

forth by an exhibition of the rare courage which is needed to enable one to break away from the ranks of the party in which he has long held an honoured and influential position? Was it a sudden flaming forth of the smouldering embers of the Equal Rights' agitation of a few years ago? Was it an expression of popular indignation against the Government on account of the course which it is pursuing, under its new Chief, in the Manitoba school matter? Or is the mainspring of the demonstration to be found in the growing discontent with the National Policy? A good deal could be said in support of any of these views. Probably each of the causes indicated was operative in some degree.

Regarded from the point of view of its bearing upon the political situation, the demonstration seems to us to warrant two inferences of considerable importance. The first is that whatever may be the decision of the Supreme Court with reference to the right of the Federal Government to interfere in the Manitoba school question, any attempt on the part of Sir John Thompson and his colleagues to restore the Separate schools in Manitoba, or to compensate the appellants from Dominion or Provincial funds, would evoke a storm of indignation which would sweep the Government from power. That Manitoba must not be interfered with in the matter may be regarded as settled. As a corollary, too, the North-West Territories must, sooner or later, have the same liberty of action.

The second inference is that the dissatisfaction with the "National Policy" is deep-seated and wide-spread. It would probably be too much to say in regard to this question as we have in regard to the other, that it shows that the state of public feeling is such that the Government must either give way to it or be itself swept away. There is, we fear, still great danger lest half measures be accepted from the Government and the root of the evil left in the soil. The friends of equal rights in the matter of trade will do well to bestir themselves and keep the subject before the people during the recess. All that is needed, now that the people are awaking from their long lethargy, is that the discussion be kept up, and the spirit of enquiry and investigation into the workings of protection encouraged and stimulated. Mr. McCarthy's reference to the tariff question was comparatively brief. He was sufficiently clear and emphatic in declaring against protection as a policy for the future, but unfortunately the substitute which is the best he as yet sees his way to propose is so inadequate and open to so many objections that the effectiveness of his campaign cannot but be seriously impaired in consequence. His policy of differential duties in favour of Great Britain and by consequence in favour of all those nations with which Great Britain has treaties demanding "most favoured nation" treatment, has the very serious defect that it involves discrimination against, and almost surely retaliation from,

the one foreign nation whose commercial friendship is worth more to Canada, ten times over, than that of all other foreign nations combined, notwithstanding, and this is the point we wish to make just here, the fact that Mr. McCarthy's unequivocal condemnation of protection as a future policy for Canada met with so hearty endorsement in this City and from that audience means much, though it may not mean all that the friends of free-trade, or of tariff for revenue only, could wish.

While we congratulate Mr. McCarthy on the signal proof the demonstration gave that he stands high in the esteem and confidence of a large and influential body of his fellow-citizens, and while we recognize the ability and oratorical power displayed on this as on many previous occasions, we are bound in frankness to say that his logic seems to us to be singularly at fault in two or three particulars. In the first place, we are quite unable to understand how the man who plants his foot so firmly on the solid rock where the rights of Manitoba and the North-West are concerned in the matter of the dual languages and the public schools, can still defend his former advice to the Government to veto the Jesuits' Estates Act of the Province of Québec, and his subsequent vote for such action. If he defended Manitoba simply because he thought her legislation right, and condemned Québec simply because he thought her legislation wrong, he might, it is true, save his logic at the expense of his respect for the constitution. But if, as we understand him, he champions the cause of Manitoba and the North-West on the principle of "Provincial Rights," it surely follows that the quality of the legislation could not vitiate the same argument in the case of Québec.

Equally hard is it to reconcile Mr. McCarthy's denunciation of the injustice of the protective tariff as it operates to-day with his defence of his previous action in helping originally to fasten it upon the country. "Do you realize," he asks, "that if you buy an article worth \$10, \$4 of that is added to the price by reason of this protective policy? Do you realize that all you buy—not the goods you bring into the country, because that goes to pay your taxes, but the goods that are made in the country—are either 30 per cent. dearer or they are 30 per cent. less valuable? Do you realize what that means? You know that you have twenty millions of taxes and you have got to pay them! But, do you know, you are paying three times twenty millions, which don't go into the treasury, but go into the pockets of the manufacturers." These are pointed and telling questions. But what is the aim and end of a protective policy if not to enable the manufacturers to add so much per cent. to the prices of their goods? And what else could be expected by any one who has an astute lawyer's knowledge of human nature than that protection in a country of small population would lead to combinations? What

reason had any one to take for granted that Canadian manufacturers were so much more disinterested and philanthropic than those of other countries that they would continue to sell their goods at a much lower price than the tariff made it possible for them to obtain, or that they were so much more short-sighted than those of other nations that they would continue a ruinous competition when it was so much simpler and wiser to combine for mutual profit? We hope for much effective aid to tariff reform from Mr. McCarthy's able advocacy, but we cannot conceal our opinion that that advocacy will become doubly effective when he shall have seen his way clear to say that the protective policy was a wrong and a blunder from the outset.

THE CHILD PROBLEM.*

We must be more radical in our methods and more active every way if we expect any great degree of success in our efforts to reduce the amount of pauperism and crime in the community. We must begin at the source. If we would cope effectually with this problem we must begin with the destitute and delinquent children, and we must remove them from the evil influence and from the cruel treatment of drunken or criminal parents.

In cases of a serious conflagration, firemen do not hesitate to demolish valuable buildings to stop the advance of the flames, and in case of an epidemic the officers of the Board of Health do not hesitate to force their way, into every suspected dwelling, and, if need be, to forcibly remove the inmates young or old to the pest-house or to the fever hospital. They do not stop to sentimentalize about "the inviolability of the fireside," or in what sense "a man's house is his castle." This is surely radical treatment, but the community looks on and approves. When parents are neglecting their children or bringing them up to a life of vice or crime, in the interests of society, in the interests of the children, and, in many cases, in the interests of the parents themselves, we must interfere—of course, by process of law—and remove the children from their evil surroundings; with the consent of said parents if possible, but remove them we must.

In an admirable paper in the "North American Review," for September 1891, by Mr. Charles Martindale, a high authority and quoted approvingly by Prof. Francis Wayland, Principal of the Yale Law School, he says:—

"It is a vulgar supposition that the parent has some natural property in his children; that children 'belong to their parents.' Such is not the legal status of the infant. From the time of his birth, the infant is a subject of the State, having an individuality separate from its parents, with distinct rights of person and property, with separate obligations to and claims upon the sovereign. The only right of the parent recognized by the law is one of guardianship. The right and custody of their children, however, comes to parents not by the course of nature, not by birth or blood, but is derived from the State, and must be exercised under the

* Read before the Canadian Institute, March 4th, 1893, by A. M. Rosebrugh, M. D.