

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 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 5.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Improve The Bill. While we accept the principle of the Remedial Bill as fairly satisfactory, we are strongly in favor of its being amended so that it will not be inoperative. Clause 74 ought to provide some practical way of securing to Catholics their legitimate share of the government grant, for instance by the sale of school lands. As the clause stands, it is merely an assertion of our right to share in supplies voted by the Manitoba legislature; but what do the majority of our legislators care for rights? They delight in violating them.

Blustering Mulvey. The Nor'Wester devoted a trenchant article to the shameless bigotry of Mr. Mulvey, whose speech last week was a disgrace to any civilized assembly. Talk of ignorance! Many a Kaffir or Hottentot, unable to read or write, would be ashamed to associate with a man who thus exhibits his low vulgarity and ignorant prejudice. Yet, after all, there is nothing very astounding in the spectacle of an ill-bred ignoramus criticising the breeding and education of his betters. The man with a beam in his own eye blaming the mote in that of his neighbor is just as common as the hypocrite that strains out a gnat and swallows a camel. On no fault is the average censor so severe as on his own pet sin which he thus strives to hide.

A Valuable Tract. About two years ago, the Tribune published a series of religious articles by clergymen of various denominations. Rev. Father Drummond's answer to the question, "Why am I a Catholic?" was one of this series and attracted no little attention. A well-known traveller of freethinking propensities is reported to have gone round exclaiming, "How the devil did this rare tit-bit get into the Trib.?" It was reproduced in most of the leading Catholic journals across the border. The Cincinnati Telegraph said it proved that no reasonable man could stop short of Catholicism. A Protestant contributor to a Portage-la-Prairie paper gave the article unstinted praise. And to-day the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg issues it in pamphlet form with the imprint of the NORTHWEST REVIEW. This ten-page tract can be had for a nickel, 25 copies for a dollar and a hundred for three dollars. Send in your orders early. The title now is, "A Catholic Point of View," and a short preface has been prefixed to the original article.

The Self-Centred Jelly-Fish. The Manitoba College Journal for February has a very funny report of a Mr. G. H. Menzies' speech at a missionary meeting of the college literary society. It appears that this well-informed person spoke of all the souls that were to be saved by Presbyterian, or at least Protestant, zeal. In South America, which he calls "the neglected continent," he

places Mexico and underrates the population of this North American country by two millions. Could not the editor-in-chief descend for a moment from his Kantian pinnacle and teach this fellow a little elementary geography? Mr. Menzies further states that in South America there are only 29,000 Christians out of a population equal to that of Great Britain. This exclusion of the only true Christians, the forty million Catholics of the Southern continent, reminds us of the jelly-fish who swam alone in a tropical sea and said:

"The universe simply centres in me, And if I were not then nothing would be."
Mr. Menzies, of course, was careful not to tell his hearers that the perversion of those 29,000 "Christians" cost on an average one thousand dollars each, thanks to the liberal way in which all agents of Protestant missionary societies recoup themselves, and that most of the 29,000 are a disreputable lot. At that rate, in order to turn South America into a Protestant pandemonium, some forty billions of dollars will be required. Meanwhile the insignificant remainder (29,000—40,000,000) know just what they have to do to be saved and a vast number of them manage it.

MR. MARTIN AT TORONTO.

The Free Press of this city reports Mr. Joseph Martin as denying, at the Toronto meeting, "that he had, through the introducer of the school bill in the Manitoba legislature, denounced it as tyranny." Assuming this report as correctly representing what Mr. Joseph Martin said, it is somewhat difficult to understand how Mr. Martin could make such a denial in the face of his letter, published in the Ottawa Citizen of June 25th 1896. In that letter we find the following paragraphs:

"When I introduced the school bill of 1890, I pointed out that in so far as it provided for religious exercises in the schools, it was in my opinion defective. I am one of those who deny the right of the state to interfere in any respect in matters of religion. I then said and still think that the clause of the 1890 act which provides for certain religious exercises is most unjust to the Roman Catholics. If the state is to recognize religion in its school legislation, such a recognition as is acceptable to Protestants only, and in fact only to a majority of Protestants, is to my mind rank tyranny."

"The desire of those with whom I think in this matter is to eliminate every question of a religious nature from the school laws and to make the schools purely secular. This has not been done in Manitoba, and that course is apparently not supported by a majority of the people there. That being so, surely it will be admitted that the nature of religious exercises or religious teaching (I am unable to make any clear distinction between the two) should be such as is agreeable to the consciences of those whose money is taken to support the schools."

Surely in the face of these two paragraphs from Mr. Martin's letter, it requires a great lapse of memory or a great amount of assurance for Mr. Martin to tell a Toronto audience that he had never denounced that portion of his act as "rank tyranny." It is well known throughout Manitoba that Mr. Martin was never pleased with that portion of his bill, for Mr. Martin publicly said so. When he first announced his intention to introduce such legislation, he made a public appeal to the Protestant clergy of Manitoba to assist him in passing a purely secular school system, "because," said he, "anything short of this would be a gross injustice to the Roman Catholics." Some time after the act came into operation, in addressing the members of the Young Liberal's Club, Mr. Martin again forcibly expressed his dissatisfaction with the Act of 1890, in that it was unfair to Roman Catholics to be taxed for schools in which the religion of the majority was taught. Mr. Martin never made any secret of his opinion of that provision of his Act, which related to the religious exercises prescribed by the Advisory Board. How, then, could he deny, with any degree of consistency or any regard for truth, that he had never denounced the religious features of his school bill "as rank tyranny" towards

Roman Catholics? We are quite sure that Mr. Martin knew he was addressing an audience whose chief characteristics were ignorance and intolerance, and who would be quite ready to forgive him for anything he might do to those benighted Papists; but we did not think he would go the length of denying a statement made in a letter to the public press over his own signature.

THAT TORONTO MASS MEETING.

Toronto has always been the happy hunting ground of the religious or political demagogue, because it has ever been the home of the most ignorant and intolerant element in Canada. It is not, therefore, surprising that Toronto was selected by the political firebrands in the House of Commons and their friends, for a general blow out against the idea of "coercing Manitoba." They could not hold their meeting in Ottawa, the Capital of the Dominion, because Ottawa, thank God, is too intelligent, too cultured and, therefore, too tolerant to listen to the blatant utterances of such men as McCarthy, Martin & Co. To secure an audience that would listen to and applaud them, they had to go to Toronto.

When we consider the object of that meeting, which was to censure the Dominion Government and the Parliament of Canada for carrying out the provisions of the Constitution as interpreted by the highest Imperial Court, after having previously exhausted every possible means consistent with dignity and honor to get the local government to act on that judgment, it is laughable to read in the opening remarks of the Free Press, that the singing of the national song, "The Maple Leaf Forever," caused "a wonderful outburst of enthusiastic loyalty, which was continued when 'God Save the Queen' was sung." Here is a body of men, representatives of the people, calling a meeting for the avowed purpose of inciting rebellion against the constitutional authority charged with the execution of the judgment of the highest Court in the Empire, commencing their treasonable appeals by "a wonderful outburst of enthusiastic loyalty!" Truly has it been said that loyalty is the last refuge of rogues.

After these loyal (?) gentlemen had got over the effects of the wonderful outburst aforesaid, they easily and gracefully proceeded to pass some very disloyal resolutions. These resolutions are so ingeniously prepared to throw sand in the eyes of the electors, and, withal, so thoroughly dishonest, that we take the liberty of inflicting them upon our readers. Here they are:

1. The jurisdiction of the Dominion parliament in educational matters is exceptional, and while we may not be united as to whether such jurisdiction ought to exist, we are absolutely unanimous that it ought not to be resorted to except in cases of gross and clearly-proven abuse of power of the majority in any province, and after all other efforts to remedy a grievance have been exhausted.
 2. That in the case of the province of Manitoba, no such abuse has been proven, but, on the contrary, the provincial authorities have alleged that their system is framed with a due regard to justice, as well as to efficiency, and have courted investigation and have declared that in amending the system from time to time they will endeavor to remedy any well-founded grievance that may be found to exist.
 3. That the proposed federal measure will be difficult, if not impossible, to enforce, will embarrass the provincial authorities in an endeavor to maintain an efficient system of education, and will, in all probability, be productive of strife, confusion and costly litigation.
 4. That a conflict between the federal and provincial powers will arouse deep-seated discontent in Manitoba, and will tend to destroy the harmony essential to the successful working of confederation, and that such conflict ought by all honorable means to be avoided.
 5. That, inasmuch as the difficulties involved in the attempted federal interference will fall upon the people of Canada, the people ought to have an opportunity of pronouncing on the policy before they are committed to it by the enactment of a federal law.
 6. And, therefore, this meeting, in no spirit of hostility to Catholics, but with a sincere desire to see justice done all classes and creeds of the community, protests against the passage of the so-called remedial bill, as subversive of provincial autonomy, injurious to those for whose benefit it is ostensibly framed, and likely to provoke strife, keep alive sectarian bitterness, and impede the progress of the Dominion.
- Let our readers note well the scope of the above resolutions. In the first resolution, we are told (1) that the jurisdiction of the Dominion Parliament is undoubted; (2) that a grievance exists;

(3) that this jurisdiction should not be exercised except in cases of gross and clearly-proven abuse of power by the majority; and (4) until all other efforts to remedy the grievance are exhausted. Have not the Dominion Government exhausted every means to get the local Government to remedy the grievance? Have they not been most careful not to exercise their constitutional jurisdiction until the highest court decided that they had the jurisdiction to do so? And has not the Imperial Privy Council decided that the local government has been guilty of "a gross and clearly-proven abuse of power," and has it not demanded that the parliament of Canada should redress that wrong, in the event of the local government declining to do so? So much for the dishonesty of the men who passed this resolution. The second resolution starts out with a lie by saying "that no abuse has been proven," and in order to maintain this lie, it lies on to the end. The judgment of the Privy Council is the best and most impartial proof that it is possible to give, "that in the case of the Province of Manitoba such abuse has been proven." The author of that very act has publicly stated over his own signature that the provisions of that act were "rank tyranny" on the Catholic minority and yet the report tells us that he had the unspeakable meanness to appear on the platform at this Toronto meeting and second the adoption of this very resolution.

The third, fourth and fifth resolutions contain such utter "rot"; such meaningless platitudes and such evident dishonesty that they are unworthy of any extended comment; we, therefore, pass on to the sixth and last.

"And, therefore, this meeting" (consisting of such leaders as Dalton McCarthy, Jos. Martin, William Mulock, N. C. Wallace, Col. Tyrwhitt, A. McNeil, J. S. Willison, editor of the Globe, "and many leading city ministers") "in no spirit of hostility to Catholics, but with a sincere desire to see justice done all classes and creeds (except Catholics) of the community, protests against the passage of the remedial bill (and the judgment of the Privy Council) as subversive of provincial autonomy (i. e., the right of the province to override the Constitution) injurious to these (poor Catholics) for whose benefit it is ostensibly framed, and likely to provoke strife, keep alive sectarian bitterness (which was first aroused by the wicked and unconstitutional action of the local government) and impede the progress of the Dominion." Could dishonesty and mean political tactics, allied with treason to the best interests of the peace and harmony of this Dominion, may even its very existence, go further than this? And when the question is finally settled, as settled it assuredly will be, in the lines of justice and right, the conduct of these men will be a reproach and a disgrace to a section of our Canadian public men.

NEW ZEALAND SCHOOL SYSTEM.

To the Editor of the Free Press.
SIR,—You had the kindness to publish in your issue of the 13th January, a letter in which I pointed out the startling discrepancies between a report of a conversation with the Most Reverend T. W. Croke, Archbishop of Cashel, as it appeared in the English Review of Reviews (Sept. 1895), and the version thereof given by your correspondent, "Catholic." In the latter, the archbishop was made to say that the New Zealand system was "the best in the world," instead of "fairly satisfactory," (as Mr. Stead wrote), and that it "worked admirably," instead of "it seemed to work admirably." Moreover, His Grace was represented as adding: "And why should it not? It is a mistake to be always thrusting dogmatic teaching into every kind of instruction. Religion can be all the better taught if it is not made too stale by a monotonous repetition." Not a word of this addition, you will remember, appeared in the English Review of Reviews. Finally, there was in "Catholic's" version a comment which, under the mistaken, but very natural notion, that the American edition could not be different from the English, I then attributed to your correspondent. It reads: "A notable (your correspondent's letter

has here "noble," but this may only be an oversight), sentiment, indeed, from a Catholic archbishop, and one which, were he other than what he is, would bring down on him the anathemas of no small section of his own church." After writing to you, I found, as you said in your note, that this comment, and all the other discrepancies appear in American Review of Reviews. Accordingly, I wrote for an explanation to Archbishop Croke and Mr. W. T. Stead. Here are their replies:

THURLES, Feb. 6, 1896.

MY DEAR FR. DRUMMOND:
I have duly received your kind note and also the copy of the NORTHWEST REVIEW of Jan. 15 (reproducing the letter to the Free Press) which you were good enough to send me.

I had no idea that there was a second and "enlarged" edition of the Review of Reviews published in the United States. So far as I am concerned, I entirely repudiate it.

My views about educational matters in New Zealand have been misrepresented, or, at all events, misunderstood. In a conversation with Mr. Stead which was quite an informal one and in no sense what is known as an "interview," I referred to the diocese of Auckland alone, and not to New Zealand at large; and after having given it as my opinion that the educational system there (Auckland) was "fairly satisfactory," I added that it "seemed" (not seems) to work admirably. I only spoke of Auckland as it was twenty years ago, and did not mean to offer any opinion as to the actual state of things as regards state schools or systems.

For the rest, it is needless to say that I ever have been, and still am, a staunch and uncompromising supporter of the denominational system, at home and abroad, and that I hold it to be a shameful tyranny and injustice to tax Catholics, or any other religious body, for the maintenance of schools which they cannot conscientiously avail themselves of, and deny them, at the same time, all participation in the public funds, to which, as citizens, they have contributed their proportionate share.

If you think these few lines are worth publishing you may give them to the press.

Meanwhile I remain, my dear Father Drummond,

Yours very faithfully,
† T. W. CROKE,
Archbishop of Cashel.

Rev. L. Drummond, S. J.

Mr. W. T. Stead replied from Mowbray House, Norfolk street, Strand, London, W. C., under date of February 5, 1896. After stating that my letter and the Free Press, which I sent him, were the first intimation he had received of any discrepancy between the American and English editions of the conversation with Archbishop Croke, Mr. Stead writes that I may publish the following statement as coming from him: "The authentic version is the version which appeared in the English Review of Reviews. That which appeared in the American edition was printed from an earlier, unrevised proof, which was sent to our New York office provisionally, pending correction."

I leave these facts, sir, to your earnest consideration.

LEWIS DRUMMOND, S. J.
Winnipeg, Feb. 23.

Gen. T. J. Morgan.

It is more than likely that the Rev. Hon. General T. J. Morgan regrets by this time that he ever went to California to lecture for the A. P. A., or that going he found Father Yorke there, or that siding Father Yorke there, he got into a discussion with him. The result of the discussion has been that the Hon. General's very unsavory record in the army has been ventilated and spread before the public. From the military records preserved in Washington it appears that the Rev. Hon. General was court-martialed, first, for violation of the fifteenth article of war; second, for conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman; third, for conduct prejudicial to good order and military discipline. The specifications contain such items as connivance at false musters, opening another officer's letter, allowing a friend guilty of stealing a mule to go unpunished, etc. The court found him guilty, but, owing to a technical error—assigning a less punishment than that designated by military law—he escaped being cashiered.

Whatever feathers he brought with him to San Francisco have been plucked by Father Yorke. It is highly appropriate that a man with such a record should become an apostle of A. P. Aism. He can now take his place in the class of reverend delinquents, such as Ruthven, Slatery and the rest of them.—N. Y. Freeman's Journal.