

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 451 and 455 Richmond Street, London, Ontario. Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES. "Author of 'Mistakes of Modern Infidels.'" THOMAS COFFEY. Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Agents: Lakes King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Miss Sarah Stanley are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD. Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 21, 1905. 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.

MANITOBA'S THREAT.

We are told, with a certain amount of glee, that after all Manitoba will come out ahead in its contention with the Ottawa Government—that the Provincial rulers have the legal right to pass a law repealing the Laurier-Greenway compromise in favor of Catholics, and that the Premier, Mr. Roblin, will call the members together, and such a law will be passed.

There is no doubt the Manitoba Government can legally do so, and, judging from the past, the rulers of that Province pay very little attention to the rights of God or man so long as they can protect themselves by legal quibbles.

However, standing on the platform of legal rights alone, other things would follow. The Federal Government has the right to pass a Remedial Bill to compel the bigoted Province to do justice to the Catholic minority.

It is true Sir Wilfrid Laurier, in 1896, said "No coercion, but conciliation." But he admitted there should be one or the other to remedy the grievances which the Privy Council said existed. So far the conciliation policy has been adopted, but the moment Manitoba refuses conciliation, then Sir Wilfrid is logically bound, from his stand in 1896, to the other means at his disposal, the so-called coercion.

The Manitoba Government had no scruples about using coercion before, and will not scruple to do so again; but if the members of that Province or any other imagine that the Catholics will tamely submit and do or say nothing, such rulers are very much mistaken.

It is better for all concerned to know the truth and to face the facts—Catholics are no strangers or foreigners in Canada. They have helped to build up the country from one end of it to the other. They claim nothing for themselves but what they are perfectly willing to grant to their Protestant neighbors. They intend to maintain their own rights and respect the rights of others, and want to live in peace and harmony with their neighbors of every description. Is not this the proper spirit for every true Canadian to have?

The fact that Manitoba, in its ugly mood and spirit of revenge, can legally rob the Catholics of the God-given right of giving their children a Christian education, is a strong argument in favor of the present Autonomy Bill protecting minorities. It is not fair that the Catholics in the new Provinces should be deprived of their present educational rights and placed at the mercy of future rulers who may imitate the bad example given by Manitoba.

It is better to have the question settled at once, and we believe that notwithstanding some rascals of newspapers and politicians and preachers, the ordinary fair minded Protestant Canadian is willing to do justice to his Catholic fellow citizens, and join in working for peace and prosperity and unity in this country.

On the whole we are confident that, when the vote is taken on the present Bill, justice and fair-play and true patriotism will prevail with nearly every member of the Federal Parliament, and that bigotry, bluster and braggadocio will influence but a few.

What a Howl! Sir Charles Tupper has visited the Pope and has received the Papal blessing for "his constant defence of the rights of Canadian Catholics." What will Grand Master Sproule say? And Col. Sam Hughes and the other defenders of the faith? What a howl they would raise if Laurier were in Tupper's place!—London Advertiser

THE AUTONOMY BILL AND THE PAPAL DELEGATE.

After all the clamor and discussion on the Autonomy Bill both in and out of the House of Commons, the matter has quieted down as it has been realized that the bill will certainly pass without substantial change by a considerably larger majority than was anticipated in the beginning of the discussion. Looking back at what was elicited during the debate, it appears that Mr. Leighton McCarthy is the only Ministerialist of the House who will vote against the educational part of the measure, while several Conservatives have declared in strong terms their intention to support it as a measure of justice to all the people of the new provinces.

We are not surprised that those Conservatives who depend upon the Orangemen for support should be bitter opponents of the bill. Among these are Dr. Sproule, Messrs. Lancaster, Bennet, W. F. Maclean, Col. S. Hughes and others. This crowd was reinforced by the Hon. Geo. E. Foster, who, having been defeated in his former constituency in New Brunswick, found a refuge in North Toronto, a constituency which he has good reason to suppose will scream its delight at every attack he may make against Catholic education.

The attack made by this crowd upon the venerated Delegate of the Pope, Mgr. Sbarretti, has fallen flat. Mr. Campbell himself, the Manitoban Delegate on the question of the extension of that Province, has virtually admitted that the account given by his Excellency the Apostolic Delegate is correct, though on one point of minor detail he asserts that Mgr. Sbarretti was in error, that is, he asserts that he had not met the Delegate before he had the interview with him in Ottawa. There may have been an error on one side or the other in regard to this unimportant matter, but Mr. Campbell has made it plain that at this interview Mr. Campbell was present whereas Mr. Rogers was not. The latter, therefore, gave out a false representation of the case in this statement that "we," that is himself and his colleague, were invited to meet Mgr. Sbarretti, and in so wording the whole statement as to lead to the inference that he was present, and was, indeed, even the principal speaker at the interview. But the most important misrepresentation was the statement that this interview was held on Feb. 21st, that is, before Sir Wilfrid Laurier made his announcement on the policy to be carried out by the Dominion Government in regard to Manitoba. It is therefore evident that the interview of the Apostolic Delegate with Mr. Campbell had no influence on that policy, which is the chief point on which the whole discussion has taken place. Under these circumstances Mgr. Sbarretti could never have entertained the thought that he was influencing or shaping the policy of the Government on the question of extension of Manitoba's boundaries; and all the denunciations of Papal interference with the Government of Canada are without any other object than to inflame the minds of the populace, so as to secure the votes of those who could be so inflamed, at the next general election.

Mr. Rogers has issued a third statement in which he says that Mgr. Sbarretti does not deny his assertion that Manitoba's case had been prejudiced by the neglect of its Legislature to give a school law satisfactory to the Catholics. Mgr. Sbarretti did not say that Manitoba had actually suffered damage from this cause, but as he himself tells us:

"I urged my request (that the school law should be improved) on the ground of fairness and justice, and, referring to his (Mr. Campbell's) mission to Ottawa, remarked that from the point of view of the Manitoba Government, some action on these lines would be politically expedient, and tend to facilitate the accomplishment of his object, inasmuch as Catholics in any territory which might be annexed to Manitoba would naturally object to losing the right they had to separate schools, and to be subject to the conditions which existed in Manitoba."

This is undoubtedly the correct version of what passed at the interview, as Mr. Campbell practically acknowledges it to be so, but tries to let his colleague, Mr. Rogers, down easily by adding that Mgr. Sbarretti's version is identical with that of Mr. Rogers. The two versions are not identical. According to Mr. Rogers's statement, Mgr. Sbarretti gave it to be understood that he could and would influence the Dominion Government to grant what Manitoba asked, whereas the Apostolic Delegate mentioned merely what would naturally be the disposition of the Catholics towards Manitoba if the province would carry out his suggestion that the school law should be made more satisfactory to them.

Mr. Rogers represents Mgr. Sbarretti as dominating the Dominion Government, whereas he only told Mr. Campbell what a keen observer of events might readily say. His Excellency had good reason for his remark, as he must

have been already aware that the "postage-stamp province," as the Conservative opponents of the Autonomy Bill have now dubbed it, has been already told by the Legislatures and people of the new Provinces that they will not consent to be annexed to Manitoba.

But it may be asked, "Why should the Papal Delegate interview members of the Manitoba Government at all?" We answer that this is a free country in which any one who has or thinks he has a grievance, or who desires legislation of any kind, is at liberty to ask the Government for the relief he desires. Delegations of all descriptions do this every day, and perhaps there have been more Protestant ministerial delegations asking for legislation than of any other class. Is there any reason why Mgr. Sbarretti should not have the same freedom?

Not long since, the Dominion and Ontario Governments received ministerial deputations asking for prohibitive and Lord's Day legislation. Surely Mgr. Sbarretti has a right also to interview also the members of any of the Canadian Governments on behalf of fair treatment for nearly one half the population of the Dominion.

The outcry raised against Mgr. Sbarretti could come only from bigoted creatures. Yet the Mail and Empire had the assurance to announce to its readers that His Excellency is actually to be recalled by the Pope; and "the Orange Wing" in Parliament had the equal audacity to demand his recall.

The Hon. Chas. Fitzpatrick deserves the greatest praise for the dignified manner in which he rebuked these bigots, and for his statement that he hoped His Excellency would remain long in the country. For his part he hoped that the Holy Father would not recall him.

The insinuation of some of the lodge members of Parliament that the memorandum of desirable amendments to the Manitoba school law presented by Mgr. Sbarretti to Mr. Campbell was prepared by the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick was indignantly repudiated by that honorable gentleman. It is, indeed, now fully established that no member of the Dominion Government had anything to do with the interview itself or with the Apostolic Delegate's suggestions.

THE GLOBE'S PROVINCIAL RIGHTS CRY.

We publish in this week's CATHOLIC RECORD a very clever letter, having reference to the Autonomy Bill, from Mr. Chambers, a prominent Protestant resident of the city of Quebec. It appeared in the Toronto Globe of 12th April. The editor of the Globe adds a footnote in which he advances as answer to Mr. Chamber's contention the well-worn shibboleth of Provincial rights. Surely the editor of the Globe will recognize the fact that there is such a thing as Provincial wrongs as well as Provincial rights. Furthermore, it must be in his recollection that about twenty years ago two electoral campaigns in the Province of Ontario were carried on with the cry of "Down with the Separate schools." And, finding that these schools could not be interfered with by act of the local legislature, an agitation was inaugurated to have the British North America Act amended so that the power would rest with the Provinces to abolish Separate schools. True, this agitation was not successful, but there may come a time when an anti-Catholic agitation in the North West would have a different result. The liberality displayed by the Catholic majority of Quebec as compared with the narrowness and bigotry which is now a-days so much in evidence amongst the majority in the Province of Ontario, places the latter Province in an unenviable light amongst thoughtful, intelligent men who are not blinded by prejudice.

SAUL AMONG THE PROPHETS?

Will wonders ever cease? The Toronto Mail and Empire a few days ago had an editorial article under the title "How our Schools can be Improved," and, strange to say, our clamorous "Equal Rights" contemporary comes out without disguise as an advocate of moral teaching in the schools, and says: "To declare that rules of moral conduct must not therefore be taught in school is to throw away the baby with the bath."

We must have moral teaching therefore, but he tells us that this moral teaching must exclude all Christian dogma, and the reason he gives is "Ontario will never tolerate in her Public schools any exercises which have for their object the dissemination of sectarian views or dogmatic instruction." And again, "At one time it was supposed that there could be no objection to the reading of passages from the Bible; but now there are few passages that have not served as a theological battleground. It is evident, therefore, that there might be objection to Bible reading."

We should naturally suppose that an educationalist who maintains that there

should be moral teaching, and who declares that such teaching is of the highest importance, should be delighted at the fact that there are at least some schools in the province in which such teaching is given, namely, the Catholic Separate schools.

But no! there is no more bitter opponent of Catholic schools than this same journal. If moral teaching is so important, surely there can be no harm done if the Catholic children have that moral teaching along with the dogmatic teaching which must be the basis of all morality. But the mere mention of such a thing is, to the Mail and Empire, a red handkerchief flouted in the face of an enraged bull.

The fact is that the stand taken by that mild-mannered and "ethical" journal is that of the agnostic; and the reason advanced is certainly a curiosity: "Ontario will never tolerate this." If so would it not be better to educate Ontario up to the mark of appreciating what is right and just, instead of fomenting the hatred of a certain faction of its people against allowing religious instruction (moral included) in the Catholic schools all over the Dominion—in Ontario, Manitoba, and the new Northwestern Provinces?

But it is interesting to note the basis on which the Mail and Empire would ground moral teaching, as a substitute for Christian dogma. The article in question says:

"Every one will agree that the child who believes it is wrong to lie and to steal will make a better citizen than the urchin who has no such theories. Now we do not imagine that any child of sound mind and school age in Ontario does not know that lying and stealing are sins. Most of them know it in the same way that they learn the distance to the moon. They view it as an abstract proposition. They do not know it as surely and as unmistakably as they know they are cold and hungry. Why should not a competent teacher take the necessary time to transform this vague abstraction into a fixed principle? He must be convinced that if he steals he will be punished, not by teacher or guardian, or by the law, but by himself. No child is too young to learn that there are certain moral laws as fixed and irrevocable as the laws of nature, and that he can no more break one of them with impunity than he can thrust his hand into the fire and not be burned."

"Lying and stealing are sins," for sooth. And what is a sin, but an offence against God's law? Take away God and His teaching, and there can be no such things as the sins of lying and stealing. It is easy to see, therefore, that as soon as the child begins to look for the reasons for a moral code, the sinfulness of these acts will disappear if he has not been taught that there is a God, the Rewarder of good and the Punisher of evil, a God who loves mankind. There will, therefore, be no motive left why the grown up child should be truthful and honest except the fear of the policeman's club. Lying and stealing must cease to be sins in themselves if the child has been taught according to the Mail and Empire's "fixed and irrevocable principles." There will be no sin if the grown child can only escape being caught in his lies and thefts. This is the kind of morality which the Mail and Empire would have taught in the schools.

No moral teaching can be efficacious without Christian dogma for its basis, and for this reason it must be a most desirable thing to see Catholic schools established wherever Catholics are numerous enough to support them, and in such cases they should be entirely exempt from contributing towards the support of schools for their neighbors who prefer to send their children to schools without any religious teaching. We do not desire to force the teaching of Catholic dogmas upon Protestants, but we insist upon our natural right to instruct our children in their full duties of religion and morality. We have no objection to Protestants doing the same thing if they can agree upon a plan of satisfactory moral or religious teaching; but we have the plan already settled on for ourselves, and in operation, and what we require as a satisfactory solution of the educational problem is that we have not forced upon us a solution which may be very satisfactory to Protestants, but can never be so for Catholics. This we require, not as a concession or privilege, but as our inalienable right.

THE HON. FRANK OLIVER. It is stated in despatches from Edmonton that at a meeting held on April 13th at Fort Saskatchewan the new Minister of the Interior, the Hon. Frank Oliver, was the recipient of an address signed by the business men of the district, irrespective of their political parties, in which their support and influence were pledged to the new Minister in the coming contest. Every Conservative business man of the town signed this declaration, from which it may fairly be inferred that the people, independently of their party affiliations, are favorable to him and that they are pleased with the Autonomy Bill as it

stands. The people of the North-West have evidently not been moved by the anti-Catholic agitators of Ontario who are pulling the wires to work up an opposition to the Government on account of the Bill. The prospect is that Mr. Oliver will be elected without opposition. Will the Toronto Mail and Empire then persist in asserting that the West is unanimous against the school clauses?

THE POSTAGE-STAMP PROVINCE.

A despatch from Winnipeg states that in consequence of the recent agitation on the School question, Premier Roblin proposes to summon at once a session of the Manitoba Legislature for the purpose of repealing the School settlement arranged in 1897 between Premier Laurier and Messrs. Sifton and Greenway whereby some small concessions were made towards meeting the desires of the French-Canadian Catholics of that Province. This, if true, is a piece of petty spite which could emanate only from the meanest of small-minded legislators. Should this report prove to be correct, we can only express the hope that the "postage-stamp province" may remain long as a postage-stamp amid the provinces of the Dominion.

We take the liberty of informing Messrs. Roblin and Rogers, who are the ruling spirits of the Manitoba Government, that neither Sir Wilfrid Laurier nor the Hon. Charles Fitzpatrick has authorized us to express this sentiment.

SURE TO PASS.

The Hon. Mr. Monk, the leader of the Conservative party of Quebec, has declared in Parliament that he will support the Autonomy Bill education clauses. He reminded the House that the purely secular schools of the United States have not been productive of good results, quoting several Protestant authorities in favor of this view. He also quoted Mr. Balfour, who is a firm believer in religious education. He declared in favor of the higher principle of religious instruction. He protested against the charge that those who support the Autonomy Bill are under the domination of the clergy. He said that the Quebec clergy do not interfere in politics.

Mr. George H. Parley of Argenteuil, a Protestant and a Conservative, said that he thought the Bill should be withheld for a year so that the jurisdiction of Parliament should be ascertained. Nevertheless, he left the impression that he will vote for the Bill, as he has no objection to continue to Catholics the very moderate means of education which the measure before the House grants, and which they possess at present.

It is expected that every Conservative member from the Province of Quebec will support the Bill, as an acknowledgment of the fair treatment accorded to the Protestant minority of that Province by the Catholic majority. Thus the normal majority of the Government will be considerably exceeded on this question.

Mr. Pringle, the Protestant Conservative member for Stormont, Ont., spoke strongly in favor of the Autonomy Bill, amid unseemly interruptions from his own side of the House. He said he was not there to represent Protestants or Roman Catholics; but he would do what is honest and right. Stormont is a strongly Protestant constituency.

Mr. Miller, the Liberal member for South Grey, also spoke earnestly for the Bill. He showed up the absurdity and viciousness of the course pursued by Mr. Willison of the Toronto News, who admitted that the Bill would pass by a most decisive majority, and yet asked the people of Toronto to keep up the agitation against it, and to remember the men who vote for it when another election comes on.

We will note carefully those who vote both for Mr. Borden's anti-Separate school amendment and for the Bill itself, and we trust our readers will keep their names in view.

YET ANOTHER.

Mr. H. B. Ames, the Conservative Protestant member of Parliament for St. Antoine division, Montreal, on April 13th declared that he must reluctantly break with his party to support clause 16 of the Autonomy Bill. He had been for ten years a member of the Council of Public Instruction in Quebec and in that time they had never yet had to consider one case where there was a grievance caused by unfair treatment of the minority by the majority. He accepted Mr. Borden's constitutional argument, but declared that there is a higher view, and that is the justice that is due to the minority. In voting for the bill he was moved by a sense of justice and not through fear of any portion of his electorate. He regretted there had been so much intemperate language used in such inflammable material. As miners are not allowed to carry naked lamps in the region of inflam-

mable gases, he thought the members should travel through a debate of this kind with safety lamps.

The majority for the educational clauses of the Bill is growing.

Mr. Ames' testimony to the liberality of the Catholic majority in Quebec is most valuable. Ontario and Manitoba might learn therefrom a useful lesson. After all, something good comes forth from Galilee.

Peterboro Examiner: As to clerical interference in politics, it is to be noted that during the controversy now raging, while Protestant clergymen have taken general and active parts in intermeddling with politics, there has been, so far as known, an entire absence of interference on the part of the Roman Catholic clergy of Ontario. Has not one as much right as another in a land which boasts of its "civil and religious liberty" and "equal rights."

THE HON. FRANK OLIVER, MINISTER OF THE INTERIOR.

It is now a little over a month since the Hon. Clifford Sifton resigned his portfolio as Minister of the Interior in Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Cabinet, and members of the Opposition party in the House of Commons have been engaged in the amusement of twitting him to the effect that he dared not open a constituency in the North West by the appointment of a member from the territories to take Mr. Sifton's place, as they asserted that the indignation of the whole North-West against the educational clauses of the Autonomy Bill is so intense that not a single constituency would return a member of the Government coming back for re-election after accepting office with the burden of the Autonomy Bill on his shoulders.

Mr. R. L. Borden has been peculiarly persistent in taking this view of the matter, and has endeavored to keep up the excitement by continually enquiring in the House whether the vacancy had been filled, and when it would be filled. At the same time, we must admit that Mr. Borden did not indulge in the acrimony which was the chief argument of several of his followers.

We must presume that it required time and careful consideration on the part of the Premier to fill so important a position. We do not consider that Sir Wilfrid took any undue advantage by not allowing himself to be hectoring into hasty action; and when questioned so constantly he always replied good-humoredly to the effect that he could not then give any information on the subject, but that he would willingly give the desired information as soon as possible, which would probably be very soon or in a few days.

The duties of the Prime Minister are both numerous and onerous, and some latitude must be allowed him in his manner of conducting the Government, at all times, especially at a moment when an attempt is being made to inflame the minds of the public, as has been the case on the present occasion.

Mr. Borden's reply to Sir Wilfrid was that he desired it to be understood that he asked the question every day until the appointment should be actually made.

The Mail and Empire was also continually declaring under inflammatory sensational headlines that the entire West is in arms against the Bill, and that the attempt to fetter the two new provinces by bonds which can never be cast off will be bitterly resented at the first opportunity afforded them.

Notwithstanding all these gloomy predictions, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to the astonishment and consternation of his opponents, has done the very thing which they said he dared not do. Mr. Frank Oliver of Edmonton has been appointed to the vacant office, and has gone West to ask his constituents for their endorsement. It is expected that the nomination will take place on April 25, and polling a week later, should a poll be required. Thus the opponents of the Autonomy Bill will have the opportunity they were apparently so anxious for to test public sentiment on the proposed legislation.

But their courage seems to have oozed out at their finger ends as soon as this glorious opportunity of taking the stronghold from the Government was afforded them. It is believed, in fact, that Mr. Oliver will be returned by acclamation.

The constituency is a large one, having more than eight thousand voters, including a considerable proportion of Catholics; but for this very reason the election will test fairly the sentiment of the whole population of the North-West, both Catholic and Protestant, on the Autonomy Bill. The opponents of the Bill have asserted that the Northwestern Catholics do not want Catholic Separate schools. The election will show whether this assertion is the truth or a mere election trick.

Sir Wilfrid and his colleagues are said to be of the opinion that this election will clear the situation by making known the actual public opinion in regard to the School question in the new

provinces. Mr. Oliver is the proprietor and editor of an independent paper published in Edmonton, the name of the Bulletin, and has been in public life since 1883. He held a seat in the Territorial Assembly. Nine years ago he entered the Parliament, and he is there regarded as a gentleman of high attainments and unimpeachable integrity. He is thoroughly familiar with the ways of the great North-West, and his general satisfaction has been manifested through the new Province's selection for the portfolio of Interior. He was received with arrival at Edmonton with manifestations of approval such as were before shown in the region of politics. There is little doubt that re-election by a majority greater than he received in November was returned by over two thousand votes more than were his opponent.

In fact, the present agitation of the Autonomy bill has been almost entirely confined to being engineered from chiefly by the Orangemen and others of certain denominations. These heterogeneous elements combined to create a public opinion against the Bill, simply because it is, it is supposed, opposed to Catholics, though it is equally to local Catholic and anti-minorities the same principle. The schools which will be established under the educational clause of the Bill will not differ from the schools further than that it will be permitted to have religious teachers, such as will meet the needs of the people.

We unhesitatingly wish the Minister of the Interior the success of his courage and fairness men while the Ontario agitators endeavoring to create a hostile North-West against the bill which is aiming to establish a system of education in the West from the start.

JOAN D'ARC.

Our attention has been called by correspondents to an account of the Toronto Mail and Empire's sketch, in which there is a sketch of the life and death of Joan D'Arc. The writer of this sketch is the most brilliant and truthful regular contributors to the paper, and the most just, especially anything relating to the Church is the subject of regular correspondence. It is a fact as stated by there was a great beech-tree in the village of Domremy, which was born and lived in her and until she became the daughter of her country from a foreign land.

There was on the outskirts a little chapel known as the hermitage of our Lady of Mountain (Vermont). This on a hill, the verdant oak suggested thoughts of peace and communication with God. The custom of the little maid was to make a pilgrimage to this chapel every week. This chapel are still visible and kind it was a forest of oaks the grand beech-tree was a distance away.

This tree was known in the fairy-tree, around which the children were wont frequently and dance.

It was known that in the times the fairy-tree was respected sacred to the fairies perhaps believed that the gave favors to those who danced it, and that the roots were efficacious to cure disease. We know by experience takes a long time to die ancient traditions which are to particular localities, and it was probably not at all to the general rule. At there was at the foot of the spring concerning which many legends of favors granted by fairies who were supposed in the neighborhood, and it is believed that the great spring gave forth a soothing water of which those who were feverish slaked their thirst and refreshment.

But the pagan superstition had been attached to the surroundings had not the general of the people, that they celebrated there on the fourth Sunday of which occurs in the beginning of and which is known as the