COMMISSIONER'S REPORT, VANCOUVER ISLAND RIOTS, 1913-14.

VICTORIA, B.C., December 21st, 1916.

To His Honour FRANK STILLMAN BARNARD,
Lieutenant-Governor of the Province of British Columbia.

SIR,—Pursuant to the terms of a Commission issued to me on the 3rd day of August, 1916, under the provisions of the "Public Inquiries Act," whereby I was appointed "Sole Commissioner to inquire into—

> "All claims for compensation for injury, either to person or property, arising out of and in the course of the riots or disorders which occurred during the coal-miners' strike on Vancouver Island in the years 1913 and 1914,"—

I have the honour to report as follows:—

Upon receipt of the Commission, I at once published the necessary notices in the Gazette and newspapers circulating in the county in which the inquiry was to be held, took the oath of office prescribed by section 6 of the "Inquiries Act," and entered upon the work of the inquiry.

Mr. Harry Langley was appointed Secretary and Stenographer, and Mr. H. W. Herchmer, counsel to represent the Government.

Claims to the number of 380 were filed with the Commission, the great majority of them within the time originally fixed by the notice calling for the same, but some during the sittings, as on the opening day of the hearing I announced that any claims filed before the sittings were closed would be heard, provided there was no unnecessary delay or expense incurred.

No claimant was refused a hearing. Sessions were held at Nanaimo and Ladysmith. The Commission was opened at the Court-house, Nanaimo, at 2.30 p.m. on the 16th day of August, 1916, when the letters patent addressed to me were read and the scope of the inquiry explained.

Hearings were held at Nanaimo and Ladysmith from August 16th to September 30th without any unnecessary interruption. On the latter date I had to adjourn *sine die* in order to attend to my judicial duties and was unable to resume the hearings until the 22nd day of November, when a hearing was held at Victoria. On November 27th hearings were resumed at Nanaimo and continued until December 1st, when after due notice the hearings at Nanaimo were closed. Two additional hearings were held at Victoria on December 14th and 15th for the accommodation of two large claimants who had been unable to fully present their cases at Nanaimo.

Hereto annexed are two Schedules, A and B, showing the amount of each claim presented, the amount of damage assessed by me, who represented the claimants at the hearing, and any special circumstances which it seemed advisable that I should bring to Your Honour's attention.

From the evidence adduced it is quite clear that between August 12th and 16th, 1913, there was a general disturbance amounting to a riot among the coal-miners on Vancouver Island, and that serious damage was done by them at Extension, South Wellington, and Ladysmith to the person and property of many people, and that had it not been for the aid of the militia, called in at a late hour, much further damage would have been done.

I was not required by the terms of the Commission to inquire into the cause of the riots, nor the efforts made by the authorities to prevent them; but incidentally some evidence was given to show that there was a general feeling of uneasiness in the communities, and very pronounced and justifiable fears that riots would take place, and that before any actual damage was done these fears were communicated to the Provincial police and authorities, and protection asked for.

I am directed by the letters patent to report, *inter alia*, "the opinions which you (I) may have formed in relation to the matters aforesaid"—that being my inquiry into the claims for compensation, etc. I do not understand that this requires me to express an opinion as to the liability of the Government to make good the losses suffered by the claimants. Neither Mr. Herchmer, representing the Government, nor counsel for the claimants addressed any argument to me upon this point, although I asked them if they wished to do so. I confined

my attention to ascertaining and assessing the amount of damage done to person and property *arising out of and in the course of the riots or disorders*, and unless and until I first found that the damage done was caused by and in the course of such riots or disorders, I made no attempt to assess them.

I cannot say that I am thoroughly satisfied with the result of my labours; and it is quite possible that I have done an injustice to some claimants; but I carefully and conscientiously devoted myself to the task, and I feel sure that my findings in the vast majority of cases are reasonable and just. I did not enforce the strict rules of evidence pertaining in the Courts, but I required claimants to describe as well and as fully as possible the different articles they claimed for, as that was the only way I had of forming any estimate of the correctness of the value placed upon them. Many seemed to resent this, and thought it sufficient to say, for example, one cooking-stove, value $60, and thought that that amount should be allowed them, as it would cost that sum to buy a new one to replace the one lost; apparently feeling that that was the measure of their damage, forgetting entirely that a new stove would have a larger life, and that they could only be allowed for the value of the article as it existed at the time of loss, taking into account the make, the age, and the amount of use it had been put to.

It will be easily understood that I was greatly handicapped by the fact that the inquiry was not held until three years after the damage was done.

In a number of cases claimants did not appear before the Commission to present their claims; this was particularly the case with the Chinese. The majority of these claims were prepared shortly after the disturbances and presented to the Government in anticipation of some compensation being granted, and when the Commission sat many of them had disappeared.

By reference to Schedule A it will be seen that a large number of Chinese claimants who appeared were allowed nothing; and I think a short explanation with reference to these might be made.

Some fifty-odd claims, Nos. 168 to 219, both inclusive, were presented by Mr. Ross, barrister, Nanaimo, who received his instructions from one Wo Kee. After the examination of a number of witnesses Mr. Ross decided that he could not proceed with the claims and abandoned them; and it appeared clear to me that while some of the claimants might have lost some things, the claims as a whole were faked and thoroughly unreliable, and that in all probability Wo Kee had made them all up since the Commission was issued. They had never been filed with the Government. I allowed nothing to any of these claimants, as it would be a hopeless task to attempt to find the small amount of genuine loss from the tainted mass; and I think Mr. Ross agreed with me.

The same remarks apply generally to the thirty-three claims, numbered from 340 to 372, both inclusive, presented by Messrs. McGill & Grant, barristers, of Vancouver. These claims had not been filed with the Government. Jang Yick Jon and Jang Dick were the prime movers in the presentation of these claims, which were for the loss of a lumber camp, etc. They were both called as witnesses; but after cross-examination I was unable to believe them, and so stated. Mr. Dockerill, of Messrs. McGill & Grant's office, then said it would be useless to proceed, and he withdrew all the claims. A number of the claimants were then interrogated by the Official Interpreter as to whether they desired to proceed without Mr. Dockerill's assistance, but they declined to do so; and it appeared to me that they felt greatly relieved in abandoning their claims.

From inquiries made by me subsequently it appeared that the camp had not been destroyed, and the teamster who carted the tents and provisions, etc., claimed for back to Nanaimo was found.

The remainder of the Chinese claims other than those specially referred to in Schedule B may be divided into two classes—those purporting to be presented by the Chinese Benevolent Society and those presented by the Chinese Consul at Vancouver; both had been prepared and presented to the Government shortly after the riots.

The Benevolent Society claims were represented when first called at the hearing by Mr. Eli Harrison, barrister, of Victoria. Nineteen of these claims were considered. There was so much irregularity in their preparation and so many unbelievable statements made that it seemed as if I would have to refuse to consider them, although it was evident that some had suffered genuine loss. I therefore adjourned the further hearing of these cases and caused private inquiries to be made with a view to ascertaining, if possible, how many of them had actually

suffered loss. After receiving a report these cases were taken up again, and were represented by Mr. Victor Harrison, barrister, of Nanaimo. Schedule A shows how each of them was disposed of.

From the evidence given before me it appeared quite clear that a deliberate attempt had been made by one Lore Gune to impose upon the Government. Every claim was grossly and fraudulently exaggerated, and in the majority of cases the witnesses had evidently been schooled and carefully instructed as to what they were to say. I found a number of cases of personation —cases where claimants claimed to have written with their own hand a list in Chinese of the articles they had lost, and when put to the test were unable to write at all. One who claimed never to have had such a list, on being asked what papers he had in his pocket, produced a list containing the items claimed for. Others who claimed that no list of their missing goods had been made were able to remember all the articles mentioned in their claim, reciting them in their exact order, and giving the amounts set out with remarkable accuracy. I finally arrived at the conclusion that the whole plan had been originated by Lore Gune, and that he was mainly responsible for the fraud. I consequently allowed nothing to those claimants who appeared to have been willing to assist his fraud, even though they might have suffered some loss. There were other cases where the claimants were ignorant and appeared to have been deceived themselves; to them I made an allowance generally of $25, feeling sure that that was probably the extent of their loss. I may add that Lore Gune did not appear when the cases were called the second time; and, of course, I acquit Mr. Eli Harrison of any part in the attempted fraud. Since the inquiry closed I have been informed that while Lore Gune was an officer in the Chinese Benevolent Society, and purported to represent it, he had no authority to do so, and in reality only represented himself.

From these Chinese claims it is a relief to turn to those presented by the Chinese Consul at Vancouver. These claims were carefully and honestly prepared, and with few exceptions were allowed in full, with a deduction for wear and tear, as the values placed upon the articles were the prices when new, and the great majority of them had, of course, been used.

The Chinese Consul was represented during the inquiry by Mr. Victor B. Harrison, assisted by Mr. David Lew, Assistant Consul. Immediately after the riots the Consul visited Nanaimo, Extension, South Wellington, and Ladysmith, and by notice invited all Chinese who had suffered damage to submit claims to him for presentation to the proper authorities; and had all the Chinese availed themselves of this offer in their behalf, no doubt they would have profited by it, instead of suffering through association with dishonest *speculators*. I can call them nothing else; for, so far as I could ascertain, they were to receive a percentage of the amount to be allowed as remuneration for their services.

Among the claims of the miners were a number claiming for loss of time. This was particularly the case with the Ladysmith claimants, all of whom, I think, so claimed; but I allowed nothing on that account, feeling that such losses did not arise out of the riots or disturbances, but solely because of the strike, and is an incident of every strike. The only case in which I made any allowance for loss of time, and they were very few; at present I can only recall two—McKinnon (No. 126) and Rennie (No. 31)—and these were cases where the claimant had suffered personal injury and had to go to the hospital; and in their cases I allowed for the time they were unable to work.

A number of claims were presented, including one of Thomas W. Gray (No. 40), for $31,000 for loss caused by fire at South Wellington in August, 1914.

It appears there was quite a large fire at South Wellington at that time in which Mr. Gray's mill and a number of dwellings were destroyed. Before inquiring into the amount of the losses I called for general evidence showing that the fire came within the terms of my Commission, as the actual riots and disturbances had taken place long before this, although the strike was still on. From the evidence adduced it appeared that the fire started in the neighbouring woods or bushes, and was carried by the wind to the buildings in question. The only evidence to suggest that it had been set by the strikers was the fact that after the fire had been in progress in the village for some time, quite a large number of strikers had gathered and they rendered no assistance in endeavouring to extinguish the fire and save the property endangered; but this I considered, unfortunately, the usual attitude of strikers, who would render no assistance to preserve the property of non-strikers, no matter how the fire originated. I asked for negative evidence to exclude the possibility of the fire in the woods having been started in any other way

than by the strikers, but none was produced. At that season of the year, when everything is so dry, and many people possibly passing through the bush, it seemed to me not at all unlikely that the fire might have been caused inadvertently by any careless smoker having dropped a burning match. In these circumstances I declined to inquire into the value of the damage done, feeling that to do so would be a waste of public money and raise false hopes of remuneration. It is needless to say that the claimants were greatly disappointed.

The only claims for damage done in 1914 were those of James Rennie (No. 31), who was actually attacked and shot by strikers, and that of Elizabeth Berry (No. 32), who was allowed $58.75 for the destruction by fire on April 5th, 1914, of a tent, etc. Personally I made no inquiry into the cause of the fire, because Mr. Herchmer, representing the Government, stated that he had made inquiries and was satisfied on that score; so it being a small claim and an isolated case, I only inquired into the amount of damage done.

There are two other claims which require special mention—viz., the Canadian Collieries (No. 38) and the Western Fuel Company (No. 123). The former had a genuine claim for damage by fire on August 13th at the time of the actual riots (as to which, *see* Schedule A), and in addition a claim for some $300,000-odd consequential damages for injury to the underground workings consequent upon the inability to secure miners to keep the mine working.

The Western Fuel Company's claim was $72,256.19, being the cost of flooding and pumping out what is known as the South Side Mine on account of a fire which was discovered in the mine on August 10th and 11th, 1913. There is no suggestion that the fire was caused by the rioters or strikers, but it is claimed that on account of the riots they were unable to obtain men to fight it; and so after consultation with the officials of the mine and Mr. Thomas Graham, Provincial Inspector of Mines, it was decided to flood it, and on the 23rd the work of pumping sea-water into the mine was actually begun. It did not appear to me that every effort to obtain men was exhausted before this step was taken; but there can be no doubt that Mr. Stockett, the general manager, after the consultation already referred to, believed it was the only course to pursue to save the mine. It is clear that before the necessity for flooding the mine arose the actual riots were under the control of the militia authorities, and also that Mr. Stockett had been informed by the strikers that he could get all the men he wanted if he would recognize the United Mine Workers of America. It is equally clear, I think, speaking generally, that the great majority of non-striking miners were afraid to go to work for fear of injury to themselves or their families, notwithstanding the presence of the militia, as the strikers might find a way secretly of causing the injury.

From the evidence adduced it appeared to me that the inability to get men to work the mine or fight the fire was an incident only of the strike, and did not in any true sense "arise out of and in the course of the riots or disturbances." I therefore declined to inquire into the amount of injury suffered.

When the Canadian Collieries claim for consequential damage was called, Mr. H. B. Robertson, barrister, of Victoria, who represented that company and who knew of my decision in the Western Fuel Company's case, made the following statement:—

"The Canadian Collieries (Dunsmuir), Limited, in presenting these claims for consideration by the Government, desires to state that it regards its claims for damages to its property caused by actual violence as a valid and proper one for which it is entitled to compensation. But that, as to the second claim, it was not the intention of the company to make any claim for damages caused through the idleness of the mines until the company learned that the Western Fuel Company, an American corporation, had made a claim for damages caused through idleness; whereupon this company, a Dominion corporation representing British capital, feels that if the claim of the Western Fuel Company is to be considered, then the British-Canadian bondholders of the Canadain Collieries (Dunsmuir), Limited, are equally entitled to consideration. But if the Government should decline to consider the claim presented by the Western Fuel Company for underground or other damages caused by idleness, then the Canadian Collieries (Dunsmuir), Limited, will beg the permission of the Government to withdraw its second claim which is based upon these same grounds."

I agreed with Mr. Robertson that in the circumstances it was unnecessary to offer any evidence; and I recommend that, in case the Government decides to consider the Western Fuel Company's claim, his claim should also be considered and an opportunity given of presenting proof.

Should the Government eventually decide to consider either of these cases, I respectfully suggest that the extent of the damage done could be much more expeditiously and cheaply ascertained by entrusting the inquiry to a practical mine manager and accountant than to this Commission, as it lacks the technical knowledge which would be required and could only be supplied by a large amount of expert advice.

Accompanying this report I am forwarding to Your Honour my notes taken down during the inquiry; also all claims presented, whether proved or not. My notes are very brief, and are contained partly on separate sheets of paper and partly in marginal notes on the particulars of claims filed. All the notes are numbered and arranged in numerical order for convenience of reference; the numbers also correspond to the numbers given to the claims in Schedule A.

I am also forwarding the stenographer's shorthand notes of the full evidence taken, together with such portions as he has transcribed for my reference and convenience.

As I followed the plan of taking the evidence during the day of as many claims as possible and working during the evenings settling the amounts to be allowed thereon whilst the evidence and the impression made on me by the witness was still fresh, I have found it unnecessary to have the full notes transcribed. This can, however, be done if desired.

Accompanying this report is a memo. of the time occupied by the inquiry and the expenses incurred, all of which is respectfully submitted.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Your obedient servant,
F. B. GREGORY.

SCHEDULE A.

In this Schedule the names of the persons through whom the claims were filed are indicated by initials, and are as follows:—

"E. M. S."—Elliot, Maclean & Shandley, Barristers, Victoria, B.C.
"Hodgson"—J. Hodgson, Estate Agent, Nanaimo, B.C.
"Self"—Presented by claimant personally.
"V. H."—Victor B. Harrison, Barrister, Nanaimo, B.C.
"H. B. R."—H. B. Robertson (Barnard, Robertson, Heisterman & Tait), Victoria.
"E. M. Y."—E. M. Yarwood, Barrister, Vancouver.
"C. C.—Chinese Consulate, Vancouver, B.C.
"Walkem"—W. W. Walkem, Real Estate Agent, Ladysmith.
"Cunliffe"—C. F. Cunliffe, Barrister, Nanaimo.
"H. E. P."—H. E. Ponsford, Notary Public, Qualicum Beach.
"Lowe"—I. E. Lowe, Estate Agent, Ladysmith.
"Potts"—Beevor-Potts, Barrister, Nanaimo.
"J. Ross"—Barrister, Nanaimo.
"C. B. S."—Chinese Benevolent Society, Victoria, B.C.
"McG. & G."—McGill & Grant, Barristers, Vancouver.
"S. W."—Means South Wellington.
"———"—The dash, where it occurs in "Amount allowed" column, means that the claim was heard and no allowance made.

STATEMENT SHOWING NAME OF CLAIMANT, AMOUNT CLAIMED, AND AMOUNT ALLOWED.

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
1	Wm. Moore	$ 96 75	E.M.S.	$ 50 00	
2	Ezra Bramley	1,964 50	,,	1,073 00	For self and family.
3	Wm. Burt	102 25	,,	81 80	
4	Jos. Shires	594 50	,,	340 75	
5	L. Lumbard	198 20	,,	140 70	
6	W. Bradley	1,071 00	,,	920 35	
7	John Campbell	3,821 20	,,	2,152 20	For self and family.
8	Wm. Simpson	486 10	,,	275 00	
9	Evan John	477 40	,,	314 75	
10	F. Beban	1,149 90	,,	922 00	
11	James White	449 00	,,	400 00	
12	Joseph Fontana	1,872 30	,,	958 45	
13	G. Schivardi	1,610 35	,,	805 15	
14	John Giacoma	822 20	,,	482 00	
15	F. Passerini	5,318 15	,,	2,868 30	
16	Samuel Thompson	664 40	,,	347 50	
17	John Michie	3,666 65	,,	2,412 15	
18	Charles Maclean	2,279 40	,,	1,315 50	
19	Arthur P. Glenn	988 45	,,	782 75	
20	James Dick	519 75	,,	403 25	
21	Wilson Goodwin	579 00	,,	538 50	
22	R. Valentine	1,054 00	,,	697 00	
23	D. Lambert	386 00	,,	263 05	
24	Wm. Cosier	934 25	,,	679 10	
25	John McLeod	595 00	,,	502 00	
26	Percy John	185 75	,,	130 60	
27	J. H. Cunningham	5,258 25	,,	2,798 95	$800 insurance collected.
28	John De Rose	152 25	,,	50 00	
29	Joseph Cuffolo	7,500 00	Hodgson	...	S. W., 1914.
30	George Taylor	6,102 30	,,	...	S. W., 1914.
31	James Rennie	2,055 00	Self	1,200 00	*See* Schedule B.
32	Elizabeth Berry	75 75	Self	58 75	*See* Schedule B.
33	F. Hilley	67 10	V. H.	51 00	
34	James Smythe	142 00	,,	136 50	
35	S. McKeown	81 50	,,	65 50	
36	Thomas Smith	318 50	,,	283 00	
37	Alexander McCrory	216 50	,,	182 50	
38	Canadian Collieries	16,763 37	H. B. R.	12,396 25	*See* Report.
39	J. A. Baxter	1,600 00	V. H.	———	*See* Schedule B.
40	T. A. Gray	31,836 20	E.M.Y.	...	*See* Schedule B and Report.
41	Daniel Bow	280 50	Self	265 05	
42	Wm. M. Brown	700 00	,,	...	S. W., 1914.
43	James Kronk	2,151 50	E. M. S.	1,422 43	No proof offered. The great majority of these men are Italians, believed to be serving in the war.
44	D. L. Williams	206 00	,,	...	
45	C. Hurd	157 00	,,	...	
46	L. & W. Wright	1,000 00	,,	...	
47	R. Romeo	139 00	,,	...	
48	V. Blito	335 50	,,	...	
49	F. Polito	2,420 75	,,	...	
50	D. Kapparigria	434 75	,,	...	
51	G. Gelonese	649 75	,,	...	
52	A. Voracalli	315 65	,,	...	
53	T. Gelonese	305 50	,,	...	
54	J. Nicifuto	320 00	,,	...	
55	J. Domineck	225 25	,,	...	
56	R. Polifrom	196 50	,,	...	
57	N. Souverini	240 00	,,	...	
58	R. Pisto	1,855 65	,,	...	
59	A. Brindisi	358 10	,,	...	
60	Nick Frento	258 50	,,	...	
61	Rappili Arcuri	427 00	,,	...	
62	R. Giardini	252 00	,,	...	

Statement showing Name of Claimant, Amount claimed, and Amount allowed—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
63	A. Rossi	$ 271 00	E. M. S.	...	
64	A. H. Nieullo	280 00	,,	...	
65	Ben Valenti	193 00	,,	...	
66	F. Smatto	314 00	,,	...	
67	F. Salvati	157 75	,,	...	
68	F. Smatto *et al.*	161 40	,,	...	
69	A. Ceuerilo *et al.*	90 65	,,	...	
70	Wing Wah Chong Co.	6,174 00	V. H.	$ 4,040 00	
71	Sing Chong & Co.	2,177 65	,,	1,470 00	
72	Kwong Lee & Co.	3,464 72	,,	2,442 46	
73	Hon Lang	59 00	C. C.	50 20	
74	Chow Yick Tung	128 50	,,	104 60	
75	Fung Chong Mon	150 10	,,	112 60	
76	Soo Dung Choy	43 45	,,	...	No proof offered.
77	Chow Ging Fook	47 95	,,	38 36	
78	Chow Shee Sun	71 00	,,	43 25	
79	Chow Nee Sun	67 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
80	Chow Kum Jam	81 90	,,	61 50	
81	Chow Wey Hou	55 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
82	Ju Ying Dong	20 90	,,	...	No proof offered.
83	Ju Yen Kay	50 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
84	Lum Tan	50 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
85	Chan Kum	87 75	,,	65 65	
86	Chan Yick Chen	42 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
87	Yip Sta Fun	56 30	,,	41 95	
88	Chow Shee Shing	31 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
89	Chow Wat Yung	49 10	,,	39 30	
90	Chow Lin Yick	37 45	,,	28 80	
91	Chow Fey	44 50	,,	35 60	
92	Chow Yow Ying	40 50	,,	32 40	
93	Yip Bing Sun	31 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
94	Chow Fook Yung	33 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
95	Chow Mow Fun	59 75	,,	48 60	
96	Chow Woy Ying	46 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
97	Chow Wing Sun	63 75	,,	51 00	
98	Jee Gum	60 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
99	Jang Kie Dong	337 05	,,	235 75	
100	Jung Kay	85 15	,,	...	No proof offered.
101	Jong Jam	55 15	,,	49 65	
102	Jang Hong	71 80	,,	61 05	
103	Jang Ling	77 85	,,	...	No proof offered.
104	Jang Mah Quong	167 75	,,	...	No proof offered.
105	Jan Yock	89 15	,,	75 80	
106	Jan Kwan	46 25	,,	41 45	
107	Hou Yim	84 70	,,	72 00	
108	Yang Nom	120 85	,,	...	No proof offered.
109	Jang Yip's Camp	84 90	,,	...	No proof offered.
110	Jee Chum Chew	93 20	,,	74 56	
111	Jang Yen	51 45	,,	...	No proof offered.
112	Ng. Ting Ten	71 60	,,	57 30	
113	Jung Yip	74 65	,,	63 45	
114	Jang Hou Tai	75 00	,,	63 75	
115	Wong Jee Yar	46 80	,,	...	No proof offered.
116	Yang Hing Young	83 55	,,	...	No proof offered.
117	Jang Hou Suen	64 90	,,	55 15	
118	Jang Pang Chi	75 45	,,	64 15	
119	Jan Lum & Co.	83 75	,,	...	No proof offered.
120	Jang Lun	60 10	,,	...	No proof offered.
121	Ho Yue On	116 65	,,	94 65	
122	Jang Jow Chow	109 40	,,	95 25	
123	Western Fuel Co.	72,256 19	E. M. Y.	...	*See* Report.
124	D. Sabiston	238 54	Walkem	190 84	
125	A. Uren	48 85	Walkem	39 85	
126	A. N. McKinnon	40,644 45	Cunliffe	7,913 75	*See* Schedule B.

STATEMENT SHOWING NAME OF CLAIMANT, AMOUNT CLAIMED, AND AMOUNT ALLOWED—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
127	John Barclay	$ 152 22	Walkem	$ 44 00	
128	Robt. Bickerton	138 25	,,	49 35	
129	Robt. Bonner	115 15	,,	56 90	
130	Est. of R. Collister	94 70	,,	77 20	
131	Dan. Campbell	132 87	,,	24 30	
132	John Davidson	159 12	,,	———	Loss of time only.
133	John Foster	161 85	,,	31 25	
134	J. P. Frauland	35 25	,,	30 00	
135	Wm. Gilchrist	108 32	,,	21 40	
136	James Glenn	223 42	,,	73 15	
137	David Gourlay	220 60	,,	81 00	
138	William Kerr	23 45	,,	21 45	
139	Patrick Malone	193 65	,,	55 75	
140	Priscilla Marsden	36 00	,,	36 00	
141	Henry Mitchell	297 40	,,	44 90	
142	James P. Ninemo	226 67	,,	100 00	
143	Benj. Rozzano	128 25	,,	...	*See* Schedule B.
144	A. & J. Richards	25 50	,,	15 00	
145	George Smith	174 92	,,	45 45	
146	John McLennan	392 85	,,	34 35	
147	Constant Muyleast	568 50	Hodgson	...	S. W., 1914.
148	A. Parker	445 00	,,	...	S. W., 1914.
149	Chas. Rice	392 65	,,	...	S. W., 1914.
150	Mrs. Mary Harker	219 15	,,	...	S. W., 1914.
151	Mrs. Chas. Nurd	147 00	H. E. P.	...	S. W., 1914.
152	Hillis Coulter	659 25	Lowe	356 75	*See* Schedule B.
153	Alexander Wright	37 15	Walkem	31 65	
154	Mary Dixon	156 00	,,	———	Loss of time only.
155	William Ross	34 00	,,	32 00	
156	James B. Weir	148 95	,,	64 25	
157	Joseph Watson	149 70	,,	14 35	
158	Alexander McLaughlin	150 75	,,	18 45	
159	Robert Houston	76 15	,,	———	Loss of time only.
160	Christina Houston	27 50	,,	25 00	
161	John Houston	79 20	,,	———	Loss of time only.
162	J. Baxter	38 70	,,	38 70	
163	James Strang	30 80	,,	...	No proof offered.
164	John Ross	87 12	,,	———	Loss of time only.
165	Smithson Bros.	17 55	Lowe	17 55	
166	Robert Gordon	234 90	Walkem	80 50	
167	Mary Cameron	1,220 00	B. Potts	...	S. W., 1914.
168	Wong Len	60 75	J. Ross	...	
169	Wong Wing	104 00	,,	...	
170	Fong Sing Lung	155 75	,,	...	
171	Jan Wing	142 50	,,	...	
172	Lum Doi	139 65	,,	...	
173	Fong Kum	131 30	,,	...	
174	Wong Ho	70 35	,,	...	
175	Wong Lin	66 50	,,	...	
176	Wong Top	84 15	,,	...	
177	Wong Top Cam	140 00	,,	...	
178	Wong On	97 70	,,	...	
179	Wong Hong	106 40	,,	...	
180	Wong Chong	76 75	,,	...	
181	Wong Yok	66 75	,,	...	
182	Wong Shen	61 65	,,	...	
183	Wong Let	57 50	,,	...	
184	Fong Sing	148 10	,,	...	
185	Hou Look	142 10	,,	...	
186	Fong Lee	146 75	,,	...	
187	Chum Lui Say	67 75	,,	...	

Statement showing Name of Claimant, Amount claimed, and Amount allowed—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
188	Chong Yee	$ 55 25	J. Ross	...	Abandoned by Mr. Ross after examination of Nos. 170, 171, 173, 184, 185, 186, 192, 193, 208, and 215. These claims were presented to Mr. Ross by one Wo Kee, and proved to be thoroughly unreliable.
189	Mar Mong Pon	37 00	,,	...	
190	Mar Gee	83 25	,,	...	
191	Fui Kin	65 25	,,	...	
192	Mar Quick Kwong	46 75	,,	...	
193	Wong Shang	69 00	,,	...	
194	Mah Been Shen	54 75	,,	...	
195	Mar Yock Shen	70 50	,,	...	
196	Chi Hing Chong	70 25	,,	...	
197	Wong Quong	46 50	,,	...	
198	Wong Don	67 25	,,	...	
199	Wong Sen	80 50	,,	...	
200	Wong Fo	55 75	,,	...	
201	Wong Jung	96 75	,,	...	
202	Wong So	88 20	,,	...	
203	Wong Po	74 50	,,	...	
204	Wong Fan	66 75	,,	...	
205	Wong Fan	206 10	,,	...	
206	Wong Lum	118 15	,,	...	
207	Wong Tan	208 80	,,	...	
208	Ma Sam Sing	5,674 65	,,	...	
209	Kun Chin Get	84 25	,,	...	
210	Mar Kee	62 50	,,	...	
211	Mah Chum	77 25	,,	...	
212	Wong Kum	56 00	,,	...	
213	Dom Chum Hi	40 00	,,	...	
214	Mah Shew Shun	61 75	,,	...	
215	Cheong Poy Kee	53 00	,,	...	
216	Quong Shew Long	41 50	,,	...	
217	Ng Chen Get	84 25	,,	...	
218	Wong Shown Man	41 50	,,	...	
219	Dong Cheong Lung	87 30	,,	...	
220	Chung Wing You	78 75	C. B. S.	...	No proof offered.
221	Ng Doy June	78 85	,,	———	
222	Mah Chong	224 60	,,	———	
223	Low Kong Yuen	117 30	,,	$ 25 00	
224	Ng Pack	94 10	,,	...	No proof offered.
225	Wong Lee Goom Chung	300 45	,,	———	
226	Shin Leon	88 35	,,	———	No proof offered (died in April before the riots).
227	Mah Chu Quon	101 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
228	Yee Yuk Sun	124 00	,,	25 00	
229	Fong Yock Yin	138 20	,,	———	
230	Wong Sick Hong	182 40	,,	...	No proof offered.
231	Ho Dun Wing	115 20	,,	———	
232	Fong Duck Kee	104 00	,,	———	No proof offered.
233	Fong Wing Kee	110 80	,,	...	No proof offered.
234	Dong Shong	75 75	,,	...	No proof offered.
235	Fong Mow	133 80	,,	25 00	
236	Ho Chow	95 00	,,	15 00	
237	Mah Min Hang	71 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
238	Mah But Chong	82 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
239	Chuie Lee Sing	166 00	,,	———	
240	Chuie Lim Sam	150 90	,,	———	
241	Chuie Yee Kay	152 90	,,	———	
242	Chuie Wong Hang	111 25	,,	———	
243	Lee Wah	86 85	,,	...	No proof offered.
244	Tso Yun Hing	85 00	,,	25 00	
245	Gee Kwong Toi	117 95	,,	...	No proof offered.
246	Ng Sin Lim	91 55	,,	...	No proof offered.
247	Ng Hing Bord	139 50	,,	———	
248	Ng Ah Tai	184 55	,,	25 00	

STATEMENT SHOWING NAME OF CLAIMANT, AMOUNT CLAIMED, AND AMOUNT ALLOWED—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
249	Chew You Kin	$ 176 10	C. B. S.	———	
250	Ny Doy Yin	94 50	,,	———	
251	Chew Dong Sing	95 55	,,	$ 25 00	
252	Chew Quock Que	194 60	,,	50 00	
253	Chew Bing Tew	199 90	,,	50 00	
254	Jung Kang	92 20	,,	25 00	
255	Chue Jung Wing	194 30	,,	———	
256	Ho Chat	113 50	,,	———	
257	Ho Yin Sam	149 08	,,	25 00	
258	Chew Quon Ying	99 70	,,	25 00	
259	Fong Yip Quong	112 55	,,	...	No proof offered.
260	Sam You	156 10	,,	———	
261	Mok Yet	135 40	,,	———	
262	Ho Wah	161 35	,,	35 00	
263	Ho Choy	128 33	,,	35 00	
264	Fong Chin Kee	146 55	,,	25 00	
265	Lai Dong Chong	142 78	,,	35 00	
266	Mah Yuen Sun	85 70	,,	...	No proof offered.
267	Pack Lit	150 95	,,	———	
268	Chang Ah Chun	73 35	,,	...	No proof offered.
269	Wong Chow	80 70	,,	———	
270	Wong Wing	139 30	,,	...	No proof offered.
271	Low Sung	119 80	,,	25 00	
272	Chow Yee War	64 20	,,	———	
273	Mah Jung Chong	119 70	,,	...	No proof offered.
274	Hong Kew	186 85	,,	...	No proof offered.
275	Jing Ding	144 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
276	Dong Chee	1,087 65	,,	250 00	Laundryman; for self.
277	Lowey Gan Teoi	58 05	,,	———	
278	Ng Ying Tip	122 15	,,	———	
279	Fonk Duck Kee	102 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
280	Ho Ming Yock	152 85	,,	———	
281	Ho Fook Hong	158 96	,,	———	
282	Fong Fung Hall	103 75	,,	———	
283	Fong Yip Won	92 10	,,	———	
284	Fong Lap Yen	117 15	,,	...	No proof offered.
285	Fong Wing Fee	91 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
286	Fong Hack Sing	104 30	,,	———	
287	Fong Son Wah	83 70	,,	...	No proof offered.
288	Ong Joy Jee	130 80	,,	———	
289	Sam Tin Sing	158 20	,,	———	
290	Shim Shong	210 25	,,	———	
291	Ho Fook Chong	191 08	,,	———	
292	Lau Wong	122 85	,,	...	No proof offered.
293	Fong Dat Sam	113 80	,,	...	No proof offered.
294	Fong Yip Sing	81 31	,,	———	
295	Chan Chun Tong	136 35	,,	———	
296	Chin Sang	109 20	,,	25 00	
297	Fong Chong Yong	423 85	,,	———	
298	Fong Dun Gee	95 75	,,	———	
299	Ho Chung	87 95	,,	...	No proof offered.
300	Wong Gar	95 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
301	Jung Fook	134 80	,,	25 00	
302	Quock Quon Sing	96 20	,,	20 00	
303	Mah Poy Jing	60 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
304	Mar Yuet	327 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
305	Ng Doi Sue	87 75	,,	...	No proof offered.
306	Hooey Toi	1,030 50	,,	...	No proof offered.
307	Ng Doi Dai	46 15	,,	———	
308	Cheey Sai Fat	88 00	,,	...	No proof offered.
309	Chuie Him Sing	117 30	,,	50 00	
310	Chuey Lin Ping	77 30	,,	15 00	
311	Tso Quon	72 00	,,	———	

Statement showing Name of Claimant, Amount claimed, and Amount allowed—*Continued.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by.	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
312	Ho Yee Lim	$ 95 50	C. B. S.	...	No proof offered.
313	Ma Sing	240 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
314	Wong Chung Keet	247 45	,,	$ 75 00	
315	Hong Fung Yuen	10,845 00	,,	150 00	*See* Schedule B.
316	Ng Ying Ho	98 75	,,	———	
317	Bing Kee	2,220 00	,,	...	*See* Schedule B.
318	Ng Doi Chin	58 75	,,	15 00	
319	Mah Sing	240 25	,,	...	No proof offered.
320	Mah Chung	121 70	,,	...	No proof offered.
321	Jane McMillan	20 00	Walkem	14 70	
322	John R. Russell	6 75	,,	6 75	
323	James Bateman	2,189 50	J. Ross	...	
324	James Rutherford	1,167 50	,,	...	
325	Tom Hayton	267 50	,,	...	
326	Mrs. Jane Jones	257 00	,,	...	
327	Mrs. Percy Turner	156 35	,,	...	
328	Mrs. R. C. MacKay	240 50	,,	...	
329	Mrs. Ed. Fielding	400 00	,,	...	
330	Mrs. H. Ruckledge	435 00	,,	...	S. W., 1914. (For South Wellington fire, 1914, *See* Report.)
331	Wm. Bennett	448 90	,,	...	
332	Mrs. Elizabeth Alice	985 00	,,	...	
333	William Brown	725 00	,,	...	
334	Robt. Jas. Arbuthnot	960 00	,,	...	
335	Thos. Laithwaite	555 00	,,	...	
336	George Richardson	1,000 00	,,	...	
337	William Brown	695 00	,,	...	
338	I. S. McMurray	716 50	,,	...	
339	Leonard Richardson	754 00	,,	...	
340	Jang Dai Lun	59 85	McG. & G.	...	Withdrawn by Mr. Dockerell for McGill & Grant. (*See* Schedule B and Report.)
341	Jang Wah Son	75 60	,,	...	
342	Gee Con Yin	60 60	,,	...	
343	Jang Wai Bai	73 85	,,	...	
344	Jang Duck Toi	77 10	,,	...	
345	Jang Jung Gip	56 35	,,	...	
346	Gee Took Kee	96 05	M. & G.	...	
347	Jang Ah Son	69 10	,,	...	
348	Jang Dai Chuck	67 60	,,	...	
349	Jang Jung Gin	83 35	,,	...	
350	Jang Tai Yin	72 60	,,	...	
351	Jang Wah Hee	68 10	,,	...	
352	Jang Lun Ying	75 35	,,	...	
353	Jang So Wah	58 35	,,	...	
354	Jang Lue Doo	69 60	,,	...	
355	Jang Yick Jon	75 10	,,	...	
356	Jang Duck Wah	78 60	,,	...	
357	Jang Air Jung	63 85	,,	...	
358	Jang Wah Goon	54 85	,,	...	
359	Jong Wah June	62 10	,,	...	
360	Jang June Wah	62 85	,,	...	
361	Jang Wah Son	56 85	,,	...	
362	Jang Guey Goon	52 60	,,	...	
363	Jang Jook Jon	77 60	,,	...	
364	Jang Guen Jon	58 60	,,	...	
365	Jang Tai Suey	69 35	,,	...	
366	Jang Tai Hue	67 15	,,	...	
367	Jang Son Too	67 60	,,	...	
368	Jang Fook Shu	68 60	,,	...	
369	Gon Si Hang	71 60	,,	...	
370	Jang Jung Kee	75 50	,,	...	
371	Jang Jung Ying	70 35	,,	...	
372	Low Tai Soon	77 60	,,	...	
373	Carpenter, A. C.	...	Hodgson	...	Taken away and not filed.

STATEMENT SHOWING NAME OF CLAIMANT, AMOUNT CLAIMED, AND AMOUNT ALLOWED—*Concluded.*

No.	Name of Claimant.	Amount claimed.	Filed by	Amount allowed.	Remarks.
374	Fong Chun Mun	$ 154 25	C. B. S.	...	No proof offered.
375	Young Yet Ming	81 95	V. H.	———	
376	Ng Joy Sun	192 25	"	$ 96 15	
377	Ho Qui	282 60	"	100 00	
378	Lung Kee	345 00	"	50 00	
379	Mah Bong	73 25	"	48 85	
380	Chow Chee	110 30	"	———	
	Totals	$323,985 12	...	$56,878 60	

SCHEDULE B.

No. 31. JAMES RENNEY.

This man was not injured by rioters, but by strikers, in April, 1914. He was attacked and was shot with buckshot, necessitating an operation and three weeks in the hospital. From the effects of his wounds he has developed varicose veins, and will have to undergo another operation.

I have allowed him for clothing destroyed, operation, and hospital charges, also for time lost while in hospital; and similar allowances for the second operation, which is necessary to restore his full working power.

I have made no allowance for pain and suffering, as that does not seem to come within the scope of this Commission; but if that were allowed, I would think his claim of $2,055 most reasonable.

No. 32. ELIZABETH BERRY.

This claim was for the loss of a tent, etc., on April 5th, 1914. Upon my proceeding first to inquire if the damage had been caused by rioters or strikers, Mr. Herchmer, representing the Government, stated that the Government would admit the damage was so caused, as he had made inquiries and had satisfied himself on that point. I therefore proceeded to assess the damages sustained.

No. 39. JAMES BAXTER.

This man is a *contractor* at Nanaimo, and suffered from a gunshot wound which confined him to the hospital for ten days. His claim is for:—

Medical and hospital expenses	$ 100 00
Loss of time and suffering	1,500 00
Total	$1,600 00

The only evidence given as to expenses incurred was, hospital expenses about $30. His evidence of damage through loss of time was most unsatisfactory, and his business was carried on just the same. Claimant says he suffered *agony*, but I do not consider that compensation for bodily pain comes within the scope of this Commission.

In any case, I cannot recommend the payment of any sum to this claimant. There is evidence that he sympathized with the strikers, if he did not actually take part in their doings. He mixed freely with them, and one of them had suggested to him that he take a gun. He had no business at the time being *within four miles of the disturbance*. He had heard that there was shooting going on, and had actually been warned twice not to proceed. His wound was, I believe, an accident which never would have happened had he not been guilty at least of idle and foolhardy curiosity. But my opinion is that he went to the scene of the trouble and mixed with the strikers and rioters with a view of at least leading them to believe that he was in sympathy with them and their doings.

No. 40. THOMAS B. GRAY.

This very large claim was for the loss of a sawmill at South Wellington, burned on August 11th, 1914. The mill had not been running for some months previously.

Before going into the details of the loss, I stated to Mr. Yarwood, who represented the claimant, that I would first require evidence that the fire was caused by strikers (the riots had been over for a year). Mr. Yarwood replied that he was unable to offer any other evidence than that already heard with reference to the 1914 fire at South Wellington. On my stating that that evidence had not satisfied me that the fire was caused by strikers, Mr. Gray gave some formal evidence, and the claim was not further proceeded with.

No. 126. Alexander Neil McKinnon.

This man has been terribly abused. He and his family were actually blown up by a bomb. Fortunately his family escaped personal injury. But he is permanently injured, as follows:—

(1.) Right arm amputated at the elbow:

(2.) Right eye seriously injured, only a quarter normal vision left, and sight of left eye endangered:

(3.) Hearing more than half destroyed; right ear practically useless; ear-drum destroyed, and left ear very defective:

(4.) Private parts badly injured and deformed:

(5.) Legs in a very bad condition, with scars and adhesions, and power of locomotion interfered with.

Before the injuries occurred claimant was a big strong man, earning about $6 a day as a miner. He is no longer able to perform manual labour, and he has not at present the educational qualifications for clerical work; but he is only thirty-four years of age, has normal mental faculties, and, strange as it may seem, after his terrible experience, his nervous system is only slightly if at all impaired, and he can, if given the opportunity, qualify himself for clerical employment.

No amount of money can compensate him for the injuries he has received; and under my interpretation of the scope of the Commission, I cannot allow him anything for pain and suffering.

I assess his actual damage as follows:—

To furniture, etc.	$ 111 25
Share of injury to house (*see* note to Hillis Coulter, Claim No. 152)	302 50
Personal injuries	7,500 00
Total	$7,913 75

In estimating the personal injuries I have been governed by what I think from my experience a jury would award; but it might easily be increased to $10,000, but even that sum would in my opinion be inadequate.

No. 143. Benjamin Rozzano.

This man's claim is for:—

Damage to property	$ 24 25
Loss of time and hotel expenses	104 00
Total	$128 25

Sixteen dollars would have covered the actual damage, if he had stated that he returned to work when the others did. After claimant left the room I learned that he had joined the strikers, and had not returned to work until March, 1915. I wished to examine him on these matters, and sent word of this; but although he agreed to return, he failed to turn up.

I cannot recommend the payment of any money to him.

No. 152. Hillis Coulter.

This claim is for damage to the house occupied by Alexander McKinnon (No. 126), which was wrecked by a bomb. At the time of the explosion Mr. McKinnon had agreed to purchase it, and had made some payments on account of his purchase. After the explosion McKinnon was unable to continue his payments and surrendered the house to the claimant. At my suggestion Mr. McKinnon and Mr. Coulter came to an agreement whereby Mr. McKinnon was to be allowed $302.50 on the house being restored.

Mr. Kent, a contractor, estimated the damage to the house at $659.25, and I have accepted his figures, and therefore allow Mr. McKinnon the sum of $302.50, and Mr. Coulter the difference between that amount and $659.25—viz., $356.75. This, I think, will be more satisfactory than

allowing the whole amount to either one or the other and having them make a payment back; besides, it provides against accidents in the matter of payments.

No. 315. HONG FUNG YUEN.

This claim, originally filed with the Chinese Consulate, amounted to	$10,345 00
Not including repairs to buildings, fences, fixtures, and fittings, afterwards claimed at	500 00
	$10,845 00
As filed with Commission	9,945 00
As amended and filed by Mr. Henderson	3,995 00

This claim I believe to be absolutely fraudulent and an impudent attempt to impose on the Commission, and I cannot recommend the payment of any part of it. It is so unreliable that it is open to the suspicion that the little damage done was connived at by the claimant. The only damage done to the building, fences, and fixtures was the breaking of one window.

My previous preliminary inquiries caused me to suspect, or rather believe, that the claim was a fraudulent one, and I determined to visit the shop. I invited claimant's counsel, Mr. Eli Harrison, to accompany me, but he declined, and when on my return the case was called he declined to proceed with it and withdrew. At claimant's request the hearing was adjourned to enable him to obtain other counsel.

The most casual observation was sufficient to enable a child to see that the claim was more than grossly exaggerated.

When the case was eventually heard the claim had been reduced to $3,995; but even then there was no serious attempt made to prove the value of the stock alleged to have been destroyed.

A claim was made for the loss of $2,605 alleged to have been in the safe. But the circumstances disclosed render it impossible for me to believe this statement. The safe was undoubtedly broken *at some time*, and apparently by a sledge-hammer from the outside, but the condition of the hinge-bolts, the door-bolts, and the interior woodwork make this impossible of belief, and the combination button was absolutely undamaged. I feel satisfied that the safe was opened in the usual way, and the damage done afterwards as a blind—which rioters would have no object in doing.

The shelving and fixtures were absolutely untouched, and many packages of tea, drugs, etc., still remained on the shelves when I visited the premises. (The place had been locked up and abandoned, with a Chinaman living in the rear.)

I have assessed the damage at $150, but I consider it an extravagantly generous estimate, and I only make it because Mr. Mainwaring, who saw the place a few days after the riot, said that the floor was covered with tea and rice, etc., at that time. The only physical damage he saw to the buildings, etc., was one broken window in the front; but claim was made for $500 under this heading.

No. 317. BING KEE.

Claim was made for the total destruction of a house in riot of August, 1913	$1,500 00
And injury to other buildings at same time	720 00
Total	$2,220 00

Claim was also made for a number of buildings subsequently burned, amount unstated.

Mr. Bing Kee was asked to provide full particulars in writing of his claim, showing the damage done to his several buildings. When his claim was called this request had not been complied with, and he said he preferred to abandon his claim rather than do so. I informed him through his counsel, Mr. V. B. Harrison, that he must do so, as otherwise I had no means of checking it. He thereupon formally abandoned that portion of his claim.

No evidence at all was offered in support of the claim for buildings burned subsequently to August, 1913.

I heard the evidence with reference to the claim for house burned in August, 1913, during the riot. Bing Kee was the only witness called, and he declined to state positively that it was burned then; said that he was not there at the time, but that his son had so reported it to him, etc. The son was present at my inquiry, but was not called. Subsequently, when inves-

tigating another claim (No. 228), a Chinese witness stated that Bing Kee's house had been burned in June; but Mr. Mainwaring, who had made some investigations shortly after the riots, said the place was burned at the time he was there, and he understood it had been burned during the riot in August, 1913. In these circumstances I told Mr. Harrison he would have to furnish further evidence, and he replied that he could get a Mr. McKay, who was an engineer at the mine, to so testify, and I directed him to produce this witness the following morning. This was not done, and the following afternoon the Nanaimo sittings closed. I wrote Mr. Harrison on December 5th and 9th on the subject, and asked him to obtain at least a notarial declaration from some white man as to the date of burning. At the time of writing this report I have not heard further from Mr. Harrison; but I am to-day in receipt of a report from Mr. William Goodwin, who was a special constable at Extension from May 2nd, 1913, to September, 1914, stating that the building was burned between June 28th and July 1st; and in view of the evidence of Claimant No. 228, I have accepted the unsworn report, and allowed Bing Kee nothing for his claim, which I am now satisfied was fraudulent and that he was a party to the fraud.

Nos. 340-372.

These claims were presented by Mr. Dockerill, of the firm of Messrs. McGill & Grant. The claims are for the loss of personal effects and a lumber camp, with tents and equipment, alleged to have been destroyed in August, 1913.

General evidence was heard, and some addressed to Claims Nos. 355, 366, and 364. The main witnesses were Jang Yick Jon and Jang Dick, who in my opinion proved unworthy of belief. In my preliminary investigations I had been unable to find any trace of any such loss as claimed by these claimants, who claimed that everything, including tent, blankets, and provisions, had been destroyed.

There were a number of suspicious circumstances connected with these claims.

Some time after I had disposed of these cases I was informed by Mr. Hastings, whom I asked to make a private investigation, that so far as he could ascertain there had been no loss, and that all the tents, provisions, etc., had been taken to Nanaimo to a certain Chinese store, and he had found the teamster who had hauled them in.

VICTORIA, B.C.:
Printed by William H. Cullin, Printer to the King's Most Excellent Majesty,
1919.