

a repetition of a brawl which has left an indelible stain upon the history of one of the most ancient and dignified deliberative assemblies in the world, and brought shame and confusion of face to statesmen of all ranks and parties. If it could be established, as there is some reason to think, that the outbreak was deliberately planned, it is highly desirable that not only the members of the House, but the British people and the world, which has looked on in astonishment, should know the fact and be enabled to justly affix the blame. So far as our present knowledge of this and previous disgraceful scenes, which differed from it only in degree, enables us to form an opinion, the honours, such as they are, are pretty evenly distributed between the parties. It may be that it is perfectly parliamentary for an honourable member to describe a whole class of his fellow-members as "garrulous and impecunious," but utterly inexcusable for one of the class so characterized to denounce the characterization as "a gross impertinence," but the distinction is too nice to be obvious to the ordinary on-looker. So too, few of us would care to pronounce an opinion upon the question whether it is more reprehensible to liken the aged statesman at the head of the Government to "Herod," or to call the member so doing a "Judas," though Speaker Peel seems to have been able to mark a clear distinction between the two. In view of the unfortunate reputation of Irishmen for readiness to resort to rough-and-ready methods of settling differences of opinion, the Nationalist members are to be congratulated on the fact, which seems to be established, that they did not strike the first blow, if indeed they struck any blow in the melee.

It then becomes merely a question of how [the necessary revenue] shall be levied—i.e., whether a man shall have his tea free and pay duty on his clothes, or vice versa. If the tax be put upon his tea, nothing happens save a rise in the price of that popular beverage; whereas, if it be put upon his clothes, a factory for the making of these clothes may be started in his own town, with the effect of increasing population and the value of everything he possesses. To prove that this injures the man in question is, indeed, a herculean task.—*Montreal Star.*

This is plausible enough to be worth examination. The man in question might soliloquize somewhat as follows: I am willing to pay my share of taxes for the necessities of an economical Government. I am not willing to be taxed in order to increase the income of my neighbour, or to secure for him a higher price for his goods than that for which they can be procured elsewhere. If my tea is taxed, I know that the amount of the tax, less the cost of collection, goes directly to the Government. The aim is simple; the method direct and effective. But if my clothing is taxed, with the double purpose of raising a revenue and creating an industry by protection, a

see saw takes the place of a straight line. The two objects are incompatible and contradictory. Just so far as the tax goes to the Government, i.e., just so far as I continue to import my clothing, the home factory is not helped. On the other hand, just so far as my tax goes to aid the home factory, i.e., just so far as I purchase its products, no revenue results. I pay the tax to the clothing manufacturer and I must be taxed on something else to make good the deficiency to the Government. In that case I am not only supporting my family and paying my share of taxes to the Government out of the proceeds of my own industry, whatever it may be, but am also being taxed for the support or enrichment of my neighbour to just the extent to which the price of my clothing is increased by the tax. Evidently to use a current metaphor more expressive than elegant, the Government cannot at the same time eat its cake (or mine) and give it to the manufacturer of clothing.

It will be remembered by some of our readers that in connection with the meeting of the International Educational Convention in Toronto a year ago, steps were taken to supply a want which has for years been felt by teachers and others interested in educational work throughout the Dominion—that of a more complete text-book of Canadian History than has yet been produced for use in the schools. To this end a Committee was formed, of which W. Patterson, Esq., of the Royal Arthur School, Montreal, is Secretary, to make preliminary arrangements and invite competition for the production of such a book. Mr. Patterson's letter, in another column, announces a plan of procedure, and invites historians and would-be historians to prepare manuscripts for submission to the judgment of the Committee. While recognizing the need of such a book, and hoping for the success of the method in causing a work of high quality to be forthcoming, we cannot conceal our opinion that, under such a scheme, both authors and the Committee are placed in a somewhat peculiar position. Desirable as it is to foster a patriotic Canadian sentiment in the minds of the boys and girls in our schools, it is still more important that they should grow up with just and broad conceptions of the status of their own country, of its history and prospects, and of its relation to other lands and nations. In being called on to produce a history to order, for an avowedly patriotic purpose, it is evident that Canadian writers are exposed to considerable temptation to patriotic exaggeration. For similar reasons the Committee will need to be on its guard against any inclination to give the preference to the work which shall be most successful in magnifying the historical incidents and the natural resources and prospects with which they deal, rather than in keeping well within the strict limits of well established

historical fact and the severe laws of historical proportion. We have to confess, too, that we do not quite understand why it should be made necessary for any would-be competitor to sue for "permission to write," and are a little curious to know what terms must be submitted to or what credentials furnished in order to gain such permission. We must assume, however, that the members of the Committee, having given the subject full consideration, have good reasons for wishing to limit the number of competitors, or to know the names, or views, or records of competitors. We can only hope that the inducements offered may prove sufficient to engage in the competition the best historical talent in the Dominion and that the chosen work may be a model text-book.

Is it better that a hundred murderer should escape than that one innocent man or woman should be sent to the penitentiary or the gallows? Is it better that a hundred innocent men or women should be suspected and imprisoned than that one guilty of an atrocious crime should escape? These are hard questions. Thoughtful persons could, we dare say, be found to approve either proposition. We do not know that the intrinsic difficulty is greatly lessened if we substitute "one" for "a hundred" in each case. Every good citizen must be more or less willing to suffer vicariously, not for the individual but for society collectively. There is no infallibility in any human agent whom we may employ for the detection and punishment of crime. Some risk is a part of the price we all have to pay for the comparative security for life and property, which are gained for the community, by our criminal laws and the machinery we employ for enforcing them. Yet, notwithstanding all our philosophy, it is not wonderful that such cases as that of Lizzie Borden, which recently occurred in Massachusetts, and which is continually being duplicated on a smaller scale in our criminal courts, should shock the public sense of justice and raise an outcry against officers and administrators. Every man who is arrested and imprisoned for a crime which he cannot be proved to have committed, and of which a jury of his peers consequently pronounce him "not guilty," has a case against the officers of justice and the society whose agents they are, which differs only in degree from that of the unfortunate woman whose long imprisonment, painful trial, and ultimate acquittal, in Massachusetts, have aroused so much sympathy and indignation. It does seem unfair that no compensation, no atonement, is deemed necessary by society or the State to the person who has been deprived temporarily at least of liberty, reputation, and social respect; very often it may be of health and the means of a subsistence, through being accused of a crime which he or she cannot be proved to have committed, not to say of which he or