

of 1889, Mr. Cotton wrote to me saying: 'A gentleman wished to buy out my interests in Vancouver,' and asked what price I would take for them. I replied that I would be glad to sell and asked the exact amount of a valuation made by Mr. Cotton of all my interests, a few days before I left for England, with the amounts he had received from me since that date, added. He replied that the gentleman had declined, but he would try and arrange with the bank to take over my interests at the sum I mentioned, and pay me interest at the rate of 10 per cent. till paid, with the option to me to withdraw my capital by giving him three months notice. He wrote several letters until February, 1890, never mentioning this affair again or intimating that the proposal was carried out, and then ceased corresponding till January, 1892. During that period I asked for a statement of my affairs, and after pressing for it, found in February, 1892, that he had arranged to carry out the proposal made to me in the spring of 1889, to buy me out for \$15,000, with interest at 10 per cent. and option to withdraw my capital on giving three months' notice. I immediately cabled my attorney as to the security, and after repeatedly pressing the matter, got Mr. Cotton to give his personal note, and a promise in writing, which he never carried out, to grant me a second mortgage on his real estate in Vancouver. His promise dated May 31st, 1892, is still hold, and the note was renewed with added interest on May 31st, 1893. During the period in which he ceased corresponding, he carried on both businesses on his own account, subsequently turning the *News-Advertiser* into a company and transferring everything belonging to the San Juan Lime Co. (possession of which he obtained in a very irregular manner), into it, and did not even offer me any shares. Having been informed of these unsatisfactory proceedings, I naturally wished to withdraw my capital, and after vainly endeavoring to do so, came out here in May, 1893. When I arrived, I was met in such an unsatisfactory manner by Mr. Cotton, that in September I gave the matter into the hands of my solicitor, and he proceeded for recovery of the value of the note dated May 31st, 1893."

The London, Eng., correspondent of the *Plymouth Weekly News* writes as follows of a recent High Church service which he attended in the world's metropolis: "At the High Church service which I attended on Sunday, Palm Sunday was sufficiently marked. All the choristers and priests who followed in procession after the cross, veiled with crape, carried palms.

During the reading of the gospel, the gosseller held his palm, and all the choristers elevated their palms. When the words were read of the consummation of the great tragedy, the congregation knelt down and remained in solemn meditation for the space of half a minute. But I had not the advantage of being at St. Agnes, Kensington, where the symbolism of the verger takes quite a new line. According to a correspondent of the *Westminster*, he is 'attired in evening dress, knee breeches, silk stockings, silver buckled shoes, silver buttons to coat and waistcoat, with the *Agnus Dei* on them, an ancient silver chain round his shoulders and a wide, black, watered silk sash, to which is suspended a sword. This he draws on the consecration of the elements of the holy communion.' The drawing of a sword at the climax of the celebration of the great feast of love strikes me as so grotesque as to be either repulsive or comic—I hardly know what the proper feeling is. I only hope that the vicar of St. Agnes will remember the passage 'Put up thy sword into its sheath,' and will use it with effect to this somewhat too bellicose member of the Church Militant.'

From what "Faith Fenton" the editor of the page for women in the *Toronto Empire* says, it is to be inferred that Col. Prior is very popular with the fair sex at the capital. It is not my desire to speak slightly of "our own gallant Colonel's" captivating qualities. If this were the only cause for complaint which the citizens of Victoria had against him it would be scarcely worth mentioning. But Col. Prior offends in other ways. For instance, some person told him once that he could sing, and ever since he has missed no opportunity of breaking forth in the most weird intonations adapted to verse. Last week, I read that during a short bill in the House proceedings at Ottawa, at a most unexpected moment, he attempted to sing a song about sticks that went a-whacking and skulls that went a-cracking when McCarthy took the floor at Enniscorthy. No doubt this is all very amusing to the habitues of the House, but the voters of Victoria did not send the Col. to the Dominion House to sing songs. Possibly the member labors under the hallucination that everything Victoria needs "can be sung for a song."

The grand jury found "no bill" in the criminal libel suit brought by the Nanaimo Reform Club against W. J. Gallagher, of the *Nanaimo Telegram*. Therefore it may be accepted as the honest belief of the men who composed the grand jury that the item which the *Telegram* published was altogether too trivial to be taken seriously. I have no

means of ascertaining how the members of the Reform Club feel concerning the result of their attempt to tyrannize over a struggling newspaper man; but I do know that they have placed themselves in a ridiculous light by their action in this matter. The item published was written in jest, and as such it might well have been accepted by the Reform Club. It is not in accordance with the spirit of the age for a man or body of men to fly into courts to settle every grievance, fancied or real, they may have against a newspaper. The free and enlightened people of Canada, as a whole, are in favor of a large measure of liberty being extended to the press in its criticism of public men, because it is in the general interest that journals should give fearless expression to the opinions which the actions of public men evoke, without being deterred by fear of punishment therefor. And, as is remarked by an exchange, those who are criticized can find means of defence, so that little harm results even when the criticism is severe.

Party feeling in Ontario does not appear to run so high as it does in this Province. Some months ago, owing to ill-health, Hon. C. F. Fraser was compelled to resign from Mr. Mowat's Cabinet. On the occasion of his colleagues retirement, Mr. Mowat spoke feelingly of the conditions under which he was forced to part with Mr. Fraser. But the matter did not drop there, Mr. Meredith, the leader of the Opposition, and for twenty years the political opponent of Mr. Fraser expressed his regret in the following words: "Although I have been in the House, opposed to him from the day he entered it—for, I think, the leader of the Government, the commissioner of Public Works and myself entered the House upon the same day—although we have had some bitter controversies, I can say that I have always—and I believe that is the feeling on this side of the house—had for the Commissioner of Public Works the highest esteem. As a public man, as a legislator, as a debater of this House, we all recognize his talents and ability and regret very much, I repeat, the reasons which the Attorney-General said have induced the hon. gentleman to take the course which he has decided to adopt. I join with the Attorney-General in the hope that rest may help to restore the hon. gentleman's health, and I should hope some important position somewhere in the public service, could be provided for the hon. gentleman where his great abilities would be of future use to the country. I hope some means may be devised by which that can be brought about." Supposing a member of Mr. Davie's cabinet was forced to retire under similar unfortunate circumstances, would Mr. Beaven express himself as did Mr. Meredith? Most emphatically no. Rather, the event would be regarded as an occasion for general rejoicing with the Opposition and Independents.

PERE GRINATOR.