

GO-PARTNERSHIP NOTICE.

THOS. W. SMITH & SON, THE CARRYING ON OF THE BUSINESS

MERCHANT TAILORS

GENERAL OUTFITTERS

CARD

TO OUR CUSTOMERS AND THE PUBLIC GENERALLY

A First-Class Modern Tailoring and OUTFITTING ESTABLISHMENTS

SHOEMAKING ESTABLISHMENT

Complete Outfit from Head to Foot

THOMAS W. SMITH & SON, Fredericton, July 7

F. B. EDGEcombe, Having imported an immense stock of STAPLE AND FANCY

DRY GOODS

PLAIN AND FANCY Dress Goods, CLOTH SUITINGS, CASHMERE, SILKS, SATINS, VELVETS, FLUSHES, Mantle & Jacket Cloths.

FANCY GOODS

English, Scotch and Canadian Tweeds, OVERCOATINGS, &c.

Blankets, Horse Blankets and Robes.

Wholesale and Retail.

ALBION HOUSE, QUEEN STREET, FREDERICTON.

BRANCH STORE: St. Mary's.

N. B.—Will take any quantity good Home-spun, Socks, Mitts, Knit Drawers and Yarn.

Orders by Mail will receive prompt attention.

Maritime Farmer.

FREDERICTON, N. B., November 24, 1881.

The Liberal-Conservative Convention.

Toronto, on Tuesday and Wednesday, was in a state of political excitement, and Sir John, the foremost man in Canada, was the hero of the hour.

The great Liberal-Conservative convention concerning which so much has been written, and which Grit editors have grown wildly excited in speculating over its object, met on the 22nd inst.

Over one thousand delegates, representatives of all the constituencies in Ontario, took their seats in Shaftesbury Hall, where the convention met.

The chair was taken by Mr. Jas. Turner, of Hamilton, in the afternoon. Along with Sir John A. McDonald several members of the Government took seats on the platform, viz., Sir Alex. Campbell, Hon. D. L. Macpherson, Hon. Mackenzie Bowell, Hon. John Carling and Hon. Mr. Aikens.

Sir Leonard Tilley who only arrived from Washington in Toronto while the Convention was sitting was not present, but he was seen and heard from at the subsequent proceedings on Wednesday at the grand Banquet.

Prominent among the Members of Parliament on the platform were Messrs. Blunt, Pilling, Rykert, Wallace, Elliot, McCarthy, Patterson, Boulbee, and "Tom" White.

The telegraphic report of the proceedings of the convention, (received on Wednesday, 23rd) was meagre. It testifies however to the unbounded enthusiasm with which "the Chief" was received by the delegates, and to the enthusiastic applause which greeted his speech.

He showed that this government had faithfully carried out the promises made at the last general election, 1878, and pointed with just pride to the prosperous condition of the Dominion under the National Policy.

Writers of the adverse faction—Grit editors and correspondents—have been preparing the public mind for some startling announcement from Sir John. They have been declaring that Sir John meant to dissolve the House, if not immediately, then certainly in the spring of 1882.

But how sheepish they now must feel. Not a word did Sir John let fall, not an allusion did he make, that could be interpreted or twisted into meaning that the general election would take place before Parliament expired by efflux of time.

Throughout his speech, he always spoke of the work which the Party had before them as being for 1883.

The Convention re-assembled on Wednesday morning, and in the evening a grand banquet took place in the Horticultural Garden Pavilion, at which over 2,500 persons were present.

We must defer further remarks until next week.

Bismarck and Gambetta.

The bearing of Bismarck and Gambetta in the present crisis in Germany and France, is watched with intense interest in Europe.

The desire of both as expressed in the speech at the opening of the Chamber of Deputies, (14th inst.) in which Gambetta explained his policy, and in the Emperor's speech read by Bismarck, at the opening of the Reichstag, 17th inst., is for peace abroad. Their declarations in that respect sound most reassuringly.

Both have enough in the internal affairs of the two countries, to occupy their minds, to test all their statesmanship.

Gambetta has not succeeded in creating a strong general impression, that he is thoroughly patriotic and unselfish, that he will not seize an opportunity to advance personal aims. The ministry he formed was not when at first announced received with favor.

The programme of his policy however, which points to the fortification of the republic to the initiation of reforms in the Senate, and in the public service, the army and navy, to the carrying out of measures to promote the interests of commerce and of internal industry, shows he is intent at present, on promoting the well being and prosperity of France.

His great rival Bismarck, has seemingly the more difficult task before him. When he found the elections had gone against the government, he sulked, railed at everybody, and threatened to resign. But now he is himself again. He sees in the divisions of the Liberal party his opportunity to maintain his position.

The opening speech, which was received with icy coldness, without a single cheer, is interpreted to mean that he is going to stand by his economic reforms for the promotion of the welfare of the working classes under the tutelage of the State.

He maintains his protective tariff, to press the passing of his tobacco monopoly and liquor tax bills, to secure financial budgets, etc. In order to secure the co-operation of the Conservatives and Ultramontanes in the carrying of his favorite measures, he is, it is said, determined to make peace with the Catholic Church, an object which the old Emperor has much at heart. Will he, after all, go to Canada?

An Effect of Independence.

A great deal lately, has been spoken and written on Independence. Some of the Liberal papers refuse to accept the teaching of the Toronto Globe on the subject, and seem bent on making "Independence" one of the plank of the platform on which "the party" must stand at next general election.

The Globe which is totally opposed to any disturbance of the happy relations which exist between the Mother Country and the Dominion understands the mind of the people of the country in this question, thoroughly better than the papers which on all other party matters, see eye to eye, and write pen to pen, with it.

Not to go into the many reasons why Canada should not seek "Independence," we simply ask, if Canada was an independent nation how could cases involving questions of the respective rights and powers of the General and the Provincial governments ever be satisfactorily settled? As a general thing, when there comes a constitutional conflict between the Dominion and any of the Provinces, the Supreme Court pronounces judgment in favor of the general central authority, and then follows in inevitable course, appeal from that judgment, to the Imperial Privy Council.

When the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council sustains the judgment of the Supreme Court, it must be accepted by the Provinces as final. Were there no appeal open from the highest Court in the Dominion, to the highest court of the Empire, to the government or people of a Province, discontent would quickly arise, and the country be thrown into a state of perpetual constitutional agitation. Canada is saved from that state of things now, owing to its having a safety valve, a right of appeal to the Imperial Privy Council. But where that shut down, which would be the case if she were independent, no one knows what explosion might not come. A conflict between the Dominion and Provincial powers, would, most probably ensue. A cry would be raised by those who favored centralisation of authority, for the abolition of the Local Legislatures, and the establishment of a Legislative Union as a central authority whose decisions should be absolutely accepted all over the Dominion.

And Ontario, the populous, richest, and fastest growing Province would be left all in favor of it. It would be opposed by minorities in Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and the state of things would arise like that which existed before confederation, when Upper and Lower Canada lived a cat and dog life, when government became almost impossible, and the gravest fears were entertained that the constitutional difficulties between the

two Provinces would break out into open war. Confederation brought about, we all know, and at an early date, through the good will and with the good wishes of the Imperial government, settled their difficulties. But who would be their help, where would be their refuge, if the Dominion were independent of the Crown, if there were no appeal for the local governments and peoples to the throne for redress of grievances, no right to carry cases where their claims came into antagonism with those of the Dominion, to the highest Court of the Empire, if the Provinces fell to quarrelling amongst themselves, and the Crown had no longer right to step in as arbitrator? Why it is conceivable that a demand for separation would be made by the Provinces by the sea, that a cry would arise for annexation, that civil war might break out, and the end might be that the whole Dominion would be swallowed up by the great Republic.

The New Motor Force.

Every announced invention is decried as impossible, until it is proved not to be. The world has progressed in works of applied science—time, obstruction by sea and land distance—have been overcome, and a chorus of voices screaming "impossible" has been raised by hundreds and hundreds in every age who seem to join the chorus of obstructives, and who hate like the Napoleon the Great, that fool of a word "impossible."

Some people imagine that to lift a ship of heavy burden from a dock at the end of an isthmus, and transport it over land and launch it in a dock at the other end, is something that never can be done. But ships were ages ago conveyed over land; in naval docks, now-a-days cradled ships are raised by hydraulic lifts from the basins, and carried short distances on rails. And what has been proved to be practicable on a small scale, is certain, sooner or later, to be carried out on a larger scale, and brought into common use.

In these days when so many marvels have been accomplished by science, there should be less incredulity manifested, when inventors announce their discoveries and projectors put forth their schemes. The resources of engineering skill, to develop further the system of locomotion and transport, are far from exhausted. Some people confidently believe, that the world is on the very eve of a movement that will revolutionize the transport system and railroad construction, by dispensing with locomotives, and causing trains to be drawn up mountain sides with ease, by stationary engines and stored electric force, thus enabling any country to construct lines at one half or one third of the present cost, and to lay them down in all directions. Mr. F. R. Conder, a pupil of the great engineer, Robert Stevenson in Fraser's magazine, gives a forecast of some of the great changes which will result from the employment of electricity as a motor, should the recently invented Faure battery prove capable of development and modification in the degree which Sir William Thompson and other scientific men anticipate. We have several times mentioned the discovery of the possibility of storing electricity in a box, which may be carried from place to place, and whose force may be applied as required. Wind mills and water falls, (Niagara could supply motor power to the whole continent), can be utilised for generating electricity which would be boxed. With the Faure motor force, a railway train could be propelled without the aid of a locomotive, by the using which so much force is expended by the carrying of coals, furnace, engine and machinery. If the use of locomotives were made unnecessary, a great part of the cost of railways would be got rid of. As long as locomotives are used good gradients must be provided, and good gradients must be much to the expense of the construction of the road. The power of an engine to draw a load decreases with the steepness of the ascent, and in consequence there is a demand for a plain level course, which increases the cost of making the road bed. If dispensing with the locomotive would decrease the cost of railways, much more would be making of the roadbeds on a simpler plan do so, and with the motor force a train could be forced up a mountain side.

Says Mr. Conder—with an electric transmission of force produced by a stationary engine, the cost incurred would be in proportion to the work done, and the values of gravity, of friction, and of atmospheric resistance can be so exactly foreseen and balanced by the engineer, that an Alpine pass will be as easy (though somewhat more costly) to go up, as a line down the level valley of the Euphrates.

So convinced is Mr. Conder, that the motor force will be brought into use in a very short time, that he protests against the scheme now on foot of tunnelling the Alps. As so impressed is the Toronto Globe with what Mr. Conder says, it is calculating how much the Pacific Railway Syndicate will gain by the use of motor force, which would render unnecessary tunnelling and other expensive works in each country of the mountainous country in the British Columbia, and the 600 miles of the scarcely less difficult region adjacent to the North Shore of Lake Superior!

Woodstock Fire—Appeal to the Public.

The Mayor of Woodstock in answering the Mayor of Fredericton's inquiry, if help were needed, on the impulse of the moment and in remembrance of the manner in which the people of Woodstock and Carleton Co. had met similar calamities, replied in the negative. On fuller knowledge of the extent of the losses by the conflagration, and on calmer consideration of the ability of the city and county to aid the sufferers, Mayor Jones and prominent citizens have decided to make an appeal to the outside public.

The fire has destroyed more than fifty houses and driven about seventy families from their homes just as winter was approaching. Not a few persons, who before the fire, which made a wide sweep, were accounted pretty comfortably off, and were well prepared to meet the long hard winter, have been reduced to the edge of distress, and are totally unable to do anything for their poorer fellow sufferers. A large amount of personal effects has been lost and also all the winter provisions stored in the cellars of the buildings that were burnt have been destroyed.

The following extract from the appeal to the public, signed R. K. Jones, explains what assistance is required and how it may be given:—

"A committee of some of the more prominent citizens, with the Mayor at the head, have therefore determined to ask for assistance, which they know will be cheerfully granted, both from those of our citizens who have escaped damage—from our more immediate neighbors in the County, and from our numerous kind friends who have expressed so much sympathy for our misfortunes, both in St. John, Fredericton, St. Andrews, St. Stephen and elsewhere.

As far as it can be determined about \$2,000 will be required—much of which would be acceptable in the shape of provisions, for the care of which a suitable depot and almoner will be provided by the Mayor and committee.

The committee will feel obliged to the newspapers published in the cities mentioned and elsewhere if they will give publicity to this statement.

The Mayors of the above cities will be requested to aid in the matter, by having laws for donations in their offices, and by taking charge of such donations.

Lists will also be placed in the hands of the following parties in Fredericton, viz:—E. Byron Winslow, Esq., at Messrs. Fraser, Wetmore & Winslow's office, and A. F. B. E. Esq.

The City of Fredericton, we are sure, will cheerfully answer the appeal. There will be no difficulty in raising the amount required, here, and in St. John and St. Stephen.

Dominion and Provincial Claims.

An important case has been exciting great interest in Ontario. The principle involved brings the claims of the General and Local Governments into conflict. The case shortly are. Mr. Andrew Mercer, a wealthy merchant of Toronto, died a few years ago, leaving property valued at \$150,000. His son Andrew Mercer, Jr., put in his claim to be heir, and took steps to put himself in legal possession of the property.

The senior of Mr. Mercer, on the ground of the illegitimacy of the claimant sought to have the property escheated to the Provincial Government.

Mr. Mercer, Jr., in the Court of Chancery, but he failed to establish his legitimacy, and the Court pronounced judgment against his claim. Thereon, Mr. Mercer, appropriated the property for the behoof of the Ontario government, all but a portion which he handed over for the benefit of the illegitimate son, who however refused to accept the judgment as final.

Immediate steps were taken by Mr. Mercer, to expend the money realised from the property, in the erection in West Toronto of a very handsome brick building, which was named "the Andrew Mercer Reformatory for Women." This building cost \$300,000, but before it was finished the government of Ontario had taken themselves the defendant of a suit brought by Mercer, Jr., to claim that the Ontario government in the matter of escheats, did not represent the Crown, and could not therefore, legally, seize his father's property. The Court of chancery decided against the claimant, who thereon carried the case into the "Court of Error and Appeal," which also decided in favor of Mercer. Mr. Mercer then appealed to the Supreme Court. Hon. Mr. McDougall, appeared for him, Messrs. Blake and Bethune, for the Ontario government, Mr. Lash for the Dominion, and Ex-Judge Lorange, for the Province of Quebec. The claimant's Counsel's argument was, that neither the Provincial government, or Legislature had the right to deal with the escheated property, or to control the revenues derivable from such property. The right of escheat, was a prerogative of the Crown, and therefore, it belonged not to a local, but to the Dominion government. The case was argued for two days in March. The judgment was given by the Supreme Court on Monday 14th inst. Four of the judges, Fournier, Taschereau, Henry and Gwynne, held that the right of escheat was transferred from the Provinces to the Dominion by the B. A. Act, and that therefore the action of the Ontario government, was ultra vires. Chief Justice Ritchie and Judge Strong, who are accounted by far the ablest and most experienced members of the Court, maintained that the Provincial governments had the right of escheat. If the decision of the majority stands after appeal to the Imperial Privy Council, where the case is to be carried, it will be awarded for Ontario government, who will have to refund the \$300,000, plus all expenses.

State Assassins and the Defence of Insanity.

The trial of Guiteau, Garfield's assassin, began, at Washington, before Judge Cox, on Tuesday, 15th, and is now progressing. The defence of insanity, Guiteau has been having outrageously brought into Court—interrupting, abusing his counsel, Scoville, and falling into violent rages with the Court for preventing him delivering a speech in his own defence, which was compounded of blasphemy, and nonsense, and cunning. Still, he showed himself amenable to reason, when the Court, angry at his vociferations, threatened to order his removal, and proceeded with the trial in his absence. He became perfectly quiet and devoted himself to his papers. If he is insane, there is some method in his madness.

In the "Atlantic Monthly" for December, just out, a number containing many valuable articles and replete with interest, there is one apposite to Guiteau and the plea set up for him. It is called "State Assassins and the Defence of Insanity," by James W. Clarke. We make the following extract from it:—

The tragedy of the 23d of July last excited revived public interest in an old topic, the defence of insanity in capital cases. It is a well-worn theme, much discussed, and always with an unsatisfactory result. What is moral insanity? What is legal insanity? Conclusive answers to both these questions have often been attempted, but never given with such definiteness and decisiveness as to settle the matter. Every day the controversy is resumed in our courts, and apparently will go on to the end of time. It is settled one day, and the day after we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that has been said, state that they do not know what does and does not constitute legal insanity, finally confessed that "the facts of each particular case must of necessity present themselves in a diversity, and with every shade of difference in each case. But if it is difficult to define what is legal insanity, which is a mere matter of human law, how much more difficult is it to determine what is a moral insanity? Dr. Sam Johnson declares that "all power of fancy over reason is a degree of insanity, and Montaigne asserts that between genius and madness there is but a half turn of the screw." "Was he insane?" It is oppressive, philosophically avers that "insanity is not a distinct and separate entity; our ordinary and the next day we find it is not settled at all. What, said the late Dr. Forbes Winslow, "is the test of insanity? I have none. I know of no unerring, infallible, and safe rule or standard applicable to all cases." So, too, the British judges, after all that