

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY. At 184 James Street East, WINNIPEG, P. KLINKHAMMER, Business-Manager.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Bookellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Bookellers, 408 Main St.

ADVERTISING RATES. Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES. Stage is paid by the Publishers. NORTHWEST REVIEW \$2 a year, \$1 for 6 months. 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.

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 controversy.

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 controversy.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 19.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

The article we wrote lately on the Sunday question is bearing fruit, as may be seen by the editorial we reproduce in another column, from the Free Press. The letter which our morning contemporary quotes is in Mr. Goldwin Smith's happiest vein, and shows what that master of English might have done had he been a Catholic.

Thousands of handbills are being circulated in Winnipeg, announcing the advent of Evangelist Leyden, who is coming from Boston to lecture here on "Romanism the Danger Ahead," "The Priest in the Confessional Box," and other sensational subjects of a similar nature. The motto, heading one side of the yellow handbills—a most appropriate color by the bye—is "Stand by our Public Schools."

We have written to Boston to find out all about this Leyden's past. The first characteristic we note is his name, a foreign one, a name famous in the annals of the early Reformation, when John of Leyden immortalized himself by immoralities that would have shocked a Turk. Yet this foreigner is going to lecture Canadians upon the danger they run from the Pope, whose followers discovered Canada, and dotted it with saints and heroes.

Those who engaged the services of this itinerant slanderer would do well to be on the look-out lest he should prove to be as disreputable as the common run of ex-Romanist evangelists, as, for instance, the drunken Slattery, the demirep Margaret Sheppard, and that "lecherous old he goat," as the Globe Review lately dubbed an aged sinner, whose vile books are but the reflex of his lustful imagination, and who, some six years ago, was spirited noisefully away from Winnipeg by the very people who had called him here, in order that his most recent lechery might be brushed up. The refuse and garbage of the Catholic Church constitute the tid-bits of Ultra-Protestantism.

With concise and pithy irony does His Grace of St. Boniface answer the editor of the Montreal Star, who inquired by telegraph what his opinion was of the Manitoba Cabinet's reply to the remedial order. Was it designedly or owing to its usual stupidity that the Free Press misinformed its readers that it was a Winnipeg representative of the Star who elicited this reply from Archbishop Langevin? Such a request from a distant representative of the great metropolitan daily would carry far less weight than what really took place, viz. the sending of a special telegram by the Editor of the Star, requesting His Grace to wire his opinion of the Greenway memorial. Nothing could be more appropriate than the short archiepiscopal despatch: "Sorry for the local government's bad will. Strange that after five years of public discussion their memorial should blandly charge the Ottawa cabinet with ignorance and claim for themselves the monopoly of knowledge. I trust the Federal government and Parliament will sustain the decision of the Privy Council of England and stand by the constitution of the country."

On Friday last the British House of Commons, by a majority of one, voted a statue to that infamous blackguard, Oliver Cromwell. To his credit be it said that Mr. Balfour voted with the bulk of the conservatives and the Irish Catholic members against this iniquitous Orange motion. For two hundred years Cromwell was treated as his memory deserved, with undisguised loathing; but first Carlyle, the Germanized Jeremy who worshipped nothing so much as success, and then T. W. Stead, the Barnum of journalism, have written eulogies of the Protector which have thrown dust in the eyes of an unreflecting generation and made Cromwell a hero. Yet the facts are that he was as cruel as Nero or Caligula, as despotic as Ivan the Terrible, as unscrupulous a liar as Voltaire, as consummate a hypocrite as the whole brood of Pharisees whom the Lord cursed, as great an enemy of civil and religious liberty as Tiberius or Diocletian. The Cromwell fable a la Carlyle and Stead is part and parcel of the entire Protestant congeries of perversions of history by which Protestantism, which has always been despotic in the use of power (as it is in this province in school matters), is made to appear as the champion of liberty. It robs in the name of fairplay, it persecutes in the name of freedom, it belittles forth its ignorance in the name of knowledge, it preaches heroic virtue with the voice of a dissembling rake. [Since writing the above we learn by cablegram that, owing to a motion by Mr. Justin McCarthy, the proposed Cromwell monument has been withdrawn.]

These are the legitimate and logical results of Protestant principles. Revolt against God's revelation, the picking and choosing, instead of honestly accepting it, can issue only in ultimate rejection of all faith, all virtue, all sincerity of language. But, fortunately, the majority of Protestants are not logical; they are far better than their principles. This is the great difference between good Protestants and good Catholics. The former are always better than their creed, they are good in spite of their Protestant errors and because of the Catholic truths they still retain, whereas the latter, however good they may be, are always inferior to their divine faith, and can generally trace their sins to some involuntary admixture of Protestant error.

Both the Free Press and the Tribune pointed out with wicked glee the contrast between Archbishop Langevin travelling from Montreal to Winnipeg in a private car with two secretaries and Bishop Neunham travelling in the Pullman like any other private citizen. But, in the first place, we have no doubt the Anglican Bishop would have gladly accepted a private car, had it been offered to him; secondly, Mgr. Langevin went in the private car only from Montreal to Ottawa on Sir Donald Smith's reiterated invitation, the rest of the way he travelled like any other citizen; thirdly, the Free Press and Tribune forgot to tell us that Bishop Neunham has been taking it easy in the last all winter, having been enjoying eight months of holidays during the twenty-two months since he was made Bishop of Moosonee; fourthly, Archbishop Langevin was accompanied not even by one secretary, let alone two, his one companion being a future missionary; fifthly, one of the next issues of both the

above named papers contained the information that at the McInnis-Russell wedding in Knox Church, both the bride and the bride's mother were attired in silk dresses presented to them by their brother and son, a missionary in India. Fancy a Catholic missionary spending money in silk dresses. Fancy St. Paul sending silk dresses to Priscilla.

DECLINED TO CONSIDER IT.

The Local Government have given their answer to the Remedial Order of the Dominion Government at last, and the answer is an emphatic NO. The reply of Mr. Greenway's government, defiant as it is, was not, however, unexpected, and it now remains to be seen what action will be taken by the Dominion Government. Sir Mackenzie Bowell, the Premier of the Dominion Government, in a recent speech on this order, said that when the time came for action his government would not hesitate to act. We now turn our eyes to Ottawa to see how he intends to redeem that pledge. The local government propose that instead of granting relief to the Catholic minority of this province, who have patiently and quietly suffered from the invasion of their legal and constitutional rights for five long years, the Federal government shall make an investigation into the status of the old Catholic system of education, for they pretend to say the Remedial Order commanded them to restore that system. No one knows better than both the Local and Dominion Governments the untruthfulness of this statement. The Catholics of Manitoba, speaking through their counsel, never demanded the restoration of the old system; nor did the Remedial Order demand of the local government the restoration of the old system. That order confined itself strictly within the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council. It is therefore unjust and unfair of the Local Government to set up such a dishonest plea in their answer to the Governor-General-in-Council. It is an insult to the Lords of the Privy Council to say that their decision was given in ignorance of the real facts of the case, and it is equally insulting to the Governor-General-in-Council to set up the plea that the Remedial Order was prepared in ignorance of these facts; The judgment of the Privy Council was given, not upon the status of the schools abolished, but upon the constitutional rights of the minority affected by the law of 1890; and the Remedial Order was based upon that judgment. It is therefore, a question of law affecting the locus standi of the Catholic minority, and not a question of the status of the schools abolished. We wish to tell the Federal Government that we will never submit to have our legal and constitutional rights and privileges conditioned on the dishonestly alleged status of our schools under the old system.

Let the Government recognize our rights and restore them, and then, if needs be, let them raise the status of these schools. It was not necessary, in the first place, to abolish these schools to raise their status. Every citizen of Canada, who knows anything of its political history, knows the villiany, duplicity, treachery and falsehood through which the government waded in abolishing our schools; every one of them knows what were the motives and what the political rascality which prompted that act. In the face of all these facts, the Greenway government have now the excessive assurance, in replying to the Remedial Order, to say that the only motives which actuated them were the inefficiency of the old system. If that were their only motive, why did they not pass laws which would raise the standard of these schools instead of abolishing them? The most novel way we ever heard of improving a system of education is to abolish it; and when ordered to restore the rights taken away to set up the plea that they cannot do so because the old system was defective. If defective, why not restore it, minus the defects? This is the most astounding plea we ever heard put forward for denying a minority their legal and constitutional liberties, when ordered to do so by the highest court in the Empire.

After refusing to restore to the Catholic minority the rights of which the Lords of the Privy Council adjudged them to have been deprived; after declining to obey the constitution by whose authority they themselves exist; after defiantly doing all this, these brilliant statesmen conclude their answer by protesting their loyalty and devotion to the Crown and Person of our Gracious Queen and the constitution they are defying. Truly has it been said that loyalty is the last refuge of rogues.

INDECENT COMMENT.

Everyone admits that the late Right Honorable Sir John Thompson was a lawyer of transcendent ability and a man of incorruptible honesty and personal and public integrity. Had he devoted these qualities to the acquiring of an independence for his family, instead of generously giving them to the service of his country, he would have left them in the enjoyment of an easy independence; or better still, he might be now living with them in that quiet and, to him, that most sanctified of earthly abodes—a Christian home. But fate ruled otherwise and we find him bestowing every energy and talent he possessed on the country he loved so much. We find him dying in the Royal Palace of Windsor, almost in the presence of his Queen. We find that Queen and the Imperial statesmen and Government of Great Britain appreciating, at their true worth, the great services which he rendered the Empire; we find our noble Queen expressing her deep sympathy for his bereaved family and caressing with motherly affection the dead statesman's afflicted daughter; we find the highest and noblest in the Empire sending messages of condolence to his widow. We witness every honor and distinction shown to the remains of Sir John. The Home Government spared no expense in showing their sympathy for Canada and their appreciation of his services to his country. The cost of all this to the Imperial Government must have been, at least, four times what it cost the Canadian government to inter, with becoming solemnity, the remains of their honored dead.

Yet no imperial statesman, member of Parliament, or public journal ever complained of the cost of these honors to the country. The action of some members of the Ottawa House and of many journals of Canada, who for mere political reasons, did not hesitate to complain of the cost of the funeral; but actually wished the government to repudiate the costs incurred by them on that occasion, must cause a blush of shame to mantle the cheeks of every self-respecting Canadian in the land. What would the people of Great Britain think of Canadians, should they judge us by the conduct of these few carping politicians.

Sir John Thompson's brilliant services to Canada cannot be too highly appreciated by the Canadian people, and the parliament of Canada only followed in the footsteps of its best and truest citizens, in supplementing the sum voluntarily subscribed by the people of Canada for the support of his widow and children. The kind words and generous sentiments expressed on this occasion by the Hon. Mr. Laurier and Sir Richard Cartwright were in marked contrast to the coarse and well high brutal remarks of some of their followers. The memory and deeds of Sir John Thompson, like those of Sir John Macdonald and the Hon. Mr. MacKenzie are not the property of any political party but the proud heritage of the people of Canada. Now that they are dead, may we not, at least, give them credit for the good they undoubtedly did for Canada, and acknowledge that, although human and erring, they deserved well of their country because they served her faithfully.

Sir John Thompson was made during life the object of a cruel persecution because he embraced the Catholic faith. Surely now that he is dead and his faith fastified, politico-religious journals and preachers might cease to wound the feelings of his family by trying to make it appear that among his funeral expenses, somewhere hidden away from view, there are large appropriations for masses for the repose of his soul. The first minister and the gentlemen charged with the funeral arrangements emphatically deny this statement and yet it is reiterated by these dishonest journals and political preachers without any regard for the feelings of the family of the distinguished departed statesman. Let there be an end of this wickedness.

THAT "SENATE SENSATION."

We are told by the despatches in the Free Press, that a sensation was created in the Senate by the resignation of seven out of the nine members in the Divorce Committee. We are furthermore told that the resigning members of the Com-

mittee made a report, which was a reflection on the Roman Catholic members of the Senate who, on account of their religion, were opposed to divorces. No doubt, whatever exists regarding the view which Catholic members, of the Senate must take on the subject of divorces. The Catholic Church has ever been the consistent and determined foe of divorce, because the law of God says; "What God hath joined together let no man put asunder." This is a law of God so imperative and binding that there is no escape from it, and the Catholic members of the Senate, whose consciences are directed by that immutable law, must, as a matter of duty, oppose all divorces.

We cannot, therefore, understand why their opposition to divorce should be made a reflection on them, unless these seven wise and learned law-maker (save the mark) wish to deny to the Catholic members of the Canadian Senate the right to exercise their freedom to vote in accordance with their conscientious convictions. No Catholic Senator could consent to act on a divorce committee, because divorce is contrary to the law of God and is, therefore, a subject on which man has no just right to legislate. No doubt it must be and is distasteful and even painful to our Catholic members, both in the Senate and the House of Commons, to witness the fact that the laws of the Country permit of a divorce law, which is practically opposed to the divine law of God. "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder." It is impossible to over-estimate the tremendous importance to be attached to these plain words of our divine Master. Hence the painful, but none the less sacred, duty imposed on our Catholic members to oppose every law which is in opposition to the plain law of God.

The Catholic Church makes marriages a Sacrament, and upon this Sacrament rests the whole structure of civil society. The hopes and destinies of humanity as well as the eternal welfare or misfortune of individual members rest on the sacred and sacramental nature of marriage; and as marriage creates the family and the family creates the State, it is absolutely necessary in the interests of both the family and the State it should be surrounded by every possible safeguard.

Look at the condition of society in the United States to-day? Outside the Catholic Church, no woman is safe in marrying in that country. It is beyond question that she owes this security to the sacramental nature of marriage. Man, with all his boasted refinement, culture, and nineteenth century intellectual advancement, has sought in every way to lower her morally and materially from the proud position in which the Sacrament of marriage has placed her. In every page of the Church's history the careful student will notice the uncompromising zeal with which the Popes have guarded the sacredness of the family and the indissolubility of the marriage contract. Almost all the great struggles between the Popes and the civil rulers, in Catholic times, were caused by the latter endeavoring to violate the sanctity of the marriage contract.

The Church lost England for a marriage, and ever since the so called Reformation marriage has been reduced, by those outside the Church, from a Sacrament to a mere civil contract, under the guardianship of the civil authorities. Catholics never subscribed to any such monstrous perversion of the laws of God, nor is it possible for them to do so in the Senate of Canada. What has been the result of this degradation of marriage to a mere civil contract? Its fruits are to be seen in the thousands of degraded homes and the blasted social fabric of family life. Among all the evil consequences of the Reformation none have been so disastrous or so wide spread in its evil results to society generally as this criminal disregard for the law of God in matrimonial matters. Surely the seven wise men, on this occasion, mostly from the west, must know very little about the position of the Catholic conscience on this filly and God-forsaken divorce question, when they undertook making a report to the House reflecting on the attitude of the Catholic senators on that subject.

A SLANDEROUS MODERATOR.

That elongated shadow of the late John Knox, known in the Northwest as the Reverend Dr. Robertson, has been making a report on the "home mis-

sions," the adoption of which, we are told, will place the general assembly of the Presbyterian Church on record against the contention of the Catholics for their schools in Manitoba. This is just what we would expect from these busy-bodies. For five years we have been witnessing these so called Christian bodies meeting and invariably resolving against the rights of the Catholics of this province. For pure unadulterated malice and falsehood, dictated in a spirit of dishonesty and the shameful absence of the commonest laws of Christianity, nothing in this whole wicked business from start to finish can even approach the resolutions of these "Christian" bodies. We have had the Anglican Archbishop of Rupert's Land demanding, in the name of the Synod of his Church, that Protestantism—that is "the right principles of life,"—be inculcated in the schools, while, in his next sentence, he deprecates the granting to Roman Catholics the right to inculcate what they consider, "the right principles of life." We have had the Methodists, year after year, passing similarly inamoral and debasing resolutions, dealing with the rights of Catholics, in which one of the bright lights said: "we will make the beggars pay taxes any way." We have had the Presbyterians of Manitoba, in meeting assembled, passing similar resolutions and, on the authority of Dr. Bryce, we are told, sending them over to the Lords of the Privy Council to prejudice their judgment on the Barret case, then pending before that Tribunal.

And now, we are informed that Dr. Robertson, in his report on "the home missions," so fixes it that the general assembly of the Presbyterians, now sitting at London, must pronounce on the school question. What has the "home missions" of the Presbyterians got to do with the rights of Catholics to educate their children in a way pleasing to themselves? It would require a good deal of research to discover anything of a connecting nature between the home missions of the Manitoba Presbyterians and the education of Catholic children. What connection is there between the home missions of the Presbyterian Church of Canada and the constitutional rights of Catholics, as defined by the Lord Chancellor of England in the Privy Council judgment of last January? But that absence of connection will not prevent such narrow busy-bodies as Dr. Robertson from interfering in matters that do not concern him. However, his opinion, or that of the general assembly of the Presbyterians is of no moment to us and we would not trouble ourselves about him or his resolutions, had he confined himself to a mere resolution without misrepresenting us.

If our readers doubt what we say we commend the following misrepresentations of them for their consideration. We quote from the Free Press:

"The report states that a decided majority of Protestants oppose the return to the state of things prior to 1890, and it is believed that if the presence of ecclesiastics is removed, the bulk of the Roman Catholic laity would be satisfied with the present law. In fact many of them prefer national separate schools. The opposition of Protestants is based on the fact that education is a matter handed over to the several provinces, and that any interference would be an infringement of provincial rights. The Privy Council of the empire declared the law of 1890 intra vires, although it admitted that Catholics had a technical grievance. Protestants contend that the bill of rights that secured the Roman Catholics their separate schools was a spurious document, as is proved by reference being made to separate schools in the bill of rights passed in Winnipeg, or in the document forwarded to the Imperial government by the Governor-General at that time. The Legislation was based on forged papers, and it is contended, the Roman Catholics can scarcely protest against its repeal. Even if the bill of rights was genuine, a few thousand people in Manitoba in 1890 should not bind the population ten times the number to-day. A dead hand has long hampered the freedom of the living. It is manifestly unjust, says the report, to bind that part of the province by legislation enacted when the people had no power to make themselves heard."

Here is a Presbyterian minister, just elected to the position of Moderator, immoderately lying about the Catholics of Manitoba, and doing it in a report on the "Home Missions" of that body of Christians which he is supposed to represent! When he says that "if the pressure of ecclesiastics is removed, the

(Continued on page 3.)