

The Northwest Review

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

P. KLINKHAMMER, Publisher, Who alone is responsible for payments, and to whom all accounts are payable.

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.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The NORTHWEST REVIEW \$2 a year, \$1 for six months.

Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTHWEST REVIEW for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time. Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest. Write for terms.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The NORTHWEST REVIEW is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association. Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published. Address all communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW. Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

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.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, JULY 17.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Read, in the 23rd chapter of St. Matthew, Christ's maledictions against the Scribes and Pharisees, and ask yourself if similar curses may not be expected to fall on the blind guides and whitened sepulchres of the present time and place.

Many thanks, dearly beloved Tribune. We dared you to publish one of our articles entire, and you did exactly what we wanted, you reproduced the whole of our strictures on the Protestant clergy. We had but a faint hope that you would be so easily caught. But you were so anxious to prove your foolhardiness that you printed our article on the very day you read our challenge, and that day was the Glorious Twelfth, when your circulation must have been almost doubled. You had no idea of the great good our article will do to the rank and file of Orangemen: for you forgot that most of them are, like Mr. Rogers of Clearwater, honest and peaceful citizens, enemies of priestcraft under any form and not all fire-eaters like the orators of last Friday. Many of these good, though deluded, Orangemen will find food for silent reflection in our pointed and pithy prose. And then think of that numerous class of readers who are chafing under the yoke of the Protestant clergy. Not all your readers, Tribune dear, are pious Protestants; the other half are more or less pronounced freethinkers, and these later are at one with us on that point.

That is one of those most important chapters of the Bible which Protestant pulpits prudently cast into the shade. In those chairs of the Pharisee is considered rather respectable. This slurring over of essential parts is a common fault of heretical teachers. All the scenes of Christ's childhood and death, all the details of his sacred passion, all the promises to Peter and the apostles, all the explicit teaching about the Eucharist and the forgiveness of sins, all the doctrine of the beatitude of poverty and suffering, all these fundamentals of Christianity are either purposely omitted or minimized; while texts of doubtful interpretation, torn from their context, are twisted so as to have a Protestant look.

While reproducing on our first page a terrible diatribe by the editor of a Texas newspaper, we do not pretend to endorse the errors that inevitably occur in all such well-meant defences by Protestants.

Their training is always so imperfect that even when they do their best they are sure to blunder. For instance, if Mr. Brann realized the full import of his words, his comparison of Father Damien to Our Lord would be blasphemous. His ranging Buddhists as believers in God shows considerable ignorance. Finally, poverty is not one of "hell's great triumphs;" if rightly accepted, it is a beatified virtue; and what is commonly understood by Protestants as ignorance, i.e. ignorance of Protestant frauds in history, morality and religion is unmixed bliss. But then, of course, that is not ignorance, it is simply the not knowing what is false, and to be unaware of falsehood is a great blessing. To fancy one knows what is not true never can be knowledge.

MR. A. F. MARTIN.

Our fearless champion in the local house has thought proper to write as follows to the Nor'Wester. The Editor of the Nor'Wester.

Sir,—The following correspondence was addressed to the NORTHWEST REVIEW, and as it does not appear in yesterday's issue of that paper, I will request that you would be kind enough to give it publication in your columns. And oblige

A. F. MARTIN.

Winnipeg, July 11, '95.

The editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW.

Sir,—I have read with a great deal of interest your article entitled "The Protestant Clergy," contained in your issue of the 3rd inst.

Such articles bordering on bigotry cannot fail to keep up the strife among our people.

If some Protestant papers choose to use violent language and make unwarranted attacks on our Catholic clergy, it is no reason why our Catholic papers should follow in the same strain.

If we want to teach these bigoted papers charity and tolerance we should be the first to practice the virtue ourselves.

We must remember that there are [a] good many Protestant clergymen who are in full sympathy with us in our fight for equal rights, and such editorials as referred to is [are] eliminating their good will towards us.

Your best friends, those who are wishing you well, agree in saying that you have been very unwise of late in the publication of several of such editorials.

We must not lose sight that we are living in a Protestant community and that we should be careful [not] to give unnecessary offence.

You may be professed [justified?] in your contempt for that idiot Leyden—everybody will give you credit for your onslaught on that poor creature—and you may even include with good grace some bigoted and meddling clergymen in your vocabulary of abuse, but it is quite a different thing when you direct your sarcasm and abuse against the Protestant clergy as a whole.

For my part I cannot help to protest firmly against such unwarranted and ill-advised attacks and in doing so, you may rest assured that I have many of your best friends who silently join in with me.

A. F. MARTIN.

Winnipeg, July 6, 1895.

We sincerely regret that Mr. A. F. Martin should have rushed into print without a word of explanation from us. When we received his letter, we could not make out if he intended it for publication or if it was merely a bit of friendly private advice. We were led to incline toward the latter alternative by the inaccuracies of expression which we are now forced to bracket so that his meaning may be made plain, but which we then thought he would surely have had corrected by some competent person before publication. However, while fully determined to publish his letter with our reply if he so desired, we requested a friend to see him about it. For some reason as yet unknown to us our friend failed to report to us the result of the interview and did not return to us Mr. A. F. Martin's letter which we had confided to him. We naturally inferred that Mr. A. F. Martin was satisfied, and, as we had no time to see him personally, we went to press.

Our regret at Mr. A. F. Martin's action arises not from any harm it will inflict on the NORTHWEST REVIEW—for the good points of his letter will, by appearing also in the Nor'Wester, reach a greater

number of honest, right-minded readers—but from the apparent antagonism thereby established between the only Catholic paper in the Northwest and a most outspoken defender of Catholic interests. Nevertheless, this antagonism is more apparent than real. Mr. A. F. Martin differs from us only as to methods. He is quite welcome thus to differ; and so are we quite free to think our articles opportune. The proof that they were wanted is that they have not fallen flat.

Had Mr. A. F. Martin more carefully read our editorial on the Protestant clergy, he would have seen that we were voicing the sentiments of a large body of non-Catholic Winnipeggers who resent the autocratic domination of so many unauthorized preachers. Talk about priestcraft! Why, there is more priestcraft ever found in Manitoba in one week than exercised in its way into the Catholic church from St. Peter to Leo XIII., and in most cases it is exercised without even the pretence of an historic claim to a divine commission.

The editorial we print this week with the heading, "Let us see," was written before Mr. A. F. Martin's letter reached us, and there we distinctly point out that not all Protestant ministers are included in our general impeachment, we affirm that a few of them are notable exceptions. Mr. A. F. Martin says there are "a good many" such exceptions. We devoutly hope he may be right; but hitherto the exceptions can easily be counted on the fingers of one hand. Perhaps Mr. A. F. Martin, by dint of kindness, charity and tolerance, will succeed in persuading the other exceptions to show that they have the courage of their convictions.

Just one word more. Back of such utterances as Mr. A. F. Martin's there lurks the unexpressed first principle that Catholic polemics should be all sweetness and mercy. This principle is erroneous. Catholic editors are, and must be militant. They are not called to the martyrdom of patience but to the battle-field of disputation. Our Blessed Lord never obliged all men in all cases to turn the other cheek and meekly await a second blow. This was a counsel of perfection in certain emergencies, not a precept binding under all circumstances. Honest indignation is often more in order than unwise submission to illegitimate interference. "Be angry and sin not" is an inspired advice justifying the thunders of invective. The Old Testament is full of the withering sarcasm of the prophets; the New Testament shows us St. John the Baptist calling the Pharisees and Sadducees "a brood (or offspring) of vipers," St. Paul hurling his anathemas against those that preach another Gospel, and the Lord Himself, of the meek and humble heart, branding the whole Hebrew race as "an evil and adulterous generation," and the Pharisees six times running as "hypocrites," and holding up these teachers that sat in Moses' seat as monuments of the most detestable and contemptible vices. Consequently, whether or not scathing denunciations are expedient is a matter in which we are absolutely free to follow the suggestions of our better judgment.

LET US SEE.

That the Tribune should put itself forward as the champion of the Protestant clergy in this province, and take exception to our article a fortnight ago, commenting on their attitude toward the minority in Manitoba, is not surprising. Such a champion may be a little hard on the respectability of these gentlemen, although their conduct, if considered in the light of Christianity, deserves no better champion than the Tribune. For five years these rev. gentlemen, if correctly reported by the Tribune, have been engaged in abusing Catholics from their pulpits and on every occasion, in synods or conferences, they have passed resolutions which, for narrow, intolerant and unchristian sentiments, are simply a disgrace to civilization. Had we access to the files of the Tribune, and were it worth the labor, we could give columns of quotations to substantiate what we say. Here, are a

few instances of what we mean. Some time after the first decision of the English Privy Council on the school act, the Rev. Father Drummond, S. J., preached a sermon in St. Mary's church on that question. For weeks afterward the pulpits of the various denominations belched forth some very choice comments on the church, the Jesuits etc. Here are a few taken from their champion sheet.

Tribune, Sept. 26, 1892;

REV. DR. DUVAL: "He thought the Roman Catholic very much better than the Mormons, but on this point (their teaching) they were the same" * * * The Roman Catholic church was taking the very life-blood out of the people" * * * They heard nothing but "obey," "obey," "obey," "be stupid," "be stupid," "be stupid."

Rev. J. J. Roy: "A place which they had lost through the corrupt spirit of Rome" * * * "Destitution and sterility is descriptive of all countries which are to-day under the genius of Rome" * * * "The Church of Rome is the most formidable combination that was ever formed against the authority and security of civil government, as well as against the liberty, reason and happiness of mankind." * * * Wealth for the people, but poverty for the people, is Jesuit morality pure and simple" * * * "To them may be applied the oriental proverb; "Wherever the Turk lays his foot the grass ceases to grow."

TRIBUNE, OCT. 11, 1892;

REV. ARCHDEACON FORTIN: "The adherents of the Society of Jesus, (often-times a startling misnomer) have proved restless and troublesome subjects wherever they have secured a firm footing"

* * * "It has been found necessary to eject them as some deadly poison from the body politic" * * * We would have thought that in the Northwest there would have been an absence of the venom which has marked their trail in other lands. But no, *semper eadem*, ah! yes, always the same bitterness, intolerance, pride, arrogance." * * * Who ever heard of a Roman Catholic priest or bishop beseeching his flock to provide himself with bibles. * * * "The Pope shows incredible bitterness against the circulation of the Scriptures." * * * "The Roman Hierarchy is opposed to the circulation of the Bible" * * * "It is not permitted to a Roman Catholic to buy or sell a copy of even the Douay Bible, without an order in writing. Should a Roman Catholic bookseller infringe this law, he would subject himself to heavy ecclesiastical penalties" * * * "Go to the province of Quebec. I have no hesitation in saying that, with the exception of the 30,000 who have been evangelized in that province and have left the church of Rome, not one in a thousand even know of the existence of such a book" (the Bible) * * * Rome has never been, is not now a friend to education in the Bible, because she knows full well that her distinctive doctrines are not based upon the word but rather contradicted by it. It is the same in France, in Italy, in Spain wherever Rome holds sway" * * * "Was it there (the Bible) that the church of Rome found weapons in the massacre of St. Bartholomew? Was it there she discovered the compulsory celibacy of the priesthood and auricular confession, two infamous doctrines which have produced more scandal and turpitude than the world is aware of?" "Pray that the word may soon have free course in Roman Catholic countries for nothing else will ever deliver them from the yoke of ignorance and superstition." We might go on quoting columns of this kind of moral and Christian (?) teaching, by prominent Protestant clergymen; but we will not afflict our readers with any more. We again state that the Protestant clergy, with a few brilliant exceptions, have done more, within the past five years, to create religious hatred and discord than any other body of men in his province of Manitoba.

HONESTY IS THE BEST POLICY.

His Grace the Archbishop of Rupert's Land and the Rev. Dr. King, Principal of Manitoba College, are perhaps the

best and most reliable exponents of the wishes of the majority of Protestants in this province. Both by their positions and their high and trustworthy character, they command a weight and respectability not to be found among the great majority of the Protestant clergy, who, unfortunately, have been governed more by a narrow, superficial and intemperate spirit, in dealing with high moral principles, than by an honest and careful endeavor to be just and fair to those whom they consider as their foes. We would like to address to these two leaders of Protestant thought a few honest and withal friendly words. Like ourselves, they believe that an education without religion lacks its chief essential; like us, they believe that a morality that finds not its foundation in the truths of Christianity is, at best, a very poor morality. To-day, their loud-voiced complaint is that the religion in the public schools falls very short of what it should be in a Christian land. To this we would answer that the religion in the public schools of Manitoba is as full and as complete as the unfortunate divisions among the various Protestant sects will tolerate. No thought, no consideration was given to the Catholics of the province in the prescription of the religious exercises in the public schools. It was devised by a Protestant government to meet the wishes of all the Protestant bodies, or as nearly so as possible, and if it does not contain enough of religious teaching to satisfy such earnest and thoughtful men as the Archbishop of Rupert's Land and the able and learned Principal of Manitoba College, no thought or consideration of the consciences and desires of the Catholics had anything to do with it. We were not considered at all in the matter. This much every honest man must admit. What then was the cause of this prescription? The cause is to be found in the fact that the government that passed the school act of 1890 contemplated putting Protestants and Catholics, in so far as they could, on exactly the same basis of equality. The Honorable Joseph Martin, the father of the present system of schools, said, when he first announced that policy, that the object of his bill was the absolute secularization of the schools, and to accentuate that intention he appealed to the Protestant clergy of the province to assist him in doing this, because, as he said at the time, "anything short of this would be a gross injustice to the Roman Catholics." Mr. Martin seemed to realize then that his chief opposition would come from the Protestant clergy. And he was right. When he brought in his school bill it proved to be one for the absolute secularization of the schools. Then Mr. Martin's fears became a reality; for His Grace of Rupert's Land and Dr. King appeared on the scene, with the result that, while the Catholics lost their schools, the religious exercises which had been prescribed in the Protestant schools were continued and are permissible in them to-day. But, while Mr. Martin allowed himself to be bulldozed into committing "this gross act of injustice against the Catholics," he was never satisfied with the arrangement and stated so on many occasions. But the injustice was done and it has remained ever since. It was done chiefly at the instance of the two gentlemen above mentioned. From the very first we told these gentlemen that they had made a grave mistake by striking a blow at Catholics which robbed them of the very privileges which they exacted for themselves. The whole thing was so unjust and immoral that it could not continue after the people fully realized how bad it was. Had these two rev. gentlemen acted in a spirit of justice, and demanded that the government be fair and just and leave the schools alone, they would not have the complaints to make that they have at present. Mr. Martin was forced to recede from his first intention; but he managed to obtain a lasting control over the schools and to surround them with regulations that would minimize the advantage gained by the rev. gentlemen, with the result that they are far from satisfied. Mr. Martin has recently characterized the present state of affairs