

only about \$35 of balance due as returnable—and I losing every day in going about it to Court in Hull City. And on that Saturday, it being the closing day of the Court there. . . . hark! he announces that the case of "Macauley against Larmour is to be laid over till next term."

Three months from the time just referred to the District Magisterial Guillotinist of heresy held his revel Court of Justice again in Hull City, and there at last and with palpable reluctance enunciated judgement in my favor and against Larmour. Why did he not do that three months previously?

5. And here, my children and friends, you will curiously and naturaliy enough enquire what became of the amount of that judgement in my favour? In reply I would ask you to turn back to the paragraph of this letter marked 2. and there you will see again how and why the said District Magistrate's judgement was given against me at Wakefield (previously) and in favor of Brooks, and you will see that that judgement in Wakefield was the outcome of the Magistrate's sharp practice and shuffling. And I may here tell you that the judgement so obtained by Brooks had remained unpaid and unsettled against me. Well the amount of the judgement in my favor was, subsequently, commanded by the said District Magisterial guillotinish of heresy, to be handed over to satisfy that judgement for Brooks who had so unfairly obtained the judgement against me previously.

Pray lend your attention to the following summary of facts in this epistolary exposition:—

Previously to the Priestly visit, in February 1876, several mem employed at my expense, and by me, had made a quantity of building timber on government land for me. Antecedently thereto numerous other