

THE ORPHAN BOY.

News, Views and Interrogatories.

A letter was received yesterday by a firm here from a gentleman in an Ontario town, who is a shareholder in the Orphan Boy Gold Mining Co. He says that "the 'Orphan Boy' swindle" has done more to "knock the bottom" out of mining stocks than you can imagine. As a result, all stocks have petered out, and you cannot think of selling stocks. If the shareholders and brokers do not make some attempt to protect themselves, you might as well "pull in your shingle." The writer says that he and others will be prepared to subscribe to a fund to secure a thorough investigation of the matter, and to protect the interests of the shareholders.

[The foregoing is from a recent issue of a morning contemporary. That this SWINDLE has done much to injure the stock market, and indeed mining, is unfortunately but too true. Still, the prevalent and strongly expressed sentiment of condemnation of the acts of the conspirators all over the province necessarily results in our favor. No means are being spared to "knock the bottom" out of this scandalous piece of trickery; and let it be said to the honor of the press that no efforts have been spared to ventilate the facts surrounding the attempted transfer of this unfortunate mine. It is to be hoped that the "gentleman in an Ontario town," and others too, will exercise a little patience and watch some development work; we've only seen the outcroppings thus far.—Ed.]

The following article was dictated to our representative yesterday morning by William Templeton, Esq., mayor of Vancouver:

"In conversation with Mayor Templeton, he challenged any of the gentlemen who are connecting his name with the alleged Orphan Boy swindle to directly charge him with any malfeasance or crookedness in the transaction."

CORRESPONDENCE.

EDITOR BRITISH COLUMBIA MINING CRITIC

SIR,—Allow me a little space in your valuable journal to ask a few pertinent questions in reference to what is now generally termed the "Orphan Boy" swindle.

1. How can J. W. Haskins hold the Orphan Boy Gold Mining Co. liable for cash he claims to have advanced on September 7th, 1896, more than one month previous to the existence of the company, the letters of incorporation having been issued on October 16th, 1896?

2. What authority has J. W. Haskins for charging the sum of \$100 for two trips to Revelstoke and return, when he was in Vancouver on his own business,

and not that of the company?

3. If it costs but \$100 for two trips to Revelstoke and return for the president and manager, why is the accommodating secretary-treasurer, H. A. Brown, paid \$100 for one return trip? Has the increased remuneration anything to do with the secretary's silence about the judgment?

4. Why did the secretary open the books of the company on or about the 21st of April, 1897, and transfer Haskins' stock to Templeton, when he had notified shareholders in March that the books of the company were closed against them without assigning any reason?

5. Why did the secretary-treasurer and board of directors not compel the president and manager, J. W. Haskins, to desist from slaughtering his stock to the exclusion of treasury shares?

6. Why was J. W. Haskins' stock made out in blank and sold to the public as treasury stock? Surely the secretary, H. A. Brown, was aware of all this; and yet he took no action to protect those who were paying him his salary for that purpose.

7. Did H. A. Brown receive in cash the modest sum of \$772.73 claimed to have been paid him by the president and manager in his bill of particulars?

8. What has become of the surplus of \$3,200 stated to have been in the treasury on December 7th, 1896, after payment of all liabilities? Yet the president and manager claims, in his bill of particulars, that a considerable liability existed at that time.

Now, Mr. Editor, I submit that this iniquitous transaction calls for a most thorough investigation upon the part of the government, and those found guilty of wrecking this most promising company should be rigorously dealt with.

A VICTIM.

Vancouver, B. C. May 18th, 1897.

[The averments in this letter are, if true, most serious ones, and in our next issue we will report the result of our inquiries. Of course, all these matters "will come out in court;" but justice, while it comes down with heels of iron, travels with soles of lead.—Ed.]

BRITISH CAPITAL.

A wealthy English capitalist, in a recent letter to a correspondent in Toronto on the subject of investment of British money in Canadian mines, gives the following advice to owners of mining prospects who are trying to sell in the old country. He says:

"I could place three or four good properties here, if the owners would only be content to take shares instead of cash at present. I find every one wanting from \$1,000 to \$25,000 in cash for a mere prospect of forty acres. They are only spoiling their chances. How much better would it be, and how much more confidence one on this side would have in the venture if a man would say, 'I

don't want more than \$500 cash in a month, and one-fifth of the share capital of any company formed to work the property.' Take it that the capital was \$250,000, he would get \$50,000 in fully paid up shares, non-assessable; and if he agreed to pool them, I could readily sell them at 7s. 6d. or 10s. If the mine went on well during the sinking of a couple of shafts. The \$500 would pay him for his outlay on the property, including two or three good reports, assays, samples, plans, etc. Men won't put up capital here to develop prospects and pay over \$500 in cash for them. Their owners either must stand in and take the risks of the things turning out well, or keep their properties."

INTERVIEW.

British Pacific Gold Property Company.

On Tuesday last Mr. W. J. Dowler, secretary of the above named company, was a guest at one of our leading hotels. Upon being shown a letter which has received much publicity, bearing date April 22nd, 1897, and addressed to Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere, he was asked:

We notice that considerable publicity has been given your company by the action of Sir Henri Joly de Lotbiniere in a letter from you containing a proposition submitted to him on behalf of your company?

"So I perceive. Sir Henri has evidently undertaken to kill two birds with one stone, and no doubt he thinks he has succeeded. He has secured a little free advertising for the company, and not a little for himself, but the cooking is yet to be done, and the broth may not be to his liking."

Was the letter you sent him intended for publication?

"Certainly not; it was of a strictly private character—the envelope was, to the best of my recollection, marked "personal," to indicate that the letter was intended for him alone. At any rate, there was nothing in the letter which would authorize or warrant its publication."

What does your company think of Sir Henri's course in this matter?

"I cannot presume to speak for the company without instructions."

Well, perhaps you have no objections to giving your own impressions in regard to it?

"As for myself, I have no hesitation in saying that the action taken by Sir Henri in this instance is without a parallel in the history of the mining industry of this country. I have been a reader of the *Montreal Witness* for many years and have always respected it for its independent course and its championship of what it believed to be right in the public interest. I can neither add to its reputation nor detract from it if I would. But neither the *Witness* nor Sir Henri is