The Weekly Mail.

TORONTO, FRIDAY, JULY 14, 1876.

MR. JUSTICE WILSON AND THE BIG PUSH LETTER.

THE deep affection in which the Bench of this country is held by the people, the purity of its course and its unquestionable uprightness and high sense of honour—this is its best protection against the slanderous violence of demagogues or disappointed suitors. It is not for us, therefore, to rise in special defence of the learned Judge so wantonly attacked in Saturday's *Globe*. His character like that of his fellows, stands too high to need defence, even if the character of his assailant for impetuous blackguardism of a low order were not fully established. But it will not be out of place here to point out the base grounds on which a leading journal has directly charged a high and honoured officer of State with abuse of his privileges and position.

In SIMPSON V. WILKINSON, Mr. Justice WILSON was called upon to pronounce an opinion on the Big Push letter. The letter was fyled in rejoinder by the defendant to establish the charge of "political intriguing" for which the plaintiff had asked the Court for a rule for a criminal information. With it, further to establish the same charge, was fyled a circular purporting to have been addressed by Mr. SIMPSON to the shareholders of the Ontario Bank. The letter and circular, in fact, constituted WILKINSON's case against SIMPSON on the "political intriguing" charge. In answer to these documents, SIMPSON fyled an affidavit denying the charge generally, as before, but making no defence of, nor denying, nor in any way referring to the letter or circular by name, in substance, or otherwise. He swore all round the charge, but carefully refrained from attacking, impugning, denying, extenuating, defending, or referring to the documents the defendant had set out in justification. Under these circumstances the Court unanimously refused the rule on this charge, and Mr. Justice WILSON, in giving his reasons for its refusal, which were necessarily founded on a comparison of the very loose nature of SIMPSON's denial with the terrible contents of the letter and circular which had gone undenied by the plaintiff. His Lordship had to consider whether the two documents, wilfully ignored in SIMPSON's denial, justified the charge of "political intriguing" as alleged by the defendant, and in so doing it became absolutely necessary for him to remark on both.

Here is the letter:

"*Private and Confidential.*]

"TORONTO, 15th August, 1872.

"MY DEAR SIR,—The fight goes bravely on, but it is hard to work up against the enormous sums the Government candidates have in their hands. We here have expended our strength in aiding the out counties and helping our candidates, but a big push has to be made on Saturday and Monday for the East and West Divisions, if we are to succumb to the cash of the Government. We could carry all three divisions easily but for the cash against us and if we carry the first on Saturday the other two will go with us in spite of all the cash they can pour in. We therefore make our grand stand on Saturday. There are but half a dozen people that can come down handsomely, and we have all done what we possibly can do, and we have to ask a very few outside for big sums. The money I have been urged to write to you, and comply accordingly.

"Yours faithfully yours,

"GEO. BROWN.

"Hon. John Simpson.

"N. B., &c."

And these are Mr. Justice WILSON's remarks upon it:

"It is, of course, a plain demand for money to oppose, it is said, the expenditure by the Government candidates at the Toronto elections, and the assertion is made, by writer and those co-operating with him had expended their strength, which I suppose means the strength of their resources for the like purpose. It is a letter written for corrupt purposes to interfere with the freedom of elections. It is an invitation to the recipient, as one with some others and to write to your Conservative friends, to offence of bribery and corruption at the polls."

No one save the parties damnified by his Lordship's opinion, would venture to assert that it is overdrawn, unnatural or unjust. It is a fair construction and a plain annivitation to bribery and corruption as ever was penned. "Come along JOHN, "come along and let us put down bribery and corruption, *we lead of success*" which was subjected to more severe condemnation by Chief Justice HAGARTY in the Louisiana case, was not nearly so explicit as this.

It is not given us to appeal to our readers in defence of one of our judges for that would be to impeach the people's trust in the Bench is not at all times wholesome, but we would ask Mr. BROWN himself, now clothed and in his right mind, we hope, after forty-eight hours' consideration of SIMPSON's letter, if he does not think that the application of such terms as "slanderer," "villifier," "traducer," "libeller," "blackguard," "liar," "cur," &c., to Mr. Justice WILSON is not an act to be atoned for by him as publicly as it was committed. His own sin, not the learned Judge, has found him out.

CONFIRMATION AND PROOF.

EVER since this journal first came before the public it has at frequent intervals pointed out that the peculiar condition of our trade relations with the United States, developed during the late civil war and continuing for some time after its close, was exceptional, abnormal, and merely temporary, and that when it had run its course Canada would experience a sudden and startling change. We endeavoured to show that the proper and some day inevitable operation of comparative Free Trade on this side of the border, concurrently with high Protection on the other side, was merely for a time masked by certain exceptional conditions, with the disappearance of which there would follow also the disappearance of those temporary advantages that, while they lasted, sufficed to compensate for our lack of protective legislation. When Free Traders here made it an argument in favour of their theory that we were better off with our fifteen per cent. tariff than our neighbours were with their average of fifty, we replied that war prices and the abnormal condition of affairs in the States were as good to us, as far as American competition was concerned, as fifty per cent. on our staples would. It will not be disputed, we think, that this journal was not merely the first in this or any other country to draw public attention to the view of Canadian and American trade relations above stated, but was besides until very lately the *only* one in which that view was maintained. So far the reference is to competition between Canada and the United States in manufactures only, but recently we saw reason for going a step further, and warning the farmers of the Dominion that the crushing disadvantages under which our manufacturers have been labouring these two or three years past were about to fall on them as well, and that this time was at hand when the fully of one-sided Free Trade would be made as manifest with regard to the farm as with regard to the factory. Of course this view of the matter was laughed at by such prophets and apostles of Free Trade as Messrs. DYONG, MILLS, YOUNG, SEXTON, RYMAL, CLIVER, and others of that school. The Party organs as the Toronto *Globe*, the London *Advertiser*, the Clinton *New Era*, and more of the same sort. Now let a circle from the columns of the *Globe* proof that we were right and our Grit contemporaries wrong. Yesterday our contemporary published a letter from Mr. A. T. FRANKLAND, relative to the selection and shipment of Canadian cattle for the English market, in the course of which the writer says: "My object in addressing "you, and through the *Globe* the farmers "of Ontario, is to *call attention to the fact* "*that our trade with the United States is* "*now at an end. It was called into ex-* "*istence by the exigencies of debt and* "*conflict*; the trade with the Mother "Country will continue for generations." This is from a man who may be presumed to know something about the cattle trade, and the relations between the American and the Canadian markets. But that has the Toronto Grit organ constantly maintained, and what has been as constantly reiterated by the Grit representatives of South Wentworth, Brantwell, South Waterloo, North Oxford, South Wellington, and the rest of the Free Trade *clique* who in Parliament bark as their leader "gives tongue?" Why, that Canadian farmers wanted no Protection, and that it would prove no good if they had it. We dare inform these gentry, who so lately as last session had nothing but twaddle for the Farmer and his Agricultural Interests Committee, and who for many sessions have done what they could to thwart and defeat every movement looking towards Protection for the farmer, that the day is near at hand when they will be called to account for their treason to the great interest they were elected specially to represent. It will be seen, ere long, whether they were right in saying that the farmers of Canada wanted no Protection, but were quite satisfied that American grain should come in here free, and American cattle at ten per cent., while twenty per cent. toll is levied on all our grain and cattle seeking a market over the border. Meantime let our Toronto contemporary ponder well the proof which its own columns afford of the fact that for the agricultural interest, as well as the manufacturing, one-sided Free Trade does not stand the test of experience.

LET ONE DO FOR ALL.

To have to take note of all the stupidities that the Grit press is guilty of in its references to the present depression is tiresome. Let one do for an example, for the present, at least, though without doubt the old humbug will keep "bobbing up" so persistently that only persistent knocking-down will suffice. Eternal vigilance is the price that must be paid to keep down nonsense. The Kingston *British Whig* says:

"The Opposition organs, led by *The Mail*, continue to close the public with free trade cookery, regardless of sense or decency. While commenting Mr. Mackenzie was a member of the Cobden Club and his Cabinet pledged to anti-protection theories, they omit to explain how it is that the tariff has been raised 2½ per cent. under the present Government. The fact is we have more protection now than at any previous time, and cannot perceive the obvious deductions to be drawn from the facts stated by itself. Many Reformers were lukewarm; they lacked earnestness; they did not co-operate heartily. In the "Reform township of Cavendish" there was a great falling off in the Grit vote, and a great increase in the Conservative vote. Exactly! These are the facts as stated by the organ. But what do they mean? Crystalized into a word, they mean dissatisfaction with the Government. Elaborated a little, we give the answer in the language of that good old Grit paper, the Newmarket *Era*, as quoted in *The Mail* of Saturday:

"What has produced this change in the public mind (for that a change has been produced is obvious) is more open to difference of opinion, and may well excite anxious enquiry.

"In our opinion it is to be attributed first to a growing dissatisfaction, springing from a widely extended disappointment on the part of the public in the evident failure—the entire omission—on the part of the present Government, to redeem its pledges, to perform its promises to inaugurate the economy, retrenchment and rigid adherence to constitutional rule, that the Government promised so profusely promised when in opposition and so fiercely denounced the previous Government with the wind, and washes disregard of. Secondly to a wide-spread and growing conviction on the part of the people of Canada that the course of the Government on the question of protection to Canadian industries is both unwise and unpatriotic. That this question of protection, and encouragement to a well devised system of varied industries, is assuming large proportions and deeply engaging the attention of the Canadian public mind at the present time, as never before, is too obvious to be questioned, and our rulers will do well to heed it."

We commend this extract to our befogged contemporary.

IF NOT BRIBERY, WHAT?

But this Mr. Justice WILSON may rest assured of: that flanders and insults shall not go unanswered, and if the dignity of the Bench is ruffled in the tussle, on his fully shall rest the blame. We cast back on Mr. Wilson his insolent and slanderous interpretation. The letter was not written for corrupt purposes—it was not written to interfere with the freedom of elections—it was not an invitation to anybody to concur in committing bribery and corruption at the polls—and he judged from what he saw the statement is false.—*Globe of Saturday.*

MARK the veteran corruptionist. Exposed under his own hand and seal, and condemned by his own vigorous English and his facile shame-faced Scotch pleas, bolstered by his appeal for bribery money, Mr. BROWN turns against the damnatory evidence with a front of brass and challenges the fair meaning of his own words. "Not "written for corrupt purposes: Not "written to interfere with the freedom of "elections; not an invitation to any-"body to concur in committing bribery "and corruption at the polls." Then what is it, and what was it written for? Let the reader look at the letter in another column. If the English language can express one's thoughts, if the language is a writer's object, then that letter is an invitation on Mr. BROWN's part to Mr. SIMPSON to bribery, that the Bench has been corrupted, and that it was the outcome of his corruption. Exactly! These are the facts as stated by the organ. But what do they mean? Crystalized into a word, they mean dissatisfaction with the Government. Elaborated a little, we give the answer in the language of that good old Grit paper, the Newmarket *Era*, as quoted in *The Mail* of Saturday:

"What has produced this change in the public mind (for that a change has been produced is obvious) is more open to difference of opinion, and may well excite anxious enquiry.

"In our opinion it is to be attributed first to a growing dissatisfaction, springing from a widely extended disappointment on the part of the public in the evident failure—the entire omission—on the part of the present Government, to redeem its pledges, to perform its promises to inaugurate the economy, retrenchment and rigid adherence to constitutional rule, that the Government promised so profusely promised when in opposition and so fiercely denounced the previous Government with the wind, and washes disregard of. Secondly to a wide-spread and growing conviction on the part of the people of Canada that the course of the Government on the question of protection to Canadian industries is both unwise and unpatriotic. That this question of protection, and encouragement to a well devised system of varied industries, is assuming large proportions and deeply engaging the attention of the Canadian public mind at the present time, as never before, is too obvious to be questioned, and our rulers will do well to heed it."

THE FAILURE OF RUSSIAN CREDIT.

THE London *World* devotes some attention to a certain aspect of the Eastern question which may have an important bearing on the contingency of peace or war. If Russia makes war on a large scale, it requires to borrow money, and it does not appear that her credit is of the best, or that she would find the millions required very easy to be obtained. The amount borrowed by Russia of late years is very large, mostly for railway purposes, and the railways are not paying concerns. For the luxury of having railways, Russia must pay from other sources, as her lines are far from being self-sustaining. In respect of their strategic over "magnificent distances" they are like the leading American lines, but they lack the immense compensation of enormous traffic and flying squarely and compactly together. But a railway stretching from the Neva in the north to the Black Sea in the South is simply impassable, as a paying enterprise, at all events with a Russian population.

Russia has an external debt, due to foreign lenders, of some eighty millions sterling, an internal debt of nearly twenty millions, and has besides eighty millions of irredeemable paper afloat and in forced circulation. For payment of interest she has to provide every year nearly nine millions sterling, which has to be sent out of the country in gold. Asking the question how she can get this money, our London contemporary affirms that she gets it simply by continually borrowing fresh sums from confiding foreigners, who will some day find that when they cease to lend her more money she will cease to pay interest. So recently as 1875 she borrowed a fresh fifteen millions sterling in London, and that was her last chance. It seems "we here have expended our strength, and because "a big push has to be "made on Saturday and Monday for "the east and west Divisions if we are "not to succumb to the cash of the Gov-"ernment." Without credit, she seems used for on polling days, for such were the Saturday and Monday referred to, if not for the purchase of votes and the treasury and protection corruption of the electors! Printing! Were special posters wanted on polling day, and had Mr. Brown with his big cheque, gone to the city to secure the now next loan with which to pay interest abroad, remains to be seen. Meanwhile it is being proven that the carriage of grain over the long distances of some Russian railway costs as much as the grain is worth at the ports, or, as that the export of grain would scarcely pay were the cultivator to furnish it for nothing. The gold produce of Russia is about three millions sterling per annum, and this falls far short of being enough to meet the interest on her debt held abroad. The country is one of peasants and nobles only, without any middle class. The merchants are few in number, and they have of late years lost money by attempts to force commerce into impossible channels. The nobles, again, are as a class over-extravagant, it being their favourite ambition to spend their roubles in cities, in gambling, ostentation, and debauchery. Paris is an enormous sink for Muscovite money, and much of the hard-earned gold wrung from the peasantry by recklessly squandered in that modern Babylon. The Court is almost fabulous in its extravagance, spending some 40,000,000 sterling annually, or four times the total cost of the British royal family. In borrowing ostensibly for railway purposes, the Russian Government has generally asked double the amount really wanted for railways, the balance being spent on the gaudy glads, Asiatic expeditions, and other costly follies. Europe has heard enough lately of bankrupt Turkey, but the revelation to the world of Russia's bankruptcy is something that cannot much longer be delayed. It is not believed that any new Russian loan could be "placed" in London at all, and Germany and Holland must next be appealed to. But the shrewd capitalists of Amsterdam and Frankfort are not likely to be charmed with such prospects of payment as Russia can hold out, and at some date not far distant the Colossus of the North will stand as a borrower little better than Turkey or the worst paying South American States.

Russian fire per cent bonds, which used to stand at 105, have dropped to 85, and a still heavier decline would be sure to follow the event of war. The experience of the capitalists of Western Europe in loans made to semi-barbarous peoples has not been encouraging, and such borrowers as Turks, Russians, and South Americans must find their sources of supply closed. The failure of half-civilized states to pay is a remarkable feature in the history of the time, and must have an important and lasting effect on the money market of the world. The check given to reckless borrowing by what we may call non-industrial nations, whose idleness and barbarism are but scantily concealed by a thin gloss of civilization, also to railway extension the world over, must inevitably establish lower rates of interest for money. Non-paying States will find it impossible to get money on any terms, and those that can and do meet their obligations will find the money advantageous only when so profusely promised when in opposition and so fiercely denounced the previous Government with the wind, and washes disregard of. Secondly to a wide-spread and growing conviction on the part of the people of Canada that the course of the Government on the question of protection to Canadian industries is both unwise and unpatriotic. That this question of protection, and encouragement to a well devised system of varied industries, is assuming large proportions and deeply engaging the attention of the Canadian public mind at the present time, as never before, is too obvious to be questioned, and our rulers will do well to heed it."

We commend this extract to our befogged contemporary.

IF NOT BRIBERY, WHAT?

But this Mr. Justice WILSON may rest assured of: that flanders and insults shall not go unanswered, and if the dignity of the Bench is ruffled in the tussle, on his fully shall rest the blame. We cast back on Mr. Wilson his insolent and slanderous interpretation. The letter was not written for corrupt purposes—it was not written to interfere with the freedom of elections—it was not an invitation to anybody to concur in committing bribery and corruption at the polls—and he judged from what he saw the statement is false.—*Globe of Saturday.*

MARK the veteran corruptionist. Exposed under his own hand and seal, and condemned by his own vigorous English and his facile shame-faced Scotch pleas, bolstered by his appeal for bribery money, Mr. BROWN turns against the damnatory evidence with a front of brass and challenges the fair meaning of his own words. "Not "written for corrupt purposes: Not "written to interfere with the freedom of "elections; not an invitation to any-"body to concur in committing bribery "and corruption at the polls." Then what is it, and what was it written for? Let the reader look at the letter in another column. If the English language can express one's thoughts, if the language is a writer's object, then that letter is an invitation on Mr. BROWN's part to Mr. SIMPSON to bribery, that the Bench has been corrupted, and that it was the outcome of his corruption. Exactly! These are the facts as stated by the organ. But what do they mean? Crystalized into a word, they mean dissatisfaction with the Government. Elaborated a little, we give the answer in the language of that good old Grit paper, the Newmarket *Era*, as quoted in *The Mail* of Saturday:

"What has produced this change in the public mind (for that a change has been produced is obvious) is more open to difference of opinion, and may well excite anxious enquiry.

"In our opinion it is to be attributed first to a growing dissatisfaction, springing from a widely extended disappointment on the part of the public in the evident failure—the entire omission—on the part of the present Government, to redeem its pledges, to perform its promises to inaugurate the economy, retrenchment and rigid adherence to constitutional rule, that the Government promised