

Next to the dead-heads come those who insist upon calling *encore* whenever they have heard anything at a concert that pleases them. Montreal audiences may be considered as remarkable for that. When the Jubilee Singers were at the Queen's Hall almost every piece was encored. It is much the same at all other concerts. That is to say, people pay a certain price to hear a certain number of pieces executed; but they insist upon having double the amount they bargained for. At an amateur concert, where the singers are content with the honour and glory of the thing, that may do very well, but when it is given by professionals I fail to see wherein the justice of it lies. A song represents so much ability, practice and actual labour, and why should the whole be repeated for nothing? If those demanding the *encore* would pay for it, the thing would be reasonable. But that never enters into the calculations of the delighted cheerists. I remember that the great English tenor, Sims Reeves, used to refuse to respond to an *encore* unless paid for it, and I think he was right. If one should go to a restaurant and demand a second plate of soup because he liked the first, should he get it for nothing? If one should relish a steak from the butcher's, should he be entitled to insist upon having another for the same money? No one will say, yes. Then let us be honest and take what we have bargained for. If we demand an extended bill of fare, let us pay for the extras.

Those writers who have been exercised in their mind over the question whether to write M.P.'s or M.'sP. for members of Parliament, will, perhaps, be glad to have so eminent an authority as the Earl of Beaconsfield for writing M.P.'s.

Some writers of letters to the *Star*, who are supposed to reflect "Public Opinion," are suggesting that our members of Parliament be paid by the day instead of \$1,000 for the session, as now. But I do hope that they won't press the matter, nor get up any enthusiasm about it, for the change would involve more expense than this poor afflicted country could bear. The session would last all the year round, if that were done. When would the Quebec Parliament close? Not even for summer fishing and Christmas Pudding.

Toronto is fast achieving an unenviable notoriety for general immorality and civic mismanagement. A little while ago public attention was called to Sunday doings at the central prison where need for reform seemed necessary. Archbishop Lynch is bitterly complaining of the impurities of the city, some of which he is compelled to witness, but it was left for the police to reach the climax of atrocities by doing to death and disgrace a poor woman called Casey. Mrs. Casey was the honest industrious wife of an honest industrious man. The room in which she and her two children slept became filled with poisonous gas in the night. She awoke half stupified with a congested brain to find her two children dead. The police put her under arrest and hurried her off to jail; she was flung into an underground cell where but meagre bed clothes were furnished. The police said she was drunk; they refused to allow a priest to see her and even her own husband was denied admission to the cell although he could hear her calls for him. The woman died of the gas poison in her brain, and the Toronto police are doubtless sorry that they did not suspect it possible for a poor woman to be in a dazed condition without being drunk—but with whom does the responsibility for these things lie?

In Montreal, too, we have had an exhibition of police brutality disclosed before the Court of Sessions. At the time of the Exhibition one of the sight-seers on the ground was clubbed by a policeman, struck on the arms, chest and head for simply being in the crowd on the grounds, and I presume he had paid to be there, while the policeman would be paid for his presence. A curious part of the drama—it might have been a tragedy—was that one of the witnesses for the defence stated that he was a policeman off duty, and swore that the policeman charged with striking the prosecutor on the head did not do so, but struck him elsewhere, but that he (the witness) did the striking on the head. Twenty dollars fine was imposed on the policeman on duty, but on the generous comrade who swore to that which made him the

worst offender of the two, no punishment was inflicted. I presume if the man had retaliated with a stick and broken the head of the policeman "off duty" some severe imprisonment would have been awarded.

If people who go out on gala occasions are to be clubbed about the head by the men who are supposed to be guardians of the people, simply because they happen to be inoffensive sight-seers in a crowd, some severe reprisals may occur at the first opportunity. Has Chief Paradis got these two men still in his force? If so, I think our Police Committee would do well to make two vacancies as an example to other members of the force how to treat orderly crowds—even if it was on an occasion when a Governor-General had to have a way made for him.

The *Globe* says the Canada Pacific Railway might probably have been constructed by the Canadian Government on the country's account, either for working or leasing, but for the circumstance of Sir Charles Tupper being Minister of Railways. No party considerations, nor even the conduct of a Minister, should obscure the light of a public journal on the future and permanent interests of the Dominion. To secure that future we need at least an option of purchase of the line, and reversion of unsettled and unimproved lands in the interest of the people. The completion of the through communication in advance of the action of the Northern Pacific would, at any rate, add greatly to the prestige of Canada among the nations, and it may be safely asserted that colonization enterprises from Europe can hardly be carried on without such prestige. Great material constructions successfully brought through are exactly the thing that the European peoples, including both capitalists and men of action, respect in a new country. The risk in any event is much less than those quite unfamiliar with financial considerations will generally understand.

In a recent paper published in London called the *Railway Sheet and Official Gazette* there is an article headed "Education of Railway Employés" in which it is stated that "the Canadian Employés have been furnished with a reading-room at Cleveland, Ohio." English people have generally had to have a war, an earthquake, or a revolution occur in a foreign country to teach them a little geography but the Editor of a newspaper which circulates amongst the intelligent Railway Employés of England should not be so ignorant of places as to make Cleveland, one of the foremost cities in the State of Ohio, "Canadian." It shows a great want of information about Canada and the United States. Schoolboys in England learn the names of the different countries on the continent of Europe, and it would be as well when they are taught the names of the English towns and counties if they were instructed in those of the Canadian Provinces and of the States, territories and principal cities of the American Union. What would the English people think of a statement in an American paper such as "English Railway Employés have been furnished with a reading-room at Antwerp"? But no American or Canadian could make such an absurd blunder.

The *American* says: "We think Secretary Thompson showed but little judgment in his treatment of H. B. M. ship, the 'Sandringham.' It was quite right to extend to a British vessel in distress, though injured at sea, the courtesies of the Norfolk Navy Yard, and to give her, by courtesy, a precedence over our own vessels. But it was a blunder to withdraw these courtesies and to order her out of the yard, because her captain indulged in profane abuse of the country whose kindness he was accepting. It was not to the captain of the 'Sandringham,' it was to the British nation that we were rendering these services. And the authorities of that nation might have been trusted to take proper cognizance of the captain's gratuitous insults. There has been, certainly, of late years, no want of readiness in that quarter, to consult our sensibilities and preferences. The attitude of the British admiralty towards our insignificant navy is very different from what it was in the opening decades of the century. The act of the Secretary of the Navy seems to indicate a want of confidence in our