

of Hoboken, to Bishop Wigger, his ecclesiastical superior, and accepted by the latter as a basis of settlement of the matters in dispute between them, is a curious document. As a clever example of "how not to do it," it reminds us of an apology Captain Marryatt puts into the mouth of one of his midshipmen, a saucy young sea-dog who had insulted one of his superior officers by declaring that he, the said officer, was not fit for a certain very menial office, and who, to escape the threatened rope's-end on the quarter deck, formally retracted his insulting words, and declared that he now considered said officer "perfectly fit." Father Corrigan is not quite so saucy, it is true, but he assures his Bishop that he is "satisfied that whatever mistakes he [the said Bishop] may have made, did not proceed from malice."

The incident is of public interest as suggesting new or greatly modified relations between priests of the Church of Rome and their ecclesiastical superiors in the United States. Father Corrigan is, it appears, a priest who is given to speaking, and to writing for the newspapers, with a freedom unwonted among the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. In consequence of several offences of this kind, Bishop Wigger had summoned him for trial, appointing a confidential priest of his own household to try the case. Then a thing heretofore unheard of happened. Father Corrigan objected to having the case tried by the person named by the Bishop. The question was left to arbitrators, and they decided against the Bishop. Friends of both parties then used their good offices with the result that the Bishop offered to dismiss the charges on condition that Father Corrigan should offer an apology and go into a retreat for two weeks. The obdurate priest refused to go into a retreat unless the Bishop would go also, with the result that the case was finally settled as above indicated. The result can hardly fail to prove a stimulus to liberty of speech among Catholic priests in the United States. If it may be taken, along with the deliverance on the school question, and the condonation of Father McGlynn's offences and his restoration to the arms of the Church, as an outcome of the visit of Mgr. Satolli, that prelate's mission will be a memorable one in the history of the Roman Catholic Church in the United States.

Among the many philanthropic institutions of Toronto there is none whose work and aims commend it more heartily to the sympathy and support of all good citizens than the "Children's Aid Society." The first annual report of this Society showed a very considerable amount of child-saving work done with very limited resources. It is to be hoped that, with the enlarged experience which its managers have gained, and in view of what may, we fear, prove to be the increased necessity for its operations during the winter which is now upon us, the Society may have largely increased means placed at its disposal by generous citizens. There can be no doubt as to the necessity and the true utility of the work carried on in the Shelter Department of the Society. As we have often had occasion to remark, there is probably no one respect in which the imperfection of our civilization is more deplorably apparent than in our defective provision for the protection and training of neglected children. The fact of the necessity of interposing in some cases to save little ones of tender years from the brutality of their own

parents, or other natural or legal guardians, humiliating as it is, is evident even from the report of this young Society.

But what a tale of woe and horror is contained in the recently published statistics of the British Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children. This Society has been in operation for eight years, and during that time has dealt with no less than 25,849 cases of cruelty, affecting 56,615 different children. Happily the old extreme views with regard to the absolute right of control of parents, no matter how incompetent or vicious, over their children, are passing away, and the claims of humanity and a Christian conception of human brotherhood are beginning to prevail. All who have hearts to sympathize with the sufferings of the unfortunate of what Mr. Asquith has called "a dumb and helpless class" of our fellow beings, will acknowledge the debt of gratitude which society and humanity owe to those who are giving time and thought and labour for the rescue of neglected, abused and destitute children, and will not fail to manifest that sympathy upon occasion in tangible forms.

We are glad to receive even the modified approval of so good a journal as the Montreal Star. We are still more gratified to find that erstwhile influential advocate of the "National Policy" now ranged so unmistakably on the side of those who are demanding tariff reform. But in one or two respects the Star has misapprehended our position. It is not correct in supposing that we have, either "wisely" or unwisely, given up, "in the face of the Democratic victory, all thought of reciprocity." The thing that we have—not, indeed, "given up," seeing that we have never advocated it, but—pronounced unacceptable to Canadians "at the price proposed," is Commercial Union on the basis of a common tariff, and that the tariff of the United States, against Great Britain. It is true, as we said last week, that "theoretically we have no admiration for commercial treaties. In its very nature a commercial treaty implies trade restrictions to be removed, and in our humble opinion all trade restriction is evil, only evil, and that continually. But as absolute freedom of trade is not likely to be reached for a decade or two in America, it is quite possible that it may be for the advantage of Canada to make, should opportunity be given, a fair treaty of commerce with the United States. Such a treaty was, if we may credit the American Secretary of State, possible a year or two ago. It will be much more likely to be attainable under the Democratic regime. Meanwhile we shall be glad to see both countries scaling down their protective and oppressive tariffs as rapidly as possible. Every reduction on either side will make such an arrangement easier.

We commend The Week, however, to consider the advisability of treating our tariff toward Britain in a broader spirit, and thus gaining for ourselves a larger trade with the market where the prices of our surplus are always fixed, whether we sell there or not. Let us be competitors and not "understudied" of the American exporters.

The above paragraph in The Star's article has puzzled us not a little. Is our contemporary indulging in a little good-natured irony at its own expense? How else are we to understand such advice to a journal which has for years been steadily advocating the lowering

of the barriers which we have disloyally erected against the trade of the Mother Country—advice, too, from a journal which has been until recently one of the staunchest upholders of those barriers? For, be it observed, the only hindrances to the freest possible trade with the British market are hindrances for which we, ourselves, are responsible, and which we may remove whenever we will. Did we not, before the Presidential election, when there seemed to be little hope of a change of policy on the part of the United States, repeatedly urge that the very best way of meeting the McKinley Bill would be to throw open our markets as freely as possible to Great Britain? Could we treat our tariff towards her in a broader spirit than that, or adopt more effective means for gaining for ourselves a larger trade with her? If we have an eye just now mainly for the market of the United States it is because it is the exclusion from that market by the double row of customs' walls that is just now doing most to create the depression and unrest which the State and we alike deplore.

THE CASE OF PETROLEA.

The enterprise of the Toronto Globe in sending out two commissioners of different political faiths to inquire into the state of opinion and feeling in the country is to be commended. It is a great improvement upon what is more often the method of the party paper., viz., to send a single commissioner expected to report only what may be supposed to be pleasing to the patrons of the paper and helpful to the party. Of course the Globe's method lies under the disadvantage that the commissioners can, in the nature of the case, talk with but a very few individuals in each locality, and can give no satisfactory guarantee that these are fairly representative of the whole, or even of the majority. Yet the probabilities are largely in favour of their being so to a considerable extent. Nor, it must be admitted, is it easy to suggest a better method. At the least, the information thus gained concerning the state and needs of the country cannot fail to be very valuable to those who are honestly desirous to know the facts.

The latest reports from these commissioners at the date of this writing covers their visit to Petrolea, a most interesting field from a protectionist point of view. As all readers of the newspapers are aware, the N. P. is just now subject to assault all along the line, but at no point has the concentration of the enemy's fire been more severe than at that suggested by the name "Petrolea." People of all classes, and especially the farmers, are beginning to ask why they should be required either to use a very inferior illuminator at a much higher price than that for which they could, but for the high tariff, procure a superior article; or to pay for the latter three times the price for which it could be procured but for that tariff. The only possible answer is that given to The Globe's Commissioners by interested parties in Petrolea. That answer is not completed in the interviews the report of which is before us, but enough appears to make it clear that we have, in this case, a defence of protection which has at least the merit of novelty. As a rule, when a protected industry is assailed the defence of its supporters is that, by reason of the better market secured by the tariff, the producers or manu-