

(Editorial concluded from Page 4.)

THE POLITICAL CRISIS.

(From Tuesday's Daily.) The political crisis at Victoria continues, and it has assumed unreasonable and unnecessary proportions. The lieutenant-governor evidently desires to be a Cromwell, in that he ignores the existence and the powers of the legislature, and Mr. Beaven seems to entertain somewhat similar views, seeing that he is willing to establish a Beaven cabinet. There is a regularly elected legislature, and to that body and that alone should the matter be left. Granting that His Honor, the lieutenant-governor, has the constitutional right to call upon Mr. Beaven to form a government, the gravity of the situation is not of a nature in this instance sufficient to necessitate his independent action. It is not for His Excellency to say what is the numerical strength of the Government or the Opposition on an occasion like this, and it is entirely unnecessary for Mr. Beaven to dwell upon the advisability of forming a cabinet of men who are at present qualified to sit in the legislative assembly. If the lieutenant-governor must satisfy his impatience as to the complexion of the House, let him call an extraordinary session of that body. The free and independent electors of this Province may be expected to infinitely prefer that their representatives in parliament, rather than the lieutenant-governor, shall say whether or no the Turner administration shall continue. If it is shown by the representatives of the people in the legislature that the country has lost confidence in Mr. Turner it is time enough for His Excellency to invite some one else to accept the responsibility of forming a new government, and, in the event that he should do so, it is quite unnecessary that he should appeal to anyone who is not a member of the legislature. THE MINER is not prepared to say that Mr. Beaven will fall in forming a cabinet, but it ventures the prediction that if he undertakes to compose one of men who are not already entitled to sit in the legislative assembly that he will have a hard time finding constituencies for them.

STOCK BROKERAGE.

A letter has been received in this city from a prominent citizen of Toronto, who, while not a stock broker, keeps in close touch with the Rossland share market. His opinions are worthy of consideration because of his high standing. The complaint which he makes is against the stockbrokers of this city, and his grievance is that they are prone to give replies and orders for shares in mining companies that are "not firm." For instance, often when there is a flurry in the market a Toronto broker will send an order here for 1,000 or 10,000 shares of a certain stock. Perhaps a telegram will be sent in reply quoting a certain price, and this may be followed a few moments later by another message giving a higher price. Perhaps immediately on the receipt of the first telegram the customer who wishes to purchase the stock has been informed that it has been or can be purchased for a certain price, and when the second telegram comes the firm is compelled to go to their client again and inform him of the change in the price, and, perhaps lose a sale.

The same trouble is often experienced in making sales in Toronto from this city. The Toronto critic thinks, and very rightly too, that one price should prevail in any one transaction and that agreements should be stuck to and the same rules and conditions which prevail in other business transactions should obtain in stock transactions. He holds that the methods, if persisted in, will injure Rossland as a stock trading center. The points raised by the Toronto man are well taken, but the local stock brokers have the same complaint to make of their Toronto brethren. Two wrongs do not make a right, however, and if the practices complained of prevail to such an extent as to constitute a grievance of magnitude the brokers who are guilty of it should stop it. It is manifestly to their interest that the brokers of Toronto should have the fullest confidence in those of Rossland. Once this confidence is lost the brokers of the eastern cities will only send orders here as a last resort, and then only when they have exhausted every other location in which shares can be purchased. The lack of confidence would in time practically ruin the market here.

On the other hand, if there is fair dealing and a disposition to stick to bargains and a lack of all sharp practices, if the same methods are followed that obtain among other business men, between the brokers of Toronto and other cities of Eastern Canada and their Rossland brethren, an enormous business will be built up. It is certain from the volume of the stock transactions at present that within the next few years the people of Eastern Canada will invest several million dollars in the shares of this camp and vicinity. In order to secure this there must be fair dealing and a disposition shown not to make all the profits that there are in transactions. There must be a give and take disposition shown that will inspire confidence. A broker's word should be as good as his bond. If this course is pursued there will be many fortunes built up in the brokerage business here, for the era of

speculation in shares is only in its infancy and is surely destined to expand to large proportions.

THE PROHIBITION PLEBISCITE.

An Ottawa dispatch gives some particulars about the prohibition plebiscite to be taken on September 29th. The form of the ballot paper and of the question to be submitted is as follows:

Are you in favor of the passing of an act prohibiting the importation, manufacture or sale of spirits, wine, ale, beer, cider and all other alcoholic liquors for sale as beverages? Yes. No.

The persons entitled to vote shall be those who have the right of the provincial franchise or those who under the Dominion franchise act passed last session would have the right to vote in a federal election. For the purposes of this vote the same proceedings, as nearly as may be, will be had as in the case of a general Dominion election. The ballot papers will be printed at Ottawa, and will be forwarded with the writ by Major Chapleau, the clerk of the crown in chancery, to returning officers. Every returning officer will appoint two agents to attend to each polling station on behalf of those desiring an affirmative answer to the question, and two on behalf of those desiring a negative answer. These agents will not be entitled to remuneration from the public treasury. In the absence of such agent two electors representing each interest will be admitted to the booth to watch the final summing up of the votes.

Pay Chute on Friday Claim.

Robert Bond, who is interested in the Friday group, on the north fork of Sheep creek, about seven miles north of the Velvet, came in from the property yesterday, bringing with him 150 pounds of ore with which he will make some mill tests. The rock is a very handsome quartz carrying plenty of copper, and Mr. Bond thinks that in it he has a second Silver King. A force of men is now working the claim, and has driven two tunnels, one of which is in 30 feet and the other 25 feet. The ledge has been tapped and, so Mr. Bond says, the pay chute is five feet wide all in clean ore. Already the miners have taken out about 20 tons of sorted rock, which is ready for shipment, and the aim of Mr. Bond in coming in this time was to get an average test out of the rock. He says that enough ore is being steadily taken out now to make small regular shipments possible.

THE CRISIS AT VICTORIA.

(From Friday's Daily.)

There is not much cause for surprise in the announcement that Hon. Robert Beaven has abandoned the task of forming a government. After his public statement on Thursday last it was almost a foregone conclusion that he could not obtain the necessary support.

While Hon. Mr. Beaven has failed to accomplish that which he started out to perform, he has, nevertheless, done something to clear the political atmosphere and reveal the true status of the several political factions. The interview with Mr. Beaven, published in Friday's issue, shows that perfect harmony does not prevail within the ranks of the Opposition. He declares that of the 19 members who are outspoken opponents of the Turner administration, nine acknowledge Joseph Martin as their leader, eight are attached to C. A. Semlin, and two have not defined their allegiance to either Mr. Martin or Mr. Semlin, but are credited with a preference for the latter. Mr. Beaven also assures us that Joseph Martin does not deny the report that he will resign his seat if Mr. Semlin is chosen as leader of the Opposition. It, therefore, would seem that the two most prominent Oppositionists cannot act together in harmony, if Mr. Semlin refuses to give way to the aspirations of the Vancouver politician. This morning's dispatches show that Mr. Semlin has accepted the invitation of the lieutenant-governor to form a government. This indicates that Mr. Semlin is inclined to disregard Mr. Martin's threat to resign his seat.

At no time since the crisis arose have there been such good reasons to expect a coalition as at present. As Mr. Semlin has accepted the commission to head an administration he may be expected to conscientiously exert himself in this matter. The main question in this connection is: Will he confine himself to selecting ministers solely from the Opposition ranks or seek to add to his Opposition following by a coalition with the Turner party? If he follows the former course, but fails to patch up a truce with Joseph Martin, he has everything to lose and nothing to gain from the election; on the other hand, if by a coalition he can swing in his support the 16 Turnerites he can safely count on a good working majority in the legislature and at once terminate the crisis.

It remains to be seen whether Mr. Semlin thinks more of his party than his country; whether he is more of a politician than a statesman; whether he would rather administer the affairs of British Columbia with the co-operation of J. H. Turner or Joseph Martin.

TREACHERY OF TRUSTED EMPLOYEES.

The surety companies, where an employer insists upon it, protects him against the dishonesty of employes, so far as money is concerned. There is another sphere of usefulness which the

surety companies might occupy and in which they might prevent a loss that is even greater than the mere amount of cash which an employe might embezzle from the man whom he betrays. It is often the case that a trusted employe after he leaves the employment of one man goes into the services of a rival in business and makes capital out of the secrets of the first, which have been given to him under the seal of confidence. Surety companies that would protect employers against breaches of this sort of confidence are needed just as much as those which are in business for the purpose of protecting them against embezzlement and any other forms of dishonesty. Legislation, which would protect an employer against this form of not only dishonesty, but dishonor, should be placed on the statute books. It is often the case that a treacherous ex-employe can inflict almost incalculable harm to the individual who gave him work by going to his rival in business and showing him the weak point in his competitor's affairs. There is more meanness, treachery and despicableness in this form of betrayal than almost any other that can be conceived. The spy, who is summarily shot during time of war, is an honorable gentleman compared with the man who so basely trades on his former employer's secrets. The secrets that were imparted to him were given in confidence by the man who was considerate enough to furnish him with occupation and a living, and they should be guarded as sacredly as though they had been given in a Masonic lodge. There is just as much infamy involved in the revealing of the one as the other, although in one case an obligation is taken and in the other it is implied, and a man is placed upon his personal honor to not tell them to the disadvantage of the individual who gave them in confidence, because he believed he could trust the man to whom they were told.

The Western Mining World in a recent issue tells of a case in point. It is as follows: The Western Mining World has often expressed its regret that extensive mining operations in this city (Butte), having in mind the general welfare of all concerned and the future of this magnificent mineral field. This periodical has refrained from any attempt to determine questions of importance in controversial cases, which duty lies in the broader opportunities of the court to arrive at truth. But the suit which F. Aug. Heinze has brought against C. S. Batterman involves a question of equity of far-reaching importance not only to mine owners, but to employers generally, and the decision of the court will be awaited with interest. No man whose business secrets are entrusted to confidential men, in the nature of things, can look upon this suit with indifference. It appears that Batterman, while in the employ of Mr. Heinze, made maps and notes of the underground workings of the Rarus mine, which he did not surrender when he entered the employ of a rival company. As chief engineer for Mr. Heinze, Mr. Batterman enjoyed an opportunity to secure information of great value to others should he see fit to impart it. Pending litigation with interests with which Mr. Batterman is now associated makes his possession of the maps and notes of the Rarus a menace to Mr. Heinze. The latter brings suit to recover possession of the papers. Without discussing the personal relations of the parties to the suit, which have nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits of Mr. Batterman's services while in his employ, whether those services consisted of drilling holes and blasting rock or in making maps and drawings of the mine. It is, therefore, not surprising that Mr. Heinze has nothing to do with the principle involved, the right to inquire into the business limitations of a confidential employe becomes a pertinent one. It would seem perfectly clear from an equitable standpoint that Mr. Heinze is entitled to the fruits