

NORTHWEST REVIEW

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
TUESDAY
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORITY.

At St. Boniface, Man.

REV. A. A. CHERRIER,
Editor-in-Chief.

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

The NORTHWEST REVIEW is on
sale at B. Vendome, Stationer, 290
Main St., opposite Manitoba Hotel, and
at The Winnipeg Stationery & Book Co.,
Ltd., 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.

AGENTS WANTED.

Agents wanted, in town and country
places of Manitoba and the Northwest,
who shall solicit and collect subscrip-
tions for the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Very
liberal terms made known on applica-
tion to the Publisher.

Address all Communications to the
NORTHWEST REVIEW, St. Boniface, Man.

Northwest Review.

TUESDAY, APRIL 4 1899

CURRENT COMMENT

The "Ave Maria" for March 25th, does not seem to have reached St. Boniface. Not only we, but also regular subscribers, have missed it all the more because it was the Lady-Day number, though the loss of any single number of so interesting and unique a review is always keenly felt.

As Christmas is the feast of joy, so Easter is the feast of glory. Christ Jesus, who had hidden his Godhead during the humiliations of Thursday and Friday last, now reveals the fact that He is very God of very God and immediately proceeds to console his best friends by reminding them that, if they bear their cross manfully to the end, they will share his glory. May our hearts be burning within us while He speaketh to us in the way as He did to the disciples of Emmaus.

We are pleased to see that the Council of the University of Manitoba has officially thanked His Grace for the offer of a site for University buildings, though the majority of the Council do not accept the offer. This is a more polite proceeding than was noticeable on a similar occasion, when, as Father Drummond lately reminded the Council—a reminder which has now borne its fruit—the late lamented Mgr. Taché's offer of eleven acres was never even acknowledged.

With reference to a certain question asked lately in the House of Commons at Ottawa, we have always considered it a point of honor among gentlemen never to publish a private conversation without the express permission of all the parties to that conversation and without submitting the report to the interested persons for their approval. If His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface had wished to have a question asked in the Commons or the Senate, he would have had recourse to those who represent the Catholic minority and whose record on this all-important school

question is stainless. We happen to know that we are at one with Mgr. Langevin in this view of that unauthorized interpellation.

The "Globe Review" for March is the spiciest number yet. Unfortunately, it is hardly quotable. One must read it through to realize its worth.

The approaching departure of Mr. F. W. Jones, the able and courteous assistant of the C. P. R. superintendent, will be to his many friends a cause of regret tempered, however, by the news that his future position as secretary-treasurer and manager of the Columbia River Company at Golden, B. C., implies financial advance. Mr. F. W. Jones is endowed with a capacity for work and with a serene skill in untying business knots which will ensure his success anywhere.

RETRACTATIONS WANTED

That staunch and highly educated Catholic, Sir William Hingston, speaking to a "True Witness" reporter about the Holy Father's health, insists upon mental labor not being unhealthy and takes care to instance his last letter to Cardinal Gibbons as "perhaps the ablest and best of his pronouncements." This is truly refreshing in the face of the chorus of apologies and covert sneers with which the majority of the Catholic papers have welcomed that admirable letter. Even the "Catholic World" for April is extremely unsatisfactory. Instead of nobly retracting the errors contained in Father Elliott's Life of Father Hecker, it strives to prove that the latter, in a work of his which was not condemned, is orthodox.

From Father Elliott first of all a retraction would have been in order. This the London "Tablet" makes clear, when it quotes as "entirely out of harmony with the express teaching of the recent Brief on Americanism" the following passage of Father Elliott's "Life of Father Hecker": "Men of stable character need no vows to guarantee adherence to a divine vocation, and men of feeble character may indeed vow themselves into an outward stability, but it is of little fruit to themselves personally, and their irremovability is often of infinite distress to their superiors." On this passage the "Tablet" says: "words which might be taken to imply that to the best sort of men vows are useless, while to others they are so often mischievous that on the whole (at least under modern conditions of society) a religious order would be better without them." The fact that such errors could go unchallenged for ten or twelve years, and that, when condemned, those who taught them do not retract but throw the blame on others, shows how necessary was the Holy Father's letter to Cardinal Gibbons.

Quite the most providential occurrence in American journalism is the recent correspondence of St. Kilian More to the N. Y. Freeman's Journal. Although Father Lambert is a doughty partisan of the Americanists, by long odds their ablest champion, he has not yet stopped the unanswerable comments of his Rome correspondent, and so we

have St. Kilian More writing this: "Nobody who reads the English work"—Father Elliott's Life of Father Hecker—"and the Papal letter together can fail to see that a number of propositions singled out for reproof in the latter are contained explicitly in the former, while the tone of the one is simply in violent contradiction with the tone of the other."

A CORRECTOR CORRECTED

An esteemed correspondent writes: "Since when have there been lepers only among the Jews? Was Naaman a Jew? Out of ten lepers healed by our Lord only one was found to return and give glory to God and he was a Samaritan." If "M.T." had read our comment of the 14th ult. more attentively, she would have seen that we never asserted that there never were any other lepers at any time or anywhere except among the Jews. What we did say was that the lepers cured by Our Lord were all Jews. True, one of the ten was a Samaritan, that is, he belonged by birth to a people who were half Jew, half Gentile. But the Samaritans, who are commonly considered a Jewish sect, recognized the Pentateuch, held most of the Old Testament beliefs and observed many prescriptions of the Mosaic law, and this one in particular was cured while in the very act of fulfilling one of these prescriptions—going to show himself to the priests. (Lev. 14, 2.) Moreover the best proof that his religious belief was orthodox is to be found in Our Lord's own words to him: "Arise, go thy way; for thy faith hath made thee whole." (Luke 17, 19.)

As Naaman was cured in the ninth century before Christ his case does not bear upon our assertion. But his conversion to the Jewish religion does afford a strong confirmation of our main contention, viz., that those who take care of the lepers ought to labor for the cure of their souls.

THE HOLY FATHER'S HEALTH.

The European papers that came by the last mails are full of details about the Pope's health. The London "Universe" says:

The wonderful vitality of His Holiness Leo XIII. amazes all men, no matter what creed they profess. At his age the Pontiff's physical strength and mental vigour are simply miraculous. Without anaesthetics he undergoes a serious and painful operation, and comes through the ordeal improved in health and spirits. And this at the end of his 89th year. There is hardly a parallel in human life for such endurance and strength of constitution. For the last ten or twelve days the eyes of civilized men have been directed towards the supreme head on earth of the Church, for whom the prayers of the Catholic world have been most fervently offered up.

Now that the crisis is past, let us briefly recapitulate the principal phases of this extraordinary trial for so aged a Pontiff. For some time the Holy Father had been troubled with a tumor or cyst in the thigh near the iliac region. This cyst, being about the size of a small baby's head, was found ripe for an operation. Before submitting to it the Pope offered up a short prayer and refused all anaesthetics.

His Holiness suffered severely, being sometimes forced to cry out with the pain. After the operation, which consisted in an incision in the form of a cross, six inches each way, he said to Dr. Lapponi in a bantering tone: "What a hard heart you must have to make an old man of 90 suffer like this!" This was on the first of March. On the second, the next day, Dr. Mazzoni told an inquirer that if the Pope recovered as fully as was expected there was no reason why he should not live ten years more.

On the 9th of March the Pope's physicians, Doctors Mazzoni and Lapponi, publicly deny that he is suffering from senile cancer; they report that he is eating better than he has done for a long time.

On the 14th of March the Paris "Vérité" announces that the Holy Father's health continues to improve so markedly that his physicians have authorized him to resume his audiences. A solemn Te Deum was celebrated on Sunday, March 12th, in St. Peter's, for the recent coronation anniversary, and also in thanksgiving for the Pope's cure.

Since the middle of last month the news of Leo XIII.'s health has continued, on the whole, favorable. One of the most recent despatches, dated March 29th, says he has sent to Dr. Mazzoni, one of the physicians who treated him so successfully during his recent illness, a gold ring set with brilliants and an autograph letter thanking him for his cure.

Still, the great age of this illustrious sufferer must prepare us for a probable early end to this most wonderful Pontificate. Meanwhile our Easter prayer should be: "Abide with us, Lord, for the day is now far spent."

OAK LAKE BANQUET.

While printing this straightforward letter from Mr. W. J. Manbey, a well known attorney-at-law and solicitor of Oak Lake; while, moreover, gladly certifying that he is a bona fide Catholic and that he has ever manfully defended the rights of his French and Catholic brethren, we leave to the writer the full responsibility of his letter. Amid the wranglings of two great political parties, on neither of which a far-seeing Catholic should place much reliance, it is some comfort to know that no insult was offered or even intended to French Catholics at the Conservative banquet which Mr. Manbey helped to organize.

To the Editor of THE NORTHWEST REVIEW:

Sir—Your readers will have observed that Grit newspapers and speakers are never tired of referring to the Oak Lake banquet to the Hon Hugh John Macdonald and that they invariably endeavour to persuade the French Catholics of Manitoba that they have a grievance in connection with the banquet. The latest offender in this respect is the Hon. Thomas Greenway, who from his place in the House has made two false statements relative to the matter:—
(1) That the words "Remember Bagot," printed at the bottoms of the bills, were intended as an insult to the French Catholics and to incite the Protestants against them.
(2) That Mr. Macdonald and other speakers present at the banquet delivered addresses hos-

tile to the Catholics and to the French Catholics in particular.

As a Catholic, as a member of the banquet committee, and as one who sat the whole night not six feet from Mr. Macdonald, I will say to Mr. Greenway, in the words of the Hon. Joseph Martin, that he is a "colossal liar."

As a member of the committee I fully adopt the responsibility for the words "Remember Bagot," and I say that they had reference solely to the infamous means by which the Liberals had snatched the representation of the constituency from us. Mr. Greenway knows as well as I do that at Bagot election Mr. Rodolphe Lemieux and other Liberal speakers told the French Catholic electors that it would be a sin to vote for the Conservative candidate, who would go to Ottawa to support Sir Charles Tupper, a Protestant, instead of a Catholic (?) like Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

So far as the speech of the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald is concerned, there was not one word from beginning to end which could be construed as hostile either to English or French speaking Catholics. This applies also to every speech made during the evening. In this I shall be borne out by every Catholic present. Among the French Catholics present I noticed Mr. Amable Marion, brother of Mr. Roger Marion, M.P.P. for Carillon; Mr. J. J. Arsenault, late homestead inspector, and who was dismissed by Laurier because he dared to stand upon a platform and reply to the foul insults hurled against the Catholics by Greenway's friend, Dalton McCarthy; Mr. Joseph Charpentier, and Mr. Framant. Among the English speaking Catholics present were Messrs. Harvey, Wright, Smith, McDonald and Flanagan.

Does Mr. Greenway imagine that no one of these gentlemen would have arisen so defend the French and the Catholics if any of the speakers had given cause?

My excuse for trespassing at such length upon your space must be the fact that it appears to be the intention of the Liberals to repeat these falsehoods ad infinitum and from Halifax to Vancouver.

That object is plain, viz., to catch Catholic votes by false pretences at the coming elections.

As it is of course impossible that I should be personally known to all your readers, and as the reptile Liberal press will probably denounce me as a sham or "basswood" Catholic, I would respectfully request you, Mr. Editor, to append to this letter an editorial note certifying that I am a bona fide Catholic and that I have constantly and on all occasions devoted my time and my ability (such as it may be) to the defence of the rights of my French and Catholic brethren, which have been so cruelly trampled under foot by Greenway and his colleagues, not because they had any conscientious objections to us, but solely in order to obtain office and the spoils of office.

Your obedient servant,

WM. JOHN MANBEY.
Oak Lake, March 24, 1899.

CAN SELL AND CANCEL.—Smith and Jones were talking the other day about their business interests. Smith was an hotel man, and Jones a manufacturer's agent. "I say," said Jones, "however do you use such an enormous quantity of pears and peaches?" "Well," replied Smith, "we eat what we can, and what we can't eat we can." "Indeed!" said the other; "we're about the same in our business." "How is that?" "We sell an order when we can sell it, and when we can't sell it we cancel it."