

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XI, No. 46.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 20, 1896.

\$2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

"THE QUARTERLY REVIEW"

On the Religious Crisis in Canada.

From The Tablet.

The general election which will take place in the Dominion of Canada towards the end of June, cannot fail, whatever its result, to make a turning point in the history of the country. The question of religion at stake in the quarrel over the Manitoba schools is complicated by one of race, which can never be raised without danger in a land of mixed population. The faith of the French colonists is dear to them not alone for its own sake, but as a symbol of their nationality, and they view any attack on it as a double wrong, assailing at once the rights of conscience and of patriotic sentiment. Hence the persistence of the Manitoba Legislature in outraging the existing constitution, strikes a blow both at the cohesion of the Dominion, and at the unity of the Empire. Even if a majority at Ottawa should be behind it in its defiance of the central authority, that majority will be disloyally contemptuous to the Remedial Order issued by the Governor-in-Council, as the representative of Her Majesty. The attempt, moreover, of a portion of the English population to oppress and maltreat their French fellow-subjects, reacts on the other provinces of the Dominion, where it cannot but tend to exasperate the already existing bitterness of race feeling on both sides. The writer of the article on "The Loyalty of Canada," in the current number of The Quarterly Review, dwells on this aspect of the question, and shows how even in the Dominion Parliament, the English-speaking Canadians of the western provinces habitually insult the religion, the language and the nationality of their French fellow-subjects. "The strenuous opposition [he says] of a large portion of the English population to the rights, privileges, and securities granted to the French, both by Great Britain herself and by the Act of Confederation, is a very important element in the problem. It is not merely opposition, but an active attack—one which the assailants would be the first to cry out about were matters reversed. The fact that they refuse, when in a majority, the freedom of education, which is freely granted to them when in a minority, is the chief cause of the crisis which actually impends. It is not a factitious grievance, worked up by French bigotry, excitability and restlessness, but a very real injustice, perpetrated by a Protestant bigotry of the narrowest kind." The contrast between the good faith of the French majority in the Province of Quebec in respect to educational franchises of the minority is then dwelt on as accentuating their claim to equal justice where they are in a position of political impotence. "Quebec [in the words of the reviewer] a Roman Catholic province, grants to all minorities, however small, the fullest and most complete liberty in school matters, thus not only complying with the strict letter, but with the widest spirit of the Act of 1867. Manitoba, a Protestant Province, the so-called champion of 'religious liberty,' enforces the very strictest letter of the Act against the Roman Catholic minority, and manifestly violates the spirit of the agreement. And yet, were Quebec to enforce the letter of the law against the Protestant minority, as it has been enforced against the Roman Catholic minority in Manitoba, there would be from the Atlantic to the Pacific, a howl of 'Popish tyranny,' and of 'persecution of Protestants.' In such a case the 'school question' would become the 'Anglo-Canadian question' and would constitute a 'crux of Dominion politics' far more difficult of solution than the present one. Such an illustration, however, will convey something like an adequate idea of the importance of the 'school question,' to French-Canadians, and of the reality of the injustice under which they are suffering."

The gravity of the crisis is shown by the subversive character of some of the remedies suggested, and the tendency it has aroused, as yet confined to the dominion of speculation, to throw the Canadian constitution into the melting pot. The violation by one province of the compact of federation sets the others free to discuss what they have gained by

it, and the French of Quebec ask, if they cannot secure equal treatment of their compatriots throughout the rest of the Dominion, by what tie they are bound to those who thus wilfully oppress them. Regarding, as they do, the action of the North-West on the school question as a deliberate attempt to extirpate at once the French language and the Catholic religion, they naturally question whether the countervailing advantages of a federal union are worth the sacrifice of individual freedom of action and independence of position. Neither Quebec nor Manitoba would have entered Confederation without the guarantees which are now proved to be absolutely worthless, the violation of which amounts to tearing up the federal compact. But the secession of Quebec would in no way help the Catholics of Manitoba, and would indeed prejudice their position, as it would leave them more entirely at the mercy of their local tyrants. Still more chimerical is the remedy advocated by M. Royal, ex-Lieutenant Governor of the Northwest, in a pamphlet quoted in The Quarterly Review. He proposes nothing less than the rupture of the colonial tie and the independence of Canada under a new constitution. "A constitution [he very justly argues] is good for very little, if, when the rights of a large class of people are at stake, it remains without power to act, and even without voice to speak." But while we endorse his premiss, we cannot equally assent to his conclusion, as we fail to see how the position of the French Canadians either in Quebec or in the Northwest, would be benefited by the dissolution of the Imperial connection. This is the view taken by La Verite, their principal organ, in reply to M. Royal's proposed solution of the crisis. In refuting his contention that in commercial matters Canada would be more advantageously circumstanced as a republic than as a colony, the French organ, after showing that the English connection is a distinct advantage in negotiations with the United States, goes on to demonstrate the helpless position of Quebec left face to face with a preponderance of hostile elements ranged against her. "If the Dominion were independent [it says] we should be at the mercy of the English majority, even in purely commercial questions. That which suits the Province of Quebec in the matter of Customs' dues and free exchange does not always suit the Province of Ontario and the West. Therefore, in that famous Canadian Republic, extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific, which Mr. Royal wishes to found, we, of the East, should of necessity always see the interests of the West preferred to ours. The severance of the colonial bond would have been of no service to us. Thus the remedy proposed by M. Royal will not be of the slightest advantage to us of the Province of Quebec, even from a purely commercial point of view."

The same reasoning applies with even greater force to the position of the school question, on which the influence of Imperial authority has been exercised, although, unfortunately, ineffectually, entirely on the Catholic side. This argument is strongly put by La Verite in the following passage: "We ask how M. Royal, after having himself acknowledged that the Protestant majority of Canada is 'so fanatical and blind' that it has become almost impossible to bring it to a calm, serious, and reasonable 'discussion' of the school question, can say, two lines further on, that it would be 'relatively easy' to insert in the new constitution of independent Canada an organic article regulating this same school question in a just sense? Since the Protestant majority of the Colony of Canada will not hear reason on this burning question, evidently the Protestant majority of INDEPENDENT Canada would not be more reasonable. For it is not the severance of the colonial bond that would render the majority wiser or more just. On the contrary the separation of Canada from the Mother Country would render our adversaries more arrogant than ever. The supremacy of England does keep them a little in check." The present constitution does, in point of fact, give the French Catholics all the rights they claim, and it is only the means of enforcing its provisions that are wanting. No law or compact is of the slightest avail against the excess of prejudice or passion, unless the sanction

of material force stand behind it. Thus even should the Canadian elections in June result in the return of a Conservative majority, pledged to do justice to the Manitoban Catholics, it is difficult to see how it could compel the recalcitrant Legislature of the province to carry out its decree. The intervention of the Mother Country, the solution advocated by La Verite, is, according to the reasoning of the writer, a logical consequence of the Imperial sanction of the term of Confederation now infringed. "If she neglects to intervene [he says] or if the majority refuse to submit to injunctions of the Mother Country, nothing can prevent the Confederation from bursting to pieces [voler en eclats] before its time." The violence of the remedies suggested show how deeply French-Canadian opinion is excited on the subject, and how disastrous to their country threatens to be what the Quarterly Review calls the "No-Popery Campaign," initiated by the Orangemen of the Northwest.

A Most Welcome Tribute From The Casket.

A few weeks ago THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, of Winnipeg, made a touching appeal to the Catholics throughout the Dominion to support the Catholics of Manitoba in the struggle for their rights. We experienced on reading it a feeling compounded of shame and indignation that such an appeal should be necessary: and also perhaps one of slight regret that our contemporary's article was such as to leave the impression, where the facts were not known, that the appeal was necessary in the case of all Canadian Catholic journals. But we were not prepared for the response with which this appeal met in the case of The Catholic Register, of Toronto; for a close and extended observation of the Review had failed to reveal to us any grounds for charging it with political partisanship. However, good came out of the evil. We admire particularly the calm, dignified and straightforward manner in which the REVIEW met and repelled the charge. We quote:

"We feel it our duty to protest against being misrepresented in this way to the readers of the Register and our co-religionists in Ontario, on whose good will and assistance we count so much, and in order that our Toronto contemporary and all others whom it concerns, may have no further excuse for thus misjudging us, we think it not out of place that we should set down a few facts to show how entirely free we are from partisan bias. In the first place we may say that the REVIEW as a paper is under no obligations to the politicians, has received no favors in the past, and there is no prospect or reason to expect that it will receive any in the future. And what we say of the paper we can most emphatically repeat of all those engaged in its management. Not a single member of our editorial staff has in any way ever been identified with either of the two great political parties, or has any private or personal end to gain by favoring one party in preference to the other. Our publisher, whilst a resident in Ontario, where he lived until a few years ago, was an ardent supporter of Sir Oliver Mowat and of Hon. Edward Blake, but now finds himself compelled by the same reasons that made him an admirer of these two eminent statesmen to oppose here the Greenway government and to disapprove of the course pursued by the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier."

The Register showed itself an honorable opponent by accepting this explanation and withdrawing the charge. It is safe to say, however, that unscrupulous men will continue to repeat it despite the REVIEW's very thorough refutation. Some of these will do so knowing that it is false. Others will repeat it believing it to be true; for as they themselves do not hold their religion in sufficient regard to sacrifice party or self-interest for it, they cannot possibly realize that any one else does. Our contemporary must be content with having satisfied honest and fair minded men as to its motives: it can afford to let others think as they will.

MANITOBA SCHOOL QUESTION.

Justice Must be Done to the Catholic Minority in Manitoba.

The Catholic Record, under the title of "Catholics in Politics," says: "We certainly are not in favor of a Catholic Party as they have in Germany and Belgium; for our situation is not the same as our co-religionists have

in these countries. American Catholics, and rightly so, never inquire about the religious belief of candidates; they leave to fanatics the odious task to discriminate against Catholic candidates. Yet there is no rule so general as not to admit of an exception. Take the case of Manitoba, where by law the Catholics are entitled to state aid for their separate schools, it is self-evident that a Catholic cannot conscientiously vote with his party if that party robs him of his rights. No man ought to be asked to sacrifice his religion to his political party—this is common sense. The excuse that religion and politics ought not to be mixed is too flimsy for serious consideration.

"Mr. Laurier, the Liberal leader is one of the most brilliant men of Canada. He is at home as an orator either in French or in English. On the Manitoba school question he is a shrewd pleader in a bad cause, or more properly a smooth demagogue. That question has gone through all the courts and the Catholics have secured a judgment. The Liberal leader is not in favor of enforcing this judgment—Manitoba must not be coerced. He wants the provincial government to be coaxed to right. What is the use of going to law with your opponent, obtaining a judgment against him and then falling upon your knees to beg him to do right to you? Mr. Laurier in a key-note speech in Montreal protested of his deep sympathy for his Catholic co-religionists in Manitoba. Mr. Laurier exhausts all his sympathy in sterile protestations. He says that the measure of the Conservative party in favor of the Manitoba Catholics did not go far enough and on that flimsy pretext he fought it to the death. Why did he not have it passed and later let his party perfect it? The hierarchy was in favor of the law. Who constitutes him judge in this case. He talks of the general things his party will do for the Catholics. Are the fierce attacks of the Liberal party on the bill for the relief of the Catholics the measure of his sincerity? What likelihood is there that he can coax an Orange majority to do justice to a feeble Catholic minority? Yet he was loudly applauded by his Catholic hearers, who will support a party of false pretenses at the polls. This is the way people allow themselves to be led by the nose by self-seeking demagogues."

The Real Issue in Canada.

The one dominating issue in the approaching general election in Canada, so far as Catholic voters are concerned, is the granting of justice to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. That issue is so clearly defined that the dullest mind can readily grasp and comprehend it. No amount of sophistry, no sentimental allegiance to party, no political expediency can obscure it or send it to a secondary position. The claim of the Catholics of that province is based upon justice, equity and the strongest constitutional guarantee. It has been formally and officially approved by the Imperial Privy Council of Great Britain, the last court of appeal and the highest court of appeal in the empire.

Catholic Liberals are now heard protesting against the coercion of Manitoba. They are contending that the principles of their party would be outraged by the forcible interference of the Dominion Government in the local affairs of a province. But their plain duty is to ignore political considerations and to support any party that will pledge itself to grant justice to the Catholic minority of the province in the Northwest. They can take their stand upon the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council and upon the constitutional guarantees given to Catholics and Protestants when Manitoba became a province in the Dominion confederation. Coercion means the forcing of a people to submit to injustice. The Catholic minority in Manitoba are coerced by the majority. The righting of this wrong would not be the coercion of the province; it would be the enforcement of a decree of the highest British tribunal in behalf of justice. Canadian Catholics who fail to give their support to their oppressed brethren in Manitoba will be guilty of a crime. Let them look to it.—Boston Republic.

Ripans Tabules cure dyspepsia.
Ripans Tabules: gentle cathartic.

BIGOTRY AND INTOLERANCE

Open, Naked and Unashamed.

From the Irish World.

"There exists in Belfast a system of bigotry and intolerance, open, naked and unashamed." These words were spoken the other day in the British House of Commons by John Dillon, leader of the Irish party in Parliament. That they are words of truth is well known to the people of Ireland. It is tolerably well known also to the people of Great Britain, and even in America there are few readers of newspapers who are ignorant of the fact that Belfast is the headquarters of Orangeism, a fact which in itself is almost confirmation sufficient of the truth of Mr. Dillon's statement, because wherever Orange influence prevails, there bigotry and intolerance, open and naked, must necessarily exist.

The occasion which brought out the declaration of Mr. Dillon was a debate on a bill which has been introduced into the House of Commons to enlarge the area of Belfast, and to extend and increase in various ways the powers and privileges of the corporation or council of that city. This means to extend the powers and privileges of the Orangemen, and to perpetuate the exclusion of Catholics from any participation whatever in the affairs of the municipality. The bill referred to, has of course, been introduced by the Orange party. Though at present they have things all their own way in Belfast, as they have had for a hundred years, they are not yet satisfied. They want to make it even more impossible than it is for Catholics to have the smallest chances of getting representation in the municipal government of the city, and so they propose to extend the boundaries and increase the forces of Orangeism, by taking in the suburban districts, inhabited mostly by gentry of the Orange persuasion.

Of course, the Orange party have the support of the Tory Government in this scheme of theirs to secure perpetuity of tenure for Orange ascendancy in Belfast. Mr. Balfour, Chief Secretary for Ireland, spoke, and voted in favor of the bill, and it was carried on its second reading by a majority of 110. The Tories of England as well as of Ireland voted for it in full force. They did this in spite of the facts presented against the bill by the Irish Nationalist members. They did not vote in ignorance. They knew of the hideous intolerance that the bill is intended to sustain and perpetuate; yet those Englishmen who often prate about their devotion to religious liberty, voted for the Belfast Orange bill. Facts and figures were supplied in abundance, showing that the Catholics, though forming more than one-fourth of the population of the city, are permitted to have no more to do in the public affairs of Belfast than the Catholics of Ireland were in the affairs of the whole country during the enforcement of the infamous penal laws. The truth is that, so far as the Catholics of Belfast are concerned, the Catholic Emancipation Act of sixty years ago might as well never have been passed. In Belfast the Catholics have yet to be emancipated. They are to-day under the same ban as all Catholics were during the reign of George III. Here are a few figures in illustration given in the House by Mr. Daly, one of the Irish members:

"In Belfast, of the twenty members of the Harbor Board, of the twenty-two members of the Board of Poor Law Guardians, of the forty members of the Town Council, and of the seventeen Water Commissioners, there is not a single Catholic (cries of 'shame!'); and of the sum of £231,686 12s. expended by the Council annually, Catholics receive but £480.

The "cries of shame" came from the Irish Nationalist and British Liberal members, but there was no such cry from a single Tory. The Tories are not ashamed of those facts. On the contrary they desire that the existing state of things in Belfast shall continue forever. One of them, Sir James Haslett, who is member of the House for a division of Belfast, made an interesting speech in defence of the Orange bill, and this is part of what he said:

I admit that the Roman Catholics form no portion of the Council of Belfast, but to say they (the Catholics) are deprived of their rights is a mistake. They

(Continued on page 3).

Senate Reading Rom Jan 7