

depended upon personal strength and dexterity.

To another stage of leadership, that which is accentuated by the purpose or purposes of the association, belongs the Boy Scout movement, where emphasis is laid upon the purpose of the association, with its aim of developing sound character and sturdy physiques as its controlling motive. In every case the methods of leadership are effected by the aim of the education or training.

By leadership is not meant skilled proficiency in any one particular art or craft, or even the power to impart these abilities to others. Leadership is the quality that enables a man to accompany others, at the same time showing them the way; or it is the deposit of power which enables a man to attract others to his view and to influence their conduct accordingly. By some it is held that leaders are born, not made. Doubtless it is nearer the truth to say that he is made as well as born. Leadership naturally relies upon personality and training. Personality is the foundation of leadership and the centre from which leadership radiates. The personality of a prospective leader, therefore, must be such as contributing to leadership. Creel, crabbedness, disloyalty, and all those qualities that repel friendship and confidence, when a part of personality, negative the capacity for leadership. Whereas cheerfulness, optimism, trustworthiness, fortitude, and sincere loyalty accelerate its influences. Qualities like these are not mushroom. They must be sought after, cultivated, and honored, or they are not acquired at all; but when once acquired they become as permanent as anything gained by training and culture.

SOME ASPECTS OF THE SEPARATE SCHOOL QUESTION

CONTINUED FROM PAGE ONE

The Separate Common School System was enjoyed without interruption from before 1863 until 1915. In the latter year a Regulation was issued from the Department of Education which forbade doing work beyond the Fifth Form either during school hours or outside of school hours. This Regulation affected prejudicially our urban advanced schools. In 1914 another Regulation of the Department of Education had already prevented further Separate Continuation Schools from being established. This Regulation affected mainly our rural Separate schools, and a right conferred by an Act of the Legislature was rendered nugatory, was in fact abolished, by the action of a departmental official. The injustice thereby done to Catholic children is widespread and grievous; the hardships they suffer therefrom will make an appeal to every man who sympathizes with children whose educational advancement is unfairly and harshly impeded. Let me illustrate by a few examples in Western Ontario that find their counterpart, I am sure, in almost every section of this Province. Tecumseh is a village on the Grand Trunk Railway with a population almost exclusively Catholic. There are over three hundred pupils in the local Separate schools. If these children were Public school pupils, they might have been established for them after the Entrance Examination a Continuation school at their very doors. But being Separate school children, they must either discontinue their education, as most of them do, or seek it at great expense and inconvenience in a far-distant College or High school. The nearest High school is at Windsor, thirteen miles away. The children from Tecumseh who attend the Windsor High school do not reach there until half past ten in the morning. If the trains are on time they will get home at the earliest at seven-thirty in the evening. Belle River and Stony Point are villages on the same line of railway; their population is likewise almost exclusively Catholic; they have respectively two hundred and two hundred and fifty pupils in their Separate schools; they are nineteen and twenty-four miles distant from Windsor, the site of the nearest High School. The hardships from which the children of Tecumseh suffer are intensified in the case of those of Belle River and Stony Point. Ashfield, Kinkora, Mount Carmel, Woodlee, are rural parishes where, for obvious reasons, Catholics have settled in close proximity to the church, and where flourishing Separate schools are in existence. The nearest High school is miles away; communications are difficult; the roads are often almost impassable. Because Separate Continuation schools may no longer be established, many a bright boy and girl are deprived of the benefits of a higher education. The Catholic population suffers, indeed, from these educational handicaps; but the injury to the State is no less severe. A nation's greatness depends very

largely upon the education imparted to its future citizens. It would seem that the very mention of these conditions should assure their disappearance. And it does not appear to me to be improper or unreasonable that the Government and the Legislature of this Province, the guardian of the educational welfare of Catholic and non-Catholic alike, should have been petitioned to remedy grievances that have become intolerable.

DIVISION OF TAXES

I come now to the inequalities and injustice from which Separate Schools suffer through the unfair division of school taxes. No supporter of Separate schools desires one single cent of the taxes that rightfully belong to the Public schools. But there are provisions in the assessment act which seem to me indefensible. Let me set forth a few of them.

(a) The Separate schools of Ontario are educating thousands of Catholic children whose parents are not allowed to pay their taxes to the schools in which their children are educated, the reason being that such children are the offspring of marriages where the fathers are not Catholics. No compulsion is used, no compulsion could be used, on these Protestant fathers to send their children to the Separate schools. In the exercise of their freedom they choose to send their children there. Is it unfair or unreasonable to ask that they should be allowed a similar liberty to direct that their taxes should be paid to the school which educates their children? We do not ask that any compulsion be put upon them; we simply ask that they be free. If they decide, while using the educational facilities of Separate schools, to pay their school taxes to the Public schools well and good. But it does appear to me that they should not be compelled and required by law, as they are at present, to pay their taxes to the Public schools, if they choose to send their children to the Separate schools.

(b) There are many corporations in which Catholics are shareholders. The present provisions of the Assessment Act in regard of the allotment of the school taxes of these corporations are inoperative or ineffective, except in the case of small or local corporations. By "small" I mean a small number of stockholders rather than a small amount of capital, and by "local" I mean locally owned rather than locally operated. In both cases it is comparatively easy to determine the religion of the shareholder. But the division of the taxes in such cases lies in the discretion of the directors. Unless these men are dominated by a sense of justice, or unless Separate school supporters are large holders of the stock, no action is ordinarily taken. Moreover, in this connection there is a very important consideration that is frequently lost sight of. It was recently set forth by the Rev. Doctor Dickie, Chairman of the Board of Protestant School Commissioners of Montreal; I adopt it without qualification. Shares of stock, and the dividends upon them, are not produced by capital alone; they are produced by capital and labor. The school taxes which are paid upon this wealth ought not to be the exclusive concern nor within the exclusive control of those in whose name the stock is held. Many of those who co-operate in the creation of this wealth are not, and oftentimes through no fault of their own, the owners of taxable property. And yet their children have an equal right with all others to the advantages and the blessings of a liberal education. Nevertheless Separate school supporters are asking for their share of corporation taxes only where Catholics own stock in the company, and not where there is no Catholic shareholder.

(c) There are other and huge corporations, such as banks, street and steam railways, electric light, gas and telephone companies, and all similar public service corporations. They receive their franchises or charters from the representatives of the people at large; they are oftentimes paid bonuses by the State or the municipality, and Separate school supporters bear their proportionate share of this burden. Shall it be held that Separate schools must be forever deprived of their proportionate share of the school taxes of these concerns? Their stock is held not only in Canada, but in the United States and Europe; it is changing hands day by day; the religion of the stockholders cannot be determined. The directors of these enormous corporations tell us, as indeed they have often told us, that they know nothing of the religious denomination of their shareholders, and if there was a way of finding it out they would not take it. It is obvious and undeniable that the present provisions of the Assessment Act are absolutely inoperative, both in theory and in practice, with regard to this kind of property. A perfectly fair division of the school taxes of these concerns would be on the basis of the average attendance of pupils in the Separate and in the Public schools respectively. It would be simply a fair wage for work done, and for work of the very highest importance to the individual and the State.

(d) There are certain properties owned by the Dominion of Canada, or by the Province of Ontario and its municipalities. Such are the

National Railways, the Hydro Electric System, Radial Railroads and similar concerns. The credit of these public properties is carried by Separate school supporters equally with all other citizens; their ownership is vested as much in the Catholics of this Province as it is in non-Catholics. They are owned by the public. Are Catholics not a part of the public? Does it require an appeal to the courts or a judgment of the Privy Council to decide that Catholics are citizens of this Dominion? These publicly owned properties are, indeed, not always profitable investments. The deficit of the Canadian National Railways last year reached something like sixty millions of dollars. Were Separate school supporters exempted from paying their proportionate share of that huge loss? And upon what ground of fairness or of justice would Separate schools be denied their rightful share of the taxes of national properties to whose purchase and up-keep Separate school supporters are compelled to pay their due proportion?

"WHY DO YOU NOT GO TO THE COURTS?"

From many quarters in recent weeks there has been addressed to us the question "Why do you not go to the Courts?"

On February 9th the Globe declared editorially: "The most satisfactory way of dealing with the case presented by Bishop Fallon would be to secure from the court of last resort a considered judgment."

On February 10th the Toronto Evening Telegram asked the question:

"Why is a decision not sought by Bishop Fallon in open court instead of in private conference?"

On February 20th the Globe returned to the subject and said: "The issues raised by Bishop Fallon's speech are so great and far reaching . . . that they should be settled in the serene atmosphere of the highest court of the realm instead of on the political platform."

On February 22nd the Christian Guardian re-echoed the invitation:

"If Bishop Fallon is willing to abide by the Act of 1863, then let him submit his claims to the proper court and let the court decide."

And finally the Hon. W. D. McPherson, who occupied the responsible position of Provincial Secretary in the Cabinet of Sir Wm. Hearst, speaking recently in a church of this city, used the following words:

"My first remark will be one of surprise that the application for the legal definition of their educational rights, as claimed to have been guaranteed to them at the time of Confederation, should be made by the petitioners to the Cabinet and Legislature of this Province instead of to the courts of Canada."

To this question I might reply that litigation is lengthy and expensive; that it is ordinarily a last resource; that to tell us to go to the courts is neither a neighborly nor a friendly action; that in fact the question, in more than one instance, has come to us in a defiant spirit from those who are positively hostile. Or I might say that it is not the ordinary custom for anyone to go to the courts to obtain the enjoyment of his rights when other means are available. Moreover people do not ordinarily go to the courts for the vindication of their rights until such rights have been definitely denied by those in whose power it lies to concede or deny them. There is another very definite objection that can quite properly be raised to the invitation that has been so frequently addressed to us to go to the courts. Roman Catholic Separate school supporters are citizens and tax payers of this Province. They are not aliens. Among the most fundamental rights and precious possessions of citizenship are constitutional agitation and the right of petition. When Roman Catholic Separate school supporters respectfully represented to the Government and Legislature of this Province that their school rights had been abridged or infringed, I submit that they were acting with perfect propriety and that they have a right to a definite reply from those to whom their petition was addressed. According to the Attorney General of the province, in so doing we are having recourse to the highest court in Ontario. But, at the present moment, I am only suggesting the above considerations in connection with the question "Why do you not go to the courts?" For I propose to answer that question very clearly, very definitely, and I trust, very satisfactorily. If we have not gone to the courts there be the burden of the blame, if blame there be, does not rest with us.

In 1908, and continuing until 1917, a considerable portion of the legislative grant which legally and constitutionally belonged to Separate schools was illegally and unconstitutionally withheld from them, and is still withheld in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of this Province. The only legal and constitutional basis upon which the legislative grant may be divided between the general common school system and the Separate common school system is the average

attendance of pupils. That is the provision and direction of the Separate Schools Act of 1863, which was followed in practice for forty-five years, and which is again being observed. In 1908, without the knowledge, consent or approval of Separate school supporters, who were one of the parties to the original contract, the Superintendent of Education, presumably by the assent of the Minister of Education, arbitrarily altered the basis of distribution of the legislative grant; and, having thus departed from the legal method of division and alleging that the Separate schools had not earned a portion of the legislative grant that was legally their own, withheld it from them. The protests of the representatives of Separate schools were unavailing for the following nine years; finally, in 1917, the Department of Education reverted to the legal method of paying to the Separate schools their full share of the legislative grant. But to this day we have been unable to obtain the restitution of that portion of our own money which was wrongfully withheld from the Separate schools during nine years. That is one of the points in issue at the present time. Should we have to go to the courts to obtain what the Government knows full well is ours?

In 1915 Separate schools were deprived by departmental regulation of the rights which had been conferred on them in common with Public schools by the Continuation Schools Act. They were forbidden to do advanced work beyond the fifth form. They were ordered to cease doing school work which they had been doing before 1903, from 1863 to 1867, and from 1867 to 1915. We are asking that these rights be restored. Should we go to the courts before making this reasonable request?

For twenty-five years and more Separate schools have suffered financially from their inability to obtain their fair share, and in most cases any share, of the school taxes of publicly owned properties, of public service corporations, and of incorporated companies. Should Catholics have gone to the courts before presuming to regard themselves as part of the public?

Request after request was made to the Department of Education for a redress of these grievances, but without effective result. Finally the Catholic Educational Council of Ontario took the matter up officially.

On August 2nd, 1916, the Government of Sir William Hearst offered as a solution of the Separate school difficulties either of the following alternatives:—

(1) That the Schools doing advanced work at the present time be allowed to continue such work, without any restriction, but that in classes of this character be opened up hereafter, in any other Separate school, or—

(2) That the whole question be submitted in a friendly way to the courts, and that pending a decision the hampering regulations of the Department of Education be suspended.

The Catholic Educational Council decided to accept the second of these alternatives, and to go to the courts. A letter embodying this decision was delivered to the Government on the following day, and an answer was promised within a week. On August 9th, the Catholic Educational Council was informed that its letter had been considered by the Government which agreed to submit all the issues to the courts. Action was then suspended for months during which time each side studied the question and prepared its case. At length, after repeated requests on our part for definite action, two members of the Catholic Educational Council met Sir William Hearst by invitation on May 21st, 1917. The Premier suggested that the proposed judicial interpretation of Separate school rights under the Separate Schools Act of 1863, and the adjudication of the differences with the Government, be deferred, alleging dislike of such litigation during the War, and offering by way of temporary arrangement concessions that seemed to relieve the situation, and that were accepted by the Catholic Educational Committee until a definite settlement could be reached.

The proposition made by Sir William Hearst on May 21st, 1917, in the name of his Government was approved by his Cabinet by an Order in Council on the 19th of June; it may be read on page 352 of the Report of the Minister of Education for 1917, and runs as follows:—

"Maintenance of Classes beyond Form V now in operation in both Public and Separate schools approved, and the said classes and the Fifth Form associated therewith are to be inspected by the Continuation School Inspectors, and it is hereby declared that nothing in this Order shall be construed as an acknowledgment or admission that under Section 93 of 'The British North America Act' or otherwise, said schools or any of them have the right to establish and maintain such classes."

Now an interesting fact in connection with these negotiations and the Order in Council that concluded them is that the Hon. W. D. McPherson, who has been publicly asking us why we do not go to the courts, and publicly inviting us to

take our case to the courts, was a member of Sir Wm. Hearst's Cabinet at the time when these negotiations were in progress, and when this Order in Council was approved and adopted. I think there ought to be a cessation at least in that quarter of the question "Why do you not go to the courts?"

But a far more amazing fact is that the said Order in Council was never observed by the Government that adopted it, and has not been observed to the present day. So having induced us to refrain from going to the courts by the offer of concessions, the Government then broke faith with us.

Meanwhile, in the preparation of its case, one of the members of the Catholic Educational Council had written to the Hon. Richard Harcourt, former Minister of Education, inquiring of him what had been the attitude of himself and preceding ministers towards Separate schools. On March 9th, 1916, Mr. Harcourt sent the following reply:—

"I have your note of yesterday. In reply I beg to say that I remember very clearly the attitude of the Mowat-Fraser Government and that of succeeding Liberal Governments towards Separate schools. These Governments, due largely to Mr. Fraser's intimate knowledge of the views and ideals of his co-religionists, had no difficulty in adjusting the minor differences of opinion and there were no serious ones, I am glad to say, which arose from time to time. It was always kept in mind that the Confederation Act, the result of many compromises, aimed at preserving intact the Educational rights and privileges which our Roman Catholic friends enjoyed before Confederation. The rights of Protestants in Quebec were similarly safeguarded. It was felt that the spirit and meaning of these concessions was that the minority in each Province should be allowed to work out its own educational ideal without let or hindrance. Naturally your people, and the same may be said of minorities everywhere, were most sensitive on all occasions, when it was feared that attempts were being made to trespass upon these rights. The Mowat-Fraser policy, continued by their successors, was one of non-interference, in the absence of well-founded complaints, as well as of positive sympathetic encouragement, towards your school boards in all their efforts to bring their work fully up to the standard of Public school work."

"In the abstract it may be contended that what is called Educational Segregation is harmful to the state; that absolute ironclad uniformity and an elaborate system leaving no room for discretion or exceptions in any locality, or under any circumstances, are the ideals to be aimed at. This argument did not dominate the Mowat-Fraser policy. Having regard to rights and privileges long enjoyed and, after much discussion, confirmed at Confederation, it was thought best to adopt a policy at all times conciliatory to minorities, to view with sympathy and to heartily encourage all work of the Separate schools, primary and advanced, to regard always the spirit of the law and regulations rather than the mere dry letter, and to admit frankly that our Roman Catholic friends were as sincerely desirous as their Protestant brethren of imparting the best available education to their children, in their own schools. To think otherwise would be narrow and uncharitable."

"It was further thought that to discourage advanced work in the Separate schools by a strained, aggressive construction of Law or Regulation, would result sooner or later in the opening of exclusively Roman Catholic High Schools, which in turn would of course intensify the suggested evils, which the theorist claims must follow in the wake of educational segregation. Our Roman Catholic friends have the legal right to establish High schools of their own. Instead of availing themselves of this right, they send their children in considerable numbers to our High schools, with results it is gratifying to know, pleasing to all concerned. I cannot imagine any appreciable harm resulting from a Departmental encouragement of advanced Separate school tuition, subject of course to generous reasonable supervision. To curtail advanced work in the Separate schools involves, there is no doubt about it, shortening of the school life of tens of thousands of our children. This means, of a certainty, handicapping their chances in after life. It means also, needless to add, a substantial loss to the State. That all the good is on the side of either educational ideal, that of the Public school or that of the Separate school, no liberal minded man in this age will seriously contend. In a word I believe it would be in the public interest to allow a large measure of freedom and discretion to Separate School Boards in working out their own ideals. You will under-

stand how difficult and unsatisfactory it is to attempt in a necessarily short letter to explain one's attitude on this important question."

(Signed) RICHARD HARCOURT.

Since the incoming of the present provincial administration the Separate school case has time and again been placed before the Minister of Education, the Prime Minister and the Cabinet of Ontario. So far as action is concerned, we are today where we were in 1915.

It is supremely unfair therefore to reproach us with not having gone to the courts.

Pushed from post to pillar by those from whom we had a right to look for definite, if not courageous action, yet relying confidently on the sense of justice of the majority of our fellow-citizens, we came to the conclusion—as free men by placing openly our petitions before the Government and the Legislature of Ontario, the native Province of most of us and the chosen home of all. We still have every confidence in the sense of justice of the majority of our fellow-citizens of Ontario. And I believe that the foregoing statement of the facts of the case will enable them to see how unfair and how misleading are the implications of the oft-repeated question: "Why do you not go to the courts?"

Our appeal is in the name of education. We claim that every child attending a Separate school in city, town, village or country, has a right to the full benefits of a Common school system. We claim that a Common school system is what was guaranteed to us by the Constitution. We hold that a Common school system must be a complete, unbridled, unutilized educational entity. It takes the child at the very beginning of its educational existence; it must lead him to a logical conclusion. The entrance examination, or the end of the Fifth Form, is not a logical conclusion. It leaves the child nowhere. But the matriculation examination is a logical conclusion. It brings the child to the door of the University, and opens that door for him. It is at that point that we believe our constitutional rights in the matter of education cease. It is to that point we claim the Separate Common school system of this Province has the legal right to lead its pupils.

"PLAIN FACTS FOR FAIR MINDS"

The Rev. Father J. J. O'Gorman, of Ottawa, has set forth in handy form the Catholic position on the Separate School Question. Here are Father O'Gorman's Twenty-one "Plain Facts for Fair Minds."

"Fact No. 1—The Roman Catholic Separate schools are as much a part of the State educational system of Ontario as are the Public schools."

"Fact No. 2—The Public schools of Ontario, both in history and in fact, are practically Protestant schools."

"Fact No. 3—There is no Catholic school teacher in the Public schools of Ottawa. Why? Because they are Protestant schools."

"Fact No. 4—So well it is recognized that Public schools are normally Protestant schools, that where this their Protestant character is nullified by the teacher being a Catholic, the Protestant ratepayers have a right by law to establish a Protestant Separate school."

"Fact No. 5—Catholics do not want and do not receive one cent of Protestant money for Catholic Separate schools."

"Fact No. 6—Catholic money is, against the will of Catholics, confiscated by Public schools, for example the Catholic share of the Ottawa Hydro Electric taxes and the Catholic share of the Canadian National Railways taxes in the Separate school sections in Ontario."

"Fact No. 7—For Public school boards to attempt to hog all the school taxes on properties in Ontario owned by the Dominion, by the province or by municipalities, is, to say the least, bad manners."

"Fact No. 8—The provisions of the Separate School Act designed to empower Catholic shareholders in corporations to assign in any municipality wherein a Separate school exists their share of the corporation assessment to the Separate schools is merely permissive as far as the directors of the corporation are concerned, and the Catholic shareholders have no means at their disposal of compelling the directors to carry out their wishes."

"Fact No. 9—All talk about the enforcement of one school on Ontario is as far from the facts as talk about one church in Ontario. If all came back willingly to the one Catholic Church then there would be one school."

"Fact No. 10—Separate schools have according to law as Common schools the constitutional right to impart the complete course of secondary education, a right guaranteed by the British North America Act."

"Fact No. 11—Separate schools have exercised this right to a certain extent and intend to exercise it to a greater extent."

"Fact No. 12—There is a regulation of the department of education in force which forbids Separate schools in High school districts to exercise their constitutional

right of teaching subjects beyond the Fifth Form. This anti-Catholic regulation is illegal."

"Fact No. 13—Separate schools have a right in decency to Continuation schools grants for doing this 'continuation work,' (i.e., secondary education) which they are legally entitled to do."

"Fact No. 14—Yet inside of high schools districts, they receive no grant for doing this higher than Fifth Form work. Here is part of the State school system doing work it is legally entitled to undertake, yet the State, though it receives the benefits in the shape of education, refuses to pay any grants."

"Fact No. 15—Not merely does the province by its laws authorize Separate schools to impart secondary education, but it likewise to all intents and purposes compels Separate schools to undertake this work, by making it obligatory for Catholics to attend school till they are sixteen or eighteen. 'The only education which can be made obligatory on Catholic pupils is Catholic education.'"

"Fact No. 16—The department of education has by its regulations nullified the legal rights enjoyed by Separate schools and embodied in the acts concerning continuation classes and schools from that of 1890 to that of 1908) to conduct Roman Catholic Separate school continuation classes and schools outside High school areas. Today, according to its regulations, such schools must not be Catholic. Religious bigotry is the cause of this disgraceful regulation."

"Fact No. 17—There is no intention on the part of the Catholics of Ontario to weaken the High school system of the province. Little as we care to make use of it, we recognize that it is a necessity for our non-Catholic fellow citizens. It is, however, a fallacy to claim that a general permission to Separate schools to do what is technically known as continuation school work, both outside and inside High school areas and to share according to the law in the public grants for the same, would impair the High schools and Collegiate Institutes of this province."

"Fact No. 18—There are two attitudes which Protestants have taken with regard to the Roman Catholic Separate schools of Ontario. The first is the attitude of those who, while admitting that the Separate school system is one of the pact and act of Confederation, and hence as indestructible as our national constitution, nevertheless are determined to prevent any development of that system in the hope that it may be stunted in its growth and hence ultimately be abandoned by the Catholics themselves."

"Fact No. 19—The other attitude is that of those Protestants who accept loyally the fact that Catholic Separate schools are with us for weal or for woe, and who as sagacious and patriotic citizens prefer that they be for the common weal and that consequently the same opportunities for development be accorded them as are accorded the Public schools."

"Fact No. 20—It is because we believe that the majority of the people of Ontario belong to the latter class, that we now appeal to the people and the government of this province to remedy two injustices from which our Separate school system is suffering, namely, an unfair distribution of school taxes and unfair restrictions as regards continuation classes and schools."

"Fact No. 21—It is clear from Bishop Fallon's public utterances that Catholic agitation on this question will continue till Catholic rights are acknowledged."

MARSE HENRY'S BAPTISM

Henry Watterson was one of the greatest characters ever developed in the American field of newspaper journalism. He was ever sympathetic with Catholic ideals. Rev. John Talbot Smith records the following conversation between Watterson and himself anent the gentler southerner's Catholic proclivities: "What always surprised me in the quotations from his paper and your speeches was the Catholic tone, the Catholic spirit, and often the sound Catholic doctrine. Knowing that your cousin was the Catholic Bishop of Columbus, I at first inferred that you were a Catholic until someone told me the contrary." Watterson laughed and said: "I think I can explain that, too. According to Catholic theology I am a member of the Catholic Household, although formally an Episcopalian. A few months after I was born my mother was visiting cousins of hers in Washington, the Semmes family, one of whose members won fame in the Civil War as the commander of the cruiser Alabama. The Semmes family was Catholic. During the visit I was taken ill and Miss Semmes carried me to the nearest Catholic priest and had me baptized, being in danger of death. So I am by baptism a member of the Catholic Household, as in sympathy and general belief. I told this little incident to Leo XIII. and Pius X. Undoubtedly the Catholic spirit shines more or less in my utterances as in my thought." To Henry Watterson's baptism and consequent sympathy for, and general belief in, the Catholic faith was doubtless due his hatred of religious bigotry and intolerance in any form. No wonder he flagellated Tom Watson!—Catholic Transcript.