

COMMUNICATIONS.

Mr. Editor,—In Q.C.J. of Dec. 10th, 1890, the first article that attracted my attention was the reference to an anonymous letter attacking our honoured Principal. Such an attack may be a laughing matter to us who know the facts of the case, but to those whose opinions are formed from hearsay and the daily newspapers, the consequences are more serious than some may suppose.

I am not surprised to see such misrepresentations and fabrications in the public press which must cater to all tastes, and could dismiss the "ministers" wrath and indignation with a smile, but on reaching that "communication" in the columns of Q.C.J. I must confess some amazement.

Now, sir, in other matters, it does not seem right that letters without signatures should be published, but when attacks are made on a person's character, it appears to me that a letter which its writer is afraid or ashamed to own, does not merit publication. What is the object of a communication to the press? Is it not to call general attention to some important matter which has escaped notice? Surely every student recognizes an old acquaintance in the substance of that attack on me, for it is nothing less. I had not thought a student would stoop so low, nor would I even now trouble to reply to one adopting methods universally considered so mean and dishonorable but for the fact that in the interest of truth it is forced on me to point out a few inaccuracies which will be sufficient to show the spirit in which the letter was written.

If ever care is necessary, it is when one is tempted to impute motives and to assail the character of another, and the testimony of a person disregarding this must be considered worthless.

The nameless champion of justice will hardly note that there might possibly be a difference between assertion and truth. I shall show, where he departs from high-sounding generalizations and condescends to particulars, how much he depends on mere assertions.

In the first place, the "address" to the jury was delivered directly from evidence taken during the trial.

Again, the "address" to the prisoner was "prepared" as it was delivered, about 7 p.m., on the 26th November, 1890. No doubt the person was deceived by my "eloquence." The verdict was prepared by the jury, by whom also was the question of validity of evidence decided.

The statement that the fine was the largest ever inflicted, is simply an untruth. And even if fifty cents were greater than any other fine, and even if only one charge were proven, those conditions would have no bearing on the question of justice.

As to "sitting on counsel"—whatever that means—I may say that Mr. Lavell, Junior Counsel for defence, on the 27th Nov., voluntarily acknowledged that they had no evidence, and relied only on attacking the character of witness for prosecution, thus showing, beyond call, that it was, in justice, a matter not of choice but of necessity that the questions proposed by the defence were not allowed, although, as I pointed out at the time, more latitude was allowed than could have been claimed

as a right—so much for the points mentioned in the letter. In conclusion, sir, let me say that I have no desire to engage in a controversy on the subject, nor do I acknowledge the right of any individual to question my conduct as judge.

Should the gentleman who was summoned wish to decide the matter, he will find me willing, not to indulge in abuse or mere words, but to refer it to the Principal, to whom alone any account is due—which has been my intention from the first.

Thanking you for your space, and trusting that your contributors will henceforth have the courage of their convictions.(?) I am yours respectfully,

E. J. E., Ch. Justice.

[Our correspondent of Dec. 10th, we believed, was not prompted by any desire to detract from the private character of any one but to point out what he considered to be want of fair play on the part of a public body, and since he claimed to voice the sentiments of a number of students we consented to publish his communication, which has called forth this reply. With all fairness to both sides, we can say that we are glad this matter has been made public, as it gives an opportunity to those who thought with our first correspondent to see how the case looks from the other side. We will publish no further correspondence on this subject.—Ed.]

PIOUS FRAUDS OR HOW FAR SHOULD THE PULPIT GO?

To the Editor of the JOURNAL.

Sir,—I quote the following extract from the *Globe's* report of one of Sir Richard Cartwright's incisive speeches:

"A thousand pulpits more or less have held up John Charles Rykert as an awful example.

"How many of these pious frauds have pointed out to hearers that Mr. Rykert is the natural outcome and very latest evolution of John A. Macdonald's system."

We are so grateful to Sir Richard for the part that he took in securing the condemnation of Rykert that we would like to back him up in further work of the kind. In order to do so efficiently, I for one wish to be sure of my ground. Would you, therefore, answer the following questions:

1. Is the system that produces Rykerts the product of one man, or is it the party system carried to its full development?

2. Are there any men of the Rykert type on the other side, in any of the provinces, and have any of their leaders ever denounced them by name?

3. When a man has been *proved* guilty, is he not in a different position to the public from men who are merely accused by political opponents?

4. When a minister cites Birchall as an awful example of sin, is he a "pious fraud" because he does not also point out that the poor wretch was the very latest evolution of his education or something else?

5. Is it the duty of a public man who aims at enlisting the public conscience on his side to denounce as pious frauds all who go with him as far as he proves his case in a court open to him but not to them?