

The Northwest Review

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

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

P. KLINKHAMMER,
Publisher,

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

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application.
Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.
Advertisements unaccompanied by Specific instructions inserted until ordered out.
Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, JUNE 3.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Blue Nose Wisdom. The Casket of May 21st reproduces two of our articles on the School question, and thus stamps them as not unworthy to act as supporters to Archbishop O'Brien's beautiful letter on the same subject, which it also gives and which we intend publishing in our next issue.

The Bishops' Charge. In printing the pastoral letter or charge of the Archbishops and Bishops of the ecclesiastical provinces of Montreal, Ottawa and Quebec we think we are affording all our readers an excellent opportunity of judging how unfairly this masterly pronouncement has been travestied by a hostile press. Not only the Charge does not side with one party and attack the other, but it distinctly affirms that their Lordships hold themselves aloof from all parties. They merely lay down general principles of Catholic conduct and then apply them to the necessary restoration of Catholic schools. If the views of the Federal Government are thus indirectly approved, this comes from the fact that Sir Charles Tupper's promises run parallel to the line of conduct indicated in the Charge, whereas Mr. Laurier has chosen to diverge from that straight line by refusing to bind himself to any such parallel course. But if the Premier, once firmly established in power, should ultimately refrain from introducing a Remedial Bill, the duty of voting for such a bill, as that duty is pointed out in the Charge, would imply the correlative duty of withdrawing allegiance from any party that should fail to introduce such a bill and of voting against that party or any other similarly delinquent party. The practical meaning of the Charge is: Catholics, whose religion must rule their public as well as their private actions (God being everywhere supreme), should vote in such a way as to ensure the passing of a Remedial Bill, irrespective of party preferences. That this general principle fits in with the Conservative policy of the hour is the consequence, not the cause, of the adoption of that policy. Had Mr. Laurier taken a like stand with like guarantees of persistency therein, the Bishops' Charge would have been an indorsement thereof.

The Difference. A Free Press correspondent has attempted to weaken the force of Mr. Phippen's excellent letter to the Rev. Joseph Hogg by showing that the interference of the Catholic hierarchy is quite as blameworthy as that of the Presbyterian minister. But the cases are not at all parallel. The Rev. Mr. Hogg, as Mr. Phippen sets forth so clearly, entirely misrepresented the Catholic position. The Bishops' Charge misrepresents nothing and confines itself to irrefutable Catholic doctrine. The Presbyterian minister appealed to prejudice and indulged in blasphemous

familiarity with the Holy One Whom the minister's chosen champion affects to ignore; the sermon was a ranting onslaught on Catholicism, as if the latter were opposed to Christ, Who is the very breath of its nostrils. The Pastoral Letter says not one word in disparagement of any other honest conviction; nay, it makes a touching appeal to the fairplay and patriotism of our separated brethren, who, it takes care to note, have in great numbers given us sympathy and support. Finally, as the Nor'Wester has most appositely remarked, the hierarchy use temperate and noble language in defence of the souls committed to their care and groaning under 'rank tyranny,' while the minister indulged in a violent diatribe against a harmless minority who have over and over again protested that they had not the slightest wish to interfere with his pet fetic of public school education and that all they wanted was a Catholic school system for themselves.

"AN AUDACIOUS LIE."

On Thursday last the Tribune published an alleged despatch from Ottawa in which it was stated that before leaving for the East Sir Charles Tupper had waited on Archbishop Langevin, who was staying at Ottawa University, and kneeling before him had begged his blessing and kissed his ring. It was further asserted that this item of news had been published in all the Eastern papers, and that Sir Charles had not denied it. It has since been proved beyond a shadow of doubt that these statements, like so much else that has appeared in the Tribune lately, were absolutely false in every particular. The Archbishop and Sir Charles Tupper have never met since the latter became Premier; the whole story as to the blessing was, in the language of His Grace, "an audacious lie"; and there was not an atom of truth in the assertion that the story had been printed in the Eastern newspapers. We do not altogether regret the publication by the Tribune of this unfounded yarn, for we verily believe it will prove to be another nail in the political coffin in which Mr. Joseph Martin is to be buried on the 23rd June. Hitherto a certain class of people in this city have been only too ready to swallow the lies of the Laurier-Martin organ, but this latest attempt to deceive them was so evidently false, and so easily proved to be so, that even these simple-minded citizens stand aghast, and will no longer have any faith in the statements of their erstwhile favorite journal or the telegraphic news published in its columns.

ONTARIO CONSTITUENCIES.

There are certain constituencies in the Province of Ontario where the Catholic vote is an important factor and one which the candidates now appealing for support have to reckon with. Some of these divisions were represented in the last parliament by members who owed their election to this vote, and these politicians now find themselves in a most unpleasant position when called on to explain their reasons for opposing the passage of the Remedial Bill. There is not the slightest doubt that they will give all manner of plausible excuses, and by making fair promises will endeavour to regain the confidence of the Catholic electorate, but we are of opinion that they will meet with but poor success. Every member of the late house who voted against the bill must have done so either because he was opposed in principal to the measure or because he was ready to put the interests of his party before his duty as a member of a constitutional parliament. The Remedial Bill would, if it had been passed, have given us a fair and just school law, and those members who voted against it, from Mr. Laurier down to the humblest amongst his following, simply aided in rivetting afresh the chains of persecution with which the Catholic minority have been bound for six long years, and, in a word, proved themselves the enemies of Catholic education and Catholic rights in the Dominion. And who is to say that

they would not for party considerations follow the very same course in the next parliament regardless of any promises they may make during the campaign? Indeed the more reasonable supposition is that should they be entrusted with the Government of the Dominion during the next five years the hopes of the Catholics of Manitoba will after the 23rd June be at a lower ebb than ever before since our trouble began. All our prospects of relief are centred in the Dominion authority, and what could we expect from a majority dominated by the Laurier-McCarthy-Patron combine which now exercises a joint control over the forces opposed to the Dominion Government. It may be and no doubt will be denied by Mr. Laurier and his few straight supporters that any such unholy alliance exists, but the proofs are too clear to admit of successful contradiction. Why, Dalton McCarthy is himself one of the Laurier candidates in Manitoba, and he has stumped this Province singing the praises of his new ally and co-leader whom he pictures as the rising hope of the ultra-Protestant party of the Dominion. The notorious Joseph Martin, the author of all our troubles, is another of the Laurier candidates here, and continually assures the people of this city that he is authorized to convey to them Mr. Laurier's private views on the school question, and that if the Liberal leader is returned to power he will not think of interfering with the Manitoba school law. These are the men who are going to shape the course of legislation in the next Dominion parliament if the people of the country are so foolish and so blind as to return to power that party of which they are such shining lights, and in view of the serious nature of the crisis we feel sure that the Catholic electors of the East will remember their co-religionists of Manitoba in their present distress and when casting their ballots will feel it their duty to vote for the candidates of that party which has already staked its existence on a noble effort to remedy our grievances, and will have nothing whatever to do with those who having once betrayed us have thereby forfeited the confidence not only of Catholics but also of all electors who desire to see right and justice prevail in the government of the country, and the wise provisions of our glorious constitution maintained.

POLITICS VS. CONSCIENCE.

It is most astounding and incomprehensible how far astray men will wander from well defined principles in their attempts to bolster up a false position taken by their party leader.

The Hon. Senator Scott, Liberal Leader in the Canadian Senate, speaking at the Liberal nomination meeting recently held in the city of Ottawa, is reported by the press as saying: "That no remedial bill that could be passed by the Federal Parliament would be effective. The Laurier policy of investigation was the only proper one. The province could alone deal effectively with the question." We have before us a most able, logical and exhaustive speech on this very question, delivered by the honorable gentleman, from his place in the Senate, on Wednesday, the 4th April 1894. In that speech, which contains an accurate and historical statement of the whole question, Hon. Mr. Scott says not one word about investigations, but demands that full and entire justice be done the minority. The speech was delivered in favor of the minority before the last judgment of the Privy Council was given in their favor, and even then Mr. Scott was for granting them fair play and justice without any investigation. The honorable gentleman's speech shows that he understands every phase of this question and that no investigation, however minute it might be, could enlighten him on it. Now that the Privy Council has decided that the Catholics of Manitoba have a grievance which no government of Canada dare ignore and exist, Mr. Scott wants an investigation. An investigation of what? Mr. Scott's speech shows that he is thoroughly acquainted

with the question. The highest court in the Empire has investigated the rights of the minority and declared that they have a constitutional grievance because these rights have been spurned. Mr. Scott will not say that any Federal Government can honorably or justly refuse to restore the exercise of the constitutional rights of the minority. He knows that the Greenway government has, time and again, positively refused to restore to the Catholic minority the schools of which they have been robbed. He knows that, in face of that refusal, the only way we can recover what we have lost is through the parliament of Canada. Is that parliament powerless to do an act of simple justice to a weak minority, and if so, why? The Privy Council say the Parliament of Canada is clothed with all the necessary authority under our constitution. If that judgment is right, and who dare question it?—why does the Hon. Senator say "that no remedial bill that could be passed by the Federal government would be effective?" Why say that "the province could alone deal effectively with the question?" If the constitution of Canada cannot effectively settle the question, and if the province positively refuses to settle it, of what use is Mr. Laurier's policy of investigation? According to Mr. Scott, if the provincial authorities remain obdurate, and they positively tell us they will, then the minority will never recover their legal status, because, as he tells us, the province alone can effectively deal with the question. If this be true, the constitution is a farce, the minority have been contending for a shadow, and the Lords of the Privy Council have been trifling with us.

We are, however, notwithstanding our high opinion of the Honorable senator, inclined to believe that he was speaking politically when he made that statement. His good common sense and truly Catholic sentiments were placed in the background and for the time obscured in his attempt to follow his leader's strangely un-Catholic stand on this question. That is all. Knowing the senator, as we do, we have great hopes that he will not long remain in the un-Catholic fog into which political affinities have drawn him.

THE PEDAGOGUE, OR THE STATESMAN, WHICH?

Mr. Joseph Martin, the Laurier-McCarthy candidate, comes before the electors of this province with only one battle cry—the school question. During his whole political career at Ottawa he has done everything that he possibly could to wreck the Hudson Bay Railway, the St. Andrews Locks and every other scheme which was advanced for the purpose of developing the city which he misrepresented and the province of which it is the industrial centre and the Capital. When he found that the people whose interests he had trifled with and sought to sacrifice were after him; when he could no longer disguise from himself that the city of Winnipeg and the province generally were not disposed to make the school question the only issue; when it became apparent that the development of this city and province was a question of much greater importance than the innocent pastime of heroically persecuting a weak minority; when the electors began to realize that this school question was merely used as a cloak to cover the base treachery of Mr. Martin in betraying the highest material interests of his city and province—in a word, when Mr. Martin and his friends realized that the people of Manitoba preferred the progressive and friendly attitude of the Conservative programme to the demagogic side issue presented by himself, he got thoroughly alarmed and at once applied for assistance to his dear friend Laurier to send up his able and unscrupulous lieutenant to revive the flagging spirits of "the Liberals."

Dalton came. Every since his arrival there has been a smell of sulphur in the air. The school question on the one side and the Church of Rome on the other. The Protestants of this province, who are seven to one in point of population, are seriously warned of the dangers that will

surely befall them if they do not check the baneful and dangerous encroachments of a weak and peace loving and loyal class in their midst. They are seriously asked by those political demagogues, in the most insulting language, if they are going to sell themselves to Rome for the H. B. R., the St. Andrews Rapids, the extension of the M. & N. Ry., etc.; in other words, they are asked to bring into power a man who, whether as Attorney General of this province, or as Member of Parliament at Ottawa, has done his little best to retard the material development of his province, and for what? To deceive the electors on a question which, no matter who reigns at Ottawa, must and will be amicably and constitutionally settled after the elections are over. There never was a more dishonest, disloyal and dastardly attempt to hoodwink and deceive an intelligent electorate, than the cry put forward by Martin & Co. in Manitoba. What have they to offer to the people of this country in exchange for the progressive and statesmanlike policy of the present government? Sir Charles Tupper's name has been impressed upon every great work that has ever been undertaken by Canada for the opening up and advancement of this greater Canada. He has been accused of entertaining too high an opinion of the capabilities of this country. He has been reproached with too great faith in our resources. His hopes for our advancement have been turned into ridicule because they have not yet been realized. Well, we would sooner have his faith and confidence and his well known ability and desire to help us guiding our destinies at Ottawa, than the parsimonious, cheese-paring, and retrogressive policy of his opponents. If this country ever hopes to advance in the paths of progress and wealth, it must have friends at Ottawa who know our wants and who are not afraid to recognize our needs and supply our necessities. We are yet in our youth, but it is a sturdy youth, which will develop into a glorious manhood with a little solicitude on the part of our Dominion statesmen. The man who is now at the head of the Conservative government has always had unbounded faith in us and, if returned to power, will inaugurate a policy of progress which will bring this great Northwest, by leaps and bounds, into a first place in the Dominion. Let the electors of Manitoba remember this when, on the 23rd of June, they are marking their ballots. Shall they mark them for a policy of progress and development, as outlined by the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald an active, influential and most honorable man, or for Mr. Joseph Martin who has nothing to offer them but a fruitless and disintegrating policy of race and religious animosities, which will dissolve into thin air and disappear as soon as the elections are over. Mr. Martin is using this cry to deceive the electors, so that he may once more go to Ottawa and oppose with all the bitterness of his nature the Hudson Bay Railway, the St. Andrews Rapids, etc. He has done it before. Do you want him to do it again? Then elect him.

GENERAL INTENTION

FOR THE MONTH OF JUNE 1896.

Recommended by His Holiness, Leo XIII., With His Blessing to the Associates of the Apostleship of Prayer, League of the Sacred Heart.

UNION AMONG CATHOLICS.

We distinguish a twofold unity in the Church—that eternal unity which is an essential mark of the Church, and that accidental unity, which consists in oneness of mind and opinion in things non-essential. The former consists in the organization of the Church under one head, with one faith, one worship, the same sacraments and the same bond of charity between her members. This unity can never be wanting to the Church, since it belongs to her very essence and is as indestructible as the Church herself. But accidental unity, or unity among the members of the Church in things non-essential, is also of paramount importance. Therefore our Lord prayed so earnestly for it. "Holy Father," He said,