

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.
At 184 James Street East. WINNIPEG.

Subscription, - - - - \$2.00 a year.
Six months, - - - - \$1.00.
All Postage is paid by the Publisher.

P. KLINKHAMMER,
Publisher,

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Booksellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Booksellers, 408 Main St.

ADVERTISING RATES.
Made known on application.
Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.
Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out.

NOTICE.
The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a party character. (2) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4) NOTES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town.
Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 25.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Together with a full report of the Catholic Truth Society's meeting last week, we publish a brief correspondence to which it gave rise in the Free Press, between the Rev. E. Heriz-Smith and Mr. F. W. Russell. The latter's reply is very effective. He might have added that there is this great difference between the losses and the gains of the Catholic Church in England and elsewhere: we lose ignorant children or feather-brained grown people, we lose the comfort-loving and the proud, the votaries of money, pleasure and vice; but we gain the most logical and thoughtful minds, the men and women who love and cultivate the most difficult virtues, the admirers of Christlike austerity and humility.

Much as would-be Catholics like Mr. Heriz-Smith surpass our Manitoba school tyrants, there is, however, a family resemblance between them. Both the Anglo-Catholic and the Greenway follower are experts in self-delusion. Just as nothing could be more glaringly illogical than the re-assumption of the term "Catholic" by the legitimate heirs of Cranmer and Ridley in whose nostrils that word positively stank, so nothing can be more inconsistent than the lofty tone of injured righteousness adopted by the Tribune of last Saturday attributing to Principal Grant a few specimens of those very sins in which it is itself steeped to the lips. Its smiles at his cocksureness and its itself dogmatic in the assertion of half a dozen gross errors. In fact it were for any one else a herculean task to crowd into less than two columns so many misrepresentations of fact glibly rattled off by a writer whose only purpose is to correct the Principal's supposed blunders.

The lameness of the Tribune's defence of its masters is strikingly exemplified in the astounding and shameless asseveration that "Attorney General Martin required the Catholic section to repay \$13,000 and more [which they had saved], declaring that the system must be changed, that such a thing should not occur again." This implies that the Catholic section were not justified in thus saving up for future emergencies—an insinuation that is absolutely groundless, since the law authorized then to do so. The fact is just the other way. The money was obtained by the local government on the explicit understanding, expressed by the Hon. J. E. P. Prendergast, (not by Attorney General Martin, whose name did not appear in the entire transaction), that the ownership of this sum was undoubtedly vested in the Catholic section of the Board of

Education. Mr. Prendergast was not then aware that the annihilation of that section had already been secretly determined on.

Another example occurs in the same article of this "policy and expediency" with which it charges Principal Grant as against its own hypocritical advocacy "of the principles of justice and right." Speaking of the many able arguments given by Mr. F. W. Luxton during three or four years in the Free Press, the special pleader says that, in spite of these arguments, "the people of Manitoba have grown more strongly in favor of national schools." By the way, this is a strange commendation of the intelligence of the majority. But, even as it stands, is it a fair statement of a well-known fact? Was not Mr. Luxton silenced just because he was creating a current of healthy public opinion in favor of the victims of "rank tyranny," as Mr. Martin put it? Is not this calling the enemy's cannon worthless after you have spiked them?

Mr. Russell's lecture is likely to be the innocent cause of a perfect deluge of historical fabrications. "Saxon" writes to the Evening News Bulletin a letter packed tight with fiction disguised as facts. He names Lingard, "Pope Gregory," "Which? there are sixteen Gregories), and "the then Pope," makes the boldest kind of bald assertions, but without any reference that might lead to exposure of his inventive ability. Then, Archdeacon Fortin—as shallow a man as that nursery of shallowness, Anglicanism, has produced—begins a series of sermons on the origin of the "English Church," which will, of course, all turn upon a quibble by which he understands the "Anglicana Ecclesia" of old documents as the Protestant church of England, whereas the phrase evidently means the Roman Catholic Church in England. He of course hangs on to the time-worn and transparent fable that St. Peter never was in Rome. Bad facts like these are the basis of Protestantism; they gave it birth and keep galvanizing it into the semblance of life.

A rather amusing incident is told of a recent coalition meeting in this city. When the platform of a certain political combine was under discussion, somebody objected to its school plank as offensive to Catholics. Thereupon arose an English exquisite declaring, in the broadest haw-haw accent, that "really it was preposterous to suppose that people of that 'clawss' would take part in such a meeting as this." And lo! on his right hand, in the very next seat sat a past President of a Catholic society, and within reach of his left hand a lady secretary of another Catholic society, and directly behind him two other Catholic ladies. On discovering his mistake, the insular exquisite remarked: "Pon my word, these Cawtholics are every where." Just what Tertullian in the third century said of more sanguinary but not more fanatical heathen circles.

BRYCEONIAN FLAPDOODLE.

When the Rev. Dr. Grant made his appearance in our province, for the purpose of looking into the school question and studying it on the ground, the Tribune received him with open arms and gave him a long interview, with the usual scare headlines for which that frothy journal is so celebrated. It introduced Dr. Grant to the people of Manitoba as a distinguished and most competent educationist and a man of such broad, intelligent and impartial mind, that his opinions were sure to be received by all, great and learned, poor and simple, without one being bold enough to gainsay him. In fact the Tribune gave the learned Principal of Queen's University such a good certificate of character that, had he not been well known to Canadians to be a respectable and christian gentleman, he would have been irretrievably ruined in character and reputation by reason of the Tribune's praises.

Our contemporary knew the learned doctor was a Presbyterian divine, and no doubt, having before its eyes those celebrated resolutions of the Presbyterian

Synod of Manitoba, which the Rev. Dr. Bryce so kindly and thoughtfully forwarded to the judges of the Privy Council, and which enabled their Lordships to decide a question of law against the Catholic minority, it supposed that these letters to the Globe, in which he promised to expose the result of his personal investigations, would be as telling against the minority as the Rev. Dr. Bryce said the Presbyterian synod's resolutions were.

The Tribune, no doubt, is a very clever journal, full of wile and astuteness, and it accordingly came to the conclusion that Dr. Grant could not be any more honest, or just, on a question involving the rights and liberties of Catholics, than the Presbyterian synod of Manitoba had been. Herein it blundered badly. The Rev. Dr. Grant, not having proved himself worthy of the high moral and religious principles of Presbyterianism as taught by Dr. Bryce and the synod of Manitoba and applauded by the Tribune, has become an object of its abuse and criticism.

While it indulged in ordinary abuse of Dr. Grant, its conduct was characteristic; but, when it ventured on criticism it fell far below its usual level. This is easily explained. Had the Tribune followed the advice we so generously gave it some time ago, this unhappy accident could not have happened, and it would have been spared the humiliation of venturing a criticism on the letters of Dr. Grant. Our advice to the Tribune was to carefully avoid publishing Dr. Bryce's contributions as editorials, because its own opinions, however bad, were infinitely preferable to those of the reverend doctor. That advice, like all other given by us, was disregarded, and the result is that its "editorial criticism" falls far below its editorial abuse of the learned Principal.

There is no mistaking the flappedoodle style of this critic and his absolute disregard of facts.

The Rev. Dr. Grant said that: "The men responsible for the change did not attack the old system for faulty administration or poor results, but they took the ground that it was wrong in principle and must be abolished root and branch."

This absolutely true statement of the learned Principal of Queen's University is criticised in this Bryceonian style:

"That was a hazardous statement to make even for so bold a man as Principal Grant. Of course we are aware that he has no intimate knowledge of the subject, but he should have known that Hon. Mr. Smart a long time before the legislation was introduced made a long and able speech showing how inequitable the old system was, how unjust it was to struggling settlers, and showing that no remedy could set that right but a fundamental change. Dr. Grant, no doubt, never heard of \$13,000 and more which Attorney-General Martin required the Catholic section to repay, declaring that the system must be changed that such a thing should not occur again. Dr. Grant did not know that one of the strongest cases requiring a change was exemplified in Portage la Prairie, where two Catholic landholders held large properties in the town, which was then on the verge of bankruptcy, and these two proprietors not having any school of their own to support, yet could not be taxed for the schools of the town. Dr. Grant never heard of the strong representations from Western Manitoba to have the system of constituting school districts by a board in Winnipeg, hundreds of miles from the locality concerned, abolished, and the municipalities given this power—a thing impossible under a dual system. Dr. Grant has probably never read Mr. Sifton's speeches in Ontario as to the state of the Catholic schools in 1890. With a magnificent sweep of the hand he obliterates years of discussion, parliamentary speeches, government reports, hundreds of newspaper letters and articles now in existence, and says Mr. Martin and his colleagues did not attack the old system for its demerits, but were mere "root and branch men," changing for the sake of change. Truly, as Bacon says, "such boldness doth fascinate."

Had the learned Principal of Queen's University as little regard for truth and honesty as this critic, he would have been still enjoying the questionable distinction of the Tribune's confidence.

Now, what are the facts? Dr. Grant, in his first letter took the stand that there were, no doubt, some things that

required reformation in the old system, but blamed the government for not making the necessary reforms without annihilating it. And, unfortunately for Lis critic, the very things he took exception to in the old system are the exceptions which his critic accuses him of not knowing. It is true that he made no reference to the theft of that \$13,000 from the Catholic section of the Board of Education by the government. But this should be a matter for congratulation instead of condemnation, on the part of his critic. Had he touched upon that subject, truth and honesty would have compelled him to have been more severe upon the action of the government than, possibly, he desired; so he wisely left that nasty subject alone. No doubt, the learned Principal read the speeches of Mr. Sifton in the Globe and having found these speeches as bad in facts as they were in sentiments, he left them severely alone out of a kindly feeling of delicacy for that wrongheaded young man. This also should be a matter for congratulation rather than censure.

Mr. Ewart is largely to blame for all his. Has he not so cruelly destroyed the personal veracity of poor doctor Bryce, that buoyant individual would not have been compelled to give us his views of Dr. Grant from behind an impersonal leader in the Tribune. Again we venture to advise our contemporary, if it has any regard for its character, to stick to its abuse of Dr. Grant, but carefully to eschew all criticism of the Bryceonian flappedoodle type. It is dangerous to the reputation of even the Tribune.

THE HONORABLE JOHN COSTIGAN'S SPEECH.

When the Hon. John Costigan speaks on any subject in the House of Commons, or outside of it, there is a truth-breathing sentiment and a tone of sincerity running through all he says that, if it brings not conviction, is sure, at least, to impress on his hearers the belief that he is giving utterance to principles the soundness of which, from the standpoint of the speaker, no man will call in question. One of the most modest and retiring men in the House, he seldom speaks unless silence were the abandonment of principle, and therefore, a crime. When he speaks it is always to the point, and there is an absence of strong or offensive language and a moderation of speech, that enables him to deal effectively with subjects in the treatment of which other men, perhaps unconsciously, become offensive and even abusive.

Mr. Costigan's speech on the Manitoba school question, during the recent debate in the House of Commons, is a striking instance of what we mean. The dishonest and unfortunate manner in which this subject has been treated in the House, by many of the speakers that preceded him in the debate, and by many of the newspapers and politicians, was, to say the least, sufficient to exasperate a less experienced and moderate man than the Honorable minister of Marine and Fisheries. To him this question was one of right and justice, and, therefore, on that account, should be approached in that spirit alone. To him, it was not a Catholic or a Protestant question; it was not a question to be viewed from a sectarian or narrow stand. It was a question to be viewed on Constitutional lines and to be dealt with in a spirit of fair play and justice. Had the minority effected been Protestant, instead of Catholic, with him the result would be the same, except, perhaps that his appeal for fair play and generosity would have been stronger, for the reason that in such a case, he would consider that the honor, as well as the justice, of his co-religionists would be affected by a refusal to restore the constitutional liberties of the minority.

Had the Honorable gentleman wished to play the part of a demagogue and reply to McCarthy et al in their own style, he might have gained a little cheap notoriety at the expense of the cause he was advocating, but that, in the eyes of a man of Mr. Costigan's integrity and honest truthful character would be contemptible. Conscious that the cause he was advocating was founded in right and justice; that the highest court in the

Empire had so decided; that the rights of the minority were guaranteed by the Constitution and could not be denied them without a violation of that compact, Mr. Costigan set to work, in his able speech, to point this out to the House and to appeal to the sense of justice and fair play of its members, and to impress upon them the necessity of adhering with honesty and truth to the confederation compact. "This," said the Hon. gentleman, "is the first time, to my mind, that a test is being made of the validity of any guarantee given under the constitution under which we live. It is the first time that the country has been called upon, and that Parliament may be called upon, to solve that problem. Were the guarantees, given at the time of confederation, valid? Were they worth anything more than the paper upon which they were written? Had they any object? Why were they put there?"

These were the questions which Mr. Costigan, in the opening paragraph of his speech, set before the House. They are most pertinent to the issue. They go to the very marrow of the matter, and if it is ever solved in a proper and constitutional manner, these questions must form the very basis of the solution. On the validity of those guarantees rests the whole case of the Manitoba minority. If they are not valid, (but the decision of the Imperial Privy Council has decided that they are) then this whole discussion is fruitless. From this point, Mr. Costigan proceeds to review the whole controversy. He points out that a comparison has been drawn between this and the New-Brunswick school question, and shows that the comparison is entirely in favor of Manitoba; he points out that, at the time Manitoba entered confederation, the New Brunswick failure was before the people and that every honorable member who discussed that question, said: "Let there be no mistake this time." He concluded his speech with an appeal that the question be discussed fairly and honestly. If the Manitoba government do not settle this question satisfactorily within the next few months, "this Parliament will be obliged," said Mr. Costigan, "to exercise its sense of justice and right."

This is Mr. Costigan's prediction. Let us hope that, for the sake of right and justice, and for the stability of confederation, should Manitoba persist in refusing to grant relief to the Catholic minority, the prediction of Mr. Costigan, as to the action of the Parliament of Canada, will be realized. And now Sir Mackenzie Bowell's recent emphatic declaration at St. Albert strengthens our hope.

(Continued from page 1)

As you are all aware, there is at the present time on foot in England a movement which may in God's providence lead to the return to the faith at an early date of many hundreds of the best and most religious members of the Church of England, and our Holy Father in view of this manifest desire on the part of so many worthy souls to promote the union of Christendom recommends all Catholics to make earnest intercession to the Blessed Virgin Mary, whose dowry England once was. Let us all pray then that Mary may restore those shrines of hers with which the Catholic forefathers of the present generation of Englishmen adorned the land, and raise up again abbeys, Cathedrals and churches such as those that now are in evidence, which though they have passed into places of an alien worship were built by Catholic hands for Catholic worship and by the sacrifices of Catholic love; and let us pray that this Blessed Virgin will look to her Son and implore Him to shed upon the English people the great blessing of professing the one true faith, and that England may once again be what it was in the ages of faith—one of the most fervently Catholic and one of the happiest nations on the face of the earth.

At the close of the paper Rev. Father Drummond, S. J., rose and in complimentary language moved a vote of thanks to Mr. Russell. He bore testimony to the accuracy of his statements regarding the progress which had been made in overcoming prejudice in England, and said from experience he gained whilst residing in that country, he could say that the bigots of this country might certainly look to the mother and and if they did they would without doubt find they were behind the age.