

ing the revenue by the same tariff is self-contradictory, we have only to suppose the case, easily conceivable, in which the preference for the foreign article is such that a lower and a higher, say a twenty-five and a fifty per cent. tariff, would produce about the same amount of revenue; that is, twice as much would be imported under the lower as under the higher rate of duty. What guidance would Sir John Thompson's principle (?) afford in such a case? It is implied in the conditions of the problem that a burden is laid upon all the users or consumers of the commodity in either case, but that it is twice as heavy under the fifty per cent. tariff. In so saying, we assume, of course, that those who purchase the home-made article are obliged to pay about the same tribute to the manufacturers which importers pay to the Government. This can hardly be successfully denied. Few, probably, will attempt to deny it. If any one should attempt to do so by claiming that the cost of the article of home manufacture is in either case materially less than that of the imported, with duty added, he would be bound to explain the phenomenon, showing cause why, other things being equal or nearly equal, any considerable number of people should persistently prefer to pay a higher price for a foreign article rather than buy one of domestic manufacture. To admit that the foreign article is better in any respect, or better adapted for the purpose of the purchaser, would be of course to concede the whole matter. The question then, for the Government, or its Finance Minister, to decide in the case we have supposed, would clearly be whether to give the greater protection to the few interested in home-manufactures, at the expense of the great body of consumers, or to favour the latter, regardless of the claims of the former. Had Sir John ended the enunciation which we have quoted with the words "service of the country," he would have laid down a simple rule for the guidance of all concerned. Having added the sentence which follows, he has destroyed the rule and left the question of the rate of duty to be imposed just where he found it, and the country, consequently, none the wiser for his utterance.

The death of Professor Tyndall removes from the field of scientific research one of its most eminent and successful explorers. Among the many who have won undying renown for themselves while laying the whole race under lasting obligations by their discoveries in this field, few, if any, have achieved greater or more lasting results. His name has so long been familiar in all circles in which any attention is paid to scientific subjects, that it would be superfluous to attempt to say what he has done as a student of nature, even were that possible in a paragraph. By many whose thoughts are mainly given to sub-

jects outside the domain of physical or experimental science, Professor Tyndall's name will be best remembered by the leading part he took in the semi-philosophical, semi-religious discussion which took place a score of years ago, in connection with the question of the efficacy of prayer. His writings at this time, in connection with his proposal to bring the question within the range of the scientific methods by means of the famous prayer-test, will still be regarded by many as illustrating the fact that many men, eminent by reason of their acuteness and success in inquiries in the domain of physical science, prove themselves singularly unfitted for logical and metaphysical disputations. May it not be that the special faculties which qualify their possessor for success in the one field of labor, and which are in turn highly developed by exercise in that field, are quite distinct in kind from those which bring both inclination and ability for research in the other? Or may it be simply that a too exclusive use of the experimental methods required in the one, prevents the due cultivation and development of the powers needed for the other? Whatever may be the explanation, some of Professor Tyndall's more recent utterances on political questions, marked as they were by a strength of prejudice and a heat of passion far removed from the judicial calmness of the expert scientific explorer, present mental phenomena of a somewhat similar kind. Apart, however, from any views which may be held in regard to his success in other departments of thought, the fact remains that his name will go down to posterity as that of one who had no superior and few peers in the scientific realm which he made peculiarly his own.

The two principles which stand out most conspicuously in the Democratic Tariff Bill now before the United States Congress are (1) raw material free; (2) ad valorem instead of specific duties. Passing by, for the present, the first, the second seems so obviously the right principle under any financial system that it is hard to see why all parties should not heartily accept it. In favour of specific duties it may be said that they are more easily collected because less room is left for evasion, and, though no Protectionist Government would openly say this, that they make it possible to collect a duty so large that no people would submit to it if the percentage were baldly stated. On the other side, the principle is obviously unrighteous, in that it has the effect of taxing the purchasers of the cheaper qualities of goods, that is, as a rule, the poor, more heavily than the rich, whereas almost every one who makes any pretension to either statesmanship or philanthropy will admit in theory that the incidence of taxation should follow just the opposite rule. The preference of our own Government for specific taxes is probably susceptible of one or

both of two explanations. Being strongly wedded to the theory of protection they find, it may be, that in the case of a number of comparatively inexpensive commodities in common use no percentage of taxation which they could venture to propose would counteract the popular preference and check importation to such an extent as to give the home manufacturers the desired protection. This is a more charitable, and probably a more correct supposition than the second reason, which is that before mentioned, viz., the facility the specific system affords for imposing an enormous rate upon a variety of cheaper articles used by the poorer classes. This latter motion, it is needless to add, is the one usually attributed to the Government by the Opposition in their assaults upon the iniquity of specific duties. This method of collecting revenue, or prohibiting importation, as the case may be, is absolutely indefensible, and will be admitted to be so, we believe, by a large and increasing number of those who believe in protection. Now that our people are so fully convinced of the necessity of tariff-reform, it may be hoped that this system of unfair discrimination against those in humble circumstances may receive its death-blow at the approaching meeting of the Dominion Parliament.

The debate in the British Commons two or three weeks since upon the Employers' Liability Act, and especially upon Mr. McLaren's proposed amendment, permitting employers to contract themselves out of the provisions of that Act, was interesting and vigorous. As our readers will remember, Mr. McLaren's amendment was defeated only by the narrow majority of nineteen. At first thought it is not easy to see why workingmen should not be free to forego the possible benefits of such an Act, if they choose to do so, in return for some other promised advantage which they deem of greater value. But further reflection makes it pretty clear that to include this provision, which, by the way, was petitioned for by a large number of railway employees, would be to render the whole Act comparatively worthless. In the keen competition of the times the workman who is unemployed, or who fears to lose his situation, will often be ready to make almost any condition for the sake of permanent employment. Hence, it would be easy for employers who were too parsimonious or too indifferent to take proper precautions to ensure the safety of their employees to make such a contract a condition of giving employment. This danger is made clearer by the fact that the same argument of "freedom" which was made to do yeoman service in this debate, was on former occasions used on behalf of a like liberty from the tyranny of the Factory Acts, Mines Regulations Acts, etc. It would never do to allow the great mass of workmen, who need and claim the protection