

The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

Reddite que sunt Cesaris, Cesari; et que sunt Dei, Deo.—Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, Feb. 1, 1890.

No. 50

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	801
THE DISAPPEARANCE OF JOHN LONGWORTHY.....	M F Egan 802
THE TASK OF THE PEACEMAKER.....	801
THE TEMPERANCE MOVEMENT IN MONTREAL.....	805
WHY NOT GIVE THE PEOPLE A CHANCE.....	805
EDITORIALS—	
Archbishop Ryan and Ireland.....	803
Mr. Gladstone's Successor.....	803
The Newspaper Attack upon the Archbishop.....	803
Mr. Gladstone and the Confessional.....	809
Mr. Stend as Confessor-General.....	809
Modern Morality.....	810
Presentation to Father McEntee.....	805
The Recent Clerical Appointments.....	810
Men and Things.....	808
Current Catholic Thought.....	807
General Catholic News.....	812

Notes.

Mr. Chapleau, speaking in the House of Commons on Wednesday last on Mr. McCarthy's dual language motion, said he wished to quote, without delay, the opinion of an experienced statesman who had given warning of the impolicy of all such attempts to denationalize the French. "If successful," he had said, "what would be the result? You may Americanize but you can never Anglicize. Let them feel that their rights and privileges are respected and the last hand that waves the British flag in the Dominion will be that of a French Canadian." Those were the words of Lord Elgin, and he asked the House to remember and deliberate upon them.

The somewhat serious charge brought by the *Empire* against the *Mail* and its Editor-in-chief, Mr. Farrer, that the latter, while in Washington, actively, and personally, and secretly sought to promote the annexation of Canada to the United States, forms the subject already of judicial investigation. It rests, therefore, with the Courts, to whom the accused parties have appealed, and to the Courts only, to determine just what amount of truth there is in the charges, whether they are supported by definite and incontestable evidence, or whether Mr. Farrer is merely unfortunate in having hobnobbed while he was in Washington in a conspicuously friendly way with certain United States Senators composing the committee upon Canadian Relations. This question being now *sub judice* it is no longer proper to discuss it.

We may, however, without at all touching upon the question of the truthfulness or untruthfulness of the particular charge which forms the subject of legal inquiry, say a word upon a question extraneous to and outside of it, the question of the course of the *Mail* newspaper in its treatment of Canadian affairs for some years past. For certainly three years past the *Mail* has devoted itself with great skill and energy towards creating dissatisfaction in the different provinces of

the Canadian Dominion with our existing political condition. The language and race differences between Ontario and Quebec have been exaggerated and embittered by its utterances; the constitution has been criticized as defective and insufficient; the North-West and the Maritime Provinces alike have been encouraged in the belief that they have no economic interests in common with Quebec and Ontario; and the impossibility of the geographically attenuated sections of the Dominion doing business with each other, iterated and reiterated till any one, as the *Montreal Gazette* truly says, reading and accepting all the paper's statements "would be convinced that the federation was on the verge of dissolution and that the longer the collapse was delayed the greater would be the risk for a violent disruption." That, we think, is a fair statement of what the *Mail* of late years has been doing. It has gone in for a propaganda of political pessimism; and so far as we can judge the programme has not been remarkably successful. The *Mail* has been a great public irritant, but it has not yet led Canadians to lose confidence in their country. Canada, as the *Gazette* says is too great a country to be swayed from its national course by the influence of any journal. However powerful, or the action of the legislation of any foreign nation; and before any change in the direction of annexation can be brought about Canadians will have to be convinced that it is to their political and moral, as well as to their commercial, welfare. The annexation idea has made no progress in Canada; its adherents are not more numerous to-day than they were a quarter of a century ago. On the other hand those who have faith in Canada's national future, as a nation politically and commercially autonomous, have multiplied many times; and this too in the face of many invitations to throw in our lot with our American neighbours, and even of coercive action on their part designed to hasten that end. For example the reciprocity treaty of 1854 was abrogated by the United States for no other purpose than to commercially starve Canada, into consent to political union. Yet for a quarter of a century we have lived and thrived without the advantages of that treaty; formed a great Confederation; added to our territory; doubled our population; and linked it from sea to sea by a great system of internal communication. That being so there is no occasion for us after all to become excited or alarmed. There are two main forces at the bottom of all national vitality—the sentimental, that is to say the pride of country, the instinct of nationhood; and the economic. The first of these we believe to be strong in Canadians; and with regard to the second, while reciprocity, we cannot doubt, would be a good and desirable thing, yet events have abundantly demonstrated that it is not absolutely essential to our progress or happiness. Some United States legislators, it may be, think otherwise. They are gentlemen perhaps who have indulged a good deal in the American dream of Continental Empire, and who from too much dreaming have passed beyond dreamland and into the domain of delirium.