

## DIFFICULT TO DECIDE.

County Councillors Wrangle Over the Treasurership.

## REED THE DARK HORSE.

The Man From Glanford the Choice on a Secret Ballot—The Count Reversed on an Open Vote—Cochrane's Friends Stick by Him—John T. Stock's Chances Appeared Very Slim.

From 2 to 5.30 p. m. yesterday afternoon the County Councillors made motions, moved amendments, and amendments to amendments, but no vote was taken on any of the motions, and the Council adjourned without coming to any decision. Promptly at 2 o'clock the meeting was called to order and the Council went into Committee of the Whole with Mr. Millen in the chair on the second reading of the by-law to appoint a Treasurer.

Messrs. Dymond and Ranton moved that the blank in the by-law be filled in with the name of T. A. Walker. This was lost on a vote of 8 to 10.

The nomination of H. P. Van Wagner was also moved under a vote of 8 to 9.

Voting on E. Kenrick's name resulted in a tie, which the Chairman decided against Kenrick.

T. S. Henderson was then nominated, but got only 7 yeas as against 9 nays.

David Bell's name met a similar fate with a vote of 8-8.

Warden McGregor then remarked that the Council might sit for a month doing business in the above way and never reach a decision. He suggested the taking of a ballot, which would be of a progressive nature in that each Councillor should vote for four applicants.

Applicants who got no votes to be dropped off the list. The second ballot should see the dropping of the three lowest and the third two and then one be dropped on each successive ballot until a choice was made.

Mr. Collins thought he could improve upon that, however, and moved that each Councillor vote for three applicants on the first two ballots, and that on each successive ballot for only one, the applicants getting the lowest number of votes be dropped until the choice had narrowed down to two candidates.

This was adopted, the ballots distributed, with the result on the first count: G. T. Attridge 2, David Bell 2, A. Cochrane 6, Cameron Gage 2, T. S. Henderson 3, Erland Lee 2, W. Mulholland 1, C. D. Potts 1, Daniel Reed 8, W. W. Ross 6, J. C. Sealey 5, J. T. Stock 5, T. A. Walker 3, J. H. Springstead 1, James Ferres, J. C. McKean and H. P. Van Wagner got no votes and their names were dropped after the first ballot.

The second ballot was as follows: Attridge 3, Bell 1, Cochrane 4, Gage 3, Henderson 2, Kenrick 3, Lee 2, Mulholland 0, Potts 0, Reed 5, Ross 4, Sealey 4, Stock 3, Walker 1, Attridge, Mulholland and Potts were dropped.

The third ballot: Cochrane 5, Gage 2, Henderson 3, Kenrick 1, Lee 2, Reed 4, Ross 1, Stock 2 and Sealey 0. Kenrick, Ross and Sealey were dropped.

The fourth ballot—Cochrane 4, Gage 2, Henderson 2, Lee 2, Reed 6 and Stock 3. Lee, Henderson and Gage were dropped.

On the fifth ballot, four councillors did not vote. The count stood Cochrane 5, Reed 7 and Stock 3. This left the names of only Cochrane and Reed before the Council. A wrangle then ensued as to whether the Committee of the Whole should rise and report to the Council these two names or take another ballot. Mr. Collins' resolution under which the balloting was done extended only to the selection of two names and finally a motion for another ballot carried. This ballot resulted as follows: Reed, 11; Cochrane, 7.

A motion to rise and report carried, but the Chairman could discover nothing to report so the Committee resumed its sitting and a motion to fill in the blank in the by-law with the name of Daniel Reed before reporting was lost, only 7 yeas for Reed and a similar motion as regards Cochrane only received three votes.

The Committee then rose and the Chairman read the action of the Council. Reed's friends contended that there had been action. Chairman Millen then amended his report with the statement that the Committee's work amounted to "no action" unless the Council adopted the report.

Warden McGregor would accept only the Chairman's report, and called for "new business."

Another war of words ensued. Messrs. Binkley and Ross contended that the committee had selected Daniel Reed's name as the one to be reported to the Council, and Messrs. Warden Nicholson and Collins being equally vigorous in their opposition to this interpretation of the problem. Chairman Millen did not appear to be sure about what he had reported, and then Mr. Loudon asked the pertinent question. What were we balloting for? Are we going to hand all our work like this?

Mr. Binkley then moved that the by-law be put through its third reading. "It is, it is," through its second," protested Mr. Collins.

"Yes, it is," insisted Mr. Binkley, "and Reed is the Council's choice on the ballot."

"That hasn't passed the Council yet," remarked the man from Dundas. "I consider that the Warden has not done his duty," said Mr. Binkley, warmly. "He took advantage of the mistake of Mr. Millen in reporting as he did."

The Warden denied this, and ruled Mr. Binkley's motion out of order.

Mr. Collins read a motion to continue John T. Stock in office until January, 1896, but did not press it.

After considerable further wrangling, during which nearly every councillor was on the floor some time or another, a motion to adjourn was defeated and another that the Council go into Committee again was carried. Mr. Millen again took the chair, although visibly affected by the terrible mental strain he was enduring.

Messrs. Nicholson and Ross nominated W. W. Ross for the treasurership. Only eight voted for the resolution, and it was lost.

Messrs. Wardell and Taylor's nomination of Arch. Cochrane got but 5 votes.

Messrs. Smith and Lowden tried the magic name of Reed on the committee again, and the vote was a tie, broken by the Chairman's emphatic "nay."

Mr. Pettit moved that the committee rise and report, but this was lost.

amid the laughter of both councillors and audience.

"Well, I am not going to keep getting up and down again like a jumping jack," protested Mr. Pettit, "let the committee do something or adjourn."

Mr. Lowden—I think we might as well go home as sit here doing business in this style. If more of the councillors had the backbone to vote in the open as they do by ballot we would have been through long ago.

Mr. Kenrick's name was again put before the committee, and secured a majority of votes, the count standing 8 to 7.

Still the committee voted down a resolution to rise and report, and amid further laughter Mr. Henderson's name was suggested at the same time that a motion to adjourn until this morning was made. The adjournment carried.

Mr. Cochrane, the Councillor from West Flamboro, did not take part in the Council's deliberations, owing to his being a candidate for the vacancy.

**MATTERS AT THE BEACH.**

**Bicyclist Ask the Committee to Build a Cinder Path.**

A meeting of the Parks Committee was held last evening. The members present were: Chairman Morris, Ald. Ten Eyck, Watkins, McAndrew and McKewen.

Nearly all the questions discussed related to the Beach, and most of them were laid over until after the committee visits the Beach next Wednesday.

Mr. Lyman Lee appeared on behalf of Mr. P. N. Cory and asked that the city build a fence along the south side of a strip of land now owned by the city. It was decided to leave the matter until the committee visits the Beach.

It was decided to advertise for twelve benches for the Gore and have more seats built at Woodland Park.

Mr. J. G. Gauld addressed the committee regarding bicycle riding on the sidewalk at the Beach. He suggested that a by-law be passed prohibiting "secoching" there, and asked if a cinder path for bicyclists could not be laid by the committee. He said the road was so soft between the canal and the city line near Burlington. The cost would be about \$75. The matter was laid over until the committee's visit.

Mr. Geo. S. Kerr asked that the committee approve of a transfer of a lot from Jos. Hargrove to F. J. Leishman. The matter was referred to Solicitor Maclean.

The question of building a lock-up at the Beach was laid over until Wednesday.

The Chairman was instructed to be more prompt in making collections and returns for scavenger work done for Beach residents.

It was decided to ask the Government for a strip of land on the Guelph road, to be used as a Potter's field.

A petition was received from Beach residents, asking that the erection of "shacks" on the lake shore be prohibited. The committee will investigate when they visit the Beach.

**LORD SALISBURY'S CABINET.**

**The State Nearly Complete—Some Extra Cabinet Appointments.**

London, June 29.—The complete Cabinet of Lord Salisbury is officially announced as follows:

Prime Minister—Marquis of Salisbury.

Lord High Chancellor—Lord Halsbury.

Lord President of Council—The Duke of Devonshire.

Lord Privy Seal—Viscount Cross.

Chancellor of the Exchequer—Sir Michael Hicks-Bach.

Home Secretary—Sir Matthew Ridley.

Foreign Secretary—Marquis of Salisbury.

Colonial Secretary—Mr. Joseph Chamberlain.

War Secretary—Marquis of Lansdowne.

Secretary for India—Lord George Hamilton.

Secretary for Scotland—Lord Balfour of Burleigh.

First Lord of the Admiralty—Mr. G. Goschen.

First Lord of the Treasury—Mr. A. J. Balfour.

Lord Lieutenant of Ireland—Earl Cadogan.

Lord Chancellor of Ireland—Lord Ashbourne.

President of the Board of Trade—Mr. C. T. Ritchie.

Chancellor Duchy of Lancaster—Sir Henry James.

It is stated to-night that the Cabinet is now complete, and that the Chief Secretary for Ireland, the President of the Board of Agriculture and the Postmaster-General will be included in the Ministry.

One or two appointments outside the Cabinet are announced, the principal being that of Mr. Geo. N. Curzon as Under Secretary for Foreign Affairs, and Mr. Robert William Hannbury as Financial Secretary to the Treasury.

**LEHIGH VALLEY ROUTE.**

**Fast Time Between Hamilton and New York.**

In going from Hamilton business men and tourists should take the picturesque Lehigh Valley.

Three fast trains daily, leaving at 6.17 a.m., 3.03 and 6.47 p.m. Through Pullman buffet sleeping cars. Hard coal used exclusively. No smoke. No cinders. No dust.

For tickets and sleeping-car berths call at Grand Trunk City or Depot Ticket Office.

**R. T. OF T. GARDEN PARTY.**

A garden party was held last evening in the beautiful grounds at the corner of West and King streets, occupied by Mrs. Cook, under the auspices of Westworth Council, R. T. of T. and proved to be an enjoyable and profitable affair. The grounds were illuminated with Chinese lanterns, and on a veranda at the west side of Mrs. Cook's house was stationed the orchestra of Wesley Church Sunday School, under the leadership of Fred Jones. Recitations and music were given by Rev. J. Van Wyck, Rev. Mr. Dunnett, Mr. Bickley, Mr. Miller, and Misses Holman, Newcombe, Jobe, Fisher and Jennie Mann. Refreshments were served.

**RELIEF IN SIX HOURS.**

Distressing kidney and bladder diseases relieved in six hours by the Great South American Kidney Cure. The new remedy is a great surprise and delight on account of its exceeding promptness in relieving pain in the bladder, kidneys, back and every part of the urinary passages in male or female. It relieves retention of water and pain in passing immediately. If you want quick relief and cure this is your remedy. Sold by H. Spencer Case, No. 50 King street west.

## THAT HENDRIE INJUNCTION.

Obstruction to T. H. &amp; B. Not Likely to be Continued.

## TERMS OF THE COURT'S ORDER.

In High Court at Toronto yesterday the Injunction case against the T. H. &amp; B. was decided. The court holds that the sections of the Dominion Railway Act, 1888, under the headings "Plans and Surveys," and "Lands and Their Valuation," apply as well to lands injuriously affected as to lands actually taken for the purposes of the railway; and the authority of the Railway Committee of the Privy Council for the execution of the works is no answer to a complaint by a land-owner that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so.

The court also held that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

The court also held that the railway company are proceeding with them without having taken steps necessary to entitle them to do so, and that the provisions of the Act do not entitle the company to be acting without lawful authority in interfering with Hunter street to the injury of the plaintiffs' property without having paid or tendered the compensation to which plaintiffs were entitled, unless they had procured the authority to do so.

## MOB IN A COUNCIL CHAMBER.

Indignant Denver Citizens Made a Move to Lynch an Alderman.

Chicago, June 29.—A special from Denver tells us, which was established last scene in the Council Chamber of that city on Thursday night. For eight hours the aldermen sat in the Council Chamber in front of an indignant multitude of citizens who threatened them with lynching if they passed an ordinance submitted by the alderman, charged to be in the pay of the Union Water Company. The people demanded an independent water service or reduction they the prices exacted for the present service.

A force of 50 policemen in uniform and a score of city detectives were in the room and they were expected to interpose between the mob and the aldermen if it came to the worst. A rope was shown by the crowd and its use was called for when Ald. Emery changed his vote from the side of the taxpayers to that of the water company. There was a rush towards the rail, but one of the citizens' representatives succeeded in holding the crowd back from executing its vengeance on Emery.

Finally after a number of addresses had been made, urging peace and promising to hold further hearings, the mob dispersed and the Council was allowed to transact its routine business. Just before the meeting ended, however, the obnoxious resolution was passed.

**A BREAK FOR LIBERTY.**

**Ten Girls Run Away From the Evelyn Institute at Manistee.**

Manistee, Mich., June 28.—The Evelyn Institute, which was established for the care of girls without legal guardians, was the scene of a break for liberty by ten of the inmates on Wednesday. The girls range in age from 14 to 18 years. Two teachers were inveigled into separate rooms and locked in. The girls then escaped to the city, but seven have been captured. The other three, it is said, are of legal age, and cannot be locked in. The girls have been ill-treated, and that they are locked into rooms on a bread and water diet for trivial offences. One girl says she was given nothing to eat for three days except what she received surreptitiously from other inmates, because she would not ask pardon for a minor offence.

**SUNSET COX ENGAGED HIS COFFIN.**

**Curious Experiences of a New York Undertaker in Recent Times.**

"Oh, yes! I've had a few queer experiences," said a New York undertaker. "You've heard of the man who superintended the construction of the grave he expects to fill. Quite in the same line was my introduction to Sunset Cox."

"One day he came to my office, and, smiling gently, asked me what the cost of a first-class funeral would be. 'After I recovered from my astonishment I told him that about \$350 would cover all expenses, and for that sum a man could be very decently interred. He bowed and left the office.'

"One afternoon three weeks later I received a telephone message calling at his house. I did so, and was ushered to his room. He was lying in bed, very ill; but he managed to say to me: 'You see, I wasn't very much off in my calculations when I asked you about the cost of a funeral. Now, you'd better get your apparatus ready.'

"Two days later Cox died."

**NARROW ESCAPE FROM DEATH.**

Woodstock, Ont., June 28.—Last night a man named Harry Fletcher, proprietor of a shooting gallery, located here for a time, came nearly losing his life by an overdose of laudanum. He was suffering from toothache, and before retiring purchased an ounce of the drug, and, keeping the bottle near him, evidently applied its contents too frequently to his pain.

This morning when a party arrived from Ingersoll to help move the gallery to that town he could not secure admittance to the quarters, his house on wheels where Fletcher lived, guarded faithfully by his dog. Assistance was procured and his life saved.

**THE OTONABEE TRAGEDY.**

Yesterday a despatch was received at the Attorney-General's Department, Toronto, from Detective Murray, who is in Florida, that it was to the effect that, provided their children were brought with them, Thomas and Hesse Gray would return to Canada and stand their trial on the charge of murdering David Scullie at Otonabee. As the cost of bringing back the whole family would be considerably less than the extradition proceedings, the Deputy Attorney-General wired Murray to comply with the request. The party is expected to reach Peterborough on Tuesday next, where preliminary enquiry will at once proceed.

**PIETY AND DOOR BOLTS.**