

"IS ENGLAND DOOMED?"

FRIDAY, APRIL 20, 1895.

The quickness with which some of our American contemporaries arrive at conclusions is really marvellous. The attention which is sometimes a sufficient foundation upon which to build an elaborate superstructure of theory, and they feel justified, from events that do not appear to be of very great importance, to draw the most momentous and far-reaching conclusions. The Seattle Post-Intelligencer of the 18th inst. furnishes us with an example of this wonderful rapidity of reasoning and of the daring logical leap of some of our American contemporaries.

TRIAL BY NEWSPAPER.

It must be a dreadful thing to be suspected of a crime in the United States. The newspapers there are perfectly merciless and at the same time thoroughly unscrupulous. The suspected man is tried by newspaper long before he is arraigned. Most of the papers take for granted that he is guilty and publish everything they can pick up by hook or by crook in his prejudice. They publish columns after columns of particulars not only of the crime but of the character and antecedents of the suspected man. Under such circumstances it seems to us that it is impossible for the man to get anything like a fair trial. Everyone likely to be connected with the proceedings if he is at all intelligent must have formed an opinion relative to his guilt or innocence. What chance, for instance, has young Durrant of being tried fairly in San Francisco. The newspapers have for days been filled with accounts of the crime he is accused of committing. Every movement he has made and every word he has said since he was accused of the crime, and for some time before, has been made the subject of discussion in almost every family in the State. People have put their own construction upon his words and acts, and have drawn their own conclusions from the evidence, such as it is, which the newspapers are filled. If the man has not committed the crime laid to his charge there are thousands in the city who will be impossible to convince of his innocence. They have made up their minds on the subject, and it would take little less than a miracle to alter the conclusions they have formed. Is there a man in San Francisco competent to sit on a jury who can honestly say that he could enter the box with an unprejudiced mind—a mind in a position to give a fair interpretation to the evidence that will be laid before him? We think not. The man who has not read the accounts of the murders and the remarks of those who tell the dreadful story, is too unintelligent and too stupid to weigh the evidence in such a case, and the man who has read those accounts carefully must be one in ten thousand if he is not influenced for or against the prisoner. The following extract from one of the sensational accounts of the murder will give the reader a pretty fair idea of the way in which the newspapers treated the suspected man.

From the facts gathered from all quarters yesterday afternoon said Detective Gibson, "I've become convinced that the murderer of Minnie Williams was Theodore Durrant. We not only arrive at this conclusion, but we also gleaned enough evidence to make us reasonably certain that he was also responsible for the disappearance of Blanche Lamson. If that were so it was reasonable to conclude that he had murdered her and hidden her body somewhere about the church, for he had access to the building and could come or go at any hour of the day or night with little fear of detection."

This and a great deal more like it was published before the suspected man was even committed to trial. One has only to read such accounts as are permitted to be published in the San Francisco papers to be convinced that a change in the treatment of prisoners in the interests of justice required. To treat a suspected man as Durrant has been treated by the newspapers is, in our opinion, a gross abuse of the freedom of the press and an outrage on justice. The law is bound to consider a man innocent until he is proved to be guilty. The newspapers in the States act upon a principle exactly the reverse of this. They, almost without exception, virtually treat a man as guilty until he is proved to be innocent. Every circumstance which tends to cast the guilt on the accused man is commented upon in the freest possible manner, and those circumstances which go to show that he is guiltless are hardly so much as mentioned.

NOT TO BE TRIED WITH.

Nicaragua will find that the vaporing of United States Jingles have had no effect whatever on Great Britain. She will in fact on reparation being made for the injuries which her representatives have received at the hands of the authorities of Nicaragua, let the aforesaid Jingles howl about the "Monroe Doctrine" as long and as loudly as they may. The attitude which Great Britain has assumed towards Nicaragua, and will maintain, can easily be discerned from the following note telegraphed to Nicaragua.

THE OLD TUNE.

A little while ago there appeared in almost every issue of the Times the strongest evidence that the COLONIST is ready, when ever there is a good reason for it, to find fault with what the Government does or leaves undone. Extracts from the COLONIST were published in the editorial columns of our contemporary in which we expressed our disapproval of the course which the Government, in some matters of greater or less importance, was pursuing. It suited the organ then to cite the COLONIST as a witness against the Government. We at the time directed attention to the fact that the Times was bearing witness to our independence and our impartiality. This view of its course seemed to make an impression, for the quotations from the COLONIST soon ceased. Now it has begun to play its old tune about the COLONIST's subserviency. Because

we have exposed its dishonesty and, as we believe, its insincerity, in the matter of the attitude of Messrs. Earle and Prior with respect to the British Pacific, it declares that "of course," in the COLONIST'S estimation, "Messrs. Earle and Prior can do no wrong."

The inconsistency of the organ is truly laughable. The other day it quoted the utterances of the COLONIST, not once or twice, but many times, in condemnation of the Government, and on Friday it declared that the COLONIST is its party's slave and must say what its masters direct. The legs of the lame are not equal.

Mr. Laurier in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne alluded to the Manitoba school question with even more than his usual indefiniteness. He was exceedingly careful not to commit himself or his party to an expression of opinion on the subject. The News-Advertiser of yesterday contains the following condemnation of his remarks on this ticklish subject:

MR. WILSON ANSWERED.

To THE EDITOR:—Mr. William Wilson has launched his attack on the Times in his issue of the 18th inst., under the title of "Other government's apology." It would not be well to allow these specious and entirely untrue calculations to go unchallenged, although, for some time past, the majority of your readers have already seen the weakness of them. The remarkable thing to be noted in this attack is the manner in which Mr. Wilson has endeavored to mislead the public by his statements. He has endeavored to make it appear that the majority of your readers have already seen the weakness of them. The remarkable thing to be noted in this attack is the manner in which Mr. Wilson has endeavored to mislead the public by his statements. He has endeavored to make it appear that the majority of your readers have already seen the weakness of them.

Mr. Post's letter of the 17th appearing in your issue of the 18th inst., covered the question of the percentage of failures in the United States for 1893 and 1894, and his figures have not been challenged, and are, I submit, correct. The method of "percentage of failures" adopted by Mr. Wilson is erroneous in that he takes the percentage of failures on the number of traders, when, as will be afterwards in this letter noted, the liabilities are much greater in the failures taking into consideration the relative proportions in Canada, in the relative proportions. To illustrate the fallacy of his comparison, suppose there had been but one failure in the United States for say \$1,000,000, and that he takes the percentage of failures for \$2,000 each. According to Mr. Wilson's calculation, Canada's percentage of failures would be greater than that of the United States by three to one, whereas on the true basis of calculation, it would be in favor of Canada, by \$6,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. Wilson states that "the depression there is a deeper one than in the United States." Mr. Wilson in making this statement is in line with Sir Richard Cartwright et al., who are always declaring that the depression in this country is a "blue ruin" and that the Victoria members are anti-railroad to the railway scheme that is nearest the heart of Victoria. The remarks of Col. Prior at the Board of Trade show that he has not been made in the terse and seriocomic style that Mr. Wilson uses to bewilder his hearers as to his intent, but still in plain and simple language, and in the case so far as the railway scheme is concerned. Mr. Wilson is aware that it is first necessary to apply for a Dominion charter and then to apply to the Dominion government for a loan to be repaid by the Dominion government. It is not so long ago that he was the loudest talking on the street in opposition to anything further towards promoting the construction of this railway. But having adopted "free trade and no taxes" for his motto, it was almost a foregone conclusion that he would make the public believe he is its warm friend and of course the Grit candidate.

It is scarcely necessary to again draw attention to the comparison made by Mr. Post. This comparison Mr. Wilson has not ventured to attack, nor do I think he can successfully do so, except perhaps, by his peculiar percentage system. If it be true that the total amount of failures in the United States for 1893 and 1894 aggregated \$77,901,880, as against Canada's \$429,492,831 (which is the actual amount for Canada, multiplied by thirteen to bring the United States to a like basis of calculation for fair comparison), how can anyone assert that the United States was in these two years more prosperous than Canada? And adding to the United States total the American railway foreclosures (clearly failures), the comparison is still more in Canada's favor, being \$1,158,728,380 for the United States to \$422,492,831 for Canada.

Another factor, too, that Mr. Wilson did not take into account, which must be dealt with in order to make a fair and just comparison and which is not even considered by Mr. Wilson, is his vicious percentage system, is the proportion Canada's traders bear to her population and the amount invested, as compared with the proportion the United States bears to her population and the amount of capital there invested.

With respect to Messrs. Earle and Prior's action in regard to the British Pacific, and what took place at the Board of Trade meeting, I have to say that not being a member of that board and therefore not being present at the meeting referred to, I am unable to place at the Board of Trade what did actually occur. It is to be regretted that I have been able to obtain, I have confidence in saying that Messrs. Earle and Prior are to be congratulated because of their position at the Board of Trade, and what then occurred, the Board of Trade would likewise be congratulated, for Mr. Wilson's ill-aimed resolution was not endorsed. The fact is that Messrs. Earle and

SHY AND SLY.

Mr. Laurier in the debate on the Address in reply to the Speech from the Throne alluded to the Manitoba school question with even more than his usual indefiniteness. He was exceedingly careful not to commit himself or his party to an expression of opinion on the subject. The News-Advertiser of yesterday contains the following condemnation of his remarks on this ticklish subject:

To THE EDITOR:—Mr. William Wilson has launched his attack on the Times in his issue of the 18th inst., under the title of "Other government's apology." It would not be well to allow these specious and entirely untrue calculations to go unchallenged, although, for some time past, the majority of your readers have already seen the weakness of them. The remarkable thing to be noted in this attack is the manner in which Mr. Wilson has endeavored to mislead the public by his statements. He has endeavored to make it appear that the majority of your readers have already seen the weakness of them.

Mr. Post's letter of the 17th appearing in your issue of the 18th inst., covered the question of the percentage of failures in the United States for 1893 and 1894, and his figures have not been challenged, and are, I submit, correct. The method of "percentage of failures" adopted by Mr. Wilson is erroneous in that he takes the percentage of failures on the number of traders, when, as will be afterwards in this letter noted, the liabilities are much greater in the failures taking into consideration the relative proportions in Canada, in the relative proportions. To illustrate the fallacy of his comparison, suppose there had been but one failure in the United States for say \$1,000,000, and that he takes the percentage of failures for \$2,000 each. According to Mr. Wilson's calculation, Canada's percentage of failures would be greater than that of the United States by three to one, whereas on the true basis of calculation, it would be in favor of Canada, by \$6,000 to \$1,000,000.

Mr. Wilson states that "the depression there is a deeper one than in the United States." Mr. Wilson in making this statement is in line with Sir Richard Cartwright et al., who are always declaring that the depression in this country is a "blue ruin" and that the Victoria members are anti-railroad to the railway scheme that is nearest the heart of Victoria. The remarks of Col. Prior at the Board of Trade show that he has not been made in the terse and seriocomic style that Mr. Wilson uses to bewilder his hearers as to his intent, but still in plain and simple language, and in the case so far as the railway scheme is concerned. Mr. Wilson is aware that it is first necessary to apply for a Dominion charter and then to apply to the Dominion government for a loan to be repaid by the Dominion government. It is not so long ago that he was the loudest talking on the street in opposition to anything further towards promoting the construction of this railway. But having adopted "free trade and no taxes" for his motto, it was almost a foregone conclusion that he would make the public believe he is its warm friend and of course the Grit candidate.

It is scarcely necessary to again draw attention to the comparison made by Mr. Post. This comparison Mr. Wilson has not ventured to attack, nor do I think he can successfully do so, except perhaps, by his peculiar percentage system. If it be true that the total amount of failures in the United States for 1893 and 1894 aggregated \$77,901,880, as against Canada's \$429,492,831 (which is the actual amount for Canada, multiplied by thirteen to bring the United States to a like basis of calculation for fair comparison), how can anyone assert that the United States was in these two years more prosperous than Canada? And adding to the United States total the American railway foreclosures (clearly failures), the comparison is still more in Canada's favor, being \$1,158,728,380 for the United States to \$422,492,831 for Canada.

Another factor, too, that Mr. Wilson did not take into account, which must be dealt with in order to make a fair and just comparison and which is not even considered by Mr. Wilson, is his vicious percentage system, is the proportion Canada's traders bear to her population and the amount invested, as compared with the proportion the United States bears to her population and the amount of capital there invested.

With respect to Messrs. Earle and Prior's action in regard to the British Pacific, and what took place at the Board of Trade meeting, I have to say that not being a member of that board and therefore not being present at the meeting referred to, I am unable to place at the Board of Trade what did actually occur. It is to be regretted that I have been able to obtain, I have confidence in saying that Messrs. Earle and Prior are to be congratulated because of their position at the Board of Trade, and what then occurred, the Board of Trade would likewise be congratulated, for Mr. Wilson's ill-aimed resolution was not endorsed. The fact is that Messrs. Earle and

FINANCIAL POSITION OF CANADA.

To THE EDITOR:—I have followed the course of Mr. Wilson's reasoning on the financial condition of Canada, and British Columbia in the night's Times, and I have come to the conclusion that his reputation as a practical joker is well merited. He assumes several propositions—that Canada is in a worse condition than the United States; that the Province pays a great deal more in taxes than the United States; that there are no advantages accruing from partnership with the Dominion; that the C. P. R. has done nothing to develop the trade of the Province; that the Canada Western should be built and should be aided by the Dominion.

As to the first proposition it is assumed that Canada's position is attributable to her protective policy. Let us see how it works out. The tariff of the United States has always been much higher than that of Canada, and therefore if the reasoning be correct, Canada should be much richer than the United States; but the United States is better off. Moral: We should raise the tariff of Canada still higher.

As to the second proposition it may be that we pay more for our railways than the Dominion than we get back. We must not forget our obligations. We have a railway and whether it pays us or not we are bound to maintain it. The Dominion, however, has one opinion for many years, and that was that British Columbia made a bargain with the Dominion for the rest of the Dominion. It was a bargain, however, that the Dominion had to live up to. The C. P. R. main line, with branches built or completed, is in round numbers \$200,000,000, or an average of \$50,000 per mile. The portion in British Columbia alone cost \$50,000,000. The rest of it was paid for by the Dominion. If British Columbia had had to build that line itself in its own territory the interest on the investment would have been \$2,000,000 per annum. Add that to the annual subsidies, appropriations, cost of public service, etc., and the account is not quite as much on the other side as we might imagine from Mr. Wilson's way of figuring.

The whole matter is this, and it is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

As to the third proposition that partnership with the Dominion is to be deprecated, the Dominion is to be deprecated for the expression of such sentiments in the Province, and the astonishing part of it is that the Dominion is to be deprecated for the expression of such sentiments in the Province, and the astonishing part of it is that the Dominion is to be deprecated for the expression of such sentiments in the Province.

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

MR. WILSON'S ATTITUDE.

To THE EDITOR:—The reference in his communication to the Times of Friday last, which Mr. William Wilson makes to the Board of Trade shows him to be possessed of bad taste and worse judgment. He came before the board with his resolution and was patiently listened to by the fifty or sixty members present; the subject was very freely and friendly discussed, and the all but unanimous opinion being that it would be unwise to pass the resolution, Mr. Wilson asked permission to withdraw it. "Yes," said the board, "you may withdraw it." "Yes," said the board, "you may withdraw it."

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

COMPLIANCE WITH THE G.

The endorsement of the explanations regarding the Dominion anti-duty given by Messrs. Earle and Prior did not commit the members of the party, but it does reflect on them from any impression as to their said or done anything adverse to the British Pacific railway interests.

As before mentioned, Mr. Wilson must not be taken seriously, he was merely attempting a practical joke on the board; and the trouble with him was that his joke was not taken seriously, he was merely attempting a practical joke on the board; and the trouble with him was that his joke was not taken seriously, he was merely attempting a practical joke on the board.

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

WINNIFREY.

points along the coast in Manitoba in about 1800, and was probably the first white man to see the water in the bay. He was a sailor on board a ship, and he was the first white man to see the water in the bay.

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.

It is not a matter of dollars and cents, but of principle. Would the Province pay less or more if the Liberals were in power? Will somebody explain in behalf of the Liberal party what is the basis of the new arrangement by which Mr. Wilson's "grievances" are to be remedied?

Mr. Wilson's attitude towards the Dominion is one of hostility, and almost indolent to advise the public of the history of the Dominion, but I "refrained" and will refrain from criticizing his defence and theories of the Dominion, remarking, however, that when a gentleman gets the use of another's pulpit by courtesy, he is understood to be the lender or the congregation, particularly a partisan character.