

A FARMERS' club has been organized at Nelson, Manitoba. Meetings will be held every second Saturday, for the purpose of discussing matters relating to agriculture, horticulture, stock-raising, etc. A large number of the farmers in the district have connected themselves with the club, and several interesting papers have already been promised for the next meeting. In a progressive agricultural community, an organization of this kind should not only prove a pleasant diversion to the farmers, but should also result in much actual good to the community. In a new country especially, where farming must to a great extent be experimental for some time to come, the interchange of ideas gained from practical experiment, should prove of great interest and value to all. The farmers could also combine in procuring new sorts of seeds or plants, which could be distributed among the members for practical test, and in this way much good might be accomplished. The system could also be extended by the organization of clubs in other districts, with an interchange of papers between the different clubs. If conducted in the right way, these clubs should be a benefit to the rural communities where they exist, socially as well as in furthering progressive agriculture.

RUMORS have been kept up with great persistency that a large number of Canadians will be knighted in honor of this the Queen's jubilee year. It is said that twenty-five brand new knights will be created in this country, including the mayors of leading Canadian cities, Winnipeg being mentioned among the latter. This is perhaps the silliest proposal yet in connection with this knighting business, and if carried out will bring the ridiculous farce into well-merited contempt. Canadians who have long breathed the pure air of this new western world, free from the stifling influences of flunkeydom, should care little for these hollow baubles which fall like crumbs to the dogs that cringe around the table of royalty. Sensible people have long been disgusted with the attempts made to establish a Canadian aristocracy, especially during and since the temporary residence in the country of a member of the reigning family. The proposed wholesale creation of new knights, if carried out, would only serve to increase the popular disgust with the whole business. It is to be hoped that many Canadians will be found whose democratic principles will preclude them from accepting the dauble.

THE Montreal *Trade Bulletin* attacks the C.P.R. for erecting hotels in the Northwest. The *Bulletin* says: "Such is the eagerness of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company to compete for the trade of the country, whenever good profits are indicated, that they have gone into the hotel business in the Northwest, which, it is said, promises lucrative returns. Of late considerable plant has been shipped from this city to the Northwest for the purpose of erecting new hotels, and running them in the interest of the company. Of course the managers of the road can advance the plausible pretext that it is all for the good of the new territories, which they have better means of opening up in this particular line, than private individuals. An exactly similar excuse was put forward when the famous C.P.R. wheat deal was concocted, the syndicate an-

nouncing that their buyer was instructed to "go into the virgin wheat fields in order to help the farmers to obtain full value for their offerings, well knowing that if he ran up prices a cent or two per bushel, they could fix it all right on rebates, after the grain was shipped out of the country." This is perhaps carrying hostility to the great monopoly a little too far. There are plenty of good and justifiable grounds upon which the company may be attacked without seeking out unjust reasons for pitching into the C.P.R. The company has not gone into the hotel business in the Northwest with any idea of securing "lucrative returns" from such investment. The so-called hotels along the railway in the Northwest are simply eating-houses for the accommodation of travellers, and are a necessity, rather than a paying investment. Indeed, it is quite probable that the company has been obliged to conduct them at a loss. In a new country, where there was scarcely any accommodation for travellers, it was clearly the duty of the company to provide such accommodation; and moreover, it will be found that at points where fair hotels have been established by private parties, the company has not erected eating-houses. The eating-houses have only been located at points along the line where the trains stop for meals, and only then at small places where reasonable accommodation would not otherwise have been provided. In the Rocky Mountains these hotels served instead of dining cars, and thereby lessen the danger of taking an extra car over a difficult piece of road. Over the greater portion of the road travellers can now have the choice of taking their meals in the dining cars, or taking a cheaper meal at the eating houses. In the mountains, where the dining cars are not attached, a better class of hotels have been provided, which will serve as houses of accommodation for travellers who wish to stop over to view the mountain scenery, as well as for dining stations. If the C.P.R. is to be made a popular route of travel, good accommodation had to be provided, and in the absence of such accommodation at stopping points along the line, the company was obliged to provide it.

THE action of the Catholic Church toward the Knights of Labor, has been a matter of great interest, not only to the Knights and the adherents of the Church, but also to many outside of both bodies. In the province of Quebec the Church authorities did not hesitate to condemn the Knights, and the faithful were forbidden on pain of excommunication, to associate themselves with the great labor organization. In the United States, however, many of the Catholic bishops and clergy generally took a more moderate view of the case, and some even went so far as to defend the Knights as an institution not at variance with the teachings of the Church. The American Cardinal, who is now at Rome, has submitted a lengthy document to the Holy See, in defence of the Knights. Cardinal Gibbons first declares that the organization of the Knights of Labor prescribes neither oath nor obligation, which would render it a secret society to be condemned by that Church. The Cardinal further points out that the head of the order, together with about half the membership, are Catholics, who would feel justly aggrieved by the condemnation of the

order. The argument is also advanced that the formation of an organization is the best means of obtaining an object desired by a member of people in common, and that labor is therefore justified in combining to obtain its rights. The main arguments against the condemnation by the Holy See of the Knights, is summed up by the Cardinal as follows: "That it would be dangerous to the reputation of the Church in our democratic country. That it would be powerless to compel the obedience of our Catholic workmen, who would regard it as false and iniquitous. That it would be destructive instead of beneficial in its effects, forcing the sons of the Church to rebel against their mother and to range themselves with condemned societies which they have hitherto avoided. That it would be ruinous to the financial support of the Church at home and to the raising of Peter's pence. That it would turn into doubt and hostility the marked devotion of our people toward the Holy See. That it would be regarded as a cruel blow to the authority of the bishops of the United States, who, it is well known, protest against such a condemnation." It is thought that the Holy See will take a favorable view of the case as presented by Cardinal Gibbons, backed by the almost unanimous opinion of the American bishops. This would appear to be the case, judging from the tenor of a report prepared by Monsignor Straniero, late Papal Alegate in the United States, on the present condition of the Catholic Church in America. The Monsignor states that "there is not a single article in their (the Knights) statutes which can be properly condemned from a Catholic point of view." In referring to the action of the Quebec bishops in condemning the Knights the Monsignor says: "The American Episcopate was generally opposed to such measures, which, though possibly suited to Canadian Catholics, might prove unwise when applied to Americans, should it be considered necessary to extend those measures to the United States. We must remember that in the United States the citizens are accustomed to freedom and independence in ideas, and are sure to be heard, and if they are not listened to who will be blamed." This last quotation, taken with the American Cardinal's summary of arguments in opposition to the condemnation of the Knights, gives the key to the situation. In other words, in Canada (or at least Quebec), where the people were more under the control of the clergy, it might do very well to condemn the Knights, but in the United States, where "the citizens are accustomed to freedom and independence in ideas," it "would turn into doubt and hostility" many of the people who are now adherents of the Church. This is evidently suiting the action to the exigencies of the case, and is an instance where, in the sight of the Monsignor, what is sauce for the goose is not sauce for the gander. Canadian Catholics, and especially those among them who may have been connected with the Knights of Labor, will not likely relish the comparison made between them and the Catholics of the United States, who are accustomed to greater "independence in ideas." If the Knights are to receive the approval of the Church in the United States and not in Canada, it will be difficult to make Canadian Catholics believe that they have not been unjustly dealt with, unless they are much more devout than ordinary mortals usually be.