



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS WEST OF TORONTO.

VOL. XI, No. 27.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 8, 1896.

\$ 2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

FROM THE EDMONTON PAPERS.

Important Address by the Catholics of Edmonton, and Reply of Archbishop Langevin.

Last Sunday in spite of the storm, which raged all day, a large concourse of people gathered at the General Hospital to assist at the ceremony of blessing the building. Punctually at the appointed hour a procession was formed in one of the wards on the ground floor in the following order: Father Le Marchand, Crossbearer, two acolytes; Fathers McCarthy, Lestane, Leduc, Bishops Grouard and Grandin and Archbishop Langevin. They passed through every room and ward in the building sprinkling holy water and repeating the prayers and responses provided for such occasions by the church. The spectators were then invited to assemble in one of the large wards, where they were addressed by Archbishop Langevin, who congratulated the people of Edmonton in having secured the services of the Sisters of Charity and particularly of Sister Mary Xavier from St. Boniface and eulogized the services of the medical profession. His Grace speaks excellent idiomatic English with scarcely any trace of French accent and his remarks were received with profound attention. He was followed by the venerable prelate of St. Albert, who spoke in French praising the work of the Sisters of Charity, who in ministering to the sick and suffering were doing it to Christ himself. A collection for the Hospital was taken up which realized \$55.00 and the crowd adjourned to the little church of St. Joachim, which was speedily packed to its utmost capacity. As soon as the Archbishop was vested in his mitre and cope and had taken his seat in front of the altar, Mr. N. D. Beck, on behalf of the Catholics of Edmonton, read the following address:

To the Most Rev. ADELARD LANGEVIN, O. M. I., D. D., ETC., ARCHBISHOP OF ST. BONIFACE:

My LORD ARCHBISHOP,—We, the undersigned, on behalf of all the Catholic population of Edmonton, whatever their mother tongue may be, are deeply gratified to greet you on the first occasion of your coming among us since your consecration as Archbishop.

We felicitate you on your elevation to that high and holy office. We recognise in you one who has already proved himself to be a worthy successor to the late Monseigneur Tache, who in the same office labored so long and faithfully and well for the spiritual and temporal welfare of all his flock.

We pray that you may be spared AD MULTOS ANNOS to continue and develop the work of which he laid the foundations so well and true.

The name of Archbishop Tache—and already yours too—is for ever inseparably linked with the question which now most agitates the minds of the people of Canada,—the Manitoba school question. Although so-called, and strictly speaking correctly so, it is in reality one which also affects deeply all Catholics elsewhere throughout the whole Dominion, but especially us of the Northwest Territories, one which affects us by no means merely by sympathy but very deeply by a consideration of our own interests; for our rights, we do not say our privileges, in regard to the education of our children, have also, though not yet to so large an extent, been grossly invaded, and we believe that our liberty in this regard will in the future be more or less greatly curtailed according to the degree in which our fellow Catholics of Manitoba suffer defeat or triumph in the trying fight in which they have been so long engaged.

With regard to our own schools we still maintain the position taken in the name of the lay Catholic population by the Catholic separate school trustees throughout the territories in 1893, when petitioning for the disallowance of the ordinance of 1892, namely, that since the passage of that ordinance the so-called Catholic schools of the Territories were then, and still are Catholic in name only, and in view of the oft repeated assertion that the agitation against the present school system is an agitation on the

part of the ecclesiastical authorities only, we may on this occasion be permitted to declare that the movement for the disallowance of the school ordinance of 1892 had its origin, not with the ecclesiastical authorities, but with the lay trustees of our own separate school from whom the first of the many petitions for disallowance emanated.

In reply to the denials and specious arguments on the part of the Executive Council of the Legislative Assembly to those petitions the truth of the statements and conclusions contained in them was unanswerably established by a memorial from your venerated predecessor and we look with entire confidence to Your Grace as the Metropolitan of the ecclesiastical province of which we form a part, to aid us with your great ability and the prestige of your high position in freeing ourselves from the fetters placed on us by the school ordinance of 1892.

That ordinance compels us to use for the qualification of Catholic teachers and for the instruction of Catholic children a series of text books uniform with those used in the case of Protestant teachers and Protestant pupils and of a character to which as Catholics we cannot fail to object most strenuously. It compels us to submit to the inspection and superintendence of the entire system of our schools by non-Catholics who have, at best and to say the least, no sympathy with our views concerning education, and religious instruction is prohibited under severe penalties save for a meagre half hour at the close of the school hours—and yet we are told that our schools are Catholic.

The present school system of the Territories—like the present school system of Manitoba—is based upon a false and abominable principle that is "the echo of the cry 'We have no king but Cæsar.'"

It is a gross violation of the natural and God-given and inalienable rights of parents in respect to their children, rights which it is beyond the power of man by legislation or otherwise to take away, save unjustly and by force. We gladly acknowledge the right and, under circumstances, the duty of the state to aid the parent in the performance of his duty in this regard; to provide for the parent's neglect; but the parent is first, the state last. No school system will be satisfactory unless and only in so far as it is based on a recognition of these principles. The school law of the Territories prior to the ordinance of 1892 as actually administered was under the circumstances tolerable as an approximate application of these principles, but we declare the system imposed on us by the ordinance of 1892 to be intolerable.

We have said much upon the school question, but Your Grace will, nevertheless agree with us, that we have given it no undue prominence.

Concluding, we again greet Your Grace, and tendering to you and their Lordships, who are beside you, the expression of our profound respect and reverence, we ask Your Grace's blessing upon ourselves and our children.

Archbishop Langevin in reply expressed his thanks for the expressions contained in the address and for the opportunity which it gave him of stating his views. The school question was looked upon as of the very first importance by Catholics, who in their present stand on the subject were fighting for their rights, and would defend these rights if necessary to the death. They were not slaves. This question was not one that could be settled by synods. It must be settled by that court of highest jurisdiction, the parliament of Canada. And unless parliament granted Catholics their school rights confederation could not stand. He could not understand how, when a government does its duty, it should not be supported. This was not a question of Catholic or Protestant, but of right and justice. A commission of enquiry had been suggested. For five years we have had nothing but the school question. Every one knew about it. It was strange that the matter had been before the courts from year to year and yet we knew nothing of it. Even the children could tell of the school question. No—we need no commission! but justice and right. A commission on this question would be an insult to the country and every one in it. When England made her laws she did not possess all the land she

does now. And when she makes her treaties these treaties stand good even if she adds to her possessions. If Australia did not belong to England, English treaties would stand just the same. Then it should be so in the case of Canada, as in that of England. An addition to the Territory of Manitoba did not abrogate the agreement regarding Manitoba. Catholics claimed their constitutional rights. They claimed that the minority in the Territories have the same constitutional rights as in Ontario. As long as you in the Territories have not your school books, your teachers, your inspectors, your training for teachers, you have no separate schools in fact. Are your interests protected on the council of public instruction by a representative without a vote? The council meets and may listen to your representative, but does as it pleases afterwards. Such a system could not be accepted. He had a direct interest in the school question in the Northwest, as a part of the district of Assiniboia was included within his diocese. The Catholics of the Territories were bound in conscience to fight to obtain here what they in Manitoba wanted, and were bound to have. He was pleased to see that the laity were with the hierarchy on this question. It had been insinuated that the hierarchy held stronger views on this subject than the laity, and he was glad to have it thus proven that it was not so. The duties of the hierarchy and laity were the same. It was the duty of every Catholic to educate the children under his care according to his conscience. The first right in respect to education belongs to parents, and parents were bound as well as the clergy to answer before God for the education of their children. As you give them food and raiment you must give them moral training. At the great tribunal you will be asked the question "did you give moral and religious training?" Catholics as well as Protestants wanted a first class education, and he denied that the education of Catholics was inferior to that of Protestants. Our public men can perform their duties as well as others. A Manitoba member had admitted to the speaker that the Catholic members of parliament were superior to the Protestant members in education. We want our children to be good and then to be learned. Catholic children should receive Catholic instruction. Under the present regulations in the Northwest, when the children had been tired with the day's work, during the last half hour religion was allowed to be brought in. This could only tend to disgust the children with religious teaching. Food must be given daily. Moral training should be instilled in the minds of the pupils throughout their whole course of study. In conclusion he thanked his beloved people from the bottom of his heart for their address. He was sure that the bishops of St. Albert and Athabasca-Mackenzie sided with him in the stand taken on this question and in his gratitude for the expressions contained in the address.

His Grace concluded his address, of the impassioned eloquence of which, the above gives a very meagre idea, with the episcopal benediction. It is needless to add that his speech, coming at this particular juncture made the profoundest impression on his audience. Bishop Grandin then spoke in French, thanking the Archbishop for his address, after which the benediction of the Blessed Sacrament followed with His Grace as celebrant. During the afternoon's different ceremonies the Edmonton Brass Band, whom His Grace specially thanked for their services, rendered the following programme: at the entrance of the bishops, Matador Quickstep; during the blessing of the building, Golden Shower Waltz; during the collection, Wanotrum Waltz; at the entrance of the bishops into the church, Dauphin Quickstep and a closing piece, Velvet Galop. The music was well rendered and added greatly to the enjoyment of the spectators of the ceremonies. The choir may also be congratulated on the way in which they sang the service, without any special preparation for the occasion. After the ceremonies several prominent citizens among whom were Messrs. N. D. Beck, F. Oliver, Duplessis, J. Kelly and J. Fairbanks, had the honor of dining at the presbytery with the bishops and archbishop.

The Meaning of President Cleveland's Message.

From the Tablet.

There is some danger lest in the natural resentment caused by the manner of President Cleveland's message to Congress we should in this country overlook, or ignore, the sentiment and the line of reasoning which lies beneath it, and which have so warmly commended it to the hearts of the American people. The American, looking around and seeing his own sisterhood of Sovereign States, united in one Republic, without an army and without a navy and yet with unarmed hands sheltering and shielding the peace of a hemisphere, cannot help contrasting the lot of the New World with that of the Old. And the result of the contrast is a passionate resolve to keep the blood tax from the Americas, and to see that the New World is not made a scene for a repetition and renewal of the feuds and the ambitions of Europe. The Americas have seen how another continent has been parcelled out; how the doctrine of the HINTERLAND has been pressed, and they know how certain it is that in a little while all the Old World quarrels, the dynastic bickerings, the race rivalries, the frontier disputes, and the standing armies of Europe will be mimicked and reproduced upon the soil of Africa, from Alexandria to the Cape. With this tremendous object-lesson before them the American people have turned for protection to that doctrine of "hands off," which was first enunciated by President Monroe at the suggestion of an English statesman, Mr. Canning. The days of the Holy Alliance are over and done, and that form of organized oppression is no longer to be dreaded, but the fear of European entanglements and a murderous competition in armaments remains. The Monroe doctrine may not be a part of any code of international law, but it is a part of the settled policy of the United States, and that within the knowledge of all the world.

Even Lord Salisbury, though denying its applicability in the present case, does not dispute its reasonableness as a canon of conduct in the foreign policy of the United States. He admits that the American Government would be well entitled to resist any attempt by a European power to make new conquests in the American hemisphere, and he probably sympathized warmly with the United States Government when it ordered Napoleon III out of Mexico. Now obviously, from an American point of view, it matters not at all whether European aggression takes the form of an invasion by some Power such as Germany, having at present no footing in the hemisphere, or consists of a violent extension of frontier on the part of a power such as England, already settled there. The new invasion and the seizure of fresh territory are equally attempts to extend the political systems of Europe in the New World, and, therefore, infringements of the Monroe doctrine. So far the British and American diplomatists are at one. But Lord Salisbury urges that in the dispute with Venezuela Great Britain is not seeking to annex the territory of another Power, but merely claiming her own. This is denied by Venezuela and has been denied for half a century. Their contention is that under cover of a frontier dispute, Great Britain is trying to extend her political system in America by filching valuable land from a feeble neighbor. Whether there is a case for the interference on the part of the United States on the basis of the Monroe doctrine, depends absolutely upon whether Great Britain is lawfully entitled to all that she has seized from Venezuela. Under these circumstances the United States Government suggested that the question of the disputed territory should be submitted to international arbitration. The decision of such a tribunal would have settled the quarrel, and also have obviated the necessity of invoking the Monroe doctrine. Unfortunately, the British Government would not consent to arbitration and Mr. Cleveland was at once placed in a dilemma. A sister republic was appealing to the United States and complaining that she was suffering a violent wrong at the hands of a European Power seeking to extend its frontier by force. How should he be deaf to such an appeal? He had begged both

parties to let their claims be adjudicated upon by an arbitrator, and Lord Salisbury had refused. Disappointed in his attempt to get a judicial decision with the consent of both parties as to whether Great Britain was offending against the Monroe doctrine, or merely claiming her own, Mr. Cleveland had only one course open to him. Unwilling to construe the refusal of Great Britain to go to arbitration as an admission that her claims would not bear investigation, he has invited congress for the satisfaction of its own conscience, to hold an inquiry and determine for itself the proper line between Venezuela and British Guiana. Mr. Cleveland has exhausted every effort to induce this country to let a judicial tribunal decide the issue, and having failed, before yielding to the supplication of Venezuela to go in and vindicate the Monroe doctrine by force, he has asked Congress to appoint a commission, which, after carefully taking evidence, will report to him whether there is a case for interference or not. The only fault we find with the President's action is that he has been needlessly abrupt in closing the door to negotiations, and by appealing publicly to Congress has made their resumption very difficult. A little more patience would have given statesmen on this side of the Atlantic time to understand the vastly different proportions which this dispute assumes in London and in Washington. In England the whole business is regarded merely as a vexatious little affair which will have to be attended to some day or other, but which meanwhile can drag itself along as it has been doing any time for the last fifty years; in the United States, on the other hand, where the spectre of British aggression always looms so large, the quarrel with Venezuela seems directly to concern the national honour, and the most sacred and cherished traditions of American life.

For our part we regret deeply that both Lord Salisbury and Lord Kimberley have refused to submit the whole question to arbitration. It is surely irrelevant to contend that our right to the territory within the Schomburgk line is too clear for dispute; the fact remains that it is disputed and has been disputed for years. And surely the fact that upon the merits of our case we are bound to win, is the palest of reasons for refusing to go before an international tribunal. And it has not been the fault of Venezuela if this case has not been submitted to the decision of the most august Judge in Christendom. Mindful how effectively Pope Leo arbitrated between Germany and Spain in the case of the Caroline Islands, the President of Venezuela, as far back as the summer of last year, commissioned Archbishop Tosti, Vicar Apostolic at Caracas, to go to Rome and beg the Sovereign Pontiff to use his good offices to settle this dispute. Leo XIII in the cause of peace was quite willing to undertake the difficult duties of arbitrator, but the intervention which Prince Bismarck had sought Lord Kimberley declined. The decision of such an arbitrator, in whose favor it were given, would have been gladly accepted as final by the Catholic people of Venezuela, while our own Government, if they had had the instinct of a statesman among them, would have welcomed an honourable and dignified way out of a difficulty which now threatens us with the most hideous calamity which could possibly befall either branch of our race. When we remember how little it matters to the permanent interests of England whether the frontiers of British Guiana are set a few miles this way or that, and how infinitely important it is to us, and to our children's children, to avoid a struggle with our kindred in the United States, we may well wonder at the blindness which led Lord Kimberley so to throw away this unique opportunity of bringing a long quarrel to an honourable close. If all the Guianas were blotted from the earth to-morrow the English future would remain absolutely unaffected, and yet it is for so poor a thing as a patch of one of them that our statesmen decline the good offices of the Holy See, and risk a serious quarrel with the American people. Happily we feel sure that, whatever the blunders those in high places may commit, the saving common sense of both nations will forbid the worst. The spirit that rang out in the brave and generous words of the American Ambassador on Wednesday night, words for which in the hereafter two nations will bless him, will find an answering echo in millions of hearts on both sides of the world, and guard its peace.