with the public schools, properly so called, to be supported by the taxes of the people. The vices of such an arrangement are many. It makes the Government responsible for religious teaching in a country which has no State Church, and in which the absolute separation of Church and State is accepted almost as a political axiom. It tends to intensify and perpetuate, with the aid of Provincial funds, educational and religious prejudices and lines of division between citizens, which it should be the aim of wise legislation to minimize or obliterate. Above all, let us say it frankly, it pledges the Government and Legislation to the support of what the great majority of the members of those bodies conscientiously believe to be the worse, side by side and equally with that which they believe to be the better educational courses and methods. Still further, it deprives a Province—and there is reason to fear, by logical consequence, a whole chain of future Provinces—of that freedom to follow its own judgment on educational matters, which is enjoyed by some of the older Provinces of the Dominion, and of which others are deprived only in virtue of a constitutional provision which belongs in time and in character to a much earlier period in the history of political enlightenment and progress. And all these results turn on the interpretation of a single and certainly somewhat ambiguous phrase in the Manitoba constitution. We cannot deny that in seeking to be guided, as the Court no doubt was, by the intention, rather than the literal meaning of the words "or practice" in the Constitution, the judges observed a sound principle, however hard it may be for the lay mind to discover the identity, or even close kinship, between a purely voluntary system of denominational schools, such as existed prior to the entrance of Manitoba into the Confederation, and a system of State-aided Separate schools such as that in question. While we say this, we fully appreciate and sympathize with the complaint of the Roman Catholic whose conscientious scruples—albeit themselves the product of the training of his Church and clergy—prevent him from using the public schools for their legitimate purpose, and relying on the religious teachers for religious training, as all other denominations are bound to do. There is certainly an apparent hardship in compelling the members of this body to pay for the support of schools which they cannot conscientiously patronize—no matter how ill-grounded those scruples may be. But the hardship is apparent rather than real, since all other religious societies are thrown upon their own resources for the propagation of their religious tenets, without being released from payment of taxes for educational and other national purposes. It is, we hope, unnecessary to add that in these comments we are by no means pronouncing an opinion on the decision of the Court whose duty it was to interpret the meaning and intention of the Constitutional Act, not to pronounce on the merits of the Act itself.

IF we may judge from the results of the first skirmishes in the Election Courts, it is by no means improbable that both political parties will have soon to face the equivalent of almost half a general election. One of the oldest and most reliable of the Liberal members, Mr. Trow, has gone down at the first onset, and, sad to say, through attempted corruption by his own son. The second case in the Courts, that of North Perth, has revealed a set of facts which may carry with it serious consequences for many members on both sides of the House. It has been clearly shown that the leaders and their agents, both Conservative and Liberal, purchased Grand Trunk travelling tickets almost by wholesale and distributed them gratis amongst their supporters. At the time of this writing the decision of the Court has not been pronounced upon the legality of this method of providing free conveyance for voters, but it seems scarcely possible that it can be otherwise regarded than as a corrupt act within the scope of the statute. It would be a strange anomaly should the same law which forbids the hiring of a cab to convey voters to the polls permit the employment of a railroad coach for that purpose. The presentation in Court by a traffic auditor of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of a bundle of accounts, to the amount of many thousands of dollars, most of them still unpaid, for tickets furnished to the orders of Cabinet Ministers, Opposition leaders and their respective agents and supporters, is a most suggestive comment upon our electoral methods. The verdict of the Court upon these transactions will be awaited with interest, and, we venture to say, by many with deep anxiety. It is noteworthy in this connection, that the evidence of the Grand Trunk officials effectively vindicates the management of that road from the charge of working in the interest of the Opposition by furnishing free conveyances, and coercing its employees. At the same time Mr. Seargeant, the General Manager, did not hesitate to say that his sympathies were wholly with the Opposition and its policy, and that he took no pains to conceal the fact. In view of this avowal, the last item in the published list of accounts above referred to, viz., "Sir John Macdonald, services free," is somewhat curious, if not suggestive. If it means, as it apparently does, that Sir John had *carte blanche* to order services without charge, how is the fact to be reconciled with the party predilections so frankly avowed by the Business Manager? Could such unwonted generosity have been prompted by that kind of gratitude which has been defined in politics as a "lively sense of favours to come"? If not, how is it to be accounted for?

"GENTLEMEN, *there* is a treaty." These are said to have been the words of the Duke of Burgundy, on one occasion, in a cabinet council, in reply to cogent reasons of state urged in favour of violating the provisions of a certain treaty which was believed to operate unfavourably to France. This single sentence, uttered with his hand resting upon the document in question, was in the estimation of the pupil of Fenelon a sufficient answer to all arguments based on grounds of profit or expediency. A similar answer, as at least bringing the discussion down to the real question at issue, might, it seems to us, be made to the pleas appearing from time to time in some Canadian journals in defence of the action of the Government in the matter of the refund of tolls on the Welland Canals. The *Empire*, for instance, in an elaborate leader replying to a recent article in the Cleveland *Marine Review*, goes into statistics to reach the conclusion that, taking into account original cost and working expenses of the Welland and St. Lawrence Canals, "a cent per bushel for the whole route can hardly be deemed an exorbitant toll." Further, after reciting some of the complaints of unfair discrimination made by the *Review*, the *Empire*, assuming the fact to be as represented, says: "No doubt Canada, if she choose, can levy differential tolls on her canals. Her right to do so has never been questioned." It is not a little strange that in these words, as throughout its whole article, the *Empire* does not even allude to the existence of the Washington Treaty, upon which the complaint of our neighbours is wholly based. As all our readers are aware, by one of the articles of that Treaty the British Government engages to urge upon the Government of the Dominion to secure to citizens of the United States the use of the Canadian canals on terms of equality with the citizens of the Dominion, while the United States Government guarantees to British subjects the use of the St. Clair Flats Canal on like terms, and engages to urge upon the State Governments the opening to them of State canals connected with the lakes or rivers traversed by or contiguous to the boundary line. Well founded complaint is, we believe, made on behalf of Canada that, whether through administrative neglect or failure of Federal influence, the State Governments have not in all cases opened their canals to Canadian vessels on the same terms which are applicable to their own citizens. This fact affords ground for earnest remonstrance, but, as two wrongs cannot make a right, and as the St. Clair Flats Canal has been made free to Canadian vessels, it cannot justify any failure on the part of the Dominion to fulfil its engagement, not only in the letter but in the spirit. The Ottawa Administration has, it is charged, failed to do so in two ways, viz., by the refund of eighteen cents per ton of the Welland Canal tolls, which it has for some years made by Order-in-Council in favour of vessels coming through the Welland Canal, on condition that their cargoes of grain be carried to Montreal, or some port east of Montreal, and now by refusing that rebate in cases where the transhipment of the grain to smaller vessels—which is necessary in order to their passage through the St. Lawrence Canals—is made at other than a Canadian port. The Canadian Government contends that, as the rebate is made to American as well as Canadian vessels on the same conditions, viz., that of going with their cargoes to Montreal or ports east of Montreal, and that of transhipping at Kingston, or some other Canadian port, there is no discrimination and hence no violation of the Treaty. On the other side it is urged that both the rebate and the regulation which now conditions it, by discriminating, as they do and are intended to do, against American ports and American routes do in effect discriminate against American vessels, and so violate the spirit if not the letter of the Treaty. As we have on former occasions admitted, in regard to the refund itself, the reply seems to us forcible, if not conclusive, and would, we fancy, be so regarded by our Government were the conditions reversed. But be that as it may, it is clear that the whole question is one of Treaty interpretation, and should be argued on its merits as such. It certainly cannot be fairly solved by calling the refund "purely a domestic regulation," or pleading that "no promise was held out that refund would be given for grain transhipped at any but a Canadian port."

AN interesting contribution to the discussion of the question of disestablishment in Wales was made by the Bishop of St. Asaph, in a speech delivered at the recent Church Congress in England. It is a common-place of the argument in favour of disestablishment that the Established Church in Wales is the Church, not simply of a minority, but of a comparatively insignificant minority of the people of Wales. The Bishop asserted that according to a calculation based on the latest statistics published in the year-books of the four Nonconformist bodies, viz.: Calvinistic Methodists, Congregationalists, Baptists and Wesleyans, which practically comprise the whole of Welsh Nonconformity, the total number of "adherents" claimed by these four denominations is 46 per cent. of the whole population of Wales and Monmouthshire. The Bishop also allows for minor sects and for Roman Catholics, adopting an estimate made by Mr. Dillwyn, and claims that after adding these there still remains 50 per cent. of the population to be accounted for. Dealing with the Bishop's figures the *Spectator* admits that it is still open to the Nonconformists to declare that where 50 per cent. of the population reject the teachings of the Welsh Church, that Church cannot in justice claim to be endowed to the exclusion of all other denominations, but points out that this line of argument is something very different from that taken by Mr. Gladstone and others, who declare that with only slight exaggeration it may be said that "the Nonconformists of Wales are the people of Wales." This is, of course, true, provided that the figures of the Bishop of St. Asaph, or rather the assumptions based upon them, are correct. We strongly suspect that the accuracy of these figures will be promptly challenged. But, accepting them for present purposes, it is clear that the Bishop and the *Spectator* both proceed upon the very large assumption that all who are not either "members" or "adherents" of some one or other of the Nonconformist denominations may be counted for the Church. It is the injustice of this method of enumeration which moved the Nonconformists of England, in Parliament and out, to protest strenuously and effectively against having a column for religions in the census statistics. No doubt in Wales as elsewhere there is a percentage who are either openly agnostic or otherwise sceptical, and a still larger percentage who may be classed as "indifferent," none of whom can be properly counted as either members or adherents of the Church, who may even be pretty safely counted on the side of Disestablishment. In view of this well-known fact it is pretty evident that to admit that one-half the population are attached to Nonconformist bodies, is equivalent to admitting that very much less than half can be reckoned as favouring the establishment. Indeed, when due weight is given to this consideration, we do not think that there is any great mystery in the fact—which the *Spectator* confesses itself unable to explain satisfactorily, in harmony with the Bishop's figures—viz.: that "Wales sends to Parliament twenty-seven Disestablishment Members and only three supporters of the Church."

IT seems impossible to know what to believe and what to disbelieve of all that is published as news concerning the difficulty between the United States and Chili. The maltreatment of sailors wearing the United States' uniform, resulting in the murder of one or more of them, in the streets of Valparaiso is, we suppose, a fact, and it certainly was an outrage which no self-respecting nation could afford to overlook. Indeed it is surprising, if it be really true, that the Provisional Government of Chili should have hesitated to offer apology and as far as possible reparation for such an occurrence. Whatever provocation may have been given by the injudicious partisanship of U. S. Minister Egan during the late civil war, it could not justify an attack of that kind. It is not unlikely, indeed, that the sailors in question may have provoked the assault, but, if so, a judicial enquiry should still have been promptly held, and might have established the fact to the