

continuing to mix Mgr. Sbarretti's name with it.

Secondly, "The measurable time" is the indefinite period which is always the refuge of sensational reporters who make it their practice to invent telegraphic despatches from Rome.

Thirdly, And lastly, we deem it extremely improbable that the Holy Father would deem it an indiscretion for Mgr. Sbarretti to hold an interview with a member of one of our Canadian Governments with a view to obtain more favorable legislation for the Catholics living under that Government.

Mr. Hays, the general manager of the Grand Trunk Railway, though not a citizen of Canada, or the British Empire, nevertheless has frequently held interviews for the purpose not only of obtaining rights, but even to get favors for the railway system which is under his able management.

Mgr. Sbarretti represents the whole Catholic population of this Dominion, as well as the Pope, and there can be no reason why he should not be received respectfully by the members of our Governments, provincial or federal, and we venture to express the hope that he may remain long in the Dominion, where his administrative ability has been admitted by all who have had occasion to have intercourse with him. When he shall be recalled, we feel certain, the purpose will be to elevate him to the dignity of the Cardinalate.

#### THE AMERICAN NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN ON DIVORCE.

Miss Susan B. Anthony, who has been known for many decades as the most persistent of Women's Rights advocates, attended the National Council of American women which met last week in Washington, D. C., to consider measures to be adopted for the general benefit of women. This question of divorce was considered, and it was almost unanimously agreed that the facility with which marriages are dissolved in the United States is a monstrous evil by which women are the greatest sufferers.

A resolution was proposed pledging the Association to cooperate with the Church and State to ascertain the causes leading to divorce with a view to obtaining such legislation as shall tend to abolish divorces.

Miss Anthony bitterly opposed this resolution, saying:

"I do not consider divorce an evil by any means. It is just as much a refuge for women married to brutal men as Canada was once a refuge from brutal masters. I will never vote for a resolution that will cut women off from refuge from designing and brutal men."

It is clear that Miss Anthony has no appreciation of the ends for which marriage was instituted by Almighty God, which do not merely consist in the pleasure of the man or the woman, but have reference also to the care of the family to which husband and wife are equally bound to devote themselves. The divine law of marriage is, therefore, that husband and wife are bound to each other for life, and so Christ declares that "what God hath joined together no man may put asunder."

But Miss Anthony is a woman of peculiar views, and divine law has no restraint for her. So true is this that not long since she issued a Bible mutilated to suit her notions. Her protests, however, had no weight with the National Council of Women, who passed the resolution against divorce by an overwhelming majority. Miss Anthony herself is of that respectable age that makes it highly probable that even with her views on the lawfulness of divorce, she is not likely ever to appear in the divorce court whether as complainant, or respondent.

The National Council of Women deserves credit for having paid no attention to the whims of the notorious lady who endeavored to induce them to favor divorce.

#### THE MAIL AND EMPIRE DISCOVERS A DIRE PLOT.

The Toronto Mail and Empire of April 19 affects great indignation on account of an hypothetical attack which is to be made upon the educational "rights of the Protestant minority in Quebec." And on what authority is this attack expected? It is said that Mr. Bourassa has "hinted" in an address made in Montreal that such an attack is contemplated, though Mr. Bourassa "declares that he is personally opposed to such action." On this foundation our contemporary lets off this direful bombshell:

"To put the case in plain English, the Liberal leaders have introduced a proposition which their party paper has admitted to be unconstitutional and wrong. Mr. Bourassa, another Liberal, states that unless that which is unconstitutional and wrong be adopted, oppressive and tyrannical measures may be taken against innocent parties."

Mr. Bourassa's speech is useful chiefly as an illustration of the intolerance of those who desire to coerce the West. It also testifies to the character

of the campaign Sir Wilfrid Laurier is conducting in the East.

Who are "those who desire to coerce the West" according to the story of the Mail and Empire? They are chiefly the French-Canadians of the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, together with the English-speaking Catholics of all the Provinces. These are styled in another editorial of the same journal published a few days earlier, "the oppressors of the West," who are determined that the new Provinces shall be bound, not free.

This is along the same lines on which Mr. W. F. Maclean spoke in Parliament, saying that "a solid Quebec wants to give autonomy to the new Provinces," the fact being, as remarked at the moment by Messrs. Bourassa and Smith, that the Autonomy Bill is supported as well by "a solid Nova Scotia, and a solid British Columbia."

But is it true that the proposal of the Government to grant to the minorities, Protestant and Catholic, in the new Provinces is a coercion of the majority?

There is properly no coercion where that majority is not compelled to do some act which is disagreeable to those who are comprised within it; but they are not so compelled under the Autonomy Bill, which, instead of coercing any one, gives liberty to the minority to educate their children in their own way, and in the manner in which their conscience directs them, whereas the majority are not compelled to send any of their children to the Separate Schools. The Autonomy Bill will free the minority from the coercion to which the amendment of Mr. Borden would subject them, but it coerces no one. The statements of the Mail and Empire, are therefore, fraudulent and false.

But are the French Canadians in general the oppressors and tyrants represented by that journal?

We may let the representative of the Quebec minority, who are supposed to be the oppressed now threatened, answer this question.

At the meeting of the Church of England Provincial Synod in September, 1898, in Montreal, the Rev. Canon Burke said:

"We owe a debt to a gentleman who is tolerably well known, namely, the Pope of Rome (laughter) for the help he has given to religious instruction in the Public Schools of the Province of Quebec. It is the insistence by that Church upon religious training going hand in hand with secular knowledge which has awakened the people; and now they have in the schools under the Protestant Committee a regular course of religious instruction which meets the need so far as Quebec is concerned. It seemed almost a pity that the Pope did not do for Ontario what he had done for Quebec."

The Rev. D. Williams, of Stratford, (now Bishop of Huron) said: "There is now no difference of opinion as to the need of religious instruction in the schools."

Mr. Howton, Protestant School Inspector for Quebec: "Whatever their shortcomings, Quebec heads the Dominion in the matter of religious instruction in the so-called Protestant schools."

It must be borne in mind that these Protestant schools were established in Quebec by the unanimous action of the Quebec Legislature, even before the Legislative union with Upper Canada, and the laws were amended to meet the desires of the Protestant minority by one of the first acts of the Quebec Legislature, after Confederation, so that they might be placed once for all beyond any injurious legislation by succeeding Legislatures of that Province.

There is no movement in Quebec to diminish the rights of Protestants in regard to education, and of this the editors of the Mail and Empire are thoroughly aware, so that there can be no object in its publication of such a statement except to excite fanaticism in Ontario in the hope that a religious war may in some way injure Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

But what are we to say of Mr. Bourassa's words?

According to the Mail and Empire itself, Mr. Bourassa did no more than hint at such a contingency, adding that he is personally opposed to any such movement, but that "it will be difficult to resist it if the opponents of the coercion bill refuse to capitulate." Therefore, the movement, if it exists at all, has not Mr. Bourassa's support. And whose support has it? Not a single authentic name has been mentioned in connection with it, and for a good reason, because there is no such movement. The Mail and Empire does indeed name Sir Wilfrid Laurier as engaged in the enterprise, but this is too absurd to be refuted seriously, as there is not a particle of proof attempted to be given for any such assertion. Such random venomous statements must be treated only with contempt. They will do more harm to the individual who hurls the bomb than to him at whom it is aimed.

As regards Mr. Bourassa personally, it is well known that, even if he contemplated heading such a movement, it would have no prospect of success, for

the sentiments of political vengeance are far from the thoughts of the people of Quebec. Mr. Bourassa is an estimable gentleman, but he is not and never has been and never claimed to be the authorized spokesman of either Sir Wilfrid Laurier or the people of Quebec. The Protestants of Canada may rely upon it that the people of Quebec have no thought of adopting the "unconstitutional, wrong, oppressive and tyrannical measures against innocent parties" conjured up by the Mail and Empire, as a means of revenging themselves upon the narrow and narrow minded Ontario majority which is expected to vote for the coercion of the Catholics of the North-West. That small majority will be more than wiped out by the larger majority which will be given for the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bill from the other Protestant provinces of the Dominion, for there will be solid Protestant provinces for the Autonomy Bill as it stands, which will suffice to pass it into law, even without a solid Quebec.

We have already quoted several opinions in regard to the fair treatment always accorded by the Catholic province of Quebec to the Protestant minority. To these may be added that of Mr. Monk, the leader of the Conservative party in Quebec. This gentleman said during the debate on the Autonomy Bill:

"No lesson is better taught under the school system of Quebec, and in the schools, than respect for the convictions of others. It is unfortunate that this is not the case in schools in some other parts of the country."

Mr. E. T. D. Chambers of Quebec in a letter to the Globe dated April 8 says:

"As a humble member of the Quebec minority, I appeal to the sense of British fair play of the Protestant majority of Ontario to accord equal rights to minorities in every part of this wide Dominion. In the Province of Quebec, the Protestant minority is in the full enjoyment of its separate schools. The representatives of that minority would not have agreed to Confederation on any other terms. . . . What warrant have we to call ourselves equal righters if we refuse to other minorities elsewhere the privileges which we ourselves enjoy as the English-speaking and Protestant minority in the Province of Quebec?"

#### ATHEISM IN THE PULPIT.

The rapidity with which the Protestant Church of Germany is going into infidelity has been recently strikingly exemplified in the case of Rev. Dr. Fischer, of Berlin, who, in an address delivered at the last convention of the Protestant Verein, maintained that the most advanced phase of theological thought should be proclaimed from the pulpit and taught in the schools. Since the convention this teacher of religion has published a pamphlet embodying his views. He maintains that the attachment of past generations to a belief in divine revelation has made the Bible itself a God in the public estimation. Miracles such as are related in the Bible should be discarded, as also should the belief in the existence of a hell for the punishment of the wicked. Of heaven he seems to be in doubt, as he passes this point without remark; but we may infer that he no more believes in a heaven than in a hell, inasmuch as its existence is based upon the same grounds of faith as the belief in a place of punishment. The two are equally asserted by our Lord, Who, in the 25th chapter of St. Matthew's Gospel, asserts that the wicked shall go into everlasting punishment, and the just to everlasting life.

The existence of Christ he admits, but only as man. His miracles and His Divinity he rejects as contrary to modern science. The creation of the universe by God, providence and the rise of prayer he rejects uncompromisingly, and the prevalent belief in God as a personal Being is also rejected. In fact the Christianity he would have taught is shorn of all reality, and is worse than Deism, which at least acknowledges the reality of God, while, in fact, Dr. Fischer's teachings are rankly Atheistic. Yet he is one of the most prominent pastors of Berlin, and within the past year the theological faculty of the University of Koenigsberg conferred on him the title of Doctor of Divinity, which is rarely conferred in Germany.

The Consistory of Berlin have indeed called upon Dr. Fischer to resign his pastorate, but he has numerous defenders, and there are others who agree with him in the main, but who think it is not expedient to go so far as present as to preach such things from the pulpit.

A special Convention of about thirty Berlin preachers has taken up the task of defending Dr. Fischer, the plea being that there should be complete freedom in the expression of theological thought in the pulpit, and independence for scientific investigation.

It is remarkable that the defenders of Dr. Fischer are chiefly found among the clergy, while the laity favor the established orthodox views of religion. This entirely reverses the action of

our Lord, Who sent His Apostles to teach His doctrines to the whole world. The clergy, who are supposed to be the successors of the Apostles, are now in need of being taught Christian truth by the laity.

At the rate at which Atheistic views are spreading, the Lutheran State Church cannot long survive as a form of Christianity.

#### THE CASE IN SMALL COMPASS.

Mr. David Henderson, M. P., of Halton, Ont., in a speech recently delivered in the House of Commons, placed himself upon record as an opponent of the Separate School clauses of the Autonomy Bill.

On the same day Mr. Cash, M. P., of MacKenzie, N. W. T., said in the course of his speech:

"Personally, he said, he favored National schools, but in justice to the large number of Roman Catholics in his district, he would support the Separate school clauses."

Here we have a member from the North-West Territory, where the people are directly interested, supporting the Separate school clauses, and an Ontario member denouncing them. It is not unreasonable to claim that the majority of the members from this province are actually either by bigotry or a desire to score political points, and in not a few cases, both motives may with justice be charged. The people of the North-West Territories have abundant reason to say to a goodly number of people of Ontario: "Gentlemen, we wish you would mind your own business."

#### A "POEM."

Mr. Robert Aude, whose abode is not given, has written a "poem" to the Toronto Mail and Empire. The editor, with a view, no doubt, to encourage a literary genius to persevere, characterizes the production as "patriotic and spirited." We publish a few stanzas, "not for their intrinsic value," but to show how far the Toronto papers have gone in the direction of "yellow journalism."

Sbarretti, so far as he may represent the views of his order, with this we're content. But when he attempts to dictate with a frown the laws of our people, we then cry "sit down."

We must have, and will have, our rights to the full. In spite of the Papacy's mandate or bull we stand on one platform, no favorites have we. The old constitution, all Britons are free.

In its prospectus the Toronto Mail and Empire promised it would be a newspaper published by gentlemen for gentlemen. Expediency and a thirst for power oftentimes lead "gentlemen" into unlovely quagmires.

#### THE AUTONOMY BILLS.

In the Toronto Mail and Empire of Saturday, April 22nd, there is an editorial entitled "Inside History of the Crisis," which begins with the statement that "the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bills were prepared by the Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick, the Minister of Justice of the Dominion. Much stress is laid upon the fact that this was not done by Hon. Mr. Sifton. We are told that Mr. Fitzpatrick 'acknowledges' all this, as if it were a crime of which the latter gentleman admitted his guilt. It is clear that if these clauses were to be in the bill at all, they should have been prepared by some one, and we fail to see any fault in the fact that they were prepared by the Minister of Justice, who is, as his office requires him to be, an eminent jurist."

But the Hon. C. Fitzpatrick was one of the forty Catholic Liberal members of Parliament who appealed to the Pope many years ago on a question which concerned these Catholic Liberals only, so far as they were Catholics, who considered that they were too severely treated by certain members of the Canadian hierarchy. According to the Mail and Empire's whine, this fact should have put Mr. Fitzpatrick outside of the possibility of being a member of the Government. The vote of the people of Canada has several times decided otherwise, as the Government, with Mr. Fitzpatrick included, has been several times sustained by popular vote in the general elections which have taken place since that occurrence. This suffices for the complete justification of the Hon. Minister of Justice.

But this attack upon the Hon. C. Fitzpatrick is merely the prelude to a renewed attack upon Mgr. Sbarretti for the supposed crime of having had a hand in urging upon Sir Wilfrid Laurier to put into the Autonomy Bill the clauses which authorize Catholic teaching in the Catholic schools of the North-West, wherever a Catholic minority is sufficiently strong and zealous to support such schools with their own taxes, and the small help with which the Government will supplement the efforts of the ratepayers.

We have stated more than once that Mgr. Sbarretti has the same right to confer with members of the Government in regard to the legalization of

Catholic schools, and their efficiency, as the representatives of any Association in the country have to urge their views upon the Government. This is done every day, but it is not always the case that the Government accedes to the wishes of those who present their petitions to it. Even as the Mail and Empire states the case, that journal admits that Mgr. Sbarretti did not succeed in having his views fully accepted, but that His Excellency at last yielded to the representations of Sir Wilfrid Laurier that more could not be secured from Parliament than is contained in the amended form of the Autonomy Bill.

Our contemporary further gives, on the authority of the *Evenement*, a circumstantial account of the negotiations, according to which the original clauses of the Autonomy Bill had been accepted by the Apostolic Delegate, and states that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had so "announced." Thereupon Mr. Sifton, Sir William Mulock and Mr. Fielding threatened to resign. Mr. Sifton actually resigned, but the other Ministers named showed no inclination to do so, and their speeches in the House showed that they were fully impressed with the importance of continuing to the minorities of the North-West, Catholic and Protestant, the rights they have enjoyed since they were organized as Territories of the Dominion. The objections of Mr. Sifton to the educational clauses of the original bill have been removed by the amendments finally adopted; and it has been made evident by subsequent occurrences that the electors of the North-West are not at all opposed to them as a body, though a few small factional meetings controlled by persons or Orange Lodges have pronounced against any provision for Separate schools. Notwithstanding this the Liberal representatives of the North-West will vote as a unit for the Bill, and the whole trend of the information coming from the North-West is that there is no objection offered by the people of the new provinces generally, to the continuance of Separate schools under their new constitution, as they have been found not to interfere with the continuance of the Public school system now in force.

The voice of the North-West will be heard in our House of Commons, and it will be in favor of the continuance of Separate schools as they already exist. It has now been proved beyond doubt that the whole agitation in opposition to the adoption of the Separate school clauses in the Autonomy Bill has been engineered in Ontario—and chiefly in Toronto: not in the North-West at all.

Ontario is a respectable province of our Dominion, but it must be understood that it is not to override arbitrarily the whole Dominion. It has influence enough that it sends more representatives to Parliament than any other Province, but if we have a Confederation worth preserving, a small Ontario majority must yield to an overwhelming majority from the other provinces of the Dominion—otherwise our Confederation is a farce.

All through the present crisis, the Toronto Mail and Empire, the News, and some other journals have shown a disposition to excite Protestant public opinion against Catholics. Now we admit that Catholics are a minority of the population of the Dominion, but they are so respectable a minority that they can afford to laugh at the threats of such members of Parliament as Col. Sam. Hughes of North Victoria, that if the Orange demands are not acceded to that respectable body will take up arms to enforce its "Ascendancy."

The days of Orange Ascendancy have passed away; and we have a way in this Dominion to enforce the law, so that Col. Hughes may be gently reminded that if he leads an imaginary Orange brigade to the conflict, he and it may disappear in the smoke.

It requires no extraordinary penetration to see that neither Sir Wilfrid Laurier nor His Excellency Mgr. Sbarretti furnished either the *Evenement* or the Mail and Empire with the story of their interviews, so that the whole thing may be put down as a mere fabrication.

WE WERE much surprised to read a statement made by Rev. J. W. Hoyt, M. A., of Chatham, Ont., at a meeting in Toronto of the Baptist Young Peoples' Union. He said that

"Baptists believed they had a right to interpret the Scriptures and the Christian life according to the best of their ability, and not even Sir Wilfrid or the Liberal party had the right to prevent them."

What could be the motive of the Rev. Mr. Hoyt in making an assertion of this kind? What proof has he that Sir Wilfrid Laurier or the Liberal Party—or any one else, for that matter—ever trouble themselves about what the Baptists believe or what they do not believe? The speeches of some of the Ministers of the Province of Ontario

prove that there is abroad much of an intemperance other than that produced by the consumption of intoxicating beverages.

WE PUBLISH in another column an article from the Montreal Daily Witness on the School Question, which will be read with interest. When it is remembered that the Daily Witness has always been classed as a strong Protestant paper, the utterance will have a special significance for our fellow-citizens of Ontario who have been forced into opposition to Catholic schools.

#### ITALIAN HONESTY, CHARITY AND INDUSTRY.

William P. Andrews in the Christian Register of March 9 replies effectually to a recent writer in that paper who had charged the Italian people with dishonesty in their treatment of four-ists, and had called attention to the great number of beggars and idlers in Italian cities. As to the first charge Mr. Andrews asserts that Italian cabmen are far less likely to be extortionate than a similar class in this country; and says as to the Italian beggars:

"We desist against the beggars and declare that the Italians spent all their charity on the churches, the fact being that Italian charities, apart from the Church, are far larger than our own in proportion to our means, and that the Church itself is the greatest giver of all."

He declares that the charity and charitable institutions of Italy are beyond belief until we know them. At Naples the poorhouse is larger than the royal palace; and the great charitable baths as factis, where 300 of the poorest have better treatment than the rich, and have in it a better establishment, has no counterpart in the world. To see these poorest of the poor arrive, bent and worn with disease and suffering, and to see them depart, after a fortnight in a palace, well and happy, is a lesson to the world in charity. And with each departure comes, all through the bathing season, another depuration. This has gone on for four hundred years, before "country week" was dreamed of in America.

This, continues Mr. Andrews, is but one of the myriad charities of Italy, for every little town has a list of charitable institutions which it is hard to duplicate in the civilized world.

As to the charge of laziness or idleness he says it is made because the average tourist does not realize the industry of the people. "We [that is, the tourists] see them idle at hours of the noon and afternoon when we work," says Mr. Andrews. "We do not appreciate that a man who begins his day's work with the earliest streak of dawn and continues it till 11 at night must have a season of rest in the middle of day. We are for hours in bed, after the Italian peasant (whom we see resting from mid-day till 4 p.m.) is laboring in his fields or his shop. He has already worked for eight hours and deserves his rest and recreations. We who have risen from our comfortable beds four or five hours after he went to work do not know this fact, and make comments on his laziness and idleness which are wholly unwarranted."

#### WHY CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETIES ARE NEEDED.

Against us there stand in hostile array the rank secularism of our public school system; the "load of trash" under which the bookstalls groan; the open and systematic campaign of associations such as the Rationalist Press Agency against supernatural religion, and the overweening conceit of the man in the street who "assumes that he has not only a right to express his opinion on everything in heaven or on earth, but that his opinion is of equal value with that of a trained intellect who has studied the question with ripe judgment and mature powers." To day, as of old, it is the mental ripeness that is humble and the intellectual rawness that is proud. We are likewise face to face with the attacks of professing Christians who oppose us in misgiving as to the outside protection of the Ten Commandments. In these and other countries Catholics are often petted and stormed by enthusiasts of other faiths with weapons as coarse as the insane fabrications of Rousseau and in substance as venomous as the gibing and mendacity of Voltaire. Many of our opponents are no doubt, honest, but hot-headed, credulous and unscholarly enthusiasts—not manufacturers, but retailers—and their hearts stand excused, although at the expense of their heads. As to certain others, it inflicts a strain upon common Christian charity to convince oneself that—like Dr. Martin Luther and the Radical Socialist defamers of French convents—they do not deem any every weapon lawful against "Rome."

#### NO ATHEISM IN TRUE SCIENCE.

"There is no atheism about true science," says the New Zealand Tablet. "But, of course, there are many who will not see. Nelson, for instance, on a historic occasion clapped his blind eye to the telescope and 'did not see' the signal which he preferred to disregard. And, in the comedy trial of 'Pickwick,' did not Sam Weller look straight up into the roof of the court and, therefore, 'didn't see' his portly father sitting conspicuously in the gallery? There are those who 'do not see' God in His universe because He is a Personage Whom they would willingly ignore. The shallow thinkers and the vociferous half-educated fancy, too, that we are in another 'twilight of the gods.' But three hundred years ago Sir Francis Bacon clapped the cap upon their form of the atheistic fad. A little learning, said he, leads to atheism; deep study leads back to faith."