

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT

Room 11, Grain Exchange Building,

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.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The Northwest Review \$2 a year, \$1 for six months.

Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest.

Agents of Review. The following gentlemen have been appointed agents of the NORTHWEST REVIEW.

Mr. A. A. McKinnon, Fort William, Ont. and Mr. C. Dahm, Hat Portage, Ont.

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 NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post Office Box 68, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

ST. BONIFACE, Dec. 12th, 1892.

Messrs. E. J. Dermody, & Co.

GENTLEMEN—I see by the last issue of the Northwest 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 columns."

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

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversy.

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 15.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

"Don't antagonize the Government," is now the way of saying, "what fools we have been."

We have always maintained that it is the duty of majorities to treat minorities justly and fairly, but we would not like to accept Mr. Arthur Balfour's definition of the rights of minorities as just or fair.

"When Protestant Ulster, with an absolutely unanimous voice, declares against the measure with aversion and abhorrence, then majorities ought not to count."

Poor Dr. Bryce! That professorship seems to be as far off as ever. When with the government learn that the Rev. doctor's opinions on University matters are as unpopular among the educationists of Manitoba as is the doctor himself.

Stewart Mulvey is an extraordinary man, no doubt, but when he undertakes to become the critic of such men as Mr. Edward Blake, most men will agree with us that he has overstepped the line which is said to separate the sublime from the ridiculous.

The Rev. Dr. King was very indignant at the Government because it could treat a man like the bishop of Rupert's Land with discourtesy, on account of all he had done for education in this province. We think the doctor was right, but why was he not indignant at the Government because of its treatment of His Grace, the Archbishop of St. Boniface? His Grace was laboring here for the interest of education long before the advent of the Bishop of Rupert's Land in this country; he did more for the Province of Manitoba and the government of the country than his Lordship of Rupert's Land had a chance to do, yet the rev. doctor ever had no word of protest, no indignant feeling, when the Government of this province violated all its solemn promises and, in one moment, swept out of existence the educational rights of Catholics. Nay more, the history of this basely infamous deed records that the rev. doctor, while protesting against any interference with his religious ideas in education, never said a word, except in commendation, of the action of the Government for interfering with the religious convictions of His Grace, on the question of education.

The following "Rhyming symbol" is from the Free Press, and it so cleverly strikes off the part played by the Rev. Dr. Bryce, in the recent university excitement, that we cannot forbear giving it to our readers, together with the introductory note accompanying it.

A Rhyming Symbol. This bit of rhyme, by its structure, which adds one extra syllable to each new line until the climax in the two central lines, and then dwindles off at the same rate till it suddenly flattens out into a big six-foot line splurge picture the swelling of Dr. Bryce's hopes, the puncturing of said swelling by the University Council and the subsequent spluttering of the tumor. Observe that the softening of the rhymes towards the middle of the piece symbolizes the "proud flesh" that is often the result of diseased tumefaction.

FATHER CHERRIER'S NEW CHURCH.

On the first page of this issue we give our readers a pen picture of Rev. Father Cherrier's new church, taken from the columns of our able contemporary, the Free Press. A careful perusal will convince every one that the new church of the Immaculate Conception must prove a great ornament to the city of Winnipeg and a lasting monument to the devotion and energy of its popular pastor and to the self-sacrifice and piety of the congregation of the Immaculate Conception.

"DON'T ANTAGONIZE THE GOVERNMENT."

At a recent meeting of the University council, the Rev. Dr. King exhibited a most tender regard lest the University in passing any resolution on the propositions of the government, should say anything that might antagonize the government. No doubt such a course was dictated by prudence and wisdom but it was such a change from the Rev. doctor's language of the previous day when he characterized the conduct of the government as "simply an outrage."

out, they virtually asked the government for new legislation. The government in granting this request, went a step further and said, "Gentlemen, you ask us to undertake certain work involving certain expenditure, now, we are willing to do this but certain conditions must be complied with. We will begin by making your university a mere political machine! Don't complain gentlemen! Politics is our profession and it takes money to run "the machine" successfully. We, therefore, want the administration of your University lands. We will give you a guarantee that all the proceeds of those lands shall be expended on university work, that is, we shall expend it for you. You may be learned men and experienced in educational needs, but you are not men of sufficient business capacity to administer your lands. We must do that for you. We will sell those lands and we will use the proceeds to reward such men as our very dutiful and conveniently obedient political servants -- by appointing them to lucrative professorships. These terms are, no doubt, galling to you, but it is, nevertheless, our ultimatum and is only the logical outcome of your invitation for us to help you. Do not squirm too much or it may be all the worse for you. Remember, if you antagonize us we will get even with you. You made this innovation to have a slup at the Catholic College of St. Boniface. You did the same thing in 1890, when you were dishonest enough to demand that the schools of this province should be made Protestant instead of secular, as we intended. We grant you that boon as we may now grant you this, for a time. The length of that time will depend on your good conduct, but be careful and "don't antagonize the government" or that time will be shortened. No doubt your object was most patriotic and christian in crushing those "Romanists!" However that may be, it suited our political exigence and we granted it, and we will continue it just as long as it pays and no longer." Is it any wonder that the Rev. Dr. King ("don't want to antagonize the government?" Is it any wonder that such wise, logical, just and christian principles, advocated by such prudent and far-seeing men as the Bishop of Rupert's Land and Dr. King should be now bearing such tasteful and abundant fruit? And the end is not yet. Were it not that our sense of justice is outraged by the dishonest designs of the government, we would be pleased to see it give those just and christian? gentlemen a taste of the medicine which they had no scruple of conscience nor feeling of justice to hold to our lips and make us drink to the bottom. A day of retribution is surely coming.

ST. JOSEPH.

St. Joseph! How the mere uttering of that holy name warms the heart of the devout adorer of the Divine Child Jesus! St. Joseph! How the unexpressed thought of that beautiful name passing through the mind, though unuttered by the lips, becomes either a Te Deum of praise, or a supplication for aid! Nor is it wonderful that the name of Joseph should awake such echoes in the Catholic heart; rather, it would be wonderful if it were otherwise. Shakespeare says "what is there in a name?" If it be true that William Shakespeare was a baptized Catholic, there is reason to fear that his Catholic sentiments had to be suppressed. As he says, "a rose by any other name would smell as sweet." There may be much truth in this, even if we mount to the high standard of the queen of flowers: but the bard of Avon must have forgotten his early Catholic teaching, if he knew not that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, and every tongue confess, that there is no other name given unto men whereby we must be saved: his Catholic instincts must have lain dormant if he ignored the sweet and beautiful name of Mary, the Mother of Jesus, and the holy name of Joseph, her own chaste Spouse, and the foster father of her Child. The month of March, as we all know, is consecrated to St. Joseph, because on the 18th day of that month the feast of this holiest of men takes place.

And now let us see why it is that we have such reverence for the name of Joseph, and by what titles that blessed name claims so large a share of our love, our veneration, and our confidence. We will make this investigation rather in the order of time, than in the proportion of dignity. In the first place, Joseph was of the royal race of David, the lineal descendant of that great king. But noble as he was by birth and lineage, he was still more noble in holiness and virtue. Thus the Holy Ghost could find no words of praise more applicable than these:—"now Joseph, the husband of Mary was a just man." By this eulogy we are given to understand, that he was supereminent in all virtues and graces: that he not only possessed them all, but that all were equally-balanced, just, perfect. Surely, were there no other reason than this of the most exalted sanctity, we must love and reverence the name of Joseph.—In the second place, Joseph was the husband of Mary, the chaste spouse of the Immaculate Virgin Mother of the Saviour of the world. If the glory of the husband is shared by the wife, so equally, if not even more abundantly, is the glory of the wife reflected on the husband. Mary,

the spouse of Joseph, was the most glorious, because the purest, the holiest, and the most exalted amongst women. Joseph her all-worthy husband, must be therefore, the purest, the holiest, and the most exalted amongst men.—In the third place, this noblest amongst men, who, alone of the children of men, was found worthy by Almighty God, to be the husband of Mary, was thus selected for a still higher, and an equally unique dignity, namely, to be the foster-father of the Divine Child Jesus. If Jesus could look into the eyes of Mary, lighted up as with a ray from heaven's own glory, and say to her, "My Mother;" so when that mother handed Him to Joseph, her spouse, that beautiful Child would repeat the gaze, and say to him, "My Father." Nor need we stay to answer the vain objections of those who carp at our applying the title of Father to St. Joseph. We know better than they do, that St. Joseph was not the real father of Him who had no man for His father: but was conceived by the Holy Ghost in the chaste womb of the Blessed Virgin, therefore He was the Son of God, and the Son of Mary. Nor need we be ashamed to imitate what we find in the second chapter of St. Luke: in verse 27th, speaking of the presentation in the temple, it is said, "and when His parents brought in the Child Jesus to do for him according to the custom of the law:" the word "parents" as applied to Joseph and Mary is repeated in verse 43rd, and but five verses farther on, we hear the Blessed Virgin, whose maternity of Jesus none can deny, giving a share of that maternity in a spiritual sense to St. Joseph, when she says, "behold thy father and I have sought thee sorrowing."—Let us not forget one more title by which the name of Joseph claims our undying veneration. He has been appointed by the infallible Vicar of Christ the Patron of the Universal Church. And who is there after the Immaculate Mother of Jesus, could fill this place so worthily as her chaste spouse, St. Joseph? Is he not the patron of little children? he who carried the Divine Child in his arms, lifted Him up, and laid Him down, kissed Him, fed Him, clothed Him, and laboured for Him? and taught Him when He was old enough his own trade, that of a carpenter? Is he not equally the patron of those that have entered into the holy bonds of matrimony? he who was the faithful spouse, the watchful guardian, the unwearied caretaker of the spotless Lily of Israel that was confided to his care? Is he not the protector of all Christian families? he who was at the head of the Holy Family on earth? Is he not the patron and protector of those who have forsaken the world, whether as Priests, or Religious, men or women, who have consecrated themselves to Jesus Christ by irrevocable vows, more especially the vow of perpetual chastity? Is he not the patron of the rich and noble? he who was the descendant of the royal house of David? Is he not also the patron of the poor and of the artisan? he who was the carpenter of Nazareth, the obscure town in Galilee? Independently therefore of the perfection of his graces and of the singular variety and dignity of his privileges, we can unhesitatingly assert that no higher nobler being ever walked on this earth, after Jesus and Mary, than he who was the foster-father of the one; and the husband of the other, Joseph most holy: and thus it is that we love to unite his name to their most sacred names, and to say with confidence Jesus, Mary and Joseph protect us.

MULVEY AND HOME RULE.

The Grand Orange Lodge of Manitoba held a meeting recently in Winnipeg and Stewart Mulvey moved the following resolution.

"That this grand lodge of Manitoba now assembled in the city of Winnipeg heartily sympathize with the Protestant brethren in Ireland on account of the threatened Rome rule affliction about to be imposed upon them by British or rather un-British statesmen. That we strongly protest against subjecting our fellow Protestants to the tyrannical and unscrupulous rule of the Irish priesthood. That as Canadians we cannot help but look with shame and sorrow upon the actions of our once respected countryman Hon. Edward Blake, in allowing his respected name to be associated with those of jail birds and released convicts in soliciting funds from the enemies of Great Britain for the so-called promotion of home rule, but which in reality means the dismemberment of the empire. That a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Hon. Edward Blake, and also to the Right Hon. the Earl of Erne, Imperial grand master, assuring him that should the day of conflict ever come he can reckon men and means from the prairie province of Manitoba."

The Free Press took the following editorial notice of this resolution. We commend it to the careful notice of our readers as one of the cleverest pieces of satire it has been our pleasure to read in a long time. This resolution is so ridiculous in its tone and so impertinent in its language that to treat it seriously would be to become as ridiculous as its authors. The Free Press says:

"Mr. Blake will be deeply grieved to learn that Brother Mulvey is not pleased with him. That resolution, passed at the meeting of the Orange grand lodge last Thursday, was entirely too cruel, and Brother Mulvey, instead of moving, ought to have done his best to moderate it. It speaks of "our once respected countryman, Hon. Edward Blake." The "once" has reference to the time no

doubt when Mr. Mulvey and his brother Orangemen of Manitoba were such strong supporters of Mr. Blake; when they "respected" him so highly and were such good friends to him that they did all they could to uphold his hands in his good work. We do not know when that time was, but they could not be so affectionate in their reminiscences unless they had once loved him as a brother. Looking back to those days, it is with a sigh of regret that we see him now consorting with "jailbirds," cut-throats, murderers and such like, and it is with a great sob fit to break one's heart that they part with him, he to go his way to the gallows and they theirs to the reward of the righteous. But enough tenderness still lurks in their hearts to prompt them to send a copy of the resolution which stigmatizes him as a companion of jail birds. For this we have no doubt Mr. Blake will feel proud and grateful. A gentleman himself, he will appreciate the exquisitely refined delicacy of this attention.

The resolution goes on to protest against subjecting our fellow Protestants (in Ireland) to the tyrannical and unscrupulous rule of the Irish priesthood. They need not go so far afield for objects of their sympathy. It would better be on them as honest and consistent defenders of the British constitution and an open Bible to protest against subjecting their Catholic fellow citizens to the "tyrannical and unscrupulous rule" of the Protestant priesthood of Manitoba. Besides misplacing their sympathy they are wasting it. There is no in Ireland being subjected to the tyrannical and unscrupulous rule of the priesthood of that country. The only tyranny or persecution known in Ireland for many a day was that of the Ulster Protestants. For that statement we have the authority of Prof. Bryce, at the present moment one of Her Majesty's Ministers, and known the world over as a distinguished scholar and historian. In the Home Rule bill which Brother Mulvey's resolution assails, and for supporting which Mr. Blake is accused of consorting with jail birds and convicts, the religious freedom of the minority is specially and amply protected. Not a right or privilege now enjoyed, either in respect to religious or educational affairs, is to be left to the mercy of the majority. Protestants are being surrounded with every possible or desirable safeguard; they are being enfolded in the constitution with such great care that no harm can come to them. This regard for minorities is an example of the broad, Christian spirit which has ever animated the Liberal statesmen of Great Britain. We do things differently in Manitoba. Here the spirit of the constitution is violated in order to deprive the minority of the rights and privileges it was supposed to have assured them. About the time this resolution was being passed Mr. Fisher in another place was relating of his own personal knowledge the deception and treachery practiced by the men who have done this in order to get power and opportunity. A Liberal candidate in the person of a Presbyterian opposed the French Catholic Minister of Dr. Harrison's Government in St. Francois Xavier. He would not consent to become a candidate until authorized by the leaders of his party to assure the French Catholic electors of that constituency that their would be no attempt to interfere with their institutions in case the Liberals succeeded to power. He was so authorized accordingly, and the assurance was given. Mr. Joseph Martin went out into the constituency to repeat and emphasize the assurance. He told the electors that their language and schools were protected by the constitution and could not be taken from them, but that in any event the Liberal party would be the last to lay a hand upon them. Mr. Fisher, who was chairman of the meeting at which Mr. Martin said this, was at the time President of the Manitoba Liberal Association, and to him Mr. Martin appealed to corroborate what he said as to the policy of the party. In perfect good faith, a faith he has honorably observed ever since, Mr. Fisher did this. The French Catholic electors of St. Francois Xavier took the word of these Liberal leaders and elected the Presbyterian Liberal candidate over the French Catholic Minister. This was the doom of the Harrison Government. Within a week it resigned, and Mr. Greenway and Mr. Martin came in. Mr. Fisher also stated that Mr. Greenway was a party to the promise made in behalf of the Liberals, that the language and schools of the minority should not be disturbed. He knew this of his own personal knowledge. Yet despite these solemn pledges, on the strength of which and that alone they succeeded to power, these men soon after coming in passed laws to abolish those institutions; they did the very thing they pledged themselves and their party not to do. They deceived the French Catholic electors of St. Francois Xavier into defeating one of their own race and religion; they played on their innocent trust to lure them on to their own destruction. Words fail to properly characterize such baseness. We are quite sure that Mr. Blake's jail bird and convict companions would scorn to be guilty of it.

the Catholic minority of Manitoba. In one case the impelling influence is that honorable and chivalrous feeling which is ever ready to protect the weak against the strong; in the other it was that unscrupulous greed for power which at first did not hesitate to deceive and then betray the weak to the strong. In the one, care is taken to see that every reasonable protection is afforded them: in the other, solemn pledges are violated and faith dishonored in order that the protection they had should be taken from them. This act of treachery has been applauded by a considerable portion of the Protestant priesthood of Manitoba, who have joined in subjecting that minority to the tyranny of the majority. Mr. Blake and his jail birds would not have lent themselves to such baseness as this; the former at any rate, whom we know, would rather his two arms were palsied and his tongue would cleave to the roof of his mouth than that by word, look or act he should be thought to approve of such conduct, or had part or lot with the men guilty of it. We respectfully submit to Brother Mulvey, whose righteous soul is yearning to set the world right, that he begin here with his protests, and leave Ireland and the Irish, including Mr. Blake and his jail birds, to settle their own affairs."

THE GOVERNMENT AND MANITOBA UNIVERSITY.

The council of the university of Manitoba held its quarterly meeting on the first Thursday in March for the transaction of ordinary business. Shortly after the meeting was opened, the chancellor read a proposed bill which, from its nature, threatened the very existence of the university. It was quite evident from the nature of this legislation that the government contemplated, in the words of Dean Gridale, to make the University, "a mere political machine." It was quite evident to all present that the proposed change was distasteful to nearly all the members of University council. The Rev. Principal King was not slow in making his displeasure known to the council and was highly indignant at the government's discourtesy to the chancellor, characterizing it as "simply outrageous." He dwelt in feeling language on all that the chancellor had done for the advancement of education in this province, and to find the government undertaking to change anything without first consulting with and receiving the approval of the chancellor was "simply outrageous." There is no doubt that the Rev. Doctor King was justified in making the remark he did in regard to the action of the government, but what else could he expect? He and the chancellor sowed the wind and they are now reaping the whirlwind. They, among many others, were not content with the university as it was at first constituted. They petitioned the government of Manitoba for new legislation the object of which was to establish a teaching University, something which was never contemplated when the University of Manitoba was first established. Now, when the government brings in legislation to carry out their wishes and go them one better, they are angry and they begin to see, now that it is too late, that the government is going to dictate terms which are inimical to and even threaten the very existence of the University. That some unworthy motive has been actuating the government was strongly suspected by many of the members and this suspicion became a reality when a member of the government,—in fact, the very one who drafted the bill complained of,—told some of the members of the committee that the government "were after the university lands." Had the university not owned some \$150,000 acres of land, which promises to be a source of future wealth to it, the Greenway Government would not be so anxious to harass the university with laws the object of which is to get their booting hands upon those lands. These lands were granted to the University by the Dominion government, in order to assist the university, as at first constituted, for giving higher education in the province. Those lands are a rich inheritance and, therefore, an object for a dishonest government to covet. What guarantees have the members of the university of Manitoba got that the government will keep faith with them and administer those lands properly? The very moment the university parts with its lands, it places itself in the hands of an unscrupulous government. What is then to prevent the government, the moment it gets possession of those lands to bring in legislation which will virtually make it master of the University and, therefore, master of all its possessions. We are ready to admit that an honest government would not be guilty of such conduct, but is the Greenway government to be trusted? Have their public acts been of a nature to inspire such confidence in them? Take them either as a government or as individuals making up that government, and we say they are not to be trusted. There is no sound reason why the University should hand over the administration of those lands to the government, and if the university does hand them over, it will soon find out that the government will be both the controlling power in the university and the owner of its lands.