

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

78 PRINCESS STREET.

EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

E. J. DERMODY & CO.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to the office in writing.

Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out. Notice of Births, Marriages and Deaths, 50 cents for each insertion.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The NORTH WEST REVIEW \$2 a year, \$1 for 6 months.

Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTH WEST REVIEW for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at once.

The NORTH WEST REVIEW is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published. Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The following gentlemen have been appointed agents of the NORTH WEST REVIEW.

Master Andrew G. Crawford, Brandon, Man. Mr. A. A. McKinnon, Fort William, Ont. and Mr. C. Dahm, Rat Portage, Ont.

Mr. J. Barreau, Medicine Hat, N. W. T. Subscribers in arrears will please pay them. They are also authorized to canvass for subscribers, give receipts for all monies collected on our account, etc.

Address all Business Communications to THE NORTH WEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local interest, or of a political or social character. (2) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia.

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

ST. BONIFACE, Dec. 12th, 1892.

GENTLEMEN—I see by the last issue of the NORTH WEST REVIEW that you have been instructed by the directors of the journal with the management of the same, "the company for the present retaining charge of the editorial column."

I need not tell you that I take a deep interest in the NORTH WEST REVIEW which is the only English Catholic paper published within the limits of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories. I hope that you will obtain a remunerative success. It is enough that the editors do their work gratuitously, I cannot expect that the material part of the publication should remain without remuneration. I therefore strongly recommend to all Catholics under my jurisdiction to give a liberal support to the NORTH WEST REVIEW.

It is fully my approval, though, of course, I cannot be responsible for every word contained in it. The editor writes as they think proper, they are at full liberty to say what they wish and in the way they like best.

The sole control I can claim is over the principles they express and I have no hesitation in stating that the principles announced by them are sound and ought to be endorsed by every sound Catholic in this country.

I therefore consider that you enter a good work and I pray to God that He will bless you in its accomplishment.

Yours all devoted in Christ, ALEX. ARCHBISHOP OF ST. BONIFACE, O. M. I.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 5.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The Northwestern Chronicle of St. Paul says: "We notice from the Winnipeg papers that Capt. P. D. O'Phelan is doing valiant work in behalf of home rule for Ireland."

We may add that the gallant Captain is doing more than this. He has been shedding a flood of historic light on the early history of the "Island of saints."

To the March number of the Contemporary Review Mr. Herbert Spencer contributes a second paper to prove "The inadequacy of natural selection." With sledge-hammer force he shows the fallacy of the theory, yet concludes the essay by hoping his readers will not think he is attacking Darwinism!

Our readers who have read the works of Mr. W. S. Lilly and Mr. Wilfrid Ward will not be astonished at an intellectual missing link in Mr. Spencer's philosophical method.

There are few things that create more unhappiness than a morbid sensitiveness. Like jealousy, it makes the meat it feeds on. This wretched state of mind arises from a diseased self-esteem. You imagine that people think less of you than your merits deserve, and that they are continually seeking occasion to exhibit to you the ill opinion and even contempt that they feel.

Once possessed of this notion, you analyze every look cast toward you and weigh every word spoken in your presence, for in them you expect to find a poisoned arrow. And as people are mostly careless, many a sentence tipped with a cruel shaft pierces your heart. One's whole life may be embittered in this fashion:

Our times are not favorable to a healthy appreciation of the self-sacrifice and self-restraint which the sweet yoke of Christ demands of those whose happiness it is to bear it. We are surrounded with an atmosphere tainted with the blighting influences of the worst and lowest forms of infidelity and irreligion. Materialism, utilitarianism and rationalism are the false deities to whom many deluded men offer the homage of their intelligence.

The idea of a life beyond the grave—

of a heaven and a hell—of personal accountability to the Creator—of a divinely instituted body of teachers to guide and direct the faith and morals of mankind—of respect for and obedience to such teaching authority, appears scarcely important enough to attract more than passing notice. Yet these are fundamental truths without a realizing appreciation of which, religion and morality are meaningless words and human conduct, instead of looking to eternal truth of this principle, recognizes no higher motive than the suggestions of caprice or vagaries of fashion. The Bishop of Wichita.

The Presbyterian Witness has this to say on a matter elsewhere referred to in our columns:

If the views attributed to Mr. Clark Wallace, Comptroller of Customs, have really been uttered by him he ought not to be a member of parliament or an officer of the government. He is said to have expressed sympathy with Orangemen in Ireland. That is quite legitimate, we too have sympathized with the men who desire to retain their present status in the Empire; but Mr. Wallace is said to have added a scarcely veiled threat of active aid to civil war in Ireland. This is utterly wrong. The British people are the proper judges of their own affairs and we have no right to intervene by threats or promises. Especially is it improper for Government officials to utter words which easily lead themselves to the interpretation that in a certain degree they favour civil war.

A distinguished and prominent pastor in New Jersey recently said regarding the comments of the daily press on Mr. Sattolli's celebratory propositions on the schools in the United States:

"I do not agree with those," he says, "who attempt to torture Archbishop Sattolli's language into an endorsement of such a step as this. On the other hand, I understand him to take strong ground in favor of the maintenance of Catholic education in schools where it is already established, as in this State. It is only as an alternative, where Catholic schools cannot be supported, that we would make concessions favorable to any such compromise as is here proposed."

Commenting on the above utterance by one in authority to speak, the Catholic Columbian, one of the best conducted Catholic papers in the United States says:

"This, of course, is correct view of the Archbishop's propositions; and as his words are so interpreted by all intelligent Catholics, there need be no fear that our parochial schools will ever be subjected to the workings of a plan that would materially change their present administrative character. The number of new schools which the parishes are continually adding to their equipment shows that American Catholics have not misinterpreted the famous propositions."

All of which is reproduced by us in the hope that it may shed a little light on this question, for the informants of those journals which falsely say that the Pope endorsed national schools whither they be Protestant or Godless.

The following is from UNITED CANADA Our contemporary the North West Review of Winnipeg, so hearty agrees with our opinions on many questions that they print them as their own, and forget to give UNITED CANADA credit. This sometimes accidentally occurs, but don't let it happen too often.

In reply we wish to assure our contemporary that we never knowingly took anything from its columns without giving it credit. It is quite true that each a thing might inadvertently happen because of the fact that our poverty does not admit of a paid editorial staff, and in our absence, the printers may have made a clipping and neglected to give the paper from which they took it the proper credit. While we may endorse many opinions of our contemporary and quote them in our columns, yet we can assure UNITED CANADA that we have seen nothing in either the literary merits or the public importance of any of its articles, to induce us to give them to the public as our own. We do not even now know to what particular article UNITED CANADA refers, and if our contemporary will mention it, we are even now ready to correct the mistake. Were we inclined to be unkind, we might retort by reminding our contemporary of the old adage about people who live in glass houses throwing stones. More information can be given on this subject if our contemporary is thirsting for it. Quantum Sufficit!

Speaking at a banquet tendered to a member of the Orange order in Kingston a little over a week ago, the Hon. Clarke Wallace is reported to have said:

"I am pleased to see that the men of Ulster are not prepared to submit to Mr. Gladstone. They have the sympathy of the Orangemen in Canada. They shall have more than that, they shall have our active aid if necessary. The Orangemen of Canada would not be worthy of their ancestors if they failed to afford just such assistance as their brethren in Ulster require."

Surely this is not such language as it becoms a responsible minister of Her Majesty's Government in Canada to employ. It is only in the event of the Home Rule bill passing both Houses of the British Parliament and receiving the assent of the Sovereign that there can be any call for such active aid as the Hon. Mr. Wallace promises, on behalf of Canadian Orangemen, to render the brethren in Ulster. He promises, therefore, to assist a band of disaffected men in a rebellion against the Crown and the Parliament of Great Britain. It would

have become the Grand Master of the loyal Orangemen of Canada to urge upon his fiery friends in Ulster the necessity of dutiful submission to the law, instead of encouraging them to pursue their rebellious course by the proffer of assistance. Antigonish Casket.

ORANGE "LOYALTY"

Orangeism is the same all over the world. An Irishman once described "British fair play," as "roast beef and plum pudding of John Bull and potatoes and butter-milk for Pat." Similarly, we may describe Orangeism as loyalty to the Crown of England when it can have its own way and treason and rebellion when it cannot.

The Orange society has lived and fattened so long on the misfortunes of Ireland, that it is hard to see its beneficent power curtailed by the emancipation of the people on whose miseries it has so long depended for an existence. Now that the Irish people are about to obtain their liberty, in the boon of self government, Orangemen, all over the Empire, are clamoring against it, and when they cannot have their own way, are silly enough to threaten to rebel against the laws of the country. This is only a repetition of history. When the Irish Church was disestablished, the air was so charged by similar threats, but they amounted to nothing. Orange bravery was never great except when it was backed up by a penal code which allowed them to exhibit their valor in hunting a priest or wringing a school-master. It was in such valorous pastime that it found its greatest delight. Penal codes and Catholic persecutions were the carrion on which it thrived. If some helpless family was to be evicted or the life of some son of the soil sacrificed, it was the ready instrument to carry out the devilish behest; but when it had to fight, the fighting was done in threatening only. Why should any attention be given to their foolish threats? If Home Rule was made law, the Orangemen of Ulster and Canada, too, would meekly submit, or confine their warlike sentiments to passing warlike manifestoes. The cowardly instincts which made them valorous in persecuting women and children and killing helpless priests, are not the materials out of which soldiers are made.

Away, then, with this nonsense! Let them fume and bluster, threaten and rebel. It will neither hasten nor retard the cause of Home Rule. The only amusing feature of the whole farce is the super-loyal pretensions of those men. They seriously and solemnly tell us that the great and primary object of their society is to uphold "the Crown and constitution of Great Britain." They are sworn to do so, so they tell us, and yet no sooner do the Crown and constitution displease them, by making certain laws, than they threaten to smash the one and kick the other into the bovine. But, do not fear, they will do neither, not because of their sworn loyalty but because of the risk they would run of getting hurt. The average Orangeman is very careful of himself and will not unnecessarily, or even necessarily, hurt himself. If there be any person whose feelings he is tender of himself, the bravado is always a coward and never fights except when there is little or no danger of getting hurt. His loyalty in the past was a mask to excuse his rapine and plunder. Now that those incentives are about to disappear forever, the loyalty fraud dwindles into thin air.

We shall hear no more about it until some other favorable opportunity presents itself.

"HAULTAIN TALKS."

Our city contemporary the Winnipeg Tribune, is always seeking sensational news to keep alive the unfortunate strife on the school question. It publishes a dispatch from Toronto, under the above heading in which it purports to give Mr. Haultain's opinions on the school question in the Northwest Territories. Among other things it makes Mr. Haultain say: "The English speaking people were now, and always would be, in the ascendancy in the Northwest, and there was no danger that the separate school system would be engrafted on the Territories."

We do not know whether Mr. Haultain used this language or not. Possibly he did not; and for two reasons: (1) Mr. Haultain is an intelligent man and knows that "a separate school system is already engrafted on the Northwest Territories and (2) we do not believe (and we speak from a personal acquaintance with the honorable gentleman), that Mr. Haultain is a demagogic politician who would trample on the conscientious scruples and religious convictions of a minority, to win the passing applause of a brute majority. We absolutely refuse to believe, in the absence of better proof, that Mr. Haultain would be so unjust as to deprive the minority of their rights, simply because "the English speaking people were now, and always would be, in the ascendancy in the Northwest." That would be, indeed, a most peculiar code of public morality. There are a large number of English speaking people in the Northwest who are in favor of separate schools. Mr. Haultain might as well say that the language plainly implies—viz: that the Protestant "people are now, and always would be, in the ascendancy in

the Northwest, and, therefore, will the separate school system be abolished) in the Territories." That would be the honest way to putting it. As we said before, separate schools are now engrafted on the Territories and it would be an evident and manifest dishonesty to abolish them, just because the people who want them are not, for the time being, in the ascendancy. We would like to remind Mr. Haultain that one of the reasons which actuated his revered father in helping to engraft a similar separate school system on Quebec, was not because "the English speaking people were then, or ever would be, in the ascendancy" in Quebec. His father demanded a separate school system in Quebec, just for the very opposite reason, viz: that the English speaking people were not then, and never could expect to be, in the ascendancy in Quebec. Let Mr. Haultain bear this in his mind when he talks of the minority in the Northwest. Why cannot the same code of morality be extended to all alike? Must the Protestants of this Dominion have two codes of justice—one for Catholic minorities, in one place, and another for Protestant minorities, in another place? It would certainly seem so, if we accept the utterances of their leaders and the conduct of many of their followers, as evidence of their feelings.

Whither does this lead us? Although Protestants are now, and always may be, in the ascendancy in the Northwest, yet we would remind them that they are not in the ascendancy in all places in the Dominion, and, furthermore, that the Catholics of this Dominion are a very large and respectable minority. They constitute over one-third of the population and have a right to be considered in the making of our laws. Their rights are just as dear to them and their religious principles and convictions just as deserving of respect and consideration as those of any other class. It should not be a matter of ascendancy but a question of justice. Catholics have no wish, and have shown no desire, to curtail any of the rights of conscience of Protestants when and where Catholics are in the majority. All they ask is that the same measure of justice which they measure out to others should be measured out unto them. Surely, this is not asking too much? It is simply asking fair play and justice. Mr. Haultain is an Englishman, proud of his nationality and very prone to speak of "British fair play" and justice. Is it British fair play to crush a minority's rights of conscience because the other side is now, and always may be, in the ascendancy? Snel not.

"WHY CONDEMN FREEMASONRY?"

We are in receipt of a letter from a party signing himself "Freemason" but not sending us his name. His letter will receive a place in our columns as soon as he sends us his name. In his letter he says: "Why does the church condemn freemasonry?" * * * "It is a benevolent, unsectarian and harmless society which counts among its members the best and highest in the land." The writer of this letter evidently knows very little about the history of Freemasonry, or he would never have asked such blandlike questions. Not knowing that history, it is a different thing for our correspondent to understand why the church, through the Supreme Pontiff, should so scathingly and uncompromisingly condemn the freemasonry sect. Did he know that history, he would know that the quarrel between the church and the freemasons was one that the latter forced upon the church by its own terrible misdeeds. Our esteemed contemporary, the Liverpool Catholic Times, replying to the comments of a portion of the secular press in England on the recent letter of the Pope to the Catholics of Italy on freemasonry, so aptly and ably answers our correspondent that we quote a portion of it. Our contemporary says: Cannot John Bull give the Pope credit for knowing his own business? And is John himself well read in the history of these innocent Freemasons? We fancy not. Could he say where they sprang up, what was their original design, how they have grown to their present dimensions, and in what manner they exercise their undoubted influence in the Press and Parliaments of Europe? About all this our humane friend knows little, and cares less. He believes in a fashion the Golden Legend of the Lodges. But if you talk to him of "Naturalism" as a religion propagated in them, he will stare at you. What is "Naturalism?" he asks. Well, John, it is Secularism plus philanthropy; that is its definition. Yes; and "Secularism" what is that? he inquires, as though it were a new thing, not yet imported into Britain. One cannot help feeling sometimes that the French are in the right of it when they say that every Englishman adds hypocrisy to his other vices. For Secularism on this side of the Channel is rampant, victorious in the Board schools, flourishing among artisans, intent under many names upon seizing the Government of to-morrow and shaping men's lives according to its detestable standard. Secularism believes neither in God nor Devil, Heaven nor Hell; it laughs at immortality and the judgment to come,

its aim is enjoyment on this side of the grave; and when it calls itself humanitarian the true meaning is that to all intents and purposes it would abolish God and His Revelation. We are weighing our words, and such is the account we must give of Secularism. But in England, the Secularists, though powerful as we have shown, are not fully organized; and their readiest instruments, the Dissenting bodies, do not suspect the work they are doing. In Italy, Secularism has been fully equipped and conscious of this long while. It is the State within the State, and the anti-Christian, anti-Theistic, but most unmistakable of churches which we know as Freemasonry. We do not propose to call Catholics into the witness box on this subject. But Englishmen will find the clue which they invariably miss to the Pope's denunciations in half a dozen pages of Lessing, written more than a hundred years ago by one who penetrated into the secret of the lodges and was charmed with his discovery. Since then, the chronicles of all Europe may furnish a comment on his words. Freemasonry was invented, we believe, in the seventeenth century, but reached its acme in the eighteenth, when the widest revolt of modern times against Revelation and Catholicism was taking place. It began as a vague philanthropic Deism, and it has developed on the Continent into a fighting Atheism; and is now in France, Italy, and the countries under French influence, what the Holy Father calls it, an "abject Realism." If we desire to know its essence more profoundly, we must connect it with the great Jewish propaganda, extending over finance, politics, art and journalism, which has emerged for a moment into the light, thanks to the earthquake of Panama, but which prefers to work in darkness. We must not be understood as in any degree, however slight, recommending or defending the crusade against Semites as a people, which we view with shame and horror. But that Freemasonry has been, and still is, in close connection with Jewish rationalism cannot be doubted. It is, therefore, essentially a war against Christian dogma and Catholic institutions—of all which, we repeat, Englishmen, whether inside the lodges or gaping round their entrance, have not the remotest idea. They take no interest in Continental politics as a whole, and the literature which reflects these movements of thought, these currents of activity, is a dead letter to them. That Jews control the money market they know. That there is a Jewish influence at work in every European country, and that it may be Conservative, Socialist, or Anarchic, but is always anti-Christian, they cannot realize. And how it should have created or sustained Freemasonry is beyond them to conjecture. Yet the proofs are patent in the history of Revolution during the last seventy years.

However, they could applaud the Pope when denouncing Lassalle, Karl Marx, and Bakunin; for Englishmen detest Socialism and anarchy. What they admire is philanthropic liberalism; and is Freemasonry, they ask again, anything else than this? Yes, Leo XIII. declares it is the enemy of the church; it has captured the Government of Italy, and is the moving spirit which animates its legislation. "These are facts. And what do they imply? Secularized public schools from which religion is banished; "civil" that is to say, atheistic marriages and funerals; toleration of public vice; immense peculation in all ranks of officials; exclusion of Catholics from posts of influence and dignity; a severe putting-down of all religious manifestations as contrary to the peace of society; and vexatious and tyrannical laws, such as dictate the exorbitant taxes on ecclesiastical property, the conscription of clerics, the withholding of church revenues, and the shameful attacks on the freedom of the pulpit which are now a part of the Italian code. Years ago, religious orders were forcibly suppressed, and the Pope draws a just contrast between the "vows of obedience" at which Freemasons scoff, and their own blind and secret oaths, so long the instrument of terrorism and sometimes of crime, yet binding on the individual members of every cabinet that has governed Italy, and of multitudes both of electors and representatives. Again we say, a State within a State, and a militant church.

Well may we exclaim, then, is there not a cause? When the public and private institutions of a country have fallen into such hands; when Parliament, press, and army; when charitable societies, schools, universities, and the national finances have been taken over and exploited (for that is the only word to describe it) by a minority whose aim is now declared to be the uprooting of the Catholic name, the destruction of the Papacy, and the worship of atheistic progress, can even stolid Britons suppose that the Father of Christendom will keep silence? They may point to the benevolent works of Freemasonry at home; but have they ever reckoned up its works abroad, or inquired into their nature? Not they; Italy is still to them the happy hunting-ground of political constitution-mongering and missionary efforts. To Leo XIII. and the Catholic nullions it cannot appear in the same light. All they ask—putting aside the Roman question, which we need not

touch upon just now—is a like degree of freedom with that which we enjoy in the British Empire, and which has enabled our brethren in the United States to flourish so amazingly. On the principles of Liberal toleration, Italians have every right to such. If the Christian religion be God's truth, they have ten thousand times more right to it. Who is it that hinders this consummation? Who is their constant and their deadliest foe? Are they so infatuated, so utterly lost to reason, that they mistake for him a harmless philanthropist? By no manner of means. Their foe has made no secret of his designs. He says "Freedom is for Freemasons, not for Catholics." And in every department of State he acts accordingly. As a destructive agent, Secularism is without a parallel. When it has made of the school, the club, the newspaper, the voting-urn, of marriage, and even of funerals, mere "civil" institutions, evaporating from them the last aroma of religious influence, it will have fulfilled the mission it has deliberately set itself, and "conducted God across the frontier." If Leo XIII. did not cry aloud against so monstrous, yet so well-organized a system of iniquity, he would surely be the blindest of guides, instead of what he is—a beacon-light to this chaotic and storm-driven century.

"From religious to social ruin," the Holy Father warns us, "is a rapid transit." "The licence of error and vice," the luxury of classes, "enjoying at their ease all the delights and pleasures of life," the lapse of numbers into their paganism; the awful corruption of literature, science and art, while "the people are oppressed and impoverished"; "precocious crime," "public scandal," the increase of suicides—these are disquieting signs for the future. And more ominous than all, perhaps, is that "empire of modern States," with its centralized machinery, which in the hand of a clique or a faction, of purchased Deputies, and daring financiers, and Masonic Premiers such as we have beheld in Signor Crispi, has become a ubiquitous despotism as unjust as it is irresistible. Surely, the Pope is the champion of freedom in a Free State; Leo XIII., and not the Freemasons who have endeavored to make the church into a mere telephone of the Minister of Public Worship, as a prelude to silencing it for ever. Yes, if Catholics desire freedom, they must organize. Though they be persecuted, still they must organize. Isolated, and as individuals, they will be devoured one by one, in a sort of stupid amazement and criminal apathy, by the Moloch whose ministers are the Jews, infidels, and atheists that control Freemasonry. The Holy Father has spoken—will Italian Catholics act?

Given to Levity.

"Gosh" exclaim Josiah Punkerton, as he gazed at the leopard in the menagerie, "jes" look at them freckles! "I suppose," said Dolson, seriously, "that if Job was alive now he wouldn't be afraid of cholera." "Why not?" innocently inquired Duffer. "Because he would know that he had been thoroughly boiled." Miss Smiles—But didn't you promise me when I refused you last spring that you would never mention this subject again? Bullfinch—Yes, I know, but I never dreamed that your father would have such luck with his sugar stock. "I paid the man for finishing the cistern this morning Josias," said Mrs. Chugwater, "and it took the last cent there was in the house." "Never mind that, Samantha," replied Mr. Chugwater, soothingly, "we've got something for a rainy day at last!" "Women," soliloquized young Mealey, as he waited in the parlor for the young woman he intended to take to the opera, "women are very curious creatures. Here's that girl of mine. She can change her mind thirteen times in a minute, but it takes her two hours to change her dress."

A Game Little Indians Plays.

Can you fancy Indian children, out on the wild western plains, playing at anything as mild as "Button button; who got the button?" or "London Bridge? Yes these games are two amusements of which they are very fond. They make much more of these games than we do, and usually play them out-of-doors with often a big circle of braves and chieftains for spectators. Another game, which is the greatest favorite of all, is "Wood-Ball." One of the young warriors winds a bit of raw wool or loose cotton into a loose ball. All then seat themselves in a circle and the leader takes his place in the center. The ball is tossed toward the leader and the game is begun. As soon as the ball gets near enough to him, the leader, without touching the ball, blows it to some one in the ring. It is immediately blown back to him, and so the play goes on. When the leader succeeds in blowing hard enough to send the ball outside the circle, he is relieved from his post in the center and in his place is put the one who has allowed the ball to go outside.

—N. Y. Ledger.

"They who consecrate themselves to the service of God must not be disappointed if their service is not always appreciated by men. He labors for a sweeter reward than the praise of men, will not be turned from his purpose by a failure on the part of those who ought to give encouragement. God's 'Well done' will be worth more than earthly recognition."