

Northwest Review.



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

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

VOL. XI, No. 44.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, MAY 6, 1896.

{ \$ 2.00 per Year.
{ Single Copies 5 cents.

THE C. M. B. A.

Winnipeg Branches' Reply to Grand President Fraser.

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—Mr. O. K. Fraser, Grand President of the C. M. B. A., has thought it proper to publish in the columns of the eastern Catholic papers a letter in reference to the stand taken by him at a recent convention of Liberal clubs in Ottawa. Mr. Fraser, whilst declining to defend himself beyond a solemn protestation of faithful allegiance to the Church as illustrated by his past career, fails not, however, to severely criticize the action, as embodied in their circular, of Branches No. 52 and 163, of Winnipeg, as being in direct opposition to the laws of the C. M. B. A.

Had Mr. Fraser called our attention to any misstatement with regard to his utterances as quoted by us from "The Canadian Freeman," it would have been, we must say, an immense relief to our wounded feelings as his persecuted brother-Catholics, but not one word to take back or palliate his recent speech at Ottawa! Therefore, however, blameless his stand might have been in the past, we are left perfectly free to judge him from his last utterances; and we here repeat that his remarks coming as they did from our Grand President,—for although he did not actually pose as the Grand President of the C. M. B. A., yet everybody knew that the citizen who was addressing the assembly was the head officer of one of the foremost and most influential Catholic associations of Canada—his remarks, therefore, must have had much more than an ordinary weight on the minds of his hearers. This is what made us feel not only the more aggrieved, but at the same time the more humiliated: And, how could it be otherwise? when not only a brother-Catholic, but the Grand President himself of the noble association in which we glory to hold membership, raised his voice in condemnation of a measure brought forward in order to bring relief to a Catholic minority now for six long years under the pressure of a most odious persecution.

Mr. Fraser will have it, however, that the question was a quasi-political one and therefore should have been left alone by the members of the C. M. B. A. We wish to say here that, whilst we recognize to Mr. Fraser the right to belong to any political party he may choose and to view accordingly most questions offered for his consideration, we regret to be unable to accept his views with regard to the Manitoba School Question. Had this question in our estimation been a mere political, or even a quasi-political one, we would never have opened our lips nor taken the pen in condemnation of Mr. Fraser's action. But quite different is the case as it is presented and still presents itself to our minds and hearts. For to begin with an illustration: Let us suppose that one of our fellow-Catholics should have brought before the civil courts a case in which he appealed to the judges on the bench for the restoration of a religious right of which he had been deprived in a most unjust and brutal manner; let us suppose, furthermore, that a sentence had been passed in his favor, but that his enemies should have found some side issue to continue their odious persecution upon him; could there be, we ask, a Catholic association, or any member thereof who would refuse to extend all possible sympathy and earnest assistance to the poor sufferer? We believe it not. But is not the case of the Catholic minority of Manitoba exactly the same? Has not the supreme tribunal of the realm decided that we have been unjustly deprived of rights and privileges guaranteed to us by the constitution of the land; and, moreover, has not the Catholic hierarchy from the one end to the other of the Dominion of Canada, demanded also the restoration of these rights? How, then, comes it to pass that Mr. Fraser, who calls himself a loyal Catholic, and in whose hands rests the highest authority of a noble association, the members of which profess, above all, to faithfully follow the hierarchy of the church in all things pertaining to religion and morals; how comes it that he, the Grand President of the C. M. B. A., is found siding with those who by all

means at their command have to this day opposed justice being done! We remember reading that on one solemn occasion a lawyer was heard to say, in reference to the Manitoba school question, that although the minority of the province had a grievance, yet the Federal Government—the appointed guardian of the constitution, and defender of justice and protector of persecuted minorities—the Federal Government for political exigencies, should not redress the wrong inflicted on the Catholics of Manitoba: could it be, perchance, for similar reasons that Mr. O. K. Fraser would have opposed the Remedial Bill proposed at Ottawa? For, has not the appointed guardian of our religious liberties, the Most Reverend Dr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, declared himself satisfied with the proposed Remedy? Why, then, should Mr. O. K. Fraser, with all his boasting of loyalty to the Church, have chosen to have followed Mr. Laurier in preference to His Grace the Catholic Archbishop of Manitoba? Would he have allowed politics to take precedence on religion, and it is for that reason that he condemns the action of the two Winnipeg Branches of the C. M. B. A.? We wish to tell Mr. O. K. Fraser that with us all political feelings are laid aside when our religious liberties are at stake; and in asking the redress of the wrong inflicted on us we look in no way to the political colors of the party upon whom we call for such redress. It so happens that it is a Conservative government that proposed a remedy to our grievance; had the remedy come from the leader of the opposition, we would entertain for him and his followers the same gratitude that we now owe to the Conservative party. For us all political colors completely disappear in the all absorbing question of the restoration of our rights to give a Christian education to our children. Mr. Fraser says he is content to be judged by those who know him, we are content also to accept the judgment not only of those who know us but all our fellow-Catholics throughout the whole Dominion, convinced as we are, that we are much more than our Grand President, acting according to the aims of our noble association, the C. M. B. A.

Yours fraternally,
On behalf of St. Mary's Branch No. 52,
L. O. GENEST, President,
H. A. RUSSELL, Secretary.
On behalf of Immaculate Conception Branch No. 163.

A. PICARD, President,
P. O'BRIEN, Secretary.

THE TRIPLE ALLIANCE.

"The people like to be humbugged." So said Barnum, the great American showman. This is the reason, it may be fairly assumed, that the triple alliance of Messrs. Wilfrid Laurier, Dalton McCarthy and Joseph Martin is meeting with some measure of success throughout Canada.

The respective policies of these gentlemen, though distinctively different in themselves, and, when viewed in the light of reason and common sense, as opposite as the poles, are a unit on one point—to defeat the Dominion Government.

Mr. Laurier, the leader of the Liberal party, speaking to a Quebec audience, says that he would settle the Manitoba School Question by a policy of conciliation; he would appeal to the generosity and the sense of justice of the Protestant majority; he would appeal to Mr. Harcourt, a member of the Mowat (Ontario) Government, who (Mowat) is the champion of the Catholic minority of Ontario. Mr. Laurier, however, conveniently does not tell his listeners that he appeals to Mr. Harcourt and Mr. Mowat are of no use to the people of Manitoba. His appeals on the Manitoba School Question have to be made to his friends, Messrs. Greenway, Sifton, et al, and no others. The Catholic minority of Manitoba can hardly fail to have a very vivid recollection of what that has amounted to in the past, and can scarcely be expected to be very sanguine of anything to come of it in the future. Again, Mr. Laurier tells the people of Quebec that the Dominion Government are to blame in that the Remedial Bill is no real remedy for the grievance of the Manitoba Catholic minority; that it does not go far enough; and, finally, that the Gov-

ernment are not sincere and never intended to pass the bill. This is the summing up of Mr. Laurier's charge against the Government in respect to the Manitoba School Question.

Next comes Mr. Dalton McCarthy. He directly charges the Government with playing into the hands of the Catholic hierarchy and in being the tool of that church in trying to fasten separate schools on Manitoba; and he lauds Mr. Laurier for his patriotic and manly stand against the Government in trying to play into the hands of the hierarchy. As showing the love of this member of the unholy triple alliance for Mr. Laurier's compatriots and co-religionists, a quotation from his recent address to the people of Canada may be made: "On the answer which will be given at the polls to the demand of the French Canadian hierarchy to have Manitoba coerced and have separate schools re-established in that young and vigorous province depends not merely the Mackenzie-Bowell-Tupper Administration, but in a large measure the peace and well-being of the future for Canada; and again, to me it seems to be unstatesmanlike as it is unpatriotic for the sake of a temporary peace with our French-Canadian fellow-subjects to foster a spirit of French nationalism." What do our French Canadians think of this appeal of Mr. Laurier's new ally from Ontario? The electors of Ontario are told that the only way to prevent the Catholics getting their schools and to crush out the national aspirations of the French-Canadian race is to defeat the Dominion government.

And now for Manitoba. While Mr. Laurier in Quebec is going to settle the Manitoba School Question and give the Catholic minority a better and more far-reaching measure of relief than is provided by the "worthless Remedial Bill," and while Mr. McCarthy in Ontario is going to wipe out the constitutional guarantees of the minority and humiliate the French-Canadians of Quebec, provided the electors of Quebec and Ontario will drive the Dominion Government out of office; while all these things are going on, Mr. Joseph Martin, the third element in this ignoble union says: "The Government at Ottawa say they are bound, morally and politically, to obey the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council." This he denies. He holds that it is an outrage to suppose that the Imperial Parliament intended that anything done on education or anything else should never be altered or changed, no matter how much circumstances might change. He charges that the Government take the stand, "We refuse to budge an inch unless and until His Grace of St. Boniface says he is satisfied." Mr. Martin adds: "It only remains for the electors of Manitoba to be true to themselves upon this question." That is, defeat the Dominion Government.

Let us recapitulate the various reasons given by the several members of this unholy alliance for defeating the Government.

In Quebec they must be defeated because they did not bring in a sufficiently "remedial" measure, and because they were not sincere in their promise to give the Manitoba minority a remedy at all; for had they been sincere they would have passed the Remedial Bill despite Mr. Laurier's six months' hoist and the obstruction tactics of the triple alliance.

In Ontario the Government must be defeated in order to crush the rights of the Catholic minority and the national aspirations of the French-Canadians. "No peace must be made" with our French-Canadian fellow subjects that will foster a spirit of French-Canadian nationalism," and the "French-Canadian hierarchy," must not be tolerated.

In Manitoba the Government must be defeated because they consider that they are bound, morally and politically, by the judgment of the Imperial Council, and admit and declare that no settlement can be effected that is not satisfactory to the minority whose grievance the Privy Council says should be removed.

According to the programme of this triple alliance, there is no possible escape for the Dominion Government. No way is open to them that leadeth not to destruction. They'll be damned if they do, and they'll be damned if they don't.—Nor'Wester, April 29.

A PAGAN SYSTEM OF EDUCATION.

Cardinal Logue, commenting the other day on the so-called national education system in Ireland as relating to religious education, observed that the spirit of the system is essentially pagan. According to the rules of the "National Board," there must be no mention of religion in the schools during school hours, except what are called "common truths." Cardinal Logue is puzzled to know what "common truths" there are which might not be objected to by some sect or another. It is true, the board rules permit the teachers to speak of God, but they can go no further without danger of offense to somebody, and if they go no further, such religion is little, if anything more than what the pagans believe, as the Cardinal thus remarks:

"You can speak of God, of course; but if you speak of the incarnation of Christ you must take care there are no Jews present. If you speak of the Trinity you must take care there are no Unitarians present. If you put up the Ten Commandments before the children, you must take care not to divide them—you must throw them in a lamp just as in Genesis, and so on for the other subjects. The teachers must take care not to say anything whatever about religion that is certain beyond the mere existence of God. I don't know any other religious truth that he could mention consistently with the rules of the board during the hours devoted to secular instruction. And hence I say that if our children were brought up in the bare, naked principle of this system of national education they would be brought up not as Christian children, but pagan children, because even the pagan admitted the existence of some supreme being."

The main, original purpose, however, of the "national" system of education in Ireland, as Cardinal Logue well knows, was not to make pagans of the Catholic children of Ireland, but to bring them up in indifference to, and, if possible, in ignorance and hatred of the faith of their fathers. To destroy the Catholic Church in Ireland was the object the first promoters of the system had in view. This was frankly avowed many years ago by the Protestant Archbishop of Wheatly. He was one of the board of commissioners in the early period of the system, and he got "Scripture lessons introduced into the schools, which he hoped would Protestantize the whole country in a generation or two. The "Scripture lessons" had to be abandoned when the Catholics became strong and organized enough to insist on a small share of their rights. Then the "common truths" scheme was started, the Protestant ascendancy party being willing to have even paganism than the hated "Popery." If we cannot get our own, we will take any religion or no religion, so long as Catholicity is barred out. This is the principle of the Protestant party in Ireland in the matter of public education. Cardinal Logue is, of course, right in describing it as paganism.—Irish World.

Lady Burton.

Lady Isabel Burton, whose death the cable announced on Monday last, had a literary sense that was absolutely free from sentimentality. When her husband died she resolutely committed to the fire whatever writings of his were in her opinion, indecent. She then accepted the censure of her friends with composure; but she did give to the public a volume of entertaining memoirs. One of her stories was told about their official life in Mexico. They lived near a monastery, and, of course the village had its bully. His great delight was to abuse the monks, for he was a self-styled agnostic; and he would strut up and down by the hour in front of the monastery insulting its inmates and challenging them to fight. "If they were soldiers of God would they not come forth and fight a soldier of the devil?" Such was his pet taunt. One day a monk came out and accepted the terms. The village and its wife was quickly on the spot. The bully went down like a sack of corn at the first blow, and half a dozen times he stood up again it was only to fall with more terrific force. Then, yelling for mercy, he lay on the ground; but the monk said to him: "Oh come on;

even the devil would be ashamed of you for fighting so badly." The peace of the village was not afterwards disturbed. That monk had just come to the monastery; he had resigned a high commission in the French army, and his military training had not been quite rubbed off.—Catholic Register.

Cannot Serve Two Masters the Masons and the Church.

Three months ago John F. Byrnes, of Danielson, died. He was a member of the Catholic Church there, and also of Orient Lodge, No. 37, Knights of Pythias. When the Pope issued a manifesto placing the Knights of Pythias, together with several other secret societies, under the ban of the Church, Byrnes with several others, refused to leave the society. He attended church regularly and also was a regular attendant at the meetings of his lodge. When he was taken sick he sent for Father Chaquette, pastor of the French Roman Catholic Church. The priest informed the dying man that he could do nothing for him until he renounced the Knights of Pythias. Byrnes told the clergyman that he believed the society was good, and he declined to give up his membership. His funeral took place in the afternoon, the Knights of Pythias taking charge of all the arrangements. Byrnes was buried in a Protestant cemetery. Orient Lodge attended in a body, but many of the deceased man's friends staid away.

RECENT CONVERSIONS.

A. I. Dupont Coleman, Son of the Episcopal Bishop of Delaware.

Dispatches from Wilmington to the secular press say:

A sensation has been sprung in fashionable, social and religious circles in this state over the announcement that the Rev. Alexis I. du Pont Coleman, son of Bishop Leighton Coleman, of the Delaware diocese of the Episcopal church, has been converted to the Roman Catholic faith in New York. Bishop Coleman on learning of his son's action went at once to New York to wait upon him. Mr. Coleman is about thirty-two years of age, and was educated at Oxford university, England, where he spent a considerable part of his early manhood. Until about eighteen months ago he was rector of St. Michael's mission, this city, a pronounced Ritualistic church. He resigned on account of his health and went to New York to do some priestly work in connection with one of the orders of the Episcopal church.

The Northwestern Chronicle says that Mr. Coleman is thirty-nine years old and has long been leaning toward the Catholic Church. His wife is expected to follow him into the church. He was received by Father William Smith, S. P. M.

Rev. Mr. Coleman is not the only distinguished Protestant whom Rev. Father Smith has had the pleasure of receiving into the church. During the past sixteen months he has baptized, after thoroughly instructing them in the tenets of the Catholic church, Mrs. Phil. Daly, better known as the actress Jennie Joyce; Frank Bang, son of the late Henry J. Bang, proprietor of the Sturtevant House; Mrs. E. Hogan, widow of Senator Hogan; Harold Depew, and a well known Unitarian clergyman of New York city, whose name is withheld. The order to which Father Smith is attached is called the Fathers of Mercy.

Mr. R. James, a brother of Henry James, the novelist, and of Professor William James, of Harvard college, has joined the Catholic Church. He was received into the fold by Rev. P. M. O'Connor, of St. Malachy's church, Arlington, Mass. In early manhood he was an Episcopalian, although he was brought up in a Swedenborgian atmosphere. He has spent five years in investigating the claims of the Catholic Church and he has become fully convinced of their validity.—Northwestern Chronicle.

Remember!

All who pay their subscription will receive a copy of that admirable up-to-date book, "PLAIN FACTS FOR FAIR MINDS."