

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
WEDNESDAY
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORITY.

At 184 James Avenue East.
WINNIPEG.

Subscription, - - - - - \$2.00 a year.
Six months, - - - - - \$1.00.

P. KLINKHAMMER,
Publisher,

THE REVIEW is on sale at the
following place: Hart & McPherson's,
Booksellers, 364 Main street.

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.
Address all Communications to THE
NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box
506, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 1.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

The Hoodlum Fiasco.

When we were informed, Thursday last, by flaming 'dodgers,' that a grand procession would take place the next day in order solemnly to inter the Remedial Bill, we foretold it would fail. We know of no city in America where "the baser passions of a mob" are more quickly held in check by the prevalent good sense of the people than Winnipeg. Probably this is due to the fact that our young city has always been the home of the most sensible people from all parts of Canada. At any rate we were sure beforehand that the demonstration would turn out a fiasco. The Free Press report, which we print elsewhere, amply establishes the completeness of the failure. So ridiculous have the participants in this hoodlum demonstration become that they are now trying to conceal their identity. The leader of this small gang, composed mostly of foreigners and fun-loving boys, was a public school teacher of this city, whose name, together with the names of his fellow processioners we are keeping in pickle for future developments.

An Easter Thought.

Shall we all, next Sunday, cast off for good the ceremonies of the grave? Alas! there will probably be some hypocritical lip-conversions, many temporary changes of life and few real resurrections to undying spiritual life. But, surely, we should all pray that the last category may be more numerous than in past Easter seasons. For us Catholics in Manitoba it is quite in order to ask the Risen Lord at length to abide with us for the day of our struggle is far spent. Let him say to us and to all the people of this province: "Peace be to you."

Catholic Influence.

In spite of time-honored jokes about Boston and 'culchaw,' there is an unmistakable flavor of high breeding and literary excellence in the cultured Bostonian. Donahoe's Magazine for April, p. 490, furnishes us with an instance in point. Alluding to the late Bishop Fitzpatrick, Charlotte C. Johnston says: "The Catholic public is far more influential than it was in those early days. An injurious story in a magazine has now only to be widely condemned by the Catholic public, to be followed by a penitential course of excellent articles on subjects agreeable to Catholics." This has the true ring about it; there is here no tendency to apologize for the Catholic religion; one feels that the writer is intensely proud of everything Catholic and knows how to make her legitimate pride felt. If all Catholics were like her, we should have less trouble in getting our rights. One really fearless Catholic can cow into submission and silence a host of anti-Catholic maligners, especially if, instead of harking and howling after the manner of the unskilled, he knows how to cut clean.

The Conference. The conference between the Dominion Commissioners and the Local Government, has been the one great subject of conversation during the week. The reporters of the dailies have been making Herculean efforts to gratify the curiosity of their readers, but without much success. About its labors or result we know nothing except (1) that Mr. Greenway kept away—cause, state sickness; and (2) that the minority were not represented at the conference.

SENATOR POWER'S PAMPHLET.

Senator Power, of Halifax, is a Liberal first and a Catholic after. In other words, the Honorable Senator, like many, alas! too many, Catholic Liberals, is determined to excuse the conduct of his leader in moving the six months hoist of the Remedial order. For this purpose he has written a pamphlet; but strange to say, he carefully avoids any defence of the six months hoist motion—a motion directly aimed at the very life of the Remedial Bill—and turns all his energies to show that there should be a commission of enquiry before taking any action. If the arguments of Senator Power amount to anything, they clearly condemn Mr. Laurier's stand in moving the six months hoist instead of a commission. And yet he says: "I am convinced that, under all the circumstances of the case—some of which I have discussed—Mr. Laurier's policy of inquiry and conciliation would, if adopted, be far the better for Catholics as well as Protestants." What inquiry? Mr. Laurier moved for no inquiry. On the contrary, he moved that the bill receive the six months hoist, and, in doing so, he made a direct appeal to the passions and prejudices of the ultra-Protestant element of the country. He told the House, by his motion, that he was opposed to any remedy for the grievances of the minority that did not come from the province of Manitoba. At the time he made his motion, he was seized of the fact that the local authorities had, in the most emphatic manner, declined to restore separate schools to the Catholic minority. The abolition of these schools was the grievance complained of. It was the grievance which the Imperial Privy Council declared existed and ordered to be removed. There were only two constitutional means of removing that grievance—the local legislature and the Canadian Parliament. The former said, in language most emphatic, that they would never do as ordered by that judgment; therefore, it became the duty of the Parliament of Canada to act. No sooner did they do so, than the honorable leader of Mr. Power's own party moved that their measure for granting relief receive the six months hoist. And Mr. Power calls this "Mr. Laurier's policy of inquiry and conciliation!" We greatly fear that Mr. Power's labored effort to defend his leader is as dishonest and as fruitless, so far as the rights of the minority are concerned, as the motion of Mr. Laurier. They are both much more concerned in striving to gain a political advantage than in righting the wrongs of the Catholic minority in Manitoba.

Mr. Power has adopted the same dishonest tactics as the other "Catholic" Liberals who opposed the Remedial Bill. "It does not go far enough." "It is no good." In this he is more exacting than the interested parties. He is more zealous in the defence of these rights than Mgr. Langevin and the Bishops of Canada. We would again remind those over zealous "Catholic" gentlemen that the minority in Manitoba know better than they do what is wanted. If these officious defenders were as truly devoted to Catholic, as they are to political interests, they would accept Archbishop Langevin's statement that the bill, as introduced by the Dominion Government, "means for us life and liberty." The bill having received the highest ecclesiastical endorsement, should be accepted without question by the Catholic members of the Parliament of Canada and receive their hearty support. But no; these gentlemen are more Catholic than the Bishops and even assume to direct

their Lordships' consciences, instead of being directed by them.

Mr. Power tells us in apparent seriousness that he has examined the Remedial Bill, which, as we said before, has received the highest ecclesiastical endorsement, and finds "it is not such a measure as a Catholic member of either House of Parliament should vote for." "It is calculated to do no good, but rather harm to Catholic interests in Manitoba and to cause serious injury to the Canadian people as a whole." Here we have a clash of authority between the Hon. Senator on the one side and the Bishops of Canada on the other. While we are not disposed to undervalue or belittle Senator Power's wisdom or call in question his zeal for the Church, we would remind him that for nineteen centuries it has been a fixed and most wise law of the Church that her Bishops have the directing of the Catholic conscience. If the honorable senator cannot produce any higher commission than his senatorial letter summoning him to a seat among our Canadian Lords, we must respectfully decline to abandon our old established custom of taking our directions, in matters of conscience, from our Bishops. Mr. Laurier has declared that there is no Catholic point of view for him. If Mr. Power and all other Liberals, who think with Mr. Laurier, will only take their theology as well as their politics from him, they will be saved from many of the transparent inconsistencies under which they now labor. It is a difficult task indeed to serve two masters.

THE HANDWRITING ON THE WALL.

The first voice of condemnation of the Liberal leader's treacherous betrayal of the Catholic minority comes from the Liberal county of Berthier. This county is represented in the Commons of Canada by Mr. Beausoleil, a Liberal and a supporter of the Hon. Mr. Laurier. Mr. Beausoleil could not conscientiously follow his leader in his attempt to destroy the Remedial Bill introduced by Sir Charles Tupper, Bart., as a removal of the Manitoba minority grievance pointed out by the Privy Council. In the face of Mr. Laurier's motion, Mr. Beausoleil felt bound, on that question, to support the government's measure and oppose his leader. The result has been the most ample endorsement of Mr. Beausoleil and the unequivocal condemnation of Mr. Laurier.

The county council of the Liberal County of Berthier, at a recent meeting, unanimously passed a resolution approving of the action taken by their member, Mr. Beausoleil, on the Remedial Bill and condemning Mr. Laurier's six months hoist. This is the voice of public opinion from the representatives of the Liberal County of Berthier, and we do not think that the Honorable Leader of the opposition will find it very interesting. It will not inspire him with much confidence to know that his own province repudiates him and his betrayal of his compatriots and co-religionists in Manitoba.

And how could it be otherwise? In the whole political history of Canada; in the annals of the old province of Quebec, it would be impossible to find any action of any of her public men to even approach in faithlessness the conduct of Mr. Laurier.

His co-religionists and compatriots from the grand old province of Quebec were made the objects of a most cruel persecution by a bigoted and intolerant majority, who swarmed in here from the province of Ontario a few years ago, and with their traditional hatred of the French Canadians, their language, traditions and religion, ruthlessly wiped out all the rights and privileges which they had, up to that time, enjoyed without question. After six years of valiant struggling against this cruel persecution, the clock pointed to the hour when the Dominion government, acting on the decision of the highest Tribunal in the Empire, were forced to bring in a bill to remove in part, at least, the "rank tyranny" of the majority, by restoring to us our schools. In that supreme moment, when the rights, privileges and liberties of his compatriots from Quebec trembled in the balance; at a time when

the infringement of the liberty of the Catholic minority to educate their children in accordance with their consciences without being compelled to pay tribute to Protestantism was declared by the highest court of the Empire to be a just grievance which the constitution forbade where was Mr. Laurier found? His birthplace, his race, his early training, all the traditions of his glorious province, but above all his Catholic conscience, should have ranged him on the side of right, law, justice and freedom of conscience. No man in parliament could, if he would, point with more eloquence to the justice of our cause. He could point with legitimate pride to the history and the loyalty of his race, he could tell those ultra bigots of Ontario that in his old province of Quebec no man was persecuted on account of his religion, may more, that the majority in his province treated with the greatest and kindest consideration, not only the consciences, but even the prejudices of the minority. He could have told these Ontarians that the constitution as well as the simplest rules of equity and justice were on the side of the minority and that the question could never be settled except on these lines. In a word, Mr. Laurier held the key to an amicable settlement of this question. Never in the history of Canada had a public man such a grand opportunity of rendering not only to his race and religion, but also to the peace and harmony of the country, a more noble service. It was the supreme turning point in the political life of the Honorable gentleman. How did he act? Did he stand by principle and the Constitution of his country, or did he betray both? Did he stand by his compatriots in the West, or bow down before the unreasoning hatred of our enemies? It is with deepest shame and humiliation that we are forced to record that Mr. Laurier threw us overboard and bowed down before the worst enemies—the traditional enemies—of his race and religion. It is with unspeakable mortification that we are compelled to acknowledge that Mr. Laurier not only abandoned us, but actually made an appeal for support to the bigotry and religious passions and prejudices of the Protestants of Ontario and Manitoba—the very men who had worked our ruin. Is it any wonder that the voice of Berthier County, a county of Liberals and former friends of the Hon. gentleman, should lift its voice in protest at such duplicity and treachery? And the voice of Berthier's condemnation will ring in the outraged ears of Catholics from the Atlantic to the Pacific; it will proclaim the dishonor brought upon them by the Liberal leader. Mr. Laurier has made his choice. He has told us that he wants us not; that he is content with the friendship of our enemies. So be it.

HOW THEY HATE THE CROSS.

From the Irish World.

It seems that in Ireland it is a violation of rule in the "national" schools for Catholic children to make the sign of the cross, or to bless themselves, as among Catholics it is more familiarly designated. The pious practice is universal in the Catholic Church. All the prayers of the Church, including the greatest and most solemn of her acts of devotion, the Mass itself, begin "In the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost," the utterance of the sacred words being accompanied by the motion of the right hand in the form of a cross from the forehead to the breast. The same words are among the essentials of the ritual of the first sacrament to which the Christian child is admitted in its earliest infancy, "I baptize thee in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost." In those words, too, and with the holy sign, the Catholic child, as soon as it is able to articulate, is taught at its mother's knee to begin and end its prayers.

And often without uttering the word, the holy sign is made—the sign of the cross, the emblem of man's redemption. The children of the convent schools of Ireland do this, and more particularly when they hear the clock strike the hour. They do it at home, they do it in school. It is a silent act of devotion which they learn to practice from their mothers as well as from their teachers, the nuns. But in the convents that are connected with the "National Board," or

in any schools so connected, there must be no acts or words of religion during school hours. The rule of the board is against it. Anything in the form of Catholic religion would be offensive to Protestants, and therefore it must not be permitted in a "National" school, even in a school where it happens, as in numerous cases in Ireland, that there is not a single Protestant in attendance. Of course, we recognize that a "secular" system must be so conducted—that is, that religious teaching must be excluded where there are children of various religions. This, at least, is the spirit of secularism, and the position of its champions. Nevertheless, we think that in Ireland it is carried out in a way specially designed to be as hurtful as possible to the feelings of the Catholic majority. Cardinal Logue gave an illustration of it the other day in a speech in reply to an address of welcome presented to him in the town of Drogheda. He described as follows how an officer of the "National Board," in the discharge of his "duty," of course, set himself to the task of suppressing the sign of the cross, even when silently made by the children themselves, without any direction from their teachers.

"Some three years ago the 'National Board' inspector visited the convent schools for the results of the examination. There was a practice—a Christian practice—on the part of the children to bless themselves when the clock struck. That was an act of private devotion performed by the children in their seats, and in no way interfering with the general order of the school. The inspector in the discharge of his duty reported the matter to the 'National Board.' He (Cardinal Logue) did not blame the inspector, as he was sure he considered he was discharging his duty, and the parish priest got an overhauling for permitting the sign of the cross in the schools. It was an act of private devotion, it gave offense to no one or to no parties of any other denomination. He (the cardinal) would be the first to put a stop to it if it did, but he believed a single Protestant child never put a foot inside the school. That was not all. On the last occasion when the inspector came to examine the children he found the same practice prevailed. He presumed in discharge of his duty—and he did not blame the inspector for doing his duty—he drew the attention of the nuns to the matter, and if he (his eminence) remembered aright he suggested to them to stop the clock. The nuns very properly refused to do so. The inspector spoke privately to the archdeacon on the matter, but he did not know whether the archdeacon had yet got another wiggling from the 'National Board.'"

This is an illustration of the system—almost laughable in its absurdity—to which the Catholic majority in Ireland have to submit in the schools maintained by their own money. The Orange ascendancy party hate Catholicity, therefore they hate the sign of the cross, which they regard as specially Catholic. It is "popery," therefore, it must be put down. And even when the Catholic child, of its own volition, makes the sign in silence, no Protestant being present or in sight to be "scandalized," or pained on beholding the emblem of the cross on which Christ died, even then it must be forbidden because it is a "National" school. This is the spirit of the infamous penal code which was enacted and enforced on the theory that "the law did not recognize such a thing as the existence of an Irish Roman Catholic." That "theory" they were compelled to abandon, but they still as far as they dare and have the power, make the law as offensive, as well as oppressive, as possible to the mass of the Irish people.

Mr. James Metcalfe's Speech.

During the closing hours of the Remedial Bill debate, at Ottawa, Mr. James Metcalfe, member for Kingston, and formerly immigration agent at Winnipeg, made a speech. Mr. Metcalfe charged that the wrong which had been inflicted on Manitoba was due to one man, the member for Winnipeg, (Joe Martin). That person made all the trouble he could in Manitoba and now he came to Ottawa to make more. He was the first cause of this difficulty, and, yet, he had been received by the Liberals with open arms. Not one good argument had been made why the minority of Manitoba should not receive a measure of relief. The charge of inefficiency against the Manitoba Separate schools before 1890 was without foundation. He visited them in 1889 and found many of them equally as good as the schools of Ontario. The Academy of the Immaculate Conception was one of the best schools he ever saw, and as a teacher he had seen a good many. Mr. Metcalfe said he was not disturbed by the slanders hurled by the Opposition, at Sir Charles Tupper. They hurled the same slanders at Sir