

believe that I inadvertently approved of one or more special warrants of a character similar to the ones under consideration, but received a few hours earlier. I should like to have them referred to me again, as, if they are similar to the ones returned herewith, I believe that they have been improperly approved."

To this request also I have never received any reply. So that for all I know your administration has made use of special money warrants obtained from me inadvertently, and such as the Attorney-General would not say were, or could be, constitutionally issued.

4. On the 4th of December last, upon Mr. Cotton's recommendation as Chief Commissioner of Lands and Works, the Executive Council advised me to approve of a special warrant for \$2,500 for improvements to the Provincial Home and goal at Kamloops. Mr. Cotton stated that the money was urgently required for "fire protection" purposes. In your letter to me of the 11th December last, asking me to reconsider my refusal to sign this warrant, you stated that the necessity for the expenditure of an amount like this could not possibly have been foreseen." I pointed out to you that it had been foreseen for at least a year before, as follows:

"When I was in Kamloops, over fourteen months ago, both provincial and municipal officials called my attention to the unsanitary conditions of the provincial public buildings, and strongly urged that the necessary improvements should be made as quickly as possible."

So that, although I do not for a moment question but what your statement was made in good faith, yet it was not in accord with the facts as I knew them, and the reason for the expenditure was shifted from "fire protection" purposes, as in Mr. Cotton's report, to "sanitary reasons."

5. While the Legislature was in session you advised me to make, by Order in Council, submitted on the 18th ultimo, an important change in the Mineral Act. In my letter to you of the 19th ultimo, giving my reasons for not approving of the said order, I added:

"Now, if the Attorney-General be of opinion that the government should have power to cancel such certificates, after they have been issued, I think he should refer the matter to the Legislature, and obtain its sanction to have the act amended in that respect."

And referring to this in my letter to you of the 19th instant, I said:

"The Legislature has been in session for one month since the above was written, but the Attorney-General has, so far, neither introduced, nor given any indication of introducing, a bill to amend the Mineral Act in the way that he advised me that it should be amended—that is to empower the Lieutenant-Governor in Council to cancel certificates of improvements."

This seems too much like asking me to sanction a change in the law which you hesitate to ask the Legislature to sanction. And you not only advise me to practically assume the functions of the Legislature in this instance, and that, too, while the Legislature was in session, but you did so with the full intent (which, however, I did not know at the time) of making the proposed regulations retroactive to the prejudice of a free miner's statutory right, as witness the Attorney-General's letter to me of the 16th instant, as follows:

"As my desire, as well as my duty, is to be perfectly frank with Your Honor, I may be permitted to state that, had Your Honor been pleased to approve of the Order in Council submitted to Your Honor on the 18th ultimo, I should have advised the cancellation of the certificate of improvements." (Dunlop's, page 7.)

As this matter is fully dealt with in my letter of the 19th instant to you in the matter of the Dunlop petition, I shall not enter further into it here, except to say that since the said letter was written I have learned that the certificate of improvements mentioned therein was issued to Dunlop by Mr. Kirkup, by the direction of the Minister of Mines, who acted in accordance with a decision arrived at in this matter by the Executive Council. That is to say: after you decided on a certain course, i.e., the issuance of the certificate in question, and had given instruction to a subordinate official to carry out that course, you decided upon an entirely opposite course, and sought to nullify the resulting statutory right by Order in Council, and, inferentially, threw the blame for the issuance of the certificate—if any blame there was—on a subordinate official, Mr. Kirkup; for the Attorney-General's recommendation to me in the matter was as follows:

"Whenever it appears to the Lieutenant-Governor in Council that an official empowered by the Mineral Act to issue certificates of improvements has, through mistake, error, inadvertence or improvi-