts proving our statement, and Mr. Bowser's speech, while pretending to be a refutation is really a confirmation of our argument. If we are wrong then why did the government refuse to print the "returns" in full when the house ordered it to be done? ("Hear, hear!") Here are the "Votes and Proceedings" of the last session of the assembly and on 19th February an order of the house was granted on motion of Mr. Parker Williams that these "returns" be brought down, but the order was disregarded. Fifteen days later—when the house was closing—Premier McBride stated that there had not been time to get them ready. Now, Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Bowser or anyone else says anything more upon this point I challenge him or the government to publish in full those returns made by the assessors in answer to question 11 of the Royal Commission. That will settle the question as to whether we are right or wrong. (Applause.)

Vituperation is not argument, and we are quite content to deal with the facts. Certainly we are not going to be dragged into any side issues; the main issue is too vastly important and the people have brains enough to see on which side the real argument lies.

Perhaps Memory Poor.

But Mr. Bowser produces an affidavit of the secretary of the commission on agriculture in which he swears that "no one but Mr. Cotsworth ever examined the returns sent in by provincial assessors, and neither he, nor anyone else, ever made a copy of those returns." Now, I would not for a moment accuse the secretary of making a false affidavit. I mean that. But I am forced to say that in making this affidavit the secretary must certainly have overlooked or forgotten some of the facts. Here are the abstracts made by Mr. Cotsworth in the office of the secretary which fully cover the points in dispute. And we are fully prepared to prove that a full copy of these returns was made by another gentleman before our pamphlet was printed, and Mr. Cotsworth checked off his own abstract with this gentleman's copy. (Applause.)

Again, the secretary, according to Mr. Bowser, swears that pages 352 and 353 of the Commission's Report contains "a complete and correct transmission of the provincial assessor's and deputy assessor's" returns to the commission. Now, I will not again take up the points we have made regarding Nelson and Lillooet districts which have not been answered by Mr. Bowser or anyone else, though desperate attempts have been made. But I will ask the secretary and Mr. Bowser just one question that applies to both pages. If this is "a complete and correct transmission" of the returns why are the figures for New Westminster district entirely left out on page 352; and why are those for Slocan district also entirely missing on page 353? These figures are all here in the abstracts, but they are not in the published report. (Applause.) When these gentlemen have answered that question I have just 25 other questions awaiting them regarding these two pages, and Mr. Cotsworth did not suggest one of them. (Laughter and applause.)

Before I pass on, let me here point out a peculiar touch which has cast