

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 184 and 186 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE L. NORTHGRAVES.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Agents: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Huxley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, space measurement.

Approved and Recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of London, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, N. Y., and the Clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Monday morning.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.

Agents or collectors have no authority to circulate your paper unless the amount due is paid.

Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us country. Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1905.

The Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

In matter and form are both good, and a truly Catholic spirit pervades the whole.

Therefore, with pleasure, I can recommend it to the faithful.

Blessing you and wishing you success. Believe me to remain, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ,

I. D. FALCONIO, Arch. of L'Assomption, Quebec.

LONDON, SATURDAY, APR. 29, 1905.

NARROW-MINDED MINISTERS.

If the Public Schools are responsible for the education and manners of some of our ministerial friends, one may be pardoned for not wasting words of eulogy on them.

If they continue to patriotism their defenders certainly give no sign of the patriotism that prefers the common good to selfish interests.

For during the campaign against the school classes we have too many proofs of narrow-mindedness, of unfair methods, of a desire to foment dissension—and all this from men pledged to peace and justice.

Instead of confining themselves to the question at issue they wander into paths frequented only by the irreconcilable bigot.

Instead of discussing the subject on its merits, they talk of things dead and forgotten, proffer charges which no man with a reputation to lose would dare to utter, and in general comport themselves as individuals who cannot differ from us without violating the canons of social amenity, to say nothing of charity.

It is too bad that some Canadians must view the question by the light that radiates from Toronto and Carleton county.

A sojourn in other regions might broaden and might give them the information that other Canadians who owe no allegiance to loggers are averse to the "patriotism that battons on hate and calumny" and to the fanaticism which would attain its ends regardless of the rights of others.

AN ESSENTIAL ELEMENT ON EDUCATION.

In contending for the rights of the minority, Catholics are not only defending their own interests, but those of Protestants as well.

In maintaining that religion should be an essential element of education we but plead for the best means of providing for the stability of Canada.

And we but repeat what has been said over and over again by Protestant authorities. "Education," says Rev. O. L. Barston, "is nothing less than the development of all the potencies that have been lodged in man. It concerns itself with the full contents of his being and with all his possibilities.

The claims of education are precisely the claims of manhood. If the idea of manhood be low, the product of training will be meagre and inadequate. The claims of religion upon education are precisely the claims of a complete manhood.

If a man is worth educating at all, he is worth educating roundly as a man. If the capacity of religion belongs to his manhood, it is a crime against that manhood to ignore its rights and cripple its possibilities."

MINISTERIAL INCONSISTENCY.

But our friends assert that the Public School is all that is needed for this country. They are not opposed to religion; and, with an assurance that is meet company for the arrogance of the Ontario preacher, they tell us that religion can be taught in the schools in such a manner as to not shock the conscience of the most sensitive.

Without pausing to comment on the fact that Catholics do not hold that religion is imparted as is the knowledge of history, let us merely advert to the inconsistency of the preachers.

At the beginning of the campaign against the rights of the minority, they shrieked at the audacity of the Catholic presuming to demand schools in which his children might be grounded on the principles of his faith. It was

an opportunity for them to indulge in a no Popery dance, and they availed themselves of it to the fullest extent.

Next they held up the hierarchy to the scorn and execration of the mindless, and had every Orangeman raving about "Popish aggression." Now they tell us they have no objection to religion in the school, but it must be religion of their own choosing.

No Catholic dogmas of course, but dogmas such as find favor in the eyes of the preachers. The Presbyterians, who believe in infant baptism, and the Baptists, who do not, are the representatives of the other sects which have no bond of union but antipathy to Rome would compile a text-book of religion and have it published with the imprimatur of Colonel Hughes and Dr. Sproule.

They are far from the point at issue—a fact which is deplored by leading Conservative organs. The Montreal Gazette terms it a useless and hopeless fight against Separate schools.

The Star says: "The voice of Quebec is united for tolerance. We may have our differences as to the treatment which we would have liked to have seen meted out to the old Provinces on the educational question; but we have no difference as to the real and serious danger which lies in the insane agitation which is being carried on in some quarters."

And prominent among the agitators are some Ontario preachers and editors who have assailed us with weapons that have been discarded long since by reputable controversialists.

Their tactics may please the Orangemen; but there must be some non-Catholics in Ontario who view them with regret and who are amazed at the men who bid us submit to their dictation, and then denounce us as disturbers, etc., for not complying with their wishes. These non-Catholics should speak so as to preserve to Ontario some shreds of decency.

A BIGOTED JOURNALIST.

The Toronto News is at present all that a newspaper should not be. It might have passed muster a few decades ago, but it is strange that it should thrive in a community which is such an ardent supporter of national schools.

The education of which we hear so much, and which alone can unify all classes, seems to have been wasted on it. We are sorry for Mr. Willison. We regret that his urbanity is in sad disrepair and his "judicial temper frayed at the edges."

We are also tired of his performances. An occasional appearance on the stage reserved for the drama "Bigotry" may be always expected in Toronto, but a continuous mouthing and ranting of mildewed lines in the same old mildewed way becomes a nuisance.

They should at least be disinfected. And what are the receipts of the box-office? Let Mr. Willison count them. True, he can count the plaudits and compliments of those whose purpose he now serves. But is all this preferable to the commendation of the citizens who have lived side by side with him for years, who have paid due tribute to his accomplishments as a journalist, and who, however they may differ from him at this moment, should like to be able to regard him as an honorable opponent?

ITS PASSAGE.

The editor of the Presbyterian, while stating that it is quite possible to carry this legislation through with a large parliamentary majority, tells us that it will be carried through in opposition to the deeply-rooted opposition of the majority of the people of Canada.

Our contemporary has ways and means unknown to us of ascertaining the attitude of the people of Canada towards this question. Or is his oracular assertion to solace his perturbed brethren? We have confidence, however, that the Bill will be supported by the majority of Canadians, and our reason is that without the gates of Toronto Canadians are willing to live and to let live, and the spirit which animated the constituencies of Sir Henri Joly and Mr. Justice Wurtell still abides. They recognize, as Hon. M. Laurance, K. C., put it, that the Bill involves the continuance and perpetuation of a school system based upon just principles, fair play and justice at least in a measure to all.

It involves the continuance and perpetuation of the only scheme of education in our country which we can hope to be enduring and permanent, and to be most likely to put an end to such shameful, painful, dangerous and needless agitation as we have been witnessing during the last few weeks.

THEIR'S THE RESPONSIBILITY.

The Bill, as we said before, would have provoked but little agitation but for a few political and religious fanatics who are dominated by a hatred of all things Catholic, and, with Provincial rights as an excuse, vilify the things that are dear to citizens who wish to live in peace with all Canadians, and knowing

their clamor has fallen on heedless ears, and their protests unhonored for the most part, and recognizing that members of Parliament cannot be brought into line by a summons from the preacher, they endeavor to ease the pain of defeat by the assumption that the Bill is not in accord with the views of the majority of the people—viz., the views of frenzied pulpiters like Dr. Sproule, Col. Hughes and others in these sections of Ontario wherein Bigotry flaunts itself unashamed, and the spirit of toleration is unknown.

ANOTHER "FAT BOY."

Despite the fervid preaching of our Methodist contemporaries against the iniquity of the school classes, we do not witness any remarkable demonstrations in the "Amen corner."

The game has been played so often that the non-Catholic has long since wearied of it. But though the "penitents' bench" is unadorned with mourners, the "hot air" does not decrease in volume.

The editor is, to our mind, playing the part of the "Fat Boy" in "Pickwick Paper," who made faces at the old lady in the garden.

"What in the world do you want?" said the old lady. "Please, missus, I only wants to make your flesh creep," replied the boy. And so the editor tells his readers that "Quebec is the most stagnant and most reactionary section of the Dominion."

METHODISM'S INFLUENCE.

The editor who penned these words must be either ignorant of the history of his country or must have an ignorant or credulous public. In reading them we remembered that Rev. Sydney Smith averred that wherever Methodism extends its baneful influence, boldness and rough honesty are broken down into meanness, prevarication and fraud.

We do not make this angry invective our own, but the furious declamation indulged in by the editor, the "cant" about peace and toleration, the refusal to approach the subject in a fair-minded manner and the persistent laboring to convince the non-Catholic that Protestant liberties are in danger, might tempt one to look favorably upon the words quoted above of the non-Catholic clergyman. And, were we to yield to the temptation, the quotation would be applied to him only, and not to Methodists in general.

OUR SISTER PROVINCE.

Now, is Quebec reactionary? Any one who knows anything of Canadian history recognizes the indisputable and undisputed fact that a spirit of greater toleration has always prevailed in Quebec than in Ontario.

In the assembly of Lower Canada Catholics gave in 1808 political rights to the Jews. The same assembly gave Protestant dissenters privileges which were not then accorded them elsewhere. The Protestants who represent overwhelmingly Catholic constituencies have never had to contend against a canvass based on bigotry. Is our friend able to point to similar examples of toleration in Ontario?

And Quebec was in the high-way of civilization when Ontario was a wilderness. Her sons were making history long before the pestilent brood of Orangemen came hither with its message of trouble and dissensions. Her schools and colleges dotted the land and turned out men, orators and poets and historians, years before the non-Catholic began to babble about a national school system in which our children shall meet on terms of equality with all others.

To-day, commenting on the speeches on the Bill, the Ottawa Free Press says that it is "a disgrace to the English speaking members that the French following of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and Mr. Borden surpass them in debate in English. The speeches of Sir Wilfrid, Mr. Monk, Mr. Bourassa and Mr. Lemieux have had a culture and finish that has been lacking in the addresses of their fellow-countrymen of English race and training. If this is the result of Separate school education, the more we have of it the better."

It is pitiable to hear an editor sneering at Quebec, which had a house of education long before Wesley came on the scene and which has contributed more than its quota to national glory and progress. Cartier and Champlain with their trophies of discovery—Dollard and Montcalm crowned by valor—missionaries of the stamp of Breboeuf and Jogues—Taschereau, Dorion, Chapleau, Laurier of the golden tongue—Garneau and Ferland, zealous guardians of their country's post—these and others whose services we need not recount, are fair products of a country that is supposed to be reactionary by some Ontario editors.

Not what we are, but what we would be, is our measure in God's sight. We may not be responsible for our failure to reach a high attainment, but we are responsible if we fail to strive toward that attainment.

A CONSPIRACY OF FALSEHOOD.

The Toronto Mail and Empire and the News, aided by the Hamilton Spectator and other journals of their class, have been completely foiled in their efforts to connect Mgr. Sbarretti, the Papal Delegate, with an absurdly imagined plot to deprive Manitoba of its supposed rights to an extension of its boundaries northward and westward, yet they are very loath to give up the use of this weapon of calumny whereby they have hoped to find a weak spot in the armor of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Government.

Hence with great persistency the story is kept up that his Excellency Mgr. Sbarretti was authorized by Sir Wilfrid to promise the Manitoba delegates the extension of their province as they desired it, provided their Government should grant additional school privileges to Catholics.

The story is too absurd in itself for credence, yet with the construction put by the Hon. Mr. Rogers upon the interview with his colleague, the Hon. Mr. Campbell, there is some lame opportunity afforded the journals in question to cling to it in the hope that there may be some who will believe it, and bear it in mind as a reason for opposing the Liberal candidates at the next general election.

Once for all, it is a false charge for which there is no justification in the facts which have been disclosed; and it is the most unpardonable and contemptible conduct possible to be conceived that the highest dignity of the Catholic Church in Canada should be made the target for the vituperative shafts of these abusive journalists.

May we not reasonably expect that the Catholics of Ontario will resent this meanness by every means within their power? There are many Catholic subscribers for all these journals, and we much undertake their spirit if they do not show their indignation in a manner which cannot be misunderstood.

And on what grounds do these journals base their version of the case? Here is a specimen of the reasoning of the Mail and Empire, as found in the leading editorial of its issue of April 6th.

Why is the Papal delegate here? He is here because Sir Wilfrid memorialized the Pope to send him that he might be on the spot to bargain for the next instalment of Separate school legislation from Manitoba. Will anybody believe that so distinguished a representative of the Pope would be invited to Canada to negotiate, and would be denied by his host the material with which to prosecute his diplomatic mission? In the arrangement of the two North West constitutions, Mgr. Sbarretti has been consulted. His Excellency saw the school classes before they were presented to Parliament. It is known that Sir Wilfrid Laurier was constantly with the delegate during the period when the alleged changes were being made to meet the views of Mr. Sifton. If the representative of his Holiness could be a determining factor in the settlement of the North-West Constitution, what consideration would exclude him from intervention in the arrangement with reference to Manitoba?

We do not see plainly that there would be any impropriety in Sir Wilfrid's asking the Apostolic Delegate whether the proposed educational clauses of the North West Bill would be satisfactory to the Catholic body; but there is not a particle of proof here that he did so. All is hypothetical: "Will anybody believe so and so?" And "If the Pope's delegate helped to settle the North West Constitution, what would prevent him from settling also the boundaries of Manitoba?"

But by the very terms in which the Mail and Empire makes its accusations, we can see they have no foundation in fact; for it cannot be supposed that if there were any proofs or shadow of a proof to connect Mgr. Sbarretti with a plot to connect Manitoba into bettering the condition of the Catholics of that province, such proofs would have been given by some of the parties who have attempted to make it appear that the plot existed. But they have not done this. Their arguments have been just as hypothetical as those of the Mail and Empire—"if he has done this, he might have done the other," etc.

We have the positive assurance of Mgr. Sbarretti that there was no such plot, and no agreement with Sir Wilfrid Laurier, of the kind which has been constantly dinned into our ears by the Mail and Empire and its echoes in and out of Parliament.

Mgr. Sbarretti has assured the public that he urged his request on Hon. Mr. Campbell purely "on the ground of fairness and justice," and that "the Federal Government had absolutely no knowledge of it. It was a private conversation and simply intended to express a suggestion and a desire that the condition of the Catholics in the respect mentioned would be improved. Any other assumption or interpretation is altogether unfounded." His Excellency adds:

"I think my right of speaking to Mr. Campbell in a private way and on my own responsibility cannot be disputed."

This lucid and straightforward statement of the case is fully corroborated

by Sir Wilfrid Laurier's statement made in the House of Commons on April 5:

"I have to say to the House, and I have the authority of my colleagues for this, that there never was any conference brought about by them between the delegates (from Manitoba) and Mgr. Sbarretti; and I have to make the further statement that neither myself nor any of my colleagues were the intermediaries between Mgr. Sbarretti and the delegates of Manitoba. If there has been such a conference, how it came about I cannot say. Perhaps Mgr. Sbarretti may have had a previous communication with these gentlemen. I do not know. Perhaps he knew them, and perhaps that is the reason why he called upon them to have a conference. At all events it is no concern of mine. I know nothing, and I never knew anything of it until this day, nor did the Government. What conversation took place between the Papal Delegate, Mr. Rogers and Mr. Colin Campbell I do not know."

It will be noted that this language of Sir Wilfrid Laurier was uttered before Mgr. Sbarretti's statement was made, and on the very day when Mr. Rogers launched his boomerang, which in its rebound showed that his statements were not worthy of credit.

At the moment when Sir Wilfrid spoke thus, it was still supposed that Mr. Rogers had taken part in the conference with Mgr. Sbarretti, as he spoke as if such were the case, whereas it was soon discovered that he was not at this conference at all.

In the face of this thorough refutation of the story of Mr. Rogers and the Mail and Empire, this journal had the audacity to repeat the myths if it had been proved to be an indubitable fact. Thus on April 8 we find again in the leading editorial:

"It would be an accusation against the good faith of the (Apostolic) Delegate to say that his Excellency intimated—as he declares he did—that the extension of the Province depended upon the condition of the school law, unless he believed that the Government at Ottawa would alter the boundaries and extend the provinces upon the terms which he mentioned. There can be no doubt that his Excellency did so believe."

We see in all this a set brazen purpose on the part of the Mail and Empire to deceive the public. Who, then, are the conspirators?

Some of the remarks made by Mr. Borden after the appearance of Mgr. Sbarretti's statement may be appropriately quoted here. He said:

"What did his Excellency say? He is an able and accomplished man, brought up in one of the best schools of diplomacy in the world, a diplomat, a man who would make no suggestions to Messrs. Campbell and Rogers which he did not feel he was able to carry out. He said that from the point of view of the Manitoba Government some action on these lines would be politically expedient."

Mr. Borden then endeavors to make it appear that his Excellency intended to convey the thought that he was empowered to dictate terms to Manitoba, and, in return for concessions made, to grant what Manitoba wanted. He failed miserably, however to prove this point. Sir Wilfrid Laurier showed this most conclusively. He said:

"Mr. Borden wants to know whether there was any question between the Government and Mgr. Sbarretti as to the extension of the boundaries. He has just read the statement and he finds that Mgr. Sbarretti says explicitly that the Government had nothing to do with his action. What Mgr. Sbarretti says is that if the people in the Territories would get Separate school concessions (from Manitoba) they would have no objection to being taken into that province. That is all there is in the matter."

Here we must add that the purpose for which Mgr. Sbarretti is in Canada is also misrepresented. Mgr. Mery del Val (now a Cardinal of the Church) was sent to Canada on a temporary mission to settle a disputed point between Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his Catholic supporters in Parliament on one side, as individual Catholics, and some members of the Canadian hierarchy on the other. The distinguished Papal Ablegate fulfilled his mission satisfactorily; but it was a mission with which the Government of Canada as such was not in any way concerned.

At a later period Mgr. Falconio was sent as a permanent Apostolic delegate to settle differences which might arise within the Church itself, and Mgr. Sbarretti is his successor, having been appointed to the office on the removal of Mgr. Falconio to Washington.

It is not true, therefore, as stated by the Mail and Empire, that Mgr. Sbarretti is here to negotiate with the Government on the school question of Manitoba: though undoubtedly he has the same right with any other resident in the country to interview the members of the Government in order to obtain redress of grievances, when he deems it proper so to intervene.

Mgr. Sbarretti's mission is not to the Government of Canada in any sense. He is here, just as Mgr. Falconio is at Washington, solely for the purpose of facilitating the administration of the Church in spiritual matters, and all the Catholics of the Dominion are pleased and delighted to see him in

Canada for such a purpose, and to honor him as the personal representative of our Holy Father, Pope Pius X.

THE POSTAGE-STAMP GOVERNMENT.

Loud and bitter is the complaint of the Manitoba Government that on the map of the Dominion that province looks just like a postage stamp stuck near the middle of a large envelope.

The name of the "Postage Stamp Government" will now surely cling to the Roblin administration which has invented the name for itself. But for the Government of a comparatively small province, it is just now making as much bluster as all the provinces of the Dominion together, except, perhaps, Ontario, which is apparently competing for the prize of fussiness with the Prairie Province.

It is not the people of Manitoba who are creating the present hubbub, but the Government of that Province, and especially the Hon. Mr. Rogers, who is said to be working underhand to get the Premiership from Mr. Roblin. With this end in view, he is stirring up the Province to indignation temperature, on the plea that it is an insult to Manitoba to consult Ontario or Quebec in regard to Manitoba's claims to an extended territory—a matter which in fact concerns all the provinces of the Dominion, but especially these two which are adjacent to the territory demanded.

No one in Canada seriously contemplates to cramp Manitoba unreasonably, but neither does a mother who has the true welfare of her baby child at heart at once give it everything it strains its lungs in screaming for. The extension of the boundaries of Manitoba is a question which deserves careful consideration, altogether apart from the character of its school laws; and Manitoba has no right to insist that it must be done in a hurry.

But as a matter of thought for the curious, it may be remarked that the Postage-stamp Province, even as it stands, is more than half as large again as the three maritime Provinces of the Dominion, with Newfoundland thrown in. It is considerably larger than the three Kingdoms of Great Britain and Ireland, Wales being included. It is more than two-thirds as large as France. Nevertheless it may be considered as certain that in the distribution of the Canadian territory which is still at the disposal of the Government, the Prairie Province will have a fair slice. But it has been already told that it cannot be extended westward for the reason that the population of the proposed new Provinces have already expressed a decided objection to being annexed to Manitoba. The Prairie Province has probably brought this situation upon itself by its intolerance, and it must bear the consequences. But if we are to believe certain ugly rumors which are afloat, the Postage-stamp Province or its Government at least, intends to wreak a terrible vengeance upon its Catholic citizens for its disappointment in not being allowed to take in all the territory unoccupied as far as where? The North Pole, perhaps! It is being seriously considered by the Government to take away the petty concessions which have been made to Catholics in regard to schools under the Laurier Greenway settlement. Perhaps it would be wise for the Roblin-Rogers Government not to be precipitate. Another constitutional question may be stirred up by precipitate action, under which the Government may not have entirely its own way—perhaps, even, Mgr. Sbarretti's implied warning to Hon. Mr. Campbell may prove to be prophetic, that the proposed progressive legislation may be a serious obstacle to the future progress of the Province, so that it may retain for long the distinction of being the "Postage-Stamp Province of the Dominion." At all events, the present Government has not acquired any vested title to retain its position for all time, and hostility to Catholics as an election cry may prove to be a boomerang for the party which employs it, as has already been the case in other Provinces than Manitoba.

A BOGUS REPORT.

The Montreal Star of April 20th publishes a statement which is said "to be reported in certain circles in Montreal, that Mgr. Sbarretti, the Papal Delegate in Canada, will leave this country within a measurable time."

The Star's informant is responsible for the statement that the Vatican has taken the view that his Grace's interview with Mr. Campbell of Manitoba, and his proposals re the Manitoba educational question closely approached an indiscretion.

This report has all the appearance of being a bogus affair. In the first place no responsible authority is given for it. It was, most probably, concocted in the Star office, to stir up the agitation on the Autonomy Bill by

containing to mix Mgr. name with it.

"The measurable indefinite period which the refuge of sensational report make it their practice to to graphic despatches from Rome."

"And lastly, we extremely improbable that Mgr. Sbarretti to hold an interview with a member of one of our Governments with a view to to favorable legislation for the living under that Government."

Mr. Hays, the general Grand Trunk Railway, a citizen of Canada, or Empire, nevertheless has held interviews for the only of obtaining rights, get favors for the rail which is under his able management."

Mgr. Sbarretti represent Catholic population of this as well as the Pope, can be no reason should not be received res the members of our Government or federal, and we express the hope that he long in the Dominion, where his administrative ability has been all who have had occasion to associate with him. When recalled, we feel certain, will be to elevate him to the Cardinalate.

THE AMERICAN NATIONAL COUNCIL OF WOMEN ON DIVORCE.

Miss Susan B. Anthony, known for many decades as the persistent of Women's Rights, attended the National American women which in Washington, D. C., to discuss the question of divorce.

The question was considered, and it was unanimously agreed that with which marriage in the United States is a by which women are the

A resolution was proposed to the Association to co-act with Church and State to causes leading to divorce, and to obtain such legislation as would tend to abolish divorces.

Miss Anthony bitterly resolution, saying: "I do not consider of by any means. It is just for women married as Canada was once a refuge for women. I will never let it go until it has been taken from designing art."

It is clear that Miss appreciation of the marriage was instituted by God, which do not mean the pleasure of the man, but have reference also to the family to which he are equally bound to themselves. The divine law therefore, that husband and wife are bound to each other. Christ declares that "joined together no asunder."

But Miss Anthony peculiar views, and dis restraint for her. So not long since she issued a tract to suit her notions, however, had no National Council of Women resolution against overwhelming majority herself is of that respect makes it highly probable with her views on the divorce, she is not likely to appear in the divorce complainant, or respondent.

The National Council serves credit for her attention to the whims of a lady who endeavored to favor divorce.

THE MAIL AND EMPIRE COVERS A D.

The Toronto Mail and Empire April 19 affects great account of an hypothesis is to be made upon "rights of the Province of Quebec." And on this attack expected Mr. Bourassa has an address made in Montreal, that Mgr. Sbarretti, the Papal Delegate in Canada, will leave this country within a measurable time."

The Star's informant is responsible for the statement that the Vatican has taken the view that his Grace's interview with Mr. Campbell of Manitoba, and his proposals re the Manitoba educational question closely approached an indiscretion.

This report has all the appearance of being a bogus affair. In the first place no responsible authority is given for it. It was, most probably, concocted in the Star office, to stir up the agitation on the Autonomy Bill by