

Of course, this is business, and the man who dares to raise his voice against this mode of competition, would probably be considered more fit for the asylum, than to conduct an honorable and a respectable commercial institution.

Efforts were made by defendants' counsel to establish that Chisholm possessed a wonderful influence over those with whom he had dealings, and especially the defendants.

It cannot be positively stated that Chisholm did not possess a considerable influence. Yet any statement that he did possess such an influence, being made for the purpose of mitigating or disproving the guilt of any person, implicated with him, must be taken *um grano salis*. Besides, let it not be forgotten that, through Chisholm's being a fugitive from justice, he is not here to defend himself, and that he cannot be convicted until he has had a fair trial and been found guilty.

That he was a strong man, a man of character, of determination and business ability, is undoubted; and that those, who had dealings with him, knew this, is also an indisputed fact. But to infer that he controlled those who may be guilty of the frauds in this case, is stretching the ends of truth to the point of tearing.

Still, Chisholm the financier, the man of mighty influence, the fugitive from justice — call him what you will—is one of the most interesting figures thrust into notoriety within the last few years.

He was apparently an inoffensive man, unostentatious in his demeanour, moderate in his views, retiring in his nature, and, far from discouraging confidence, he seemed to possess the faculty of engendering trust.

And yet, this man, if the alleged facts be true, was able to blind the directors and the managers of a bank, and obtain from them sums of money, the loss of