

Messenger and Visitor.

THE CHRISTIAN MESSENGER,
VOLUME LXIII.

{ THE CHRISTIAN VISITOR
VOLUME LII.

Vol. XVII.

ST. JOHN, N. B., WEDNESDAY, MARCH 6, 1901.

No. 10.

The Coming of the King's Son. The prospective visit to Canada of the Duke and Duchess of Cornwall is a matter of much interest to the people of the Dominion, who from the Atlantic to the Pacific will be prepared to give their Royal Highnesses a most loyal and enthusiastic reception. The visit is now understood to be regularly on the programme for September, but as yet there has been no announcement as to the time which their Royal Highnesses will spend in Canada or the places which they will visit. In reply to an enquiry touching the matter, Sir Wilfrid Laurier said on Tuesday last in the House of Commons that correspondence was in progress between Ottawa and London in reference to the matter, but correspondence could not at present be made public. He however intimated his concurrence in the opinion that it would be most desirable that their Royal Highnesses should visit every Province of the Dominion, and further gave the impression that the Government had suggested as the most convenient plan that the Duke and Duchess, returning from Australia, should come by way of the Pacific, land at Vancouver and pass through the Dominion to Halifax, visiting by the way the chief cities and points of interest in the several provinces.

Home Interests v. Foreign Monopoly. A petition has been presented to the Dominion Government, asking for the abolition of the duties on petroleum and its products. This demand rests on the ground that the oil industry is now controlled by the Standard Oil Company and that the prices have been unduly enhanced. In support of this it is stated that many large manufacturers in Ontario have had to resort to the use of American fuel oil and pay thereon a duty of 2½ cents per gallon on account of the extortionate price which the Standard Oil trust has placed upon the Canadian product, so that the crude oil that was formerly sold at from three to four cents per gallon is now sold at from seven to eight cents. The petition sets forth that, contrary to the provisions of the law of Canada, the Standard Oil Company or persons and corporations affiliating with it, have formed a trust or combination, with the result that the prices of petroleum and its products have been unduly increased in Canada and that the petitioners have thereby suffered great loss. The petitioners therefore ask for a removal of the heavy duty now imposed on petroleum, on the ground that if the duty were removed the Standard Oil Company could no longer continue to exact such enormous and unreasonable profits from the people of Canada, and further allege that the petroleum industry in this country is no longer a Canadian or home industry, since it is controlled by a foreign corporation, for the benefit of which millions of dollars are being drawn from the people of Canada. The Government, we should suppose, will feel bound to give the most serious consideration to this petition. If its allegations are correct there is a condition of things which calls loudly for remedy, if any remedy be possible. In view of the almost universal use of kerosene oil, the subject is one in which the whole people, and especially the poorer classes, are interested. Whatever may be said in favor of taxing the country for the purpose of fostering home industries, it is difficult to see what anyone can have to say in favor of taxing the people in the interests of a gigantic foreign monopoly. The removal of the present duty on coal oil would therefore, we take it, command the approval of the great majority of the people of this country.

The Coronation Oath. The Coronation Oath, taken by the King on the occasion of his opening his first Parliament or rather the declaration connected with the oath which indicates the monarch's attitude toward Roman Catholicism, has been of late the subject of a good deal of discussion both in public and in private places. In the Imperial Parliament it was made the ground of an amendment to the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, and in our Dominion Parliament notice has been given by Hon. John Costigan, of a motion embodying an address to the King, protest-

ing against the said declaration as offensive to the religious beliefs of His Majesty's Roman Catholic subjects in Canada and throughout the Empire, and declaring that in the opinion of the House the Act of Settlement of 1689 should be amended by abolishing the said offensive declarations connected with the oath, "and the British Sovereign freed forever from the obligation of offending the religious principles of any class of his faithful subjects." That to which especially Roman Catholics make objection is the King's declaration, in connection with his rejection of the doctrine of transubstantiation, "that the invocation or adoration of the Virgin Mary or any other saint, and the sacrifice of the mass, as they are now used in the church of Rome, are superstitious and idolatrous," and further the form in which the declaration is made which is as follows: "And I do solemnly, in the presence of God, profess, testify and declare that I do make this declaration, and each and every part thereof, in the plain and ordinary sense of the words read unto me, as they are commonly understood by English Protestants, without any evasion, equivocation, or mental reservation whatsoever, and without any dispensation already granted me for this purpose by the Pope or any other authority or person whatsoever, or without any hope of such dispensation from any person or authority whatsoever, or without thinking that I am or can be acquitted before God or man, or absolved of this declaration or any part thereof, although the Pope, or any other person or persons or power whatsoever, should dispense with or annul the same or declare that it was null and void from the beginning."

Should it be Amended? This form of adjuration is certainly significant of some things. It is remarkable as a desperate attempt to hold a bad man to his engagements by an appeal to his moral sense. It indicates a profound conviction on the part of the people of England, or of those who then acted and spoke for them, that the Stuart Kings were slippery customers whose consciences it was difficult to find and still more difficult to bind. It indicates likewise a profound suspicion that the ethical doctrines held and practised at the Vatican might be essentially different from those of plain people accustomed to gather their ideas of right and wrong from the teachings of their New Testaments, and that such a King in difficult straits might be able to find a dispensation to do other than, by the terms of a solemn oath, he had engaged to do. Therefore the attempt to construct an oath so invincible that it should be proof against all that was feared in the combination of a Stuart conscience and a Jesuit casuistry. Could such an oath ever accomplish any good? If a man were bad enough to require an oath like that, his word, in whatever form it might be given, would surely be of little value. If a man is of such character that he cannot be held to the right way except by such expedients as this—futile at best—then better send him to the block than seat him on the throne. Of far more value than such formal oaths was the simple, and evidently honest, declaration of the present monarch when, immediately on the death of the Queen, being called upon to assume the duties of office, he declared that it would be his constant endeavor to walk in the footsteps of his mother, and added: "I am fully determined to be a constitutional sovereign in the strictest sense of the word, and, so long as there is breath in my body, to work for the good and amelioration of my people." It is doubtless right that the King on coming to the throne should make a public and solemn declaration of his purpose to discharge the duties which belong to his high position in the fear of God and according to the recognized principles of the nation's constitution, as it is also important that he should be a Protestant in heart and by profession, but the nation's welfare will depend much more upon the Sovereign's personal character as to wisdom, goodness and righteousness than upon any formal declaration of religious belief, supported by the

most stringent oaths. By the great majority of Protestants, we think, the protest of Roman Catholics against the form of the Coronation Oath, as unnecessarily and gratuitously offensive, will be recognized as reasonable and just. It is doubtless offensive to the King himself and to most, if not all his ministers. Lord Salisbury acknowledges the objectionable features, but evidently thinks that at the present time more harm might result from an attempt to amend the form of the oath than from permitting it to remain as it is.

Since the above was written Mr. Costigan's resolution has been discussed and dealt with by the House. The Premier announced that after a conference with Mr. Costigan and other members of the House, it had been agreed, by way of making the resolution more generally acceptable, to strike out the last clause of the resolution, which asked for the abolishing of the declaration, and substitute therefor the following:

"That in the opinion of this House the declaration referred to in the above mentioned Act of Settlement should be amended by eliminating therefrom all those expressions which are especially offensive to the religious belief of any subject of the British crown."

The motion, so amended, was carried, 125 yeas to 19 nays.

Manitoba's Liquor Law. The question of the constitutionality of the Prohibitory Liquor Law enacted last year by the Manitoba Legislature was referred to the Supreme Court of the Province, and that court has now delivered judgment in the matter, declaring the act to be beyond the powers of the Provincial Legislature. This judgment, as we understand the matter, is without reference to any special powers or privileges with respect to trade possessed by the Hudson Bay Company, and is grounded upon the opinion that, as the control of trade pertains to the Dominion Parliament, the Provincial Legislature cannot enact legislation which interfere with the course of trade as the Prohibitory Law enacted by the Province does. As the matter now stands, therefore, the Manitoba Law is ultra vires, but whether this would be the case if the question of its constitutionality were carried to the court of ultimate appeal, may admit of doubt. The question, as to the respective spheres of legislation possessed by the Federal and Provincial Legislatures, which is here involved, is a very nice one, and though we are inclined to think that the decision of the Manitoba Court would not likely be reversed, something may certainly be urged in support of the other view as will appear by the following from the Montreal Witness: "No doubt the judges have dealt with the obvious objections that offer themselves to their finding. It is true that all matters of trade and commerce are in charge of the national legislature, but on the other hand, all regulations for the purpose of securing good morals are in the hands of the provinces. No one pretends that it is for any commercial purpose that the abolition of this trade is sought; it is sought exclusively as a moral regulation. It has certainly been held by the Privy Council that, having the right to regulate trade, parliament has the right to do that for moral purposes as well as for any other. It would, however, be a mistake, we should think, to conclude from this that because parliament had the right to stretch its trade rights to enact moral legislation, therefore the provinces have not the right vested in them to enact moral legislation. Rather, we should conclude that if trade powers can be stretched into the moral sphere, so, when the circumstances equally call for it, the right to regulate morals should include regulations of trade. The legislatures seem to have power to regulate the sale up to the point of prohibition, but not including that point. They seem even to have the power to confer prohibitory powers on municipalities, yet not to be able to exercise those powers themselves. We do not know whether it will be thought worth while to carry the question to appeal, but it is surely important enough."