Messenger & Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER, VOLUME LXIV.

Vol. XVIII.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, OCTOFER 1, 1902.

No. 40.

The Oueen of gium died suddenly at Spa on Belgium Dead. the night of September 19. The Queen had been in poor health for some three years and had suffered with heart disease, but an immediate fatal termination of her illness was not anticipated, and neither the King nor any member of the royal family nor the court physicians were with her when she died. The Queen was seated at table partaking of a light dinner when she was seized with heart fallure, and before the physician, who was immediately summoned, could arrive, she had passed away. Queen Marle Henriette second daughter of the late Archduke Joseph, Palatine of Hungary, and the Princess of Wurtemburg, was born Aug. 23, 1836. She was married to King Leopold II. of Belgium, then the Belgian Crown Prince, on Aug. 22, Leopold II. ascended the throne on the death of King Leopold I., in December, 1865. She leaves three children living. The eldest, Princess Louise, was married to Prince Philip of Saxe Coburg and Gotha. Princess Stephanie, the second daughter, was married to the late Archduke Rudolf of Austria, the Imperial Crown Prince. Princess Clementine, the third daughter, now in her twenty eighth year, is still unmarried. The deceased Queen had her full share of the sorrows of the Hapsburgs, the ill-fated house to which she belonged. Her hair is said to have been white while she was still in her thirties. The Oueen's only son, the Duke of Brabant, died suddenly under circumstances which suggested polsoning; her son-in-law was the Crown Prince Rudolph, who ended his life in a most tragic manner; her favorite nephew was killed in an accident, and her sister is in a lunatic asylum not far from the palace at Brussels. Queen Marie Henriette had not neglected the social and intellectual side of life, however. She was a clever horsewoman, a gifted composer of music, and as fond of her stud as she was of her camera and her plano.

The trial of Frank Higgins for the murder of William Doherty was concluded on Wednesday of

last week, before the Supreme court sitting in St. John, the jury finding a verdict of guilty with a recommendation to mercy on account of the prisoner's youth. The case is a remarkable one in many respects, and the trial has been followed with a more general and keener interest than any which has occurred in the city for many years. For the benefit of those who have not read the published reports of the trial, it may be well to recall here a few of the main facts in the history of the case... It was on Monday, August 5, that the body of William Doherty, a youth of 19 years of age was found in the vicinity of Rockwood Park. The evidence at the coroner's inquest went to show that death had occurred a few days before and as a result of pistol shots received in the back. Subsequent inquiry elicited the fact that Doherty had been seen on the previous Friday afternoon going into the Park in company with Higgins and another boy, and the fact that Higgins had denied being with Doherty that afternoon and had made other statements contrary to the ascertained facts, caused suspicion to rest upon him, and this suspicion was confirmed when he and a boy named Fred Goodspeed were found to have made an attempt to leave the country, purchasing tickets for Portland, Me., and travelling in that direction under assumed names. They were accordingly apprehended at Vanceboro' and brought back to St. John. Then followed a confession from Goodspeed, who is a boy of 14, in which he declared that Higgins, who is two years older, had deliberately killed Doherty and compelled him, Goodspeed, on threat of death, to assist in covering Doherty's body and to conceal the murder. Goodspeed also

Marie Henriette Queen of Bel- declared that Higgins had thrown the revolver with which he shot Doherty into the creek, below Marsh Bridge, and there, at a spot pointed out by Goodspeed, the revolver was found by the police. On the strength of this and other evidences Higgins was indicted by the Grand Jury for the murder of Doherty, and a bill was also found against Goodspeed on the charge of being an accessory after the fact. In the course of the trial Goodspeed was put on as a witness on the part of the Crown. His evidence coincided with the story he had previously told, and its force was not materially weakened by a rigid cross examination. Higgins also was put on the stand by the defence and made a statement in which he declared that Goodspeed was the slayer of Doherty. He admitted having been in the Park with the other two on Friday, August 1, and that he was near by when Doherty was killed, but declared that the shooting was the outcome of a quarrel which had arisen between Doherty and Goodspeed, the latter having previously borrowed Higgins' revolver for the purpose of shooting birds and squirrels. Higgins stated to the court that when the events connected with the killing of Doherty were fresh in his mind he had written out a minute account of what took place and he gave his evidence like a recitation, repeating it verbatim when questioned on any point, and sticking to it very firmly under rigid cross-examination. In view of the directly contradictory statements of the two boys and the consideration that the circumstantial evidence connecting Higgins with the murder as principal could hardly be regarded as fully decisive, it seemed rather improbable that the jury would be able to agree upon a verdict, and the announcement that, after two hours and half consideration, they had reached a decision, as mentioned above, was received with some surprise. However the verdict probably represents the general belief of the community as to the Higgins' connection with the ce But there is probably a pretty general feeling that Goodspeed's evidence, coherent and circumstantial as it was, did not embody all the facts of the case. It seems difficult to believe that, without any quarrel taking place between the boys and without any motive on the part of Higgins other than was indicated by Goodspeed's or any other evidence adduced, Higgins could have killed Doherty in the deliberate and cold-blooded manner described by Goodspeed. Judge Landry whose lucid summing up of the evidence was doubtless of great assistance to the jury, more than hinted at the possibility of a conspiracy in which other boys than Higgins and Goodspeed were involved. In view of the intimacy of certain gangs of boys with which the two were connected, and in view of the inability of some of these boys to recall on the witness stand facts which they would be most likely to remember, His Honor raised the question whether it were probable that only Higgins and Goodspeed knew of the murder even before the body was found. "After the finding of the body who was the centre of attraction of an admiring crowd of boys? Was it not Higgins? And yet the boys to whom he was talking swear that they don't remember whether the murder of Doherty was the subject of their conversation or not! To all appearance there was an organization as strong and perhaps more shrewd than the police." While therefore there would seem to be little doubt that Doherty was shot to death by Higgins, there are probably many persons who find it difficult to believe that his guilt is not shared by others. While there still surrounds this most lamentable affair much mystery which may never indeed be entirely cleared up, enough has been brought to light to show a very lamentable state of affairs in connection with a class of boys, which though it may not be large, has been exerting

a most pernicious influence, and has been a veritable plague spot and centre of moral corruption in the city. It is at least gratifying to observe that the facts which have been brought to light are making their legitimate appeal to the better sentiment of the community, and it is to be hoped that these deplorable revelations will lead to earnest enquiry and wholesome reform. It is understood that Mr. Mullin, the counsel for the defence, will move for a reservation of the case for a hearing in banco, and further action in the case has accordingly been postponed until Oct. 7, to enable Mr. Mullin to prepare his argument. As the decision of the judges in the Higgins case may have important bearing on the Goodspeed case, the hearing of the latter has been postponed until November

Two things continue to chal-Baffling Problems lenge the ambition, and as yet to baffle the powers of mankind. Man will never be happy, we suppose, until he shall have reached the Pole, and successfully navigated the air. The recent attempts at these achievements have not been crowned with success, and so far as the polar expeditions are concerned it cannot be said that they have done much of anything to encourage the hope of ultimate success. The attempt of Andreć to reach the Pole by balloon was probably the most spectacularly fool-hardy thing ever attempted in the interests of exploration. The attempt of Nansen and the more recent attempts of Peary and Swersdrup to achieve the ambition of polar explorers were more rational and have had a happier conclusion than that of the illfated balloonist, but they clusion than that of the liflated balloonist, but they all stopped a long way short of the Pole, and they appear to have accomplished little if anything, toward a solution of the vexing problem. In respect to aerial navigation some progress has indeed been made in the construction of a dirigible airship. The experiments of Sautos Dumout at Paris indicated a limited success, and if recent despatches from Loudon are to be credited the experiments of an aeronaut annext Sautos and in any instance of an aeronaut annext Sautos and in any instance of an aeronaut don are to be credited the experiments of an aeronaut named Spencer in navigating an airship of a somewhat different pattern from that of Santos Dumont have been quite as successful. It is said that Mr. Spencer made an air voyage of about 10 miles over London, during which he was able to direct his airship at will and afterwards to effect a safe descent. But the day of safe and successful aerial savigation has not yet dawned.

Deliverance of Metho-

The Methodist church in Canada has always manifested a lively dist Conference on interest in temperance and matters of moral reform. The

General Conference lately held at Winnipeg adopted a report recommending that a resolution be sent to the Minister of Militia, expressing appreciation of the regulations abolishing army canteens, and while regretting that for various reasons these regulations had not been enforced, the hope was expressed that with the advent of Lord Dundonald there would be a closer observance of the law governing army camps. The report reviewed the political status of prohibition in various Provinces and reaffirmed the Methodist principle of prohibition, urging that in all elections principle of prohibition, urging that in all elections effort should be made to secure representatives to introduce and support prohibition candidates. To this was added a clause, moved by Judge Chesley, referring to the prevalence of political corruption in the country. It called the attention of all Christian people to the subjects, recommended that the people give more attention to the subject of Christian citizenship, condemned venal and cowardly violation of duties, urged citizens to free their own political parties from suspicion with reference to the sanctity of the ballot, recommended that once a year a lesson on Christian citizenship be given in the Sunday Schools, that the Epworth League take action in of the ballot, recommended that once a year a lesson on Christian citizenship be given in the Sunday Schools, that the Epworth League take action in the same direction and that the educational authorities be asked to make provision that some part of Empire Day in the public schools be devoted to discussion of the sacredness of the ballot and the duties connected therewith.