

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

Room 11, Grain Exchange Building,

EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

E. J. DERMODY & CO.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to the 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.

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.

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.

Agents of Review.

The following gentlemen have been appointed agents of the Northwest Review: Master Andrew G. Crawford, Brandon, Man.

Mr. A. McKinnon, Fort William, Ont. and Mr. C. Dahm, Rat Portage, Ont.

J. Barreau, Medicine Hat, N. W. T. Subscribers in arrears will please pay them. They are also authorized to canvass for the Review, give receipts for all monies collected on our account, etc.

Address all Business Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 20, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

St. Boniface, Dec. 12th, 1892. Messrs. E. J. Dermody, & Co.

GENTLEMEN—I see by the last issue of the Northwest Review that you have been instructed by the directors of the journal in the management of the same, "the company for the present retaining charge of the editorial columns."

I need not tell you that I take a deep interest in the Northwest Review which is the only English Catholic paper published within the limits of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. I hope that you will obtain a remunerative success. It is enough that the editors do their work gratuitously, I cannot be expected that the material part of the publication should remain without remuneration.

I therefore strongly recommend to all Catholics under my jurisdiction to give a liberal support to the Northwest Review. It has fully my approval, though, of course, I cannot be responsible for every word contained in it. The editors write as they think proper; they are at full liberty to write what they wish and in the way they like best. The sole control I can claim is over the principles they express and have no hesitation in stating that the principles announced by them are sound and ought to be endorsed by every sound Catholic in this country.

I therefore consider that you enter a good word and I pray to God that He will bless you in its accomplishment.

I remain, Yours devotedly in Christ, ALEX. ARCHBISHOP OF ST. BONIFACE, O. M. I.

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 meeting throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 8.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Italian government promises protection to the pilgrims who may visit Rome this year to participate in the Holy Father's jubilee, but its past performances are poor guarantees that these promises will be kept.

The vote which acquitted Professor Briggs of heresy last week showed how badly Presbyterianism is divided on vital questions. The divisions are not likely to be healed, either, by the action of the court which acquitted the professor.

We call the special attention of the Catholic readers of the Review in our columns to the advertisement in our columns of the mission to be opened in St. Mary's church on the first Sunday in Lent. They will there see all the rules and regulations that govern the mission.

The cause of Irish Home Rule must be near to its final triumph when its opponents, in the vain hope of discrediting it, resorted to such a desperate ruse as they attempted not long ago, by the Dublin explosion, which was at once pronounced the work of an enemy of the movement.

President Diaz may be giving the neighboring Republic of Mexico a "progressive" administration, as his admirers claim; but the periodic revolts of prominent people against his methods do not argue much for the justice or acceptability of his government.

A lot of needless discussion is being made over the conditions of Dr. McGlynn's restoration to priestly privileges. The fact that the Papal representative was satisfied with the doctor's apology ought to be assurance that that was ample, and what penance, if any, was imposed on the priest, is not a matter of public concern.

They are going to build a stupendous Protestant Cathedral in New York City, where the divine who signs himself "Henry, Bishop of New York," laid the corner-stone of the edifice last week. Where the congregation that is to fill the church can be found is something

that its enthusiastic builders appear to have wholly overlooked.—The Catholic Columbian.

The Puritans of New England, soon after their arrival on American soil, decreed:

"To the end that learning may not be buried in the graves of our fathers, that every township increased to the number of fifty householders, should find one to teach the children."

This is from Dr. Bryce. And what was the effect of it all? If we judge of the system of education given by those New England Puritans, by their acts, it would be much better for them and humanity, too, had they entombed that learning with their fathers. They left England because they were persecuted for conscience sake, but no sooner did they become the controlling power than they became active and cruel persecutors themselves. Was that the effect of their system of education? If we may judge Doctor Bryce and some of his friends in Manitoba by their actions and utterances we might logically come to the conclusion that the effect of that training still lingers in the Puritan's offspring. How much better it would have been had it been "buried in the graves of their fathers!"

Dr. Bryce says: We desire to have the term Canadian, a proud, honorable and acceptable name, absorbing all the elements of our many-sided life. It will be the aim of our public schools to make it so.

Who are we? What claims have the rev. doctor to "the term Canadian," that thousands of Catholics throughout Canada cannot excel? Was the rev. doctor's immediate progenitor a Canadian? Is he one himself? The vast majority of the Catholics in Manitoba, who, this upstart pedagogue means to say, need Canadianizing, has a thousand times more right to that proud designation than he? When his forefathers were humbly pursuing their labors in Scotland or, possibly, indulging their predatory instincts across the border, there were Canadian Catholics who were, in every walk of life, making "the term Canadian," a proud, honorable and acceptable name. Long before a Bryce set his foot on Canadian soil, many of those Canadian Catholics had discovered, explored, evangelized and settled this country; had made that name proud, honorable and acceptable and had fought, bled and died to keep that term honorable and the territory covered by it for the British Crown. "The term Canadian" is a proud, honorable and acceptable name, and those who made it such are quite able to preserve for themselves, their children and their children's children, all the rights and privileges which they had won for themselves long before such statesmen(?) as Dr. Bryce appeared on the scene of Canadian life.

A STARTLING ARRANGEMENT.

Taking into consideration the un-speakable importance and nearness of the subject, a terrible protest and warning comes from Mrs. Amelia E. Barr in the current number of the North American Review. It is entitled "Flirting Wives," and lays bare a condition that, if true, and it must be true in the sections of society she represents, or she could not so publicly state it—a pessimist could not have dreamt of two generations ago. In her second paragraph she states the natural requirements which the Catholic tradition that still purifies the non-Catholic atmosphere as yet enforces.

"The sentiment demanding absolute fidelity in a wife may be said to have the force of a human instinct; in all ages it has exacted from her an avoidance of the very appearance of evil. Therefore a good woman in the presence of a frivolous flirting wife feels as if a law of nature were being broken before her eyes; since behind the wife stands the possible mother and the claims of family race and caste, as well as of conjugal honor, are all in her keeping."

Mrs. Barr then proceeds to make the most terrific arraignment of—certainly the most surprising statement about—non-Catholic society, that we have seen. We distinctly say that the state of society she details must refer to non-Catholic society, because if such a flagrant condition as she testifies to existed within any portion of Catholic society, we surely would know it. Mrs. Barr proceeds to detail the wide spread disregard, in non-Catholic society, of the "fidelity" that she states is—and surely ought to be—"a human instinct," stating that she makes no "exaggeration," and that what she details is now becoming so prevalent a state as to have produced a "wife errantry" among men! The statements she makes we cannot reproduce in these columns, because among Catholics their recital could serve no good end, could only be justified by necessity, and the necessity does not exist, more, any precautionary necessity for ever knowing of them cannot exist among Catholics where men and women frequent the Sacraments of confession and communion.

And through the six pages in the North American Review—pages of protest against this condition that she says outrages the "human instinct" in the marital relation—the name of God is not mentioned even once! How can these people expect anything much better, under such circumstances, than a return back

to the pagan state that Christianity rescued man and woman from?

THE MIND OF THE POPE ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

"And first in regard to domestic society, it is of the greatest importance that the children sprung from Christian marriage should be instructed in the precepts of religion at an early age; and that the studies in which youth is accustomed to be educated, be conjoined with religious training. To separate the one from the other is really to wish that youthful minds should remain neutral in their duties to God. This teaching is false and especially dangerous in the early years of childhood, because it paves the way to atheism and saps the foundations of religion. Good parents should exercise the greatest care to see that their children, when they first begin to understand, learn the truths of religion, and that there be nothing in the schools hurtful to the integrity of faith and morality. It is a precept of both the divine and natural law that they exercise this diligence in the education of their offspring; nor can they for any reason, be released from the obligation of this law. Truly the church, the guardian and vindicator of the integrity of the faith, whose duty it is in virtue of the authority conferred on her by God her founder, to call all peoples to Christian knowledge, and to likewise diligently see how the youth, subject to her authority, are educated, has always openly condemned what are called mixed or neutral schools, and again and again admonished parents in a matter of such great importance to avoid them with all their might. In obeying the church in this, parents at the same time serve their own interests, and very greatly benefit the State. For if childhood be not formed on religious principles, youth grows up in ignorance of the most important moral factors, which alone can nourish a zeal for virtue in men and restrain their irrational appetites."—Epistola Encyclica ad Episcopos Gallos.

WHY THIS TERRIBLE IGNORANCE?

Dr. Bryce, in his recent address, says: Macaulay in one of his grand passages wrote, of the riots in England in 1780: "Without any shadow of a grievance, at the summons of a madman a hundred thousand people rising in insurrection; a week of anarchy; Parliament besieged; . . . the lords pulled out of their coaches; the bishops flying over the tiles; thirty-six fires blazing at once in London; the house of the chief justice demolished; the children of the prime minister taken out of their beds in their nightclothes and laid on the table of the Horse Guards; and the cause of this calamity was the ignorance of a population which had been suffered, in the neighborhood of palaces, theatres and temples to grow up as rude and stupid as any tribe of tattooed cannibals in New Zealand. I might say as any drove of beasts in Smithfield market."

What was the cause of this terrible pen picture of the riots in England? The Rev. Dr. would tell us that the Reformation was a glorious emancipation of the people from the debasing influences of "monkish ignorance and superstition;" that it had lifted the people from the "dark despotism" of the Catholic church and placed them in a blaze of light? Why then such callous indifference to the poor by the rich and the titled? In Catholic times in England it was a law of the Church that the rich and titled were required to contribute to the wants of the poor. But that was in the days of "monkish ignorance and superstition!" And what about that blaze of light in which the people were supposed, at the time of which the rev. doctor is speaking, to be steeped? Why that brutality and ignorance? Surely two centuries of freedom from "monkish ignorance" and the presence of that effulgent blaze, should not have produced such ignorance as Macaulay so vividly pictures! Would the rev. doctor please explain this peculiar contradiction? How is it that history furnishes nothing to equal this brutal ignorance, when the monks were a power in England? If the rev. doctor would look into this matter more closely he might find for his gigantic intellect, a problem which, if honestly answered, might enable him to find a practical answer to the very question he has set himself—viz: What should be the aims of the state in education? He would find that the only safety of the state is in the religious and moral training of its citizens. The lessons of history have no meaning for such superficial nonentities as Dr. Bryce.

HIS GRACE'S LETTER.

We wish to call the special attention of our readers to His Grace, Archbishop Tache's letter on the "views of Pius IX, of the Third Council of Baltimore and of Archbishop Satolli on the U. S. School Question" which appears in our supplement to this week's issue. The secular press of Manitoba supporting the government and many other papers outside of the province have been very busily engaged in trying to show that the fourteen propositions of Mgr. Satolli on the school question in the United States have completely changed the policy and therefore, the teaching of the Church on the all important subject of education in that country. These papers, presuming on the ignorance of their readers, assume that their statements are true, go on to draw the conclusion, that

what is not a conscientious scruple in the United States cannot be one in Manitoba. Those papers start out with false premises and naturally draw false conclusions. They assert that Archbishop Satolli says that there is no objection for Catholics in the U. S. to attend neutral or godless schools, and therefore there can be no objection for Catholics to attend them elsewhere. But Archbishop Satolli says nothing of the kind. If our readers will carefully read our venerable Archbishop's letter, they will have no difficulty in seeing that those papers which make such statements about Archbishop Satolli, are entirely misrepresenting him.

His Grace takes the teaching of the church as promulgated by the late Pontiff, Pius IX, the decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore and the fourteen propositions of Mgr. Satolli, and he clearly and irrefutably shows that they agree not only on all essentials but actually in very detail, often using identically the same language. Thus fall to the ground all the speculations, misrepresentation and supposed departure of the present Pope and his American Legate from the well known and clearly defined principles which have always marked the divine teachings of the church on this very question. After all the misrepresentations that have been resorted to by the secular press and by many misguided and misinformed people, it will be a great revelation to the public to find that the propositions of Mgr. Satolli in no way differs from the clearly defined teachings of the church—in fact that they agree in spirit and in detail with the decrees of the Third Council of Baltimore which reflected the teaching of Pius IX, and set out in his instructions to the American Episcopacy: PIUS IX. said: Do not allow religion and piety to be excluded from your schools; all ought to be persuaded that their preservation is of great advantage, not only to citizens and families, but also to the very prosperous American nation. To realize so holy and necessary a counsel it would not be useless, when a bishop thinks it proper, to ask the help of members of religious congregations, males and females." Archbishop Satolli says the same. The venerable Archbishop of St. Boniface deserves the thanks not only of the Catholics of this country but of the entire Christian world for his masterly defence of the position of the church on this much discussed but poorly understood question. We bespeak for His Grace's letter the careful consideration of all fairminded and unprejudiced men honestly seeking for the true position of the church on the subject of Catholic education.

ARE THE SCHOOLS PROTESTANT?

We trust the Lord bishop of Rupert's Land will not be ungrateful to us for the extended notices we have been giving his recent address to the Synod of the Anglican church, because we wish to assure the bishop that we are not through with him yet. Were the remarks on which we are commenting uttered by some of the many nobodies that air their views through the government's organ, we might overlook them, but coming from his Lordship they make, to us, all the difference in the world. In the course of that address, his Lordship, speaking of the charge made by us, that the schools as by law established in Manitoba, are distinctively Protestant said:

"As to the charge that these religious exercises make the schools Protestant, I think it sufficient to say that in the English school boards the members of the Church of England mainly rely on the help of the Roman Catholic members to secure in the board schools a measure of religious instruction and, therefore, I think I am warranted in saying that such an objection here whether made by themselves or by others for them is rather with the ulterior object of making the present schools more obnoxious to many than they even now are."

It would, indeed, be difficult to construct a more ingeniously misleading sentence than the above. Because Catholics can always be relied upon to help others to maintain the principle of religion in education, then His Lordship "is warranted in saying that such an objection which is made here, whether made by themselves or by others for them, is rather with the ulterior object of making the present schools more obnoxious to many than they even now are."

Because Catholics believe that education without religion is wrong and because they helped the Church of England, in the mother land, to maintain that principle, therefore, it is wrong for Catholics to object to have their children educated in Protestantism, or receive no education at all! Because Catholics help Protestants, in the motherland or anywhere else, to maintain a principle in which they secretly believe and because they wish to see Protestants as well as themselves enjoy that principle in a manner agreeable to them, therefore, according to His Lordship, it would be right to compel Catholics to accept the religion of Protestants!

Because Catholics believe in the principle of religious toleration and grant it to others, must it follow that they cannot be allowed to enjoy a similar toleration from those others! Such logic is beneath serious consideration. Let the bishop be frank and honest, and answer these few questions. If he will only answer them fully, the answers will

satisfy everyone of intelligence as to whether his Lordship stated facts when he, at least by implication, said that the Public schools of Manitoba are not Protestant:

(1) Were the schools, over which your Lordship presided for nearly twenty years with so much zeal and ability, what they were called by the then school law of Manitoba; viz: "Protestant schools?"

(2) If they were not Protestant schools: why did you, who by your office and position, as a bishop of the Anglican church and Chairman of the "Protestant section of the Board of Education," consent to the farce of having them called so and thus permit the honest Protestant parents of Manitoba, who implicitly trusted you, to be imposed upon?

(3) In what way and to what extent did those schools differ in point of religious instruction from the present public schools? The former schools were called Protestant, the present ones, so you imply, are not Protestant. Wherein do they differ?

These are the questions, and on your Lordship's reply hinges the truth or otherwise of your claim that the schools of to-day are not Protestant schools. We want no shuffling but a straight answer to all our questions. Your Lordship has made a statement which is either true or not. We say it is not and we challenge you to prove it, or else withdraw it.

OUR SIDE OF THE QUESTION.

(Continued from page 1).

houses. I do not know which is right, and which is wrong; but in this particular respect, it is obvious that a Catholic school will gather conveniently a greater number of settlers who are ten chains apart than if they were one half mile apart.

Without criticizing either, although in this I have a decided preference for the first, it is also a fact that French-Canadians marry younger than our English compatriots; so that, proportionately, we have a greater number of settlers contributing children to our schools, and a much lesser number of childless settlers who, by occupying land within a certain radius from the school, cause their neighbors to be further off to that extent from their school center.

It is another well known fact that our French families are much larger, that is to say have more children, than our English-speaking friends. This again may be right or wrong; but this again, I contend, is essentially a matter in which each member of the community should be allowed to use his own discretion. As it is, this fact, along with the others mentioned, accounts for the larger attendance in our schools, and surely the cost of running schools must be higher in proportion with the greater number of pupils.

But, Sir, although I have found it necessary to touch these matters, I do not see how they can affect the question now at issue.

If the basis of the grant is wrong or iniquitous, which I surely deny, let us change it. If abuses have crept in the system, although none have been shown, let the government, by an energetic act of administration, say that the statute must be observed and crush out vigorously such abuses. But to reform administration and to destroy a principle are two things, and the necessity as to the one, even if it were proven, would in no way imply that the latter is desirable or called for.

—Now, what are the general principles underlying the educational system which the government are now attempting to overthrow.

Those principles, which have stood the same in the main ever since 1871, are as follows:—

- 1st. A Board of education composed of a certain number of Protestants as Protestants, and of a certain number of Catholics as Catholics.
2nd. Two Sections of the said Board: one Protestant composed of the Protestant members, and one Catholic composed of the Catholic members.
3rd. Each section having power—to control and administer its own schools, to provide for their discipline, to choose all books, maps and globes to be used therein, to pass by-laws respecting the formation of school districts, and generally for the carrying out of the provisions of the law.
4th. One Protestant member of the Board appointed as Superintendent of the Protestant Section, and one Catholic member of the Board appointed as superintendent of the Catholic Section, each superintendent being the chief executive officer of his Section and being intrusted with the general supervision of the schools of his Section.
5th. School Trustees made corporate bodies with the necessary powers for the maintenance of their schools.
6th. None but Protestants to be eligible as Trustees and qualified to vote in Protestant Districts, and none but Catholics to be eligible as Trustees and qualified to vote in Catholic districts.
7th. Teachers in the schools of the one Section to be first recognized or certificated by such Section.
8th. The legislative school grant annually divided between the two Sections

upon the basis of their respective population of school age.

9th. Each Section to pay out of its share of the grant: first, administration expenses, then \$150.00 to each of its schools, and lastly to distribute the residue between the same schools upon the basis of average attendance.

10th. Power given to each school district to supplement what they receive from the legislative grant, by means of taxation.

11. No Catholics compelled to pay for Protestant schools, and no Protestants compelled to pay for Catholic schools.

Such is then the system which has endured amongst us for twenty years. Considered in its principles, I say it is a fair system. Considered in practice, the gentleman opposite have failed to show us that it has worked badly. Neither can it be proven that the work of the one Section is detrimental to that of the other. We have no complaints against us, and the country never asked for such a change. In fact, all the evidence before us goes to show that the general population was satisfied, and the government must take the responsibility for having raised the issue.

Of course, the system is denominational. For that reason, I say it is fair. Catholics are citizens for all that, and have a claim to a fair share of the public funds to which they contribute as well as their fellow-citizens of other creeds.

It is useless to say: make education purely secular. This is nonsense. The same experience has affirmed itself everywhere. Education is always sure, by the complex nature of man, to carry a vast amount of religious teaching; and so-called secular or non-sectarian schools will always be in fact, schools where the religious views of the majority of the state or province shall be taught.

This was keenly felt at the time of the debates on confederation, and upon reading that page of our history, one at once realizes how lively was the issue, and how each section of the country was intensely desirous that their schools should be protected by the very strongest safeguards possible.

My Hon. friend the Minister of Public Works has said that in the Province of Quebec, there are few Protestant schools, and that they are so neglected that practically the province has a national system of education.

But my hon. friend is mistaken. I find in the report of the Rev. Mr. Rextford, the Protestant Secretary of the Council of Education, that in the province of Quebec, where the Protestant population is 183,990, the number of Protestant elementary schools is 916, the number of Protestant academies 38, and that of Protestant separate schools all receiving state aid, and having an attendance of nearly 34,500 children. The Quebec system and the Manitoba system are practically the same. Both are separate and denominational.

Now, let my friends go and preach in the province of Quebec the educational doctrines which seem to them so fair and equitable in this province of Manitoba when directed against Catholics. Or let the government of the Province of Quebec attempt to abolish separate schools and create a secular system of schools as it is called, and we shall see, in the space of forty-eight hours, what conflagration will rage in every portion of this Dominion.

The present system is a good one and a fair one. It shall be the best and the fairest as long as men's opinions will be at variance on religious matters.

It is partly due to this system that the two sections of the community have been enabled to live peaceably and in amity side by side, and so much so indeed that, up to the present day, it has been the glory and the pride of this young province to stand free from those bitter contentions which are unfortunately too well known in other portions of Canada.

For us, at least, Roman Catholics, the system is satisfactory. If not to others, let a change be made; but why should 15,000 free citizens be involved in such a change against their will? Why should not the voice of our conscience be heard, and why should it not be respected?

I will close this part, before taking up the Constitutional aspect of the question, by quoting the following from the Rev. Mr. Grant, Principal of Queen's University at Kingston. He says in his contribution to Macoun's work on "Manitoba and the Great Northwest":—

"Perhaps the most satisfactory factor in the history of Manitoba is its peaceful and harmonious educational development. In every other province of the Dominion, long and angry wars have been waged over common schools, academies and colleges. Well may the province that has no history in this respect be called happy. Manitoba has shown that it is possible to organize University education on a basis that does equal justice to denominational and non-denominational efforts. The harmonious co-operation of the colleges, and their willingness to make changes in their respective ideals, are signal proofs of the wisdom and Catholic spirit of the men who govern them. Educational problems considered insoluble in other countries and provinces have thus been quickly solved in Manitoba. The evil spirit of sectarianism has been exorcised, not by the ostrich-like wisdom of ignoring sects, but by frankly acknowledging the good work they have done, and securing their co-operation in common objects. Justice is done to all, and in consequence, colleges with different histories, ideals and modes of government gladly send their alumni to one centre to be stamped with the common stamp of the University of Manitoba. May the spirit that has presided over the University in the days of its poverty, not desert its authorities when through the development of the country it becomes wealthy and powerful." This is also the spirit which has presided, Sir, over the whole educational department here, and I trust that in spite of the bold attempt made by the government, it will not desert this House.

(Continued next week.)