

time had only held one session and had then adjourned for further evidence, was sure to connect Allison with the murder.

The British rule that no person accused of a criminal offence shall be compelled to convict himself had its origin doubtless in a proper sense of fair play. In the United States, while the rule still holds good in the letter, it is often grossly outraged in the spirit; all sorts of expedients being adopted by detectives to worm confessions from accused persons, and then the detectives' evidence is accepted at the trial. Our judges have so often and so strongly expressed their disapprobation of American methods in this respect, that the wonder is that a veteran Canadian officer should have lent himself to them. The effect of the trial and conviction of Allison by the detective and the newspapers may, however, as has happened in previous cases of a similar character, have an opposite effect from that intended. Anything like coercion of a prisoner by officials creates prejudice against the officer and sympathy for the prisoner. In the present case, the prisoner being a mere boy, and, it seems, a stupid one at that, it can readily be imagined what use a clever counsel will make at the trial of the treatment his client has received at the hands of a Crown officer and the newspapers.

It is as undesirable that a prisoner should be convicted on the strength of impressions formed by opinions of detectives and irresponsible and frequently very ignorant reporters, as that he should go unpunished, to mark the disgust of the jury at such unfair and un-British treatment. It is possible for the Government to prevent objectionable action on the part of its officers, but where shall we find anyone who can restrain newspaper reporters, who, in their anxiety to produce interesting "copy," recklessly create impressions which should only be formed after hearing legal evidence given at a judicial hearing?