

ten in a similar strain of discreditable abuse and undeserved reflections on our people at large. The *Globe* stoops from its position as a leading journal when it does itself the honor of even attacking and despising such insignificant writers.

#### THE VICTORIA DAILY COLONIST ON THE POSITION TAKEN BY THE STANDARD.

Within the past two weeks we have republished from the *Toronto Globe* two excellent letters from the pen of Mr. F. J. Barnard. Those letters created in this city the liveliest feelings of satisfaction that one so able and influential, as the writer undeniably is, should have come to the defence of British Columbia when she was foully attacked by an anonymous correspondent of the *Globe*, who sought to detract from the value of this Province to the Dominion and libelled in a very gross manner her citizens. It was natural that the *Globe* (intent on making the best possible bargain with Columbia in the interest of the Eastern Provinces) endeavor to pick to pieces Mr. Barnard's manly and convincing letters and try to counteract the great influence of his sound argument on Canadians to convince them of the importance of retaining their hold on this Province even at the cost of a railway from ocean to ocean. We say that such a line of conduct was quite compatible with the *Globe's* idea of its duty to the people of the Province in which it is published. One may question the wisdom of a policy of irritation in dealing with and speaking of British Columbia; but none will dispute the right of the *Globe* to advocate any policy it may see fit. We confess, however, that we were not prepared to find a newspaper published in Victoria City attacking the character and standing of the defender of the Province. It was enough, surely, that the *Globe* should assail Mr. Barnard. But no one anticipated that he would have been "wounded in the house of his friends" while in the act of defending those friends from the rude assault of what the *Standard* has bawled itself hoarse in denouncing as the "common enemy." Yesterday's leading article in the *Standard* was simply disgraceful. No doubt it was galling to our contemporary to find the man it has frequently referred to as "a traitor," extolled on all sides for the

plucky manner in which he took up the cudgels in behalf of the Province. No doubt it "ate its heart" with envy when it found his defence copied into and approved by every newspaper in the Province save one—and that itself. But because it may be devoured by those discreditable feelings is no reason why it should attempt to destroy the good impression Mr. Barnard had certainly made in the interest of Columbia at the East. Now, let us see what is the "head and front of the offending." Mr. Barnard pointed out to the *Globe* the impolicy of irritating and abusing British Columbia at a time when it was of the greatest importance that the public mind of the Province should be tranquilized and calmed. He also stated that British Columbia asked only her rights of Canada. Was there any crime in that? The *Standard* seems to think there was; for it says that in writing as he did Mr. Barnard was merely the mouthpiece of certain interested individuals (as if every Columbian were not interested in obtaining a satisfactory solution of the railway puzzle) and actually upbraids our *Toronto* contemporary for taking the slightest notice of "F. J. B.'s" letter. As Squeers would say, "Here's richness!"

A champion of British Columbia, who entered the lists against a powerful antagonist whose chief weapons are prejudice and misrepresentation, returning flushed with victory from the tournament, is to be assailed by the people in whose cause he has battled with contempt and contumely. At least, such is the treatment the *Standard* wants him to receive; but the *Standard* is not the People, nor does it represent the People of British Columbia who, not having been parties to the "Fight Mackenzie" policy in the past, are not going to help it "Kick Barnard" now. While attacking the letters of the defender the *Standard* fails not to give the anonymous writer in the *Globe* a poke. It calls him a "low literary vagrant." Any one can call names; but why does the *Standard* not dispute his "facts," combat his "reasoning," upset his "argument"? Where is the "Genial and Gifted" Amor? How does it happen that his clarion voice was not raised or his trenchant pen wielded in defence of his Province? How does it happen that a "low literary vagrant" was

LETTER  
"T  
DU  
ED  
scarce  
troub  
the vic  
now u  
ion G  
Bef  
mayac  
on thi  
both j  
comm  
stand  
ing su  
will n  
on ou  
teriall  
stand  
But, b  
ment o  
mon g  
to take  
possibl  
mainla  
to bear  
each o  
time w  
to the  
garded  
unfair  
we have  
comple  
In the  
made th  
Railway