

seem near. The travellers one meets or passes are exceedingly varied. The ox-cart, whose piercing and prolonged squeaking takes the place here of the locomotive's shriek at home, is everywhere. Caravans of camels coming heavily laden from Persia, or going back from the coast, are seen every day, and the hundreds of bells they carry of all sizes and tones, make music that is not unpleasant. Then there are the fourgoons, great lumbering wagons, drawn by four horses harnessed abreast; caravans of horses and donkeys, with drivers of every description; Turks, Armenians, Persians, Kurds, Circassians, with here and there a Frank—such were some of the people we met. We travelled partly in the old missionary wagons which had been patched up to make one trip more, and partly on horseback. We carried our own provisions with us, also our beds and insect powder. At night and Sunday we stopped in the khans, which are the hotels in this country. The rooms are unfurnished, not clean, and usually thickly populated; but the fresh air and travel makes one hungry and sleepy too, so that the minor discomforts of the way are easily overlooked. The opinion of our party, which consisted of five others besides the Erzroom contingent of three, was, that so far as our experience went, travelling in the interior of Turkey is a continuous picnic. We took ten days to make the journey.

Of this city and the missionary work here and in our out-stations, I shall hope to write at some later date; meantime we are studying Armenian, becoming informed generally in regard to the field of our future labors. I have preached twice through an interpreter. The mission premises are quite commodious and home-like; yet one's mind often turns to the home-land and the dear friends there. May God's richest blessing rest on the work of all our churches.

Very truly yours,

F. MACALLUM.

Erzroom, Nov. 22, 1890.

LAWYERS IN COURT.

My Dear Sir,—I have taken great pleasure (since I became a subscriber), in reading the INDEPENDENT, and much appreciate your bright and

pithy editorials. In the last issue, however, I find a criticism which I think calls for remark. In referring to a certain debate about to take place on the question, "Should a lawyer undertake the defence of a criminal, whom he knows or believes to be guilty?" you say, "It is time that question was decided in the negative. What would be thought of a minister who should go round lecturing for what he knows to be wrong! Truth goes on great circles, and a principle that is good for one man is good for another. Speak the truth."

Before you have read this far no doubt you will have said, "a lawyer hath done this."

But let us look at the question a moment. First of all we must recognize the distinction between the crime and the criminal. We may have a great sympathy and love for the criminal and hate his crime; we may (I think) defend the criminal, and say not one word in defence of the crime.

Every crime to a greater or less extent depends on the *intent* of the culprit, and particularly the degree of culpability to be attached to him.

Again, every crime carries with it punishment, and with almost no exception, the judge, who passes sentence, has a discretion, within certain limits, in imposing the penalty.

This discretion is not to be exercised at the mere caprice of the judge, but should be based on the facts and circumstances connected with the case, and I am sure you would say that the criminal should have the benefit of every extenuating fact and circumstance.

This being so, please tell me why a man, even though he has broken the law, should not have the assistance of a man, "learned in the law" to aid him in presenting to the court and jury such facts as might make justice take a more lenient view of his case than if he simply pled, "I am guilty." Also please tell me why it should be necessary, or be even presumed to be necessary, that a lawyer need, in doing his whole duty to such a man, say one word not true?

From my experience and observation, I have come to the conclusion that no person accused of a crime, of which the punishment is serious, should be condemned, without the accused having the opportunity, assisted by a lawyer, to place before the court every fact and circumstance that might tell in his favor. I have known of cases where un-