

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, APRIL 22.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Persecuted Mr. Nicholas Bawlf's
Mulvey. letter, which we print elsewhere, states

calmly and fairly the Catholic grievance against Mr. Stuart Mulvey. This person, who, being a major of volunteers, an ex-Grand Master of Orangemen and Secretary to the Board of Public School Trustees, ought to behave as a loyal public servant: who, moreover, as member of the Legislature, receives a second salary from the public purse and ought to be above reproach, has repeatedly gone out of his way to bully and browbeat Catholics and crowned his ridiculous braggartism by offering to shoulder a musket against the Federal Government. And yet, when one of our most respected citizens and one of those who pay the heaviest taxes protests, in guarded and temperate language, against the offensive conduct of this drawcansir, the Tribune gives prominence to an anonymous letter deploring the "persecution" to which Major Mulvey is subjected for "his courageous utterances on the floor of the house," as if courage were needed to shout the loudest in a crowd of yahoos. This suggests an addition to the fable of the wolf and the lamb. After the wolf had eaten the lamb, the wolf's family complained that the ewe was persecuting the gentle wolf in that she told how that the wolf had avowed that he would eat the lamb's brother if he got a chance.

The Purple. This name was well chosen as that of the journal of a college which has already produced nine bishops. Holy Cross is one of the most solidly successful Catholic colleges in the United States. While other institutions owe their fame chiefly to achievements in football or cognate athletic sports, the classic pile that overlooks from its proud heights the beautiful city of Worcester is famed especially for the thoroughness of its mental and moral discipline. The monthly organ of its students is a fitting representative of so flourishing an academe. Its get-up is in the best taste: unglazed, thick paper, faultless print, and—rarest of all American products—a page that is aesthetically pleasing. The last number is full of interesting and original contributions. One of the most sprightly gives some reminiscences by the first student of the College, which opened in 1843. In the domain of Belles-Lettres, so appropriate for Catholic university men, we have a delightful parallel between Horace and Dryden as satirists; in that of fiction, a well-told story; in criticism, an essay on Mallory's *Morte d'Arthur*; in booklore, an account of Glass's Latin Life of Washington, Washingtonii vita. Then follow good editorials, terse book notices, appreciative exchange notes, and —cosy corner for old students—gossip about the alumni, college societies and entertainments and the indispensable athletic column. A couple of months ago an eloquent paragraph from The

Purple on one of Senator Lodge's speeches was quoted in full as "a just view" by the New York Sun, a very unusual honor for a college journal.

A German-English Quarterly. We have just received the first number of "St. Joseph's Post," a quarterly.

half of which is printed in German and the other half in English. This organ of the "Catholic Gesellen Verein" costs only 25 cents a year and is published at 411 E. Fifth St., Dayton, Ohio. The editor thus modestly explains why this new venture appears only once in three months: "We confess that we have much to learn in the journalistic line, and we prefer to take our apprenticeship leisurely, feeling then all the more assured of a safe footing for the future. Hence have patience, dear friends. When the proper time arrives we hope to be on deck for a more frequent issue of St. Joseph's Post, but for the present we will try our best to offer a presentable Quarterly only." In an article on "Catholic Paper and Periodicals" we note a sentiment which we heartily indorse. "Every Catholic family should regularly subscribe to at least one good weekly paper of its own faith. In these earnest times it behooves every true child of the Church to be well informed on what happens in matters religious, the dangers menacing us as Catholics, as well as the progress the Church is making in this and other lands. Without a good Catholic newspaper in the family, there is imminent danger that religious interests of every kind will sooner or later suffer, perhaps be shipwrecked altogether." The German department gives a very good portrait of the Rev. John F. Hahne, first president of the Catholic Gesellen Verein. Nothing could be more genial and edifying than the whole tone of this excellent periodical, which we would especially recommend to those of our readers who are familiar with the scholarly German language.

The English Education Bill. The Tablet of April 4th, which prints as a supplement the entire Education

Bill now before the English House of Commons, says that it "is not an ideal measure and falls short of what equity requires, but it is a long step in the right direction." One sentence of the Tablet's editorial points a moral of infinite value for the Catholics of Canada in the coming elections: "Whatever success the Catholics of this country," says the great Catholic organ, "have achieved in getting their wishes attended to by the Government has been due chiefly to the fact that we have spoken with one voice." This oneness of feeling on a religious question is admirably exemplified in the case of the Irish Catholic members of the British Parliament, who, bitterly adverse as they are to the Tory majority, yet support the government in this measure of partial justice. When the non-conformist sympathizers with Home Rule expostulated with the Irish Catholic members for thus helping their natural foes and added that, if they continued to do so, they could not count on the non-conformist vote for Home Rule, the noble Catholic phalanx, with Mr. Justin McCarthy and Mr. Redmond at the head of both sections, replied that, even if Home Rule were thereby lost, they would still do their duty on the question of Catholic education. Such men would scorn to sacrifice the interests of eternity to a paltry party preference.

WHO IS TO BLAME?

Archbishop Langevin's telegram to Sir Mackenzie Bowell and Sir Charles Tupper, asking the House of Commons, in the name of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, to pass the Remedial Bill as a whole with the amendments already agreed upon, gave Mr. Laurier the best possible chance to show his good-will towards his coreligionists. He says he wants to do justice to the minority. Well, His Grace's message points out exactly what the minority desire. Mr. Laurier

pretends that the measure of relief is inadequate; but common sense should make him consent to accept this inadequate remedy, unless he meant to be more exacting than the minority, more Catholic than the Archbishop of St. Boniface. One of Mr. Laurier's pretexts was that the Federal Government were not sincere; then, why did he not support Mr. Dupont's amendments and insist upon full justice to Catholics? Had the Government thereupon refused to accept these amendments, Mr. Laurier would have been justified in saying: "You see they are not sincere." Sad as it is to chronicle so untoward an event, we are forced to own that a Catholic leader of the opposition has refused to grant us what a Protestant and an Orangeman at the head of Her Majesty's Government wanted to bestow. Whose fault is it if we have not our schools?

THE REVIEW AND THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION.

What we said a few weeks ago regarding the attitude which we felt the Catholic press of the Dominion should take in the present political crisis has apparently hurt our esteemed contemporary the Catholic Register, of Toronto, and in its latest issue we are somewhat sneeringly rebuked for what it evidently considers an act of unwarrantable presumption on our part. We have no desire to enter into a justification of our former article, but we note the matter simply because the Register goes out of its way to insinuate that our motives are not so pure or disinterested as they might be, and that we are at bottom actuated by mere political or party considerations. We feel it our duty to protest against being misrepresented in this way to the readers of the Register and our co-religionists in Ontario on whose good will and assistance we count so much, and in order that our Toronto contemporary, and all others whom it concerns, may have no further excuse for thus misjudging us, we think it not out of place that we should set down a few facts to shew how entirely free we are from partisan bias. In the first place we may say that the REVIEW as a paper is under no obligations to the politicians, has received no favors in the past, and there is no prospect or reason to expect that it will receive any in the future. And what we say of the paper we can most emphatically repeat of all those engaged in its management. Not a single member of our editorial staff has in any way ever been identified with either of the two great political parties, or has any private or personal end to gain by favoring one party in preference to the other. Our publisher whilst a resident in Ontario, where he lived until a few years ago, was an ardent supporter of Sir Oliver Mowat and of Hon. Edward Blake, but now finds himself compelled by the same reasons that made him an admirer of these two eminent statesmen to oppose here the Greenway government and to disapprove of the course pursued by the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier. There is no need for us to pursue this subject any further. We regret that between us and our Catholic contemporaries such an explanation should be necessary, and particularly that we should have a misunderstanding with the Register, which has throughout our troubles here proved itself to be a bold and unflinching friend of the Catholic minority of Manitoba. We are confident that having now shown the Register that there is no ground for its suspicious it will for the future, when it feels called upon to criticize the REVIEW, abstain from imputing to us motives by which we are not and could not be influenced—and we would add that there are one or two other Catholic papers of the east which might well take note of what we have here written and govern themselves accordingly.

THE REMEDIAL BILL DROPPED.

Never, perhaps, in the whole history of Parliamentary precedent has there been a more humiliating and disgraceful attempt made to defeat the will of the majority of the representatives of the people on a measure affecting the

constitutional liberties of a loyal and law-abiding portion of our community. A factious minority in the House of Commons coalesce to obstruct the passage of a measure which the majority of the House, acting under a judgment of the Privy Council of England, had passed through its second reading. They took advantage of the liberty of debate, allowed in committee, to obstruct and defeat the final passage of the Bill. The gravity of this procedure, when we consider the intent of the legislation and the animus of the obstructionists, at once becomes manifest.

The proposed legislation was brought for the purpose of removing a grievance which the highest court in the Empire had declared to exist, owing to the legislation passed by the local authorities of Manitoba abolishing the schools of the minority. The Privy Council judgment affirmed that the aforesaid legislation was a violation of the compact of Confederation and created a grievance against which the minority had the right to appeal for redress and remedy to the Governor-general in Council. The minority did so appeal. Their appeal was listened to and the local government, who created the grievance, were requested to remove it. They refused, in the most unequivocal language possible, to remove the grievance complained of. The government of Canada brought the matter before Parliament and proposed the only remedy possible under our Constitution. That measure, brought into the House at the command of the Highest Court in the Empire and in obedience to the Constitution of Canada, was strangled in committee, by a minority composed of a few disgruntled anti-Catholic conservatives, led by one Dalton McCarthy with whom Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, Leader of the Liberal party, united his forces. Despite that unholy alliance of the Liberals with the very worst element in the House, the Remedial Bill was triumphantly carried on its second reading and would now be the law of the land, had it not been for the humiliating and disgraceful coalition of Mr. Laurier with Mr. Dalton McCarthy. The coalition of two such men as McCarthy and Laurier, though almost inexplicable, is the most positive evidence of the depth of infamy to which men will descend in the race after political preferment. In race, in education, in faith and in all the glorious traditions of his province Mr. Laurier should be the most powerful friend of the minority in the House of Commons; but instead of these reasonable hopes in him being realized we are covered with the shame and humiliation of seeing him take the sworn enemy of his race and his creed by the hand, and unite with him to frustrate, if not destroy, the constitutional liberties of his compatriots and co-religionists in the far west. And for what has this man disgraced himself and brought upon his race this deep shame? For what mess of potage did this man snap in twain all the most sacred and traditional ties of a noble race and inspiring faith? What power on earth could induce him to unite, on a question affecting the religious liberty of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, with the sworn foe and implacable enemy of everything Catholic? What, indeed! The hope of becoming first minister of Canada, by grace of the Protestant vote. We have seen politicians in Canada make similar appeals to passion and prejudice with very indifferent success; but whatever success may attend this disgraceful appeal of Mr. Laurier, we are safe in predicting that in the end it will bring upon him and his party the ruin which always overtakes the abandonment of high and just principles for base and selfish motives.

But to the true and loyal Canadian who loves his country and wishes to see it prosper, the fortunes of individuals and political parties are of small moment in comparison with the grave constitutional issues involved in the defeat of this measure of justice to the aggrieved minority in this province. If Mr. Laurier and Mr. McCarthy succeed in

their appeals to passion and prejudice; if they can defeat the government at the coming elections, just because of its attempt to grant constitutional relief to the minority, of what use or effect are the guarantees of the Constitution? Better far have no Constitution at all than one that is powerless to protect itself from contempt and defiance. If Canadians cannot live peacefully and happily under a Constitution that they themselves voluntarily prepared and imposed upon themselves; if they cannot respect and live up to all its compacts and conditions; in a word, if they are not sufficiently patriotic and loyal to the very title-deeds of their rights and liberties and are ready to abandon them at the dictates of every politician who, for selfish purposes, appeals to their passions and prejudices, then away with the constitution and let the farce end. If, on the contrary, Canadians love their country and, as we fondly hope, are desirous of making her great, glorious, free and mighty among the nations of earth, let them put the mark of their disapproval upon the disloyal and mercenary appeals of Messrs. Laurier and McCarthy. Confederation is on its trial and the people of Canada are the jurors. What will their verdict be? We shall soon know.

"THE PRECIOUS BILL."

Under the above heading, the Toronto Globe among many other things says:

And yet, for the sake of this measure, so generally condemned as a useless source of irritation, the Government have rejected an offer from Manitoba which would give the minority (1) Catholic religious instruction during regular school hours in every school attended by Catholics; (2) Catholic representation on the Advisory Board and the Examining Board; (3) text-books satisfactory to Catholics; (4) the Government grants, the aid of the Provincial authorities and the use of the Provincial machinery of administration for schools attended by Catholics.

This reads exceedingly nice, but it lacks one necessary requisite, truth. Manitoba never made any such offers as our contemporary says it did. We have before us an official report of the offers made by the Greenway Government to the Catholic minority, and we do not hesitate to say that the Globe makes a deliberate, and, we cannot help thinking, malicious, misrepresentation of that report. The Government never offered "Catholic religious instruction during regular school hours in every school attended by Catholics." What the local Government offered was: "If authorized by resolution of the Trustees, such resolution to be assented to by a majority, religious exercises and teaching to be held in any public school between 3.30 and 4 o'clock in the afternoon. Such religious exercises and teaching to be conducted by any Christian clergyman whose charge includes any portion of the school district, or by any person satisfactory to a majority of the trustees." Compare this offer with the statement of the Globe, that the minority were offered "Catholic religious instruction during regular school hours in every school attended by Catholics." The whole value of the offer of the local Government depends upon the will of a majority of the trustees and the majority have the power to withhold or grant the request. Anyone acquainted with the treatment accorded the minority in this province by the majority will be able to understand and appreciate the value of this offer. The trustees of the city of Winnipeg, for instance, would not be very likely to invite any Catholic clergyman to give religious instruction in a school under their jurisdiction.

With reference to the next statement of the Globe that the local government offered "Catholic representation on the Advisory Board and the Examining Board," it is an utter, absolute falsehood. The local government clearly and specifically refused to grant the Catholic minority statutory representation on either of these Boards. True, they said they would have no objection to Catholics being on these Boards, but they absolutely refused to provide for such representation. The fourth offer, which the Globe says the local government makes, reads as follows and we call the especial attention of our readers to it: "The