

ESTABLISHED 1866

THE MONETARY TIMES, TRADE REVIEW

And Insurance Chronicle,

With which has been incorporated the INTERCOLONIAL JOURNAL OF COMMERCE, of Montreal (in 1864), the TRADE REVIEW, of the same city (in 1870), and the TORONTO JOURNAL OF COMMERCE.

Issued every Friday morning.

SUBSCRIPTION—POST PAID:

CANADIAN SUBSCRIBERS	-\$2.00 Per Year.
BRITISH " "	10s. 6d. Sterling Per Year.
AMERICAN " "	\$2.00 United States Currency
SINGLE COPIES	10 Cents.

Book and Job Printing a Specialty.

PUBLISHED BY THE

MONETARY TIMES PRINTING COMPANY OF CANADA, Limited.

EDW. TROUT, President.

ALFRED W. LAW, Sec'y-Treas.

Office: 62 Church St., cor. Court

TELEPHONES { BUSINESS AND EDITORIAL OFFICES, 1892
PRINTING DEPARTMENT, 1485

TORONTO, FRIDAY, MAY 22, 1896.

THE SITUATION.

Of some of the queries put to the Privy Council, in connection with the question of Prohibition, the judges say, "these questions, being in their nature academic rather than judicial, are better fitted for the consideration of the officers of the Crown than of a court of law. The replies to them will necessarily depend upon the circumstances in which they may arise for decision, and these circumstances are, in this case, left to speculation." It is added that, with some exceptions, the answers are not meant to have the weight of judicial determination. Too much stress must not be laid upon opinions which necessarily contain a speculative element. On the right of a province to prohibit the manufacture of liquor, "their lordships are of opinion that provincial legislatures would have jurisdiction to that effect, if it were shown that the manufacture was carried on under such circumstances and conditions as to make its prohibition a merely local matter in the province." It would seem to follow that a province may prohibit the manufacture for the purpose of local consumption, but not otherwise. Local consumption might apply to a part of a province and probably to the whole. Such prohibition would be neutralized in its effects by the right of importation which exists; and so long as importation is legal, one effect of local prohibition of manufacture would be to substitute a foreign liquor for one of domestic origin; another might be that the substitute would be better or worse, in point of quality.

In their joint pastoral, the Roman Catholic bishops of Quebec, with whom signs the Archbishop of Ottawa, treat the Manitoba school question as *avant tout une question religieuse*, regarding which they, as successors of the apostles, claim the right and recognize the duty of directing the faithful. They claim to hold their authority of God, to be the natural judges of all questions connected with the Christian faith, religion and morality, and to act as "the recognized chiefs of a perfect society, sovereign, superior by its nature and ends to civil society." They insist on the obligation of the faithful to follow episcopal directions, and in their circular to the clergy, which accompanies their pastoral letter, they tell the priests that private judgment must sometimes be surrendered for the common good; that

is, that if any Catholic holds an opinion on this subject different from the directions contained in these documents, he is bound to surrender it. Their principal direction is that "Catholics," without exception, "ought only to give their suffrages to candidates who enter into a formal and solemn engagement to vote, in Parliament, in favor of legislation restoring to the Catholic minority of Manitoba the educational rights which the Hon. Privy Council of England has recognized as theirs." If they fail to fulfil this obligation, they are told, they will be justifiable neither before their spiritual guides nor before God Himself. This seems to make their eternal salvation depend upon the way in which they vote on this question. If this language should be interpreted as holding over the faithful the terrors of the Church, in order to induce electors to vote in a particular way, it would probably be held to come within the prohibited lines of undue influence. If not, these communications must be held as privileged. It is a moot question to which side of the line these words belong.

The *Minerve* says: "All the Catholic bishops of Canada are unanimous in approving the entire contents of the mandement," but that those whose signatures are not appended, were not asked to sign. And it adds that the bishops of Ontario, excepting of course the Bishop of Ottawa, thought it better to leave to each ordinary "the task of giving his clergy the directions necessary to assure the success of the cause of Catholic schools." Other French journals, assuming to speak with authority, make similar statements. In the circular to the clergy, Leo XIII. is quoted as saying: "Let the priests regard the authority of the bishops as sacred, and let them well understand that, unless exercised under the direction of the bishops, their sacerdotal ministration will be neither holy, nor useful, nor held in honor." A different version of the part played by some of the Ontario bishops has been given, and there may be some ground for doubt as to which is the true one.

The Canadian Industrial League has made it plain that it does not intend to allow the tariff issue to be so completely overshadowed by the Manitoba school question as to disappear from public view. At its meeting, this week, in Toronto, a resolution was passed by this body declaring that "only men who support tariff protection should be chosen as representatives of the people in the House of Commons." Though the object to be attained is different, the method of this branch of the manufacturers is the same as that used by the Roman Catholic bishops of the three ecclesiastical provinces of Quebec. Another resolution places the League on record as being opposed to any change from protection to free trade or a revenue tariff. A long preamble to these resolutions puts distinctly in issue the whole question of protection as against a revenue tariff. A reply will come, of course, from the other side, but it will probably not take the most effective form, that of a declaration of manufacturers not represented at this meeting, that they would be content without protection if the tariff secured them free raw or partially worked material required in their business. The replies, for two different lines are generally followed, will be academic and political, one of the great parties being committed to a revenue tariff. Here economic argument comes as the ally or the antagonist of special interests. The political argument will probably abate much of the economic requirement, if we may judge by what has been done already, the defence of a revenue tariff having sometimes assumed an apologetic tone. In many places the tariff question will hold the first place, and remedial legislation the second.