

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN WINNIPEG, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

Northwest Review Office, No. 40 Mary Street. P. KLINKHAMMER, Business-Manager.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & Peterson's, Bookellers, 364 Main Street; and 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. All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The Northwest Review \$2 a year, \$1 for six months.

THE NORTHWEST REVIEW is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 588, Winnipeg, Man.

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.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 10.

EDITORIAL COMMENT. We wish all our readers the choicest blessings of this glorious Easter season.

Father Fouquet's letter this week is replete with valuable Freemason avowals. We publish elsewhere another quotation, not from a "dissatisfied brother" nor an ex-Mason, but from a Grand Master in full regalia, speaking as late as five or six years ago, and reported in one of the monthly organs of the craft.

Father McCarthy's letter effectually pulverizes the "Corporal." The Free Press, unable to say anything in reply, went off on a tangent about loyalty, insinuating, with its usual sneering snicker, that, though Canadian priests might be loyal, French priests could not. Yet it was a French Bishop, Mgr. Briand, from that same Brittany whence came so many distinguished Oblate Fathers, who communicated all such French Canadians as sided with the American Montgomery in his attack on the English at Quebec in 1775.

We once asked an Indian how it was all their public speakers spoke so well, with grace of manner and wisdom of words. He replied that no man was allowed to cultivate public utterances unless he was truthful, sensible and naturally eloquent. If any young man tried to speak who failed in one of these three requisites, he was mercilessly hooted down with cries of "you lie"; "you're too silly"; "you don't know how how to talk."

The Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg does not "assume a censorship over the Catholic press," but wishes to remain on the kindest footing with that press, because it recognizes that the Catholic press, when truly Catholic, and working in harmony with the ecclesiastical authorities, is the most powerful agent of Catholic Truth in our days.

United Canada, in its two columns of abuse of the Catholic Truth Society, which it politely and elegantly calls "Doe & Co," propounds three pretentious questions and comments. These same questions previously appeared in the Free Press, from one of the two tailors of Tooley Street now residing in Manitoba: (See Father McCarthy's letter in another column.)

IT IS ANSWERED BY AN IRISHMAN. United Canada, in its two columns of abuse of the Catholic Truth Society, which it politely and elegantly calls "Doe & Co," propounds three pretentious questions and comments. These same questions previously appeared in the Free Press, from one of the two tailors of Tooley Street now residing in Manitoba: (See Father McCarthy's letter in another column.)

Father McCarthy. If United Canada will read his letter, it will find its questions answered, and by publishing Father McCarthy's letter in its columns it may do much towards removing an uneasy feeling among our Catholic Ontario compatriots.

As a matter of justice it should do so, but as a matter of fact we don't care a cent whether it does or not, because "our Catholic Ontario compatriots" do not draw their inspirations or feelings from United Canada. With such truly Catholic journals as the Catholic Record, the Catholic Register and the Canadian Freeman, all of them under high ecclesiastical patronage, "our Catholic Ontario compatriots," who are too intelligent to be duped by a discarded and repudiated politico-Catholic (?) journal, will be able to cast aside any "uneasy feelings" they will be suspected of having, and will be able to form a just and true estimate of the position of their compatriots in Manitoba. The man or journal that attempts to state or insinuate that the school question in this province is a national rather than a religious question is an enemy to the minority in Manitoba besides being a vile slanderer of as brave and united a people as ever faced a relentless and persecuting majority.

THE CATHOLIC TRUTH SOCIETY VS. UNITED CANADA.

A political weather-cock, calling itself a Catholic newspaper, but with a record so un-Catholic as to cause the venerable and saintly Archbishop of Ottawa to withdraw his sanction and approval from it, years ago, comes out in its issue of the 30th of March with a two-column article, slandering the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg and making untruthful and misleading statements concerning two leading Catholic citizens of Winnipeg. All that is necessary for us to say regarding this article is that it has been reproduced and editorially commented upon by the worst and most unscrupulous section of the Manitoba press, against our cause. That may appear of little consequence to a paper like United Canada. If the conduct of United Canada was Catholic in its tone, sentiments, or principles, it is likely that a venal anti-Catholic press, which, from day to day opens its columns to any coward who, under an assumed name, wishes to slander us Catholics, while it refuses to insert the other side of the question, even when the writer signs his own name; is it likely, we say, that such a paper would seize with avidity the carrion supplied by United Canada, and after enjoying to its full the unsavory repast, praise the independence of that one "Catholic" (?) journal, which was not afraid to endorse the views of Mr. John O'Donohue! Praise from such a source is the most scathing condemnation. What kind of a head guides the utterances of that Ottawa journal! His heart may not be filled with malice against the cause of the minority in Manitoba, but he must be the veriest mental nonentity, if he did not know that in taking John O'Donohue under his wing he was identifying his "Catholic" (?) journal with the worst traitor to the cause for which the Catholics of Manitoba are contending. Such a man has no head to direct him, whatever his pretensions to grace may be, and unless he wishes to bring upon himself the contempt of the Catholic laity of the Dominion as well as the ecclesiastical censure of his Archbishop, he will quietly withdraw from a field of labor which he has neither adorned with the virtues of wisdom or prudence, nor made ordinarily decent by the exercise of common sense, and betake himself to some less pretentious occupation where his talents would, no doubt, be more profitably employed.

The calumny, says the Boston Pilot, in a recent issue, originates in a mistranslation—a willful one it is to be feared—of the phrase inducere obligationem ad peccatum—in reference to the binding force of the rule of the Society of Jesus. Father Bernard Dühr, S.J., whom Mr. Starbuck quotes as having given especial attention to it, finds no instance of the mistranslation in any Protestant writer earlier than 1792.

In view of Protestant credulity of evil where the Catholic Church is concerned—Mr. Starbuck cites with shame the Bishop of his own church who lately quoted as genuine "that shocking invention, the Monita Secreta," and the Protestant journals of a certain class who every now and then publish "that coarse and clumsy forgery known as the Jesuit Faith!"—he marvels at the late date of this other "absurd charge"; adding grimly of its fosterers, "They seem to have made up by zeal in propagating the falsehood by their slowness in taking it up."

Mr. Starbuck can evidently neither understand nor sympathize with what he truly calls the "positive ferocity of evil" which they think they may have discovered in Catholicity. He does not love the Jesuits himself, yet does these much-maligned men are concerned, he pleads for the limits to the permissibility even of theological slanders. "Some charges," he says, "are psychologically possible, and some psychologically impossible." The Jesuits may have murdered Cardinal Tournan or Henry of Valois, he admits. True, the evidence of such crime on their part has been shown to be very flimsy; but with another fling at certain Protestants who desire to believe the worst of Catholics—"there is still so much (evidence) as, to a hearty good will, may perhaps admit of the conclusions."

But to what straits United Canada is driven to deceive its readers? In this week's issue it says: "Here is the interview complained of," and then it publishes the interview, but does not give, as in its issue of the 9th March, any of its own comments thereon. Now what about the facts? The whole complaint of the Catholic Truth Society was against the untruthful, one-sided and misleading report of United Canada, and not against Mr. O'Donohue's interview. Why does United Canada seek to evade the issue in such a cowardly way? It will not do that journal any good to abuse the members of the Catholic Truth Society, who are not only under the distinguished patronage of His Grace, Archbishop Langevin, but enjoy his esteem and confidence. If United Canada enjoyed a similar privilege and advised with the Archbishop of Ottawa, who knows the Catholics of Winnipeg and who has publicly expressed his admiration of them, it would never have committed the offence for which it was so justly rebuked.

Is it not true that the Papally ratified constitutions of the Society of Jesus declare that they "do not bind up into sin, mortal or venial," unless in the command of a superior, given in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, or in virtue of obedience? He answers: "Undoubtedly. The normal conclusion from this to a normal frame of mind, would be that, as no superior can possibly, in the name of the Holy Lord Jesus, command that which the superior himself acknowledges as sin, the phrase 'inducere obligationem ad peccatum' must have a technical sense which needs to be inquired out. Catholic theology has various technical terms, some of which, rendered crassly into English after the stiff, unidiomatic English fashion, convey a sense strangely remote from the sense intended. 'Principally of the Holy See' is a phrase on which I have seen founded a grave Protestant argument against the temporal power, to which the words have not the slightest reference. In like manner, 'obligatio ad peccatum,' used after the same fashion into English, would give us 'obligation to sin,' whereas the perfectly well-ascertained meaning in monastic Latin is 'binding under the penalty of sin.'"

"NO QUARREL WITH THE FRENCH CLERGY"

United Canada, with a gracious burst of pathetic sympathy informs its readers that it has "no quarrel with the French Clergy." This is very condescending on the part of United Canada when it is remembered that the French Clergy owe so much to that journal. And besides when it is borne in mind that United Canada claims to be a Catholic journal of advanced "Catholic" principles, it emphasizes, as it were, its gracious condescension in not quarrelling with the Catholic Clergy. The French Clergy must be particularly pleased with the high mark of approval from United Canada on many grounds.

(1.) Because they form such a small proportion of the Catholic Clergy of the Dominion. (2.) Because, on their arrival here, some few years ago, they found planted upon our shores, the standard of the cross and were welcomed here by the Catholic press especially by United Canada whose glory it is to claim that it was among the first to sow the gospel of Christ upon these shores.

Now, had the French Clergy been the first to plant the cross upon the banks of the St. Lawrence; had they been the first to erect an altar to the Living God and offer up the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass; had they been the first to shed their blood in testimony of the Gospel of Jesus Christ; had they evangelized, civilized and converted to the Faith the Indians of this country, then they might consider the remarks of United Canada an impertinence, but as history cannot fail to give that honor to United Canada, then we humbly submit that the French Clergy should pass a resolution of thanks to United Canada for its very gracious words about them.

JESUIT OBEDIENCE.

Mr. Charles C. Starbuck, of Andover, Mass., one of the most learned Protestants in America, lately wrote an article, headed "A Centenarian Calumny" in the Independent, which gives a complete and authoritative exposure and refutation of a popular calumny against the Jesuits, namely, that their rule invests their Superior with the power of commanding the members to commit sin, and obliges the inferiors to obey such command.

On reading the above, Father Drummond, at the suggestion of a friend, addressed to Mr. Starbuck, a copy of his pamphlet "Controversy between Dr. Little and Father Drummond on the Constitution of the Jesuits," (Winnipeg, 1889.) By return of post, he received a long and interesting letter from the learned Protestant writer, of which we are allowed to print the following extract:

Andover, Mass., April 2, 1895. Rev. and Dear Sir, Accept my thanks for your pamphlet in answer to Dr. Little. I am glad I did not receive it before I wrote my article, for such a display by Little of ignorance and disingenuousness would have done too much for my temper, whereas not having any one particularly in mind my paper was written without any exacerbation of feeling.

Dr. Little's disingenuousness (which is the mildest word possibly allowable) reaches its climax in his endeavor to evade the crushing fact that his four solemn vows are expressly induced with the power obligandi ad peccatum.

Of course we can understand a Doctor of Divinity of the Church of England [Mr. Starbuck seems to be a Methodist, Ed. N. R.] being profoundly ignorant of matters nearer home than the Jesuit Constitutions. But what can we think of the management of the Encyclopaedia Britannica, that years after Gieseler had confuted and Ranke had unequivocally retracted this charge, asked such a man to write on these matters! Morally it is hardly less reprehensible than the conduct of the University of Konigsberg in the last century in standing obstinately for a Jesuit Confession of Faith which in express terms puts the Virgin above her Son. The university upheld its genuineness to the last. Bellarmine, you know, says that the Mosaic Law was burdensome, (1) because it included so many precepts; (2) because each precept obligat ad peccatum. But of course we can hardly suspect Dr. Little of any such work of supererogation as having looked into the De Romano Pontifice. One wonders, however, that it never seems to have occurred to him to examine any other monastic rules. Ignatius Loyola has supposed that he imagined Ignatius Loyola to have preceded Benedict of Nursia. Little's has not even taken account of so obvious a reflection, referred to by Dühr, that no Catholic opponents of the Company have ever dreamed of bringing such a charge.

Letter From the Editor of The Northern Star.

To the Editor of the Northwest Review. Sir,—Finding that you have published an open letter from the Rev. L. Fouquet, O.M.I., Calgary, addressed to me, I beg leave to state through your columns, that I inserted the letter he alludes to, from a correspondent to the paper of which I was editor and manager. I commented upon it in a short editorial, and his recent letters only go to confirm the opinions I then expressed. I beg most emphatically to state that there is nothing in Masonry, in antagonism to any Christian church or state. A number of detached extracts from the works of men who by the Rev. Mr. Fouquet says, were "Traitors Dissatisfied Brothers," etc., prove nothing, and I repeat that I distinctly understood that it was on account of the secrecy of the order, that Masonry was condemned by the Catholic Church.

While printing Mr. Stanley's emphatic denial, we beg to remark that such denials on the part of oath-bound men "prove nothing." They are instructed so to deny; it is a part of their nefarious obligations. Moreover the particular form of Mr. Stanley's denial may be literally defensible; there may be in the Masonry he knows of "nothing in antagonism to any Christian church or state," that is, there may be no explicit attack on Catholicism, or any other form of Christianity; but there undoubtedly is, in the very ritual of the least harmful kind of Freemasonry, a setting aside of all forms of christianity to set up in their stead a fraudulent natural religion that embraces all the falsest and most ridiculous kinds of worship. Listen to what Bro. R. H. Taylor, Grand Master of the Arkansas Masons said in his annual address, in 1889 or 1890: "You must believe the Bible? No. There are over a thousand religions in the world, each with a different creed, and such a sweeping decree would exclude from the blessed privileges of Masonry ten hundred millions of the human family. Some recognized revealed word, however, is necessary: Abraham and Isaac for the Jews, the Koran for the Turks, Confucius for the children of the sun, the Bible for the Christian world." (Freemason's Repository, April, 1890, p. 364.) This puts the Bible on a par with the Koran; is this not antagonism to christianity? Was not the "unspeakable Turk" recognized as "the infidel" for a thousand years?

The "traitors" who betray the secrets of Freemasonry are morally justified whenever they think those secrets are dangerous or bad. To take a secret oath like the Freemason's oath is against the natural law, it is a bad action; and to keep it, when the keeping involves wrong, is another bad action.

Mr. Stanley is right in saying that the church condemns Masonry "on account of the secrecy," but that is not the only motive of the condemnation. Masonry is the sworn antagonist of everything Catholic and the channel through which anti-Catholic principles are sluiced upon the world. —Ed. N. R.

Bryce, A vice Not quite nice Removes all spice From the sharp advice You give, whenever you rise, With chin high and ha' shut eyes, The counsellors to criticize And make the "Varsity Landis a prize With which Tom Greenway's chums to aggrandize What spiders practice on erratic flies You strive to do with men more world wise Than aught your fancy can devise. You dwell in a paradise Of folly. Like blind mice Near cats, in a trice You'll be cold ice, Without slice Or price To suit the presidential hopes of Dr. Bryce. —Free Press, March 7th, 1893.

Rev. Father McCarthy Answers "United Canada"

In the Nor'-Wester and Free Press. Sir,—I am sorry to have to add a few lines to the multiplicity of writings now-a-days on the much threshed-out school question. It is not to add fuel to the flames, but to enable fair-minded people to form a correct judgment by furnishing facts as against the fables so persistently circulated in this matter.

Yesterday's issue of the Free Press quotes from United Canada, which has a wrangle with the Catholic Truth Society of this city—which society by the way, enjoys the sanction of ecclesiastical authority. In this quotation, besides errors, it is sought to establish that nationality is at the bottom of the contention; that it is the French who want separate schools.

I am an Old Country Irishman, residing in Manitoba for nigh twenty-eight years. I assisted Archbishop Tache in opening the first Catholic separate school in Winnipeg—in the present St. Mary's academy—in 1869. But neither His Grace nor I could have succeeded as soon as we did, were it not for the help and co-operation of an ardent Irishman, Mr. Kennedy. He ably organized the matter: but it was a French-Canadian, Mr. Deschambault, that paid in great part for the house and land. I am sorry, by this early incident, to have to give the denial to Mr. O'Donohue's statement in United Canada, Mr. Kennedy and I were "bossing" and the French "paying" at the start anyhow. From that time to this I have not known an Irish Catholic, worthy of the name, to oppose or thwart the Church in the maintenance of separate or, as we always called them, Catholic public schools. Irish and French always gave their proportionate share of contributions to school and church purposes.

In looking over the quarter century existence of schools, the bitterness and rancor of day contrasts painfully with those days. Protestants and Catholics then enjoyed their schools without friction or animosity, and children and parents of both sections were the best of neighbors, in spite of occasional demagogues who were restless spirits, trying, for their own ends, to set the people at each other's throats.

tion or animosity, and children and parents of both sections were the best of neighbors, in spite of occasional demagogues who were restless spirits, trying, for their own ends, to set the people at each other's throats.

I further bear testimony to the fact that the French and English speaking Catholics worked harmoniously together, and with equal generosity aided in the furtherance of church and school interests. Furthermore, I always observed that those Irishmen who were and are ever harping on the idea that the Irish alone pay are the very men who never give anything themselves. "Empty vessels make most noise."

The French night-owls which seem to oppress Mr. O'Donohue makes him see the Irish people—school money and property misapplied—used for church purposes, sent off to France, etc., etc. As I was here all through these school managements, and being an Irishman like Mr. O'Donohue, I have a right to speak too. The facts are that the school sites, houses, furniture, etc., were provided by money sent from France, except as I said what Mr. Deschambault paid (\$1,500), the English and French paying their quota of taxes, or subscriptions to pay teachers, etc. I respectfully request Mr. O'Donohue to produce evidence that they were not so paid, which by the bye, should have been done before the accusation was made.

In 1886 and 1887 two new school houses were erected, the present Brothers' school and the Holy Angels school, with money borrowed by the fathers of St. Mary's (\$4,750), which schools were used by the trustees of the Winnipeg Catholic school district, and for which they agree to pay the fathers \$200 interest or rent yearly. This was paid for two years, till the wolf came down on the fold, and since 1890 instead of the fathers receiving rent, they have had to help the efforts of their generous people by personal sacrifices amounting to several hundreds of dollars yearly. I would like to know where we get the money Mr. O'Donohue tells United Canada that we pack off to France, since we want it so badly at home just now. The fact is that the grege it bulks of funds for church and school purposes in Winnipeg came from France, without counting the clerical education of all the priests who came here. St. Joseph's and Immaculate Conception schools were erected and equipped on same line.

A truly religious and Catholic spirit actuated the whole of our parishioners of Winnipeg in their dealings with church and school matters, and not a sectional or national spirit. Of course, there was always a black sheep—one or two Catholics, who, not living up to the rules of our religion, were never in touch with church interests—having some spleen to vent, or axes to grind, popped out from time to time to create trouble, to criticize what they were ignorant of, and to lend a hand to the enemies of the peace of the country.

It was even tried to bring in the Irish priests and make people believe that nationality divided them on this question of the schools. All the Oblate Fathers who passed at St. Mary's, whether Irish or French, were always a unit with the late and present archbishop on the principle of separate schools. Their Graces Archbishops Tache and Langevin never hampered or prevented us Irish priests from comparing methods, and devising means of securing equal results with the public schools, but requested us to follow up and improve the system by every means.

To sum up: Here are my answers to the three questions put by United Canada: 1. Is it true that the taxes, which are paid for school purposes, are not entirely expended for those purposes, but are partially applied to other purposes? It is not true—I will rest upon the categorical denial, so long as detailed charges, specifying time and place, are not made—when an accusation is made, the burden of proof lies on the accuser. 2. Is it true that a rental was charged for one of the schools, although the lands were free grant, and the school built with the money of Catholic laymen? It is not true. Here again I might await specific charges, and ask what school is meant. But I have given above a detailed answer. 3. Is the movement dictated solely in the interest of one dominant nationality, which, in Mr. O'Donohue's language, "does the bossing," while the Irish "do the paying"? It is not true. I consider foregoing remarks on the subject sufficient proof of this third and last denial.

JOSEPH MCCARTHY, O. M. I. St. Mary's Presbytery, Winnipeg, April 5th, 1895.

Place aux Dames.

The Toronto Daily Globe of April 18th will be edited, managed and issued entirely by Canadian women, following a plan recently adopted in some of the larger American cities with great success. This is the first time such an enterprise has been entered upon in Canada, and the profits will be applied to philanthropic purposes, and as the undertaking will give the women of the country an opportunity of showing what they can do as journalists and publishers, we bespeak a great success for our "journalistic sisterhood."

As they, the ladies, already rule the world, they surely cannot find much difficulty in giving the Globe an extra spin. The following paragraph written by the Ladies Press Committee, will give an idea of the nature and scope of the enterprise: THE WOMEN'S GLOBE. Canadian women are already noted for many graces of person, character and heart, and now they propose showing that they also possess mental powers of a high order, combined with business qualities. They have undertaken to assume charge of an entire issue of the Toronto Daily Globe (for April 18th, next). The regular editorial and reportorial staffs, certainly all the male members thereof, will be displaced for that issue by a staff of ladies who will cover every department of the paper—business, editorial, local and general. The issue will be a very large one, both as to the number of pages and as to circulation and will also be non-political and non-sectarian. The result of this unique undertaking will, we are sure be, watched with keenest interest not only by the fair sex of the Dominion, but also by the, on this occasion, more curious male element.