

terrible charge is brought against the Liberal candidate. It is affirmed that once upon a time he actually presented an Orange flag to one of the lodges at Point St. Charles. If this is a specimen of the campaign arguments in Montreal Centre we fear the constituency is hardly alive to its responsibilities and privileges.

Toronto's
Franchises.

By its resolution on Monday last with regard to keeping the control of the water franchise in its own hands the Toronto City Council covered itself with an appreciable amount of glory. Alderman Hubbard, who moved the resolution which declared "that it is the deliberate opinion of the Council that the continuance of the municipal ownership and operation of the waterworks system and the unrestricted control of all sources of water supply are desirable and absolutely necessary in the financial interests of the Corporation, and that the health, comfort, and convenience, and general interests of the citizens will be best promoted by such municipal ownership, operation, and control," is worthy of the best thanks of the citizens at large. He may have some little obloquy to endure at the hands of those who regard the City Hall as a field for the questionable talents of questionable and penniless financiers, but he will be supported by the solid and respectable element of Toronto citizenship. The municipal ownership and control of franchises, as opposed to the idea of farming them out, is an idea which, in these days, is finding much favour. It still remains a fact that municipal government on this side of the Atlantic costs nearly double what it does on the other. One reason of this difference no doubt—especially with regard to the more important British cities—arises from the economical administration of such franchises as those relating to gas, water, and street railway traffic, and any step that can be judiciously made towards something of this sort in our own case is to be commended. The history of our waterworks enterprise in the past has, it is true, been marked by numerous mistakes. These are, unfortunately, almost inseparable from progress. There is nothing in our experience, however, to warrant our giving the franchise away to a private commercial corporation who would take toll on every gallon of water we use, and who moreover could not possibly give us any definite assurance that we should not be in a worse hole in a few years than we were at the time the watercarts were going around our streets. The resolution of the City Council is also memorable as the definite ending of parleying with an enterprise which never presented sufficiently substantial grounds for asking the favour of our municipal representatives.

The
Savoyarde.

The baptism of the "Savoyarde," or presentation bell, made by Savoy to the Sacré Coeur Cathedral was really a very interesting event and was looked forward to by even those not belonging to the Church world. The bell weighs 19 tons, and is only in its temporary home as some years must elapse ere the dome and towers of the sacred edifice be completed. The baptismal ceremony of the bell was just the same as if for an ordinary baby—in the present case it was as if a "Woolwich infant" was "suspended," not held, at the font. It was clothed in a robe of white laces that cost 5,000 frs.; it was sprinkled with holy water and anointed with sacred oil; it was blessed and then called "Francoise Marguerite," after its god-mother, the Countesse de Boigne; the god-father was the Archbishop of Chambéry—all natives of Savoy and the country whose specialty is to cast bells. In the cathedral at least 40,000 persons were congregated, who

had come from all parts of France. The gathering of the clergy, under the Archbishop of Paris, was imposing, and the sermon delivered by the Père Monsabré was worthy of the best days of sacred eloquence in France. It was a stirring apostrophe where the bell was to symbolize peace on earth, good will to men, and from the hill which would be its home for ages he hoped its voice would ever sound "Vivat Jesus!"

* * *

The Hyams Case.

A MURDER case has an interest not merely for lawyers, but for all classes of the community. As states grow more civilized only the modes of killing are changed, for the original savage instinct still remains of taking by force what does not belong to you or putting a rival out of the way. As there is more dread of being found out so there is greater ingenuity shown to avoid detection. From the very nature of the crime the murderer and his victim are often, in fact usually, the only persons present. The law, therefore, is obliged to trace the crime from the evidence which is afforded by such circumstances as can be collected, showing first that a murder was committed, and next who did the act. There are few occasions when direct evidence can be got from persons who saw the crime committed. If society is to protect itself it must see that these cases in which the crime has been detected after its commission are thoroughly ventilated. The duty of the Court is not only to protect a theoretically innocent man, but also to protect society. That is what courts are organized for, and if any member of a court is so constituted that he considers it necessary to throw around a prisoner charged with murder such an aegis of protection that under no circumstances could that prisoner be convicted, he does not know his duty. The facts developed by the Crown in the case of the Hyams brothers were that these men were in great financial straits. Their record in the States was known to be bad, they having been convicted of getting from employees large sums of money fraudulently, and when convicted having "jumped their bail" and escaped here. They owed an employee here a large sum of money, obtained by some scheming representations, which they could not make good. Being cornered they promised this man to have a sum ready for him on a certain day. On that day they clear the course by sending every soul, except themselves, off on useless errands. They get the man down to where they are alone and then raise a clamour that he is found dead struck by a weight down an elevator shaft. Instead of getting the nearest doctor they run off without raising any alarm some distance for their own family doctor. He is brought down, a coroner is then telephoned for, who, after hearing their story and what the family physician reports, certifies to death by accident. When questioned by people they tell different stories. Before the death they had insured the victim's life and receive the profits of the insurance and one of them marries the murdered man's sister and thereby secures the remainder of the money. Their financial condition, apart from the insurance money received, is proved to have been utterly desperate and it was impossible for them to have paid the insurance premiums. Suspicion is not aroused until an attempt is made to insure the sister's life in the same manner as the life of the murdered brother had been insured. Then the death of the brother is remembered and the public investigation is begun. All of these facts except the last and the previous bad record of the accused are brought out as proved facts. If ever there was a case which the Crown was justified in sternly pressing for judgment it was this one.