

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

At 184 James Street East. WINNIPEG.

P. KLINKHAMMER, Publisher,

Who alone is responsible for payments, and to whom all accounts are payable.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Booksellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Booksellers, 408 Main St.

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.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The Northwest Review \$2 a year, \$1 for six months. Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTHWEST REVIEW for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time.

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

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The Northwest 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. Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a party 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. (4) NOTES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, JULY 10.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Read the Northwest's articles on the school question. They are marvels of lucidity and wisdom.

The latest venture in Canadian Catholic journalism is the Ottawa Post. We have the initial number before us, and we have read with delight its bright and able editorials. Its editorial comments on the school question in Manitoba are clever and to the point. The Catholics of Ottawa have long been afflicted in that they have not had a truly Catholic newspaper in the English language. The initial number of the Post gives a guarantee that this sad want is a thing of the past. We congratulate the Catholics of Ottawa and of the country on the promising appearance of the Post and have much pleasure in placing it on our exchange list.

Dr. Bryce is no sooner back from the Presbyterian General Assembly in Toronto than he gets himself interviewed. The style of the interview is unmistakably his own, flowing, imaginative and unfair. He modestly says of himself: "Dr. Bryce's speech was the masterly exposition of an expert, while," he condescends to add, "Dr. King, who emphasized the religious element in school training, produced a marked effect on the assembly." The fact is, according to the combined testimony of many newspaper reports and private advices, that Dr. Bryce's speech was mainly an impassioned invective against Catholics, exhorting his hearers not to be "mealy-mouthed," but to imitate the stand taken by the apostate priest and all-round traitor, rebel and tyrant, John Knox as against the winsome Mary Queen of Scots; and that Dr. King, on the other hand, whom Dr. Bryce "damns with faint praise," was the real hero of that Assembly and astonished the delegates by his power in bringing over so many hard-headed divines to his way of thinking on the paramount importance of religious training.

An amusing bit of snobbishness occurs in Dr. Bryce's account of the evening devoted to Foreign Missions. He says: "That a Chinaman, who little more than a year ago did not know any English, should deliver an address of fifteen minutes in grammatical and idiomatic English, was a revelation to his self-satisfied Anglo-Saxon auditors." We wonder how many of his Presbyterian auditors could lay claim to the remotest connection

with that Anglo-Saxon race which, even in England, is seven-eighths Norman, Dane and Kelt. Just imagine Principal McVicar or Dr. Robertson or Dr. King, with their delightful Scotch accent, figuring as Anglo-Saxons. But it sounds well, don't you know, to hear one's self classed among the descendants of the more or less mythical Hengist and Horsa hordes.

The Tribune of the 5th inst. devotes a long first editorial to the Northwest Review. According to its usual methods, it wrenches quotations from their context. It dare not publish any of our articles entire. But it evidently believes in Leyden, for it says he is opening the eyes of Protestants to the degrading doctrines of the Church of Rome. Such Protestants as Leyden will convince have not enough independence of mind to face the Protestant tradition of misrepresentation and enter the true fold. We can afford to do without them. We are continually losing such humbugs and hypocrites as Leyden, Chiniquy, Slattery and "Bishop" McNamara. But then we are continually gaining such recruits as Newman, Manning, Brownson, W. S. Lilly, George Parsons Lathrop, Sir John Thompson and the Marquis of Ripon, all of whom had groped through the den of lies or lie-den over against the Catholic Church. We lose probably as much as we gain (except by natural increase, in which Catholics, observing God's laws, far outstrip all other bodies); but what we gain is indefinitely better than what we lose. As a rule, we gain the pick of the human race, and lose the scum.

The Tribune's only other editorial on the same day was in praise of Prof. Huxley lately dead. Now, in one of his latest works, "Science and Christian tradition," Huxley says that "no one could be more competent than Erasmus to gauge the intellectual shallowness and self-contradiction of the Protestant criticism of Catholic doctrine." Huxley never concealed the contempt he felt for Protestant theologians. On the other hand, he repeatedly said that the great obstacle to the spread of his agnostic ideas was the coherent system of reasoning taught by the Catholic Church. When Rector of the University of Aberdeen, he once spoke of the redoubtable philosophic training imparted to Catholic students in Maynooth, saying in particular: "That philosophy is by no means dead and buried, as many suppose. On the contrary, numbers of men of no mean learning and accomplishment, and sometimes of rare power and subtlety of thought, hold by it as the best theory of things which has yet been stated. And, what is more remarkable, men who speak the language of modern philosophy nevertheless think the thoughts of the schoolmen."

However, Huxley was a sworn enemy of everything Catholic. He made a great show of blunt sincerity, though no man of his ability could be thoroughly honest and not find the truth. At a dinner, after a long discussion with Cardinal, then Bishop, Vaughan on the fundamental proofs of revelation, he wound up by saying good-humoredly but very decidedly: "Well, my Lord, one of these days your side and my side will have to come to blows," thus unwittingly witnessing to what the history of the Church in all countries proves—that the only argument which can be, for a time, successfully used against her is brute force, or, what amounts to the same thing, popular passion excited by wholesale slander.

We are glad to see that the editor of the Tribune has some little conscience left after all. He has toned down a too ruffianly epithet used by the Reverend contributor who wrote the article "Ad Majorem Dei Gloriam." The proof of this correction is before us in two copies of the Tribune for July 5. The first has: "the filthy character of the questions asked young women by the priests at the confessional;" the second reads: "the questionable character of questions, etc." Evidently a few copies had got out before the editor noticed the libellous word "filthy." It is passing strange that decent Catholics never hear these filthy or

questionable questions. To be sure, the confessional may be abused; every good thing in this world may be abused; in fact, the more valuable and powerful any agent is, the more terrible is the abuse thereof, witness gunpowder and dynamite. But, because a few renegade priests, having been suspended from their priestly functions precisely on account of such sacrilegious abuse, publish to the world in filthy books how the thing can be done and how they did it, is that any reason for decrying the sacrament they have profaned? There are a hundred times more abuses in the medical profession; yet no one dreams of condemning the entire faculty; people are content with avoiding immoral physicians. The church guards so safely against abuses that the most prejudiced Protestant has only to examine the laws governing the practice of auricular confession to learn how rare abuse must be.

We have received the following answer from Boston agent Leyden: "He is artfully advertised as 'An ex-Catholic preacher,' to give the impression that he was once a priest. He was not. He was a printer or press-man in Boston some years ago, from which station he fell to his present rank." Leyden's advertisements are indeed well calculated to deceive the unwary. Though he is careful not to call himself an "ex-priest" or "ex-Jesuit," yet he knows that most people will, through careless reading, infer that he was both a priest and a Jesuit. What he himself says is that he is an "anti-Jesuit," which is a most comprehensive term embracing all wilful heretics and Christ-baters in the world, Satan being the greatest anti-Jesuit known. Then, when he calls himself an "ex-Romanist preacher," as, except in the case of religious orders, all Catholic preachers are priests, thoughtful readers conclude that he was a priest. But he never was a priest, nor a Jesuit, nor a Catholic preacher.

In his lecture last Sunday, at which the audience was as usual mostly a "seedy crowd," he said the Popish clergy would rather see the devil here than Leyden. We venture to think he is mistaken. The devil would not lie so clumsily; he would appear as an angel of light, not as an ignorant imp; as a calm logical reasoner, not as an uneducated enragement; as a plausible intellectual sophist, winning the attention of the leaders of human thought, not as a vulgar revamper of transparent falsehoods refuted a thousand times and scorned by men of light and leading. Lucifer would secure as an endorser a less foolish person than the Rev. Mr. Grant, who gravely and with tears in his voice assured the densely stupid assembly (quite worthy of him) that the Pope was sometimes addressed by Catholics as "Our Lord GOD;" whereas the chosen title of the Popes is "servant of the servants of God." Lucifer would not talk such rot as Leyden did about Catholics not being allowed to read the Bible, the arch-fiend being keenly alive to the facts mentioned in the article we publish elsewhere on the Bible. Lucifer would let up on the Spanish Inquisition, because he is ashamed of Queen Elizabeth's and Cromwell's Inquisition, which was ten times more bloody. No; Lucifer uses Leyden only because he has nothing better at hand just now, Huxley being dead and Spencer on his last legs.

THE TRIBUNE AND THE ARCH-BISHOP.

We have been asked by our friends how it is that we never take any notice of the abusive articles in the Tribune against our revered and devoted Archbishop. We have tried to explain to our friends that the more the Tribune abuses any man the more the general public will appreciate his worth as a citizen and his character as a man. So well is the character of this paper for unreliability and vulgarity recognized, that the most undesirable misfortune that could possibly overtake the character of any public man would be to receive the endorsement of the Tribune. Even its own political allies, or, at least, the more respectable of them, who have any feelings of refinement, or whose

natures are not entirely brutalized, have a thorough contempt for the paper and its management. If the Tribune said anything good of a man and praised his conduct, we would say to that man: examine your conscience, my friend, and honestly try to find out what wrong you have done to merit praise from such a quarter. Now, this being the generally recognized character of the Tribune, why should we take any notice of its abuse of our dearly loved chief Pastor? If there was anything in the Tribune praising His Grace or in any way endorsing his conduct, we should indeed feel anxious about him, lest his good name should be questioned by the respectable portion of our fellow citizens; but as long as it only abuses him and calls him names, we, in common with all good citizens, feel secure from all anxiety regarding the matter.

For years his saintly predecessor, than whom there was never a more kindly, charitable, or prudent man, was made the special object of this paper's abuse. To injure a business competitor and to feed the fires of race and religious discord, the Tribune, week after week, charged Mr. Luxton, the editor in chief of the Free Press, with having sold himself to Archbishop Tache for \$40,000; the money with which he had purchased the Sun newspaper. The late Archbishop, feeling the great injustice done to Mr. Luxton by this foundationless statement of the Tribune, wrote a letter to that journal giving the most unqualified denial to that statement and saying that all the pecuniary help he ever gave the Free Press was to pay his subscription the same as he did for the Tribune itself. Notwithstanding this flat denial of a man of the highest honor and most unquestionable veracity, the Tribune, with that coarseness—that brutal vulgarity—which is its distinguishing characteristic, told the Archbishop that it did not believe that he was telling the truth, because, forsooth, it was in the interests of His Grace to tell a falsehood to shield Mr. Luxton. No one was surprised at this base insult being offered to the aged and venerable Archbishop, because all knew the Tribune, although many of the aged prelate's friends, who knew his public integrity and private virtues, were shocked at the insult so gratuitously offered.

Time rolled on and some two years afterward the same Tribune learned the fact that the money, which it accused Mr. Luxton of getting from the Archbishop, was actually received from another source and it published this in its columns. The Review called the attention of the Tribune to the fact that it had refused to believe His Grace's statement and accused him of falsehood. We demanded of it to make amends to His Grace by manfully acknowledging its error and apologizing for its insult. We appealed to the manhood and honor of its managing editor and pointed out to him that if he did not apologize fully for it, we should have to place him in the position of one who insulted an old and distinguished man and then refused to make apology for it. From that day to this the Tribune never made any attempt to apologize. What is the use of noticing such a paper? What is to be gained by doing so? The present Archbishop cannot suffer anything either in his person or character by the Tribune's abuse; in fact he is a gainer by it.

"PRIESTS' SCHOOLS."

The Free Press was once a great and powerful organ of public opinion, because it was under the management of a strong and honest man, who would not stoop to make it the mouthpiece of a narrow, unpatriotic and unjust policy. In those days the Free Press was not a hireling whose policy could be fashioned to suit the exigencies of any corporation or government; but the fearless, uncorrupted, and incorruptible exponent of right principles, just laws and fair play to all, even when their advocacy was out of tune with the babbling crowd who, for the time being, followed public opinion, that is, the opinions of a few self-seeking and unprincipled demagogues let loose on an ignorant, unthinking and excitable

population. The Free Press of those days was a journal whose opinions and principles were respected and whose power made wrong-doers quake; but, to-day, it is a poor slave to the opinions, the desires, the passions and the unprincipled designs of its masters. And its shame has not brought to it prosperity any more in the material than in the moral order. From being a financial success under the management of Mr. W. F. Luxton, it has become a financial wreck under its present management. And what it is financially, so is it morally. When it ventures to give expression to opinions and to treat of questions of moment to the public, it deals in platitudes, that have not the merit of originality, or even novelty; unless misrepresentation, falsehood, and that "snickeringsneer that stabs with a smile" be considered as such.

We have a sample of this in its designation of our Catholic schools as "the priests' schools." In what way are they "the priests' schools"? They are schools for the education, not of Priests, but of Catholic children. They are schools supported, not by Priests, but by the Catholic parents of the children attending them, and by those in sympathy with them. The public money that has been paid for their maintenance was the money contributed by the aforesaid Catholic parents and their co-religionists, and not by the priests. They exist, to-day, and have always existed, not at the dictation of the priests; but because the Catholics, who have paid for them, want them for the education of their children. There is no law, either human or divine, that imposes upon our priests the duty of educating our Catholic children. That duty is ours, and for the purpose of fulfilling it, we have established and maintained schools in accordance with our conscientious convictions. These schools are our schools, maintained at our expense, and for the education of our children. It is misleading, false and slanderous to call them "priests' schools." Of course, it is not difficult to find the motives which prompted the Free Press to call them "priests' schools." It wished to excite a bitterer feeling, if possible, against our schools, and, knowing the popular prejudice that exists in the minds of the unreasoning, took this sneering and dishonest method to attain its object.

The present editor of the Free Press would like to be classed as a gentleman and he would feel deeply hurt should anyone even hint that, in honor or refinement, he lacked any attribute of the gentleman. We would not wound that sensitive nature of his any more than we could help; but we would like to impress upon him that Catholics have feelings as refined and as sensitive as his own, and that they do not like to be sneered at any more than he does. We ask him in all seriousness, does he think that it is gentlemanly or refined to lie about the Catholics of Manitoba or about their institutions? And if not, why does he do it or permit it to be done? Catholics are proud of their priests; they know their goodness and their disinterested devotion to them and, consequently, to their children. All that is best and noblest and truest in human nature, they see accentuated in the every day life of their priesthood. They are one with their priests in all that relates to their moral and religious interests; but that does not mean that they are, as the Free Press maliciously implies, the blind slaves of the priests. No; unity of faith, unity of sentiment, unity of purpose, does not mean tyranny of the priest and slavery of the people. They know the Truth and the Truth makes them free. We, therefore, protest against the Free Press, or any other journal, or man, dishonestly and with malicious intent, miscalling our dearly cherished schools—"priests' schools." They are "priests' schools" only in the sense that, being Catholic, and all Catholics being one in Faith and morals, the Catholic priest and the Catholic laity are a unit. In the material sense of possession, these schools are not "priests' schools," and what is more, the Free Press knew they were not when it called them so.