

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 568, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 25.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Second Reading. The majority of eight-
een on the second reading of the Remedial Bill is, on the whole, very satisfactory, albeit many names appear among the nays which will make Catholics ashamed of their so-called sympathizers. The Government have stood bravely to their guns. Mr. Foster's speech, which we regret we have no space to reproduce entire, was one of the ablest ever heard, in the Canadian Commons. His peroration was justly punctuated with repeated cheers and closed amid prolonged applause. "This parliament," the eloquent Minister said, "is asked to decide; it is watched by Canada, it is watched by the world. On grounds of courage, on grounds of justice, on grounds of good faith, make your answer to those who appeal, make your answer to Canada, who is watching you, to the world, which will judge of your actions." And the first definite answer has been triumphantly given. God grant the final answer may be given as definitely and soon.

No Hope Elsewhere. For no reliance can be placed on any compromise or on any other measure of relief. Those who object to the bill because it does not grant as enough or because the case must be examined further, might be compared to a benevolent crank, who, seeing a poor man receive half a loaf of bread, snatches it from his famished grasp, saying: "This is an outrage; half a loaf is not enough; I will see that you get a square meal six months hence; meanwhile, I am going to organize a commission to find out if you are really dying of hunger." What, indeed, can Mr. Greenway give that will be comparable, in permanency and completeness, to the Remedial bill? And, as to Mr. Laurier's vague promises depending upon a problematical lease of power, foolish forsooth were he who should set store by them.

That Conference. A respectable contemporary thinks it "a deplorable thing if the steps toward a settlement are obstructed by an extravagant or obstinate attitude on the part of those who represent the Roman Catholics." This is an evident allusion to what we wrote last week about the conference. And yet we still hold we are right. Some of our well-wishers seem to entertain the fond delusion that the proposed conference will restore our rights. Even that excellent paper, the Catholic Record, of London (Ont.) says: "We shall be rejoiced if the Manitoba government should do what is undoubtedly its duty in this regard, for we have no desire to see legislation forced upon the Province against its will, but we are firmly of the conviction that it is the duty of Parliament to insist on the adherence of the Province to the constitutional guarantees under which Manitoba became a Province of the Dominion, and if Manitoba persists in

its refusal to observe them, the legislation of Parliament on the subject becomes a necessity demanded by all the principles of honor and good faith." If the Record were obliged, as we are, to read the Winnipeg Tribune, it would hardly be even so moderately hopeful. The Tribune of the 19th inst. said: "The request for a conference . . . is merely a trick to deceive the members into voting for the bill . . . The course the government has taken in the matter stamps it as a fraud on its face." "That" the conference "is pre-doomed to failure may be taken for granted . . . It is impossible to see what good can come of a conference held under such auspices and attended by such peculiar circumstances." In its issue of the 20th, the same organ of Mr. Greenway's government says: "The next step will be the conference in Winnipeg. That anything but failure will result from it seems extremely doubtful. Mr. Greenway cannot concede separate schools, and that the minority will accept less is very problematical." Finally, on the 21st, last Saturday, the Tribune treats us to a flippant article comparing Greenway's stubbornness to the obduracy of Pharaoh, and asserting—in answer to a contemporary who had spoken of this as Greenway's "fourth chance"—"that Mr. Greenway has had a perpetual 'chance' ever since 1890 to restore separate schools." So he has. At first, it was not the way but the will that was wanting. Now, even if the will has been won over, the way is hard to find.

Mr. Ewart's Letter. Read Mr. Ewart's humorous and telling letter, which we copy from the Week of the 6th inst. His masterly analysis shows how that recent Toronto mass meeting, which might have been a serious protest, was really an amusing and good-humored farce. His closing paragraph makes a particularly good point. As the law now stands in Manitoba a school in which all the children are Catholic, and there are several such schools, cannot have religious exercises acceptable to Catholics; the Protestant majority insist with "rank tyranny" that the religious exercises, if there be any, must be Protestant. The tyranny of this measure was recognized by the Toronto mass meeting.

A Terrible Percentage. The Tribune fellow who gets up the Editorial and General Notes must have gone wool-gathering last Saturday when he gravely stated that "among the diphtheria cases treated (in Philadelphia) without the anti-toxine the mortality was 125.99 per cent." How does it look when we translate this statement into another form? Out of 455 cases—the remainder implied in the Tribune's figures, 757 minus 302—573 died! Wonderful mortality indeed! The Philadelphia doctors, at that rate, would soon make Moliere rise from his grave to lash them with unparalleled zest.

A Puzzle Solved. A "Puzzled" correspondent writes to the Evening News Bulletin, wondering how it happened that His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface was, during the Lenten season, present at the St. Vincent de Paul society's entertainment, which concluded with a dance. "Puzzled" somewhat uncharitably takes it for granted that His Grace approved the dance. Not only the Archbishop did not and does not approve it, but, as he left the hall directly after the concert, he knew nothing about the dance till he heard of it several days later. We are authorized to state that, had His Grace known that the dance was to follow the concert and was patronized by the St. Vincent de Paul Society, he would have declined the invitation and taken good care not to be present. The shock which this affair has administered to certain Pharisees reminds us of another event with which

they found fault. The Archbishop of St. Boniface, accompanied by two well-known priests, dined with Sir Donald Smith on Ash Wednesday. The choice of the day was not left to His Grace; it was Sir Donald's only available evening, as he was leaving on the Friday morning. Under similar circumstances, when the dinner is a purely official affair, any Catholic would be justified in dining out on Ash Wednesday or any other day. It should, moreover, be borne in mind that the Archbishop and his priests religiously abstained from all flesh meat in spite of all the tempting viands laid before them, thus giving a valuable example of self-denial. It would have been much pleasanter and more gratifying in every way to refuse, as some did, on the plea of Lent and then enjoy a substantial roastbeef at home. Those who adopted the latter pharisaical course must have felt like little Jack Horner, who sat in a corner eating his goodly pie and saying, "What a good little boy am I!"

DUPLICITY IN POLITICS.

The apologists for Mr. Laurier's treatment of the Remedial Bill say: "The bill is no good anyway. It does not go far enough." This is not honest. It is a mere subterfuge. The fact that Mr. Laurier is receiving the highest praise from the most implacable enemies of the claims of the minority, is sufficient answer to this assumption. The Winnipeg Tribune has nothing but encomiums for Mr. Laurier's conduct. That, in itself, is the best reason why Catholics should look upon his recent motion with the greatest suspicion. Mr. Laurier has two strings to his bow—one for the ultra-Protestant element in Ontario and the other for his supporters from Quebec. The latter need reminding that the bill has been accepted and endorsed by the aggrieved and persecuted minority, who are, assuredly, qualified to decide that question. His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface has accepted the principle of the bill and given it his approval. It is, therefore, a mere subterfuge on the part of the Quebec Liberals, or any section of them, to pretend that they oppose it on the ground that it does not go far enough, especially as, in opposing it, they are supporting a motion, the object of which is to destroy, not only the bill, but the very principles on which it is based.

We can respect the honest convictions of some of the opponents of the bill, who conscientiously believe that separate schools are wrong in principle, and whose narrow views are the result of the early prejudices in which they have been reared; but for men who profess to be Catholics, and who know that the principles for which the minority are contending are the outcome of conscientious convictions, grounded on the teaching of the Church, the pillar and ground of truth, no such excuse exists. Opposing the bill on the ground that it does not go far enough forcibly reminds us of the excuse given by the Greenway government for abolishing our schools, viz., that they were doing it for our good and to protect us from the designs of the Quebec hierarchy. Let the Quebec Liberals be honest in their treatment of us and tell us that they are sorry the exigencies of party politics and the action of their leader compel them to vote against giving us relief. The violent wretch which they must necessarily give to any clinging tendrils of Catholic conscience that may have escaped the tugs of political warfare is straining enough without adding to it the twist of deceit and hypocrisy. It is bad enough, God knows, to betray the minority, who have been looking with confidence to them for relief, without adding to that betrayal an excuse that gives to that betrayal a deep-dyed duplicity. We do not wonder at their betraying us, if they do so openly and fearlessly; but to betray their co-religionists and compatriots under the thin and unspeakably dishonest guise of friendship and solicitude for our welfare is something we cannot let pass without entering a most solemn and emphatic protest. But it was even thus; the worst enemies the Church ever has had are

those of her own household, who, Judas-like, betray her with a kiss.

FOUR OF A KIND.

Greenway, Sifton, McCarthy and Laurier—all sympathizing and devoted friends of the Catholic minority; all fearful that the Remedial bill, even though passed, will not give the relief sought. How grateful ought not the Manitoba minority to be at having such warm, true and devoted champions? The ranks of the great Liberal Party are once more closed up; they have at last a policy on which they can unite. And that policy is the same as the Irishman's at Donnybrook. They love the Catholics; but for love they knock them down. Hurrah for the Big Four! Hurrah!

A WISE BOYCOTT.

The Tribune comes out with a plaintive whine—such a whine as could be expected from a whipped cur—that a Catholic benevolent society would not advertise in its columns. When Catholic benevolent societies advertise, they do so for the purpose of appealing to the benevolence and generosity of the charitable portion of the public. They, therefore, very wisely select journals that are taken and read by the better and more charitable element in the community. As a matter of cold business, then, it would be utter folly to throw away good money for advertising in a paper that is read only by the narrow, intolerant and Catholic-hating portion of the community. For that element of the community Catholics have only pity; but for the papers that cater to their passions and prejudices they have the greatest contempt.

MR. DEVLIN'S SPEECH.

In these days of party slavery when every member of Parliament is supposed to fall into line with his leader and when to act otherwise is to incur the enmity of men with whom he has formed not only party but strong personal ties, the speech of Mr. C. R. Devlin, M. P., for Ottawa County, merits the highest encomium. Mr. Devlin, in taking the stand he has, has incurred the enmity of his leader and the censure of the party to which he is politically allied; but he has earned for himself the esteem and respect of all honest men and the lasting gratitude of the Catholics of the Dominion. In refusing to sacrifice his Catholic conscience to the demands of politics and party, Mr. Devlin has taught a lesson in political integrity and the responsibilities incumbent upon public men to act in accordance with honor and justice, that reflects the highest credit upon himself and the Catholic principles in which he has been reared. Not long ago Mr. Devlin was invited, at Montreal during the bye-election, to fill the vacancy caused by Mr. Curran's elevation to the Bench, and the Manitoba school question was, we might say, the only question discussed. The Liberals, including Mr. Laurier himself, outbid the Conservatives in their zeal and determination to pass a Remedial bill restoring to the aggrieved minority in Manitoba all the rights of which they had been ruthlessly deprived by the Greenway government. Mr. Devlin delivered some telling speeches during that campaign and in every one of them he indignantly repudiated the assertions of his political opponents that the Liberals would oppose remedial legislation. Mr. Devlin was quite sincere and honest in making those promises to the electors of East Montreal, and we can imagine the chagrin and indignation he must have felt when his leader suddenly and unwisely repudiated all former utterances on that question by moving the six months hoist to the very legislation which he had previously pledged himself to support. In refusing to follow his leader and in openly and fearlessly standing by his promises Mr. Devlin has proved to all Canada that he is an incorruptible man of honor who is ready to sever his political allegiance to his leader at the dictates of conscience. To those who know how close party lines are drawn and how much so fearless a course costs, this conduct of Mr. Devlin is little short of heroic. In the name of the Catholic minority of Manitoba, whose

cause Mr. Devlin has so generously espoused, we tender to him our sincere and heartfelt thanks. In the long run his course will receive the reward it so richly deserves. In the meantime his reward is in the consciousness of doing a sacred duty to a persecuted minority and in the gratitude such a noble sacrifice must win for him in the eyes of his coreligionists throughout Canada.

HON. GEORGE FOSTER'S Splendid Peroration on the Manitoba Schools.

"After six years we come here under circumstances such as I have detailed. What is there then for this Parliament to do? On the one hand there is a well founded repugnance to do what even though clearly within our right to do, the province can easier and far better do than ourselves. There is along with that a lot of subordinate considerations, ranging from principle through considerations, and party considerations, that have brought some to vote against this bill and against remedial legislation. On the other hand what is there? There is the genius and the spirit of the constitutional dictates of this country. There is the splendid lesson of toleration and of compromise which has been read to you in that constitution, and which has been evidenced in its harmonious workings for nearly thirty years. There is the cry of the minority, small in the area of those who suffer, but large, let me tell you, in the area of those who sympathize with it in this country: from one end to the other. There are the minorities in the other provinces demanding of you where they shall stand and how they shall be treated, if in coming years, their time of trial comes, and they will have to appeal to the same high court of parliament, and invoke this same jurisdiction. (Cheers.) There is a parliament invested knowingly, definitely, positively invested by the fathers of Confederation, in the constitution with the jurisdiction to maintain these rights and to restore them if they are taken away. This parliament is asked to decide; it is watched by Canada, it is watched by the world. On grounds of courage, on grounds of justice, on grounds of good faith, make your answer to those who appeal, make your answer to Canada, who is watching you, to the world which will judge of your actions. (Cheers.)

"History, sir, is making itself in this eventful day. Shall the chapter be a record of nobleness and adequacy, or a record of weakness and inefficiency? Shall we stamp ourselves as petty and provincial, or shall we be recorded to future ages as magnanimous and imperial? Let us plant our feet on the firm path of constitutional compact and agreement, of good faith and of honest fair dealings. Let us take, and pass on, that gleaming torch under whose kindly light the fathers of Confederation came safely out from times far more troublous, and far less advanced than these times of today, into an era of harmony and continued peace. (Cheers.)

"Let us do justice to the weak and patient minority, and thus settle for ever the question of the sufficiency of the guarantee of confederation. Let us follow with cheerful emulation the shining example of our great mother country, whose foundations were laid on the solid granite of good faith, and whose world-wide and wonderful superstructure has been joined together with the cement of a strong and generous toleration. Let us prove ourselves now, in the thirtieth year of our existence, as we did under the circumstances of our natal days, a people worthy of nationhood, and worthy to rank amongst the best and greatest of nations." (Prolonged applause.)

MANITOBA SCHOOLS.

(Continued from page 1.)

which conclusions could be formed with a reasonable degree of certainty." "Shall we, therefore, now press upon the Dominion Government the necessity of adopting this safe middle course, or shall we allow them to light the fires, or—" (Prolonged cheers.) Remembering that Mr. Laurier recently said at Merrickville: "There is not a man in this audience but who would like to see the Catholic schools restored by the Legislature of Manitoba"—and that for him the idea of an inquiry is that the public may be satisfied that Catholics have a grievance, which ought to be remedied, Mr. Mulock's speech was directly opposed to that of the gentleman who seconded his resolution (Mr. Craig), upon whom, nevertheless, the audience, with thorough impartiality and the best of good taste, showered its commendations. Mr. Craig said that "he was not in favor of a commission. He was in favor of leaving