

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, 864 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, JULY 15.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Misconception. A friend, for whom we entertain the highest esteem, writes to us a private and confidential letter, in which he respectfully dissents from the attitude we have assumed since the elections. As he does not quote any special passage, it is not easy to see what he objects to. However, we gather his drift from these words of his letter: "There is no reason at present to come to Mr. Laurier with such expressions of confidence as those used by the NORTHWEST REVIEW in its last two issues." Our expressions of confidence are altogether conditional upon his doing what he ought to do. They are merely a polite way of pointing out to him what are our demands. These demands we accompanied, in our principal editorial after the elections, with a very distinct threat that Mr. Laurier's "tenure of office would be uncomfortably short" if he did not settle the school difficulty to our satisfaction. Surely, this does not betray overmuch confidence.

Our Position. We are simply making the best of a real misfortune. Instead of sitting down in sackcloth and ashes to bewail our fate and curse the victors as so many take a sad comfort in doing, we look hopefully at the brighter aspects of an unexpected situation. It seems to us that, whatever may have been Mr. Laurier's shortcomings in the past, it is a matter of life and death with him to restore our Catholic schools. If he does not, his Quebec majority will rapidly dissolve. We think, therefore, that self-interest will prompt him to do his best for us. If he is as shrewd as Sir Charles Tupper, he will see that at a glance. We are indeed sorry Sir Charles had no opportunity of proving the sincerity of his promises; but we never for a moment imagined that those promises were based on Platonic love of justice or on a consuming zeal for Catholic principles; we were quite aware that the chief motive of his manly stand was the help he hoped to get from our friends. That same hope is now Mr. Laurier's sheet-anchor. Deeming him a skilful mariner, we are inclined to believe that he will keep a firm grip on it. That is all. We have no implicit confidence in either party. Individuals occasionally are conscientious; merely political parties are moved by self-interest. Were we confronted with a party like the German Centre, united on all Catholic questions, independent on all others, our attitude might then justly be charged with being full of confidence. As it is, we are content to watch Mr. Laurier and applaud him if he rights our wrongs, though all the while we know full well he will not be toiling "pour nos beaux yeux," for sheer love of his Manitoba brethren.

A Splendid Souvenir. "The Holy Cross Purple" is the title, in purple of course, of the first alumni number issued, in June last, by the first Catholic college

in New England. Its eighty-eight pages of letter-press are in keeping with its twenty-eight beautiful illustrations, making it a splendid souvenir of what Holy Cross is in 1896 and has done in the past fifty years. Views of the college on the hilltop near Worcester, Mass., with its spacious halls for study and athletics, give one new ideas of the vastness of this Catholic academe. An interesting feature, in fact the chief centre of interest in this number, is the series of biographies. We note especially "Holy Cross students in the Civil War," General Armstrong, Rear Admiral Meade, Major Brownson, General Donohoe, Colonel Lancaster, General Guiney, Commodore McElmell. The pedigree of the Meade family is traced back, on the Mother's side (English), to the beginning of the 17th century, and on the father's side (Irish) to the early years of the 18th. For at least five generations the Meades have been well-to-do Catholics. The admiral, whose own career is most brilliant, is a nephew of Major General Meade who won the terrible battle of Gettysburg. Patrick Robert Guiney, who enlisted in the Civil War as a private and rose to be Brigadier General, is fortunate in having his life written by his gifted daughter, Louise Imogen Guiney. This sketch, all too short, is the gem of the series. He had received, at the battle of the Wilderness in 1864, a wound in the forehead that brought on his death after thirteen years of constant suffering borne with cheerful patience. On the 21st of March, 1877, "crossing the square toward his house, he had sudden warning by a slight spurt of blood to the lips. He took off his hat and knelt down by a tree: his loyal and instinctive way of meeting his Lord." Father Robert Fulton, speaking at the funeral of his dear friend and spiritual son, said: "General Guiney's I regard as a very perfect character. He conformed himself not only to what is lawful, but to what is great and fitting. He tamed and attached to himself the severer ideal. 'Blessed are they,' as you know, 'who hunger and thirst after justice, for they shall be filled.'" "This tender and reserved eulogy," adds Miss Guiney, "is worth repeating, for it touches in its application the quick of truth, and it implies very delicately the necessary strife of the man of Christian chivalry with the worldliness of our unconsidering world."

The Rule Of Faith. Among the many good things presented to the readers of Donahoe's Magazine for July is Father Griffy's substantial and irresistibly logical answer to the question, "Can Protestants prove the Bible inspired?" He sets forth the inconclusiveness of the three stock arguments relied upon by Protestants: the historical, the dogmatic and the empirical. None of these establishes inspiration; none of these applies to all portions of the Bible. Consequently, a Protestant can have no certainty that he possesses the true Bible, the whole Bible, and nothing but the Bible. On the other hand, the Catholic argues from the genuineness of the Scripture records to the truth of the Gospel narrative and therefore to the divinity of Christ. Now Christ there says he has established an infallibly authoritative Church, and that Church tells the Catholic what constitutes revealed Scripture, what books are inspired. "I should not believe the Gospel," said St. Augustine, "were I not influenced by the authority of the Catholic Church."

Truth From An Outsider. The following telegram, which appeared in the Free Press of the 8th inst., voices the sentiment lately uttered by a prominent Protestant of this city, that the mingling of boys and girls, which in theory was supposed to refine the boys, in practice has a contrary effect upon the girls. Catholics have always felt and said so. But what a howl would be raised if a Catholic priest were to speak out as Archdeacon Laurier has done!

Ottawa, July 7.—Archdeacon Laurier, preaching before the members of the Ottawa diocese of the Church of England synod last evening, raised his voice against public schools. He said: "The present public schools are no doubt popular, but the church is not satisfied with them. The mixing up of the boys and girls, as at present, is an ill-advised method, and is apt to destroy the modesty of the girls, and in many cases lead to the destruction of women. The future of the church depends on the proper rearing of its children. They have been left to the mercy of public schools, and many parents, rather than send them there, are sending them to convents, under the control of the Roman Catholic Church."

No Shirking A Remedial Bill.

The Chatham Weekly Planet, commenting upon our recent article insisting on a restoration of Catholic schools by Mr. Laurier, says that, if Mr. Laurier should attempt to go beyond Mr. Greenway's offer to the commissioners, it "would be a breach of faith with the electorate. The people declared emphatically against remedial legislation, and until they rescind that declaration remedial legislation should not be heard of on the floor of the house of Parliament." Here we join issue with our contemporary. The people did not declare emphatically against remedial legislation. The Protestant provinces gave a small majority to Sir Charles Tupper with his remedial plan; the one Catholic province gave a large majority to Mr. Laurier on the express condition, as the Electeur, Mr. Laurier's chief organ, tells us (see NORTHWEST REVIEW, July 8, p. 3), that the Liberal candidates of Quebec will "vote in favor of a remedial bill such as is demanded by our bishops."

WHAT THE MINORITY HAS DONE.

The Catholic minority has been struggling for six years to regain its school system wiped out by the act of 1890. During these six years we have expended thousands of dollars in litigation. We have had obstacle after obstacle flung in our path. While paying our school taxes to the support of Protestant schools we felt bound to levy upon ourselves a second tax for the maintenance of schools in which we could conscientiously educate our children. During the six years we have kept our schools opened every legal schoolday, and every Catholic child in Winnipeg, with the exception of five or six, attended these schools. There is not a single instance on record, where the Catholics of Manitoba have voluntarily abandoned their own schools and asked for the present system; but there are several instances where the local government, actually suspended the operation of their own law, and, allowing the Catholic minority to conduct their schools in their own way, gave them support from the annual educational grant. Affidavits were produced during the last local elections which fully prove this fact. The government could not starve even the very poorest of our rural schools into accepting their school laws of 1890; so they had to quietly wink at the violation of both the spirit and the letter of their law and allow Catholic schools to be conducted as government schools under their very eyes. When the poor Catholic half-breeds would not come to the government, the government went to them. It was not kindness, however, that prompted them to thus act so generously. They had quite another object in view. They wished to falsely tell the people of Canada that thirty or forty Catholic schools of Manitoba voluntarily came in and accepted the law of 1890. The dishonesty of this dastardly device has been thoroughly exposed and it has been clearly and definitely proved that they came in because they were told that they could teach their own religion and have their own way generally—in other words they would not have to submit to the school act of 1890 where it interfered with their consciences.

When the Catholic schools were abolished Mr. Martin thanked the members of the board of education for the good and efficient work they had done in the interests of education. The schools were acknowledged to be in an efficient condition. The first we heard about

their being at any time inefficient was after the judgment of the Privy Council decided in our favor. After these men were caught in the act of grand larceny, they wanted to find an excuse to justify their conduct, so they first gave to the public the statement that the Catholic schools were inefficient. We have searched in vain among the past reports of the Manitoba Government on education for one word that could justify such a statement. We have found many flattering commendations of many of these schools; but not one word declaring them to be inefficient. When the Greenway Government abolished them we were told that they were inefficient! In which of these two cases was the Government speaking the truth? The reports of the inspector and visitors to these schools gave the answer. And now, after six years of starvation and obstruction, they want a commission to come here and examine into the efficiency of our schools!

Another cry recently set going for the hundredth time, is that the laity do not want Catholic schools. They might just as well tell the people of Canada that the Catholic laity do not believe in the Catholic church. No man can be a Catholic who denies the teaching of the Church. The Church teaches the necessity of a religious education for her children and imposes upon Catholic parents the imperative duty of supplying such an education. How can it, therefore, be said that the Manitoba Catholic laity, who have shown themselves so faithful to the teachings of the Church, do not want Catholic schools? Let us examine into the conduct of the Catholic minority and see if their actions, for the past six years, justify the Tribune, or any others, in saying that the Catholic laity have ignored or denied this explicit command of the Church. Let us take Winnipeg, the capital of the province, as an example. We take Winnipeg because here may be found the place of all others in the province where such a condition would be most likely to appeal to the pockets of the Catholics, because of the peculiar difficulties that surround us. Six years ago, when our schools were confiscated, we had about 650 children attending our schools. To-day we have over 800. During all these years, there has not been an average of six Catholic pupils attending the Protestant schools, although we have been continuously paying our taxes to these schools. The percentage of Catholic children attending school during that time, in proportion to the Catholic population has been double that of Protestant children attending the Protestant schools. Is not this the best possible answer to the statements made by our enemies? Add to this the fact that the Catholic minority of Manitoba have repeatedly met and publicly denounced the action of the government in unjustly placing them in such a disadvantageous position; the Catholics have thus publicly affirmed that the unfair burden placed upon them is not only contrary to the constitution of our provinces, but a hateful persecution based on fanatical spite. Surely the general public, who are conscious of the truth of our statements, will feel the gross injustice which these false statements of the Tribune and other newspapers throughout Canada inflict upon the Catholics of this province.

CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OR NOTHING.

The Hon. Mr. Laurier will soon be called upon to settle the Manitoba school question. To the minority of this province the fair, just and constitutional settlement of this question is of very first importance, and we should like to be most frank and outspoken to Mr. Laurier in regard thereto.

In the first place, we would remind him of the memorable words of the late Archbishop Tache, when he said that no question involving the constitutional rights and liberties of any class can be finally settled except on the basis of justice. What do we want, then? Justice! Justice! nothing more, nothing less.

Up to May 1st, 1890, the Catholics of this province had Catholic schools. We had a system of public schools distinctly denominational in principle and practice, furnished with all the necessary legal machinery to successfully operate it. We had a board of school trustees, elected by the Catholics of each school district, and this board was authorized to assess the members of its district for the support of its schools. These trustees had a right to engage the teachers and provide all the necessary machinery and equipment to successfully carry out the requirements of the school law, etc. In 1890 all this was changed. Our schools were abolished, and with them disappeared all the other rights we had of administering them. There has never been one interval since that brutal act of confiscation was accomplished, when the Catholics ceased to protest against it, and there will never be any rest from agitation and from protest until those rights are restored. If the constitution of our country, as interpreted by the Privy Council judgment, did not give us the most solemn assurances of the justice and legality of our cause, yet would we protest, as Canadians against the invasion of that liberty of conscience which is supposed to be the birthright of all British subjects; But with the judgment of the Privy Council in our favor and with the constitution of our country as the granite basis of our rights, we will never cease our agitation for the restoration of our Catholic schools.

The air is full of all kinds of rumors. We are told that Mr. Greenway is prepared to give us the same as the Catholics of Nova Scotia have. We are told that Mr. Laurier and Mr. Greenway will settle it on the lines proposed by Messrs. Sifton and Cameron to the Dominion commissioners. We wish right here to tell Messrs. Laurier and Greenway that they are powerless to settle this question independently of the minority of Manitoba. It is we, who hold the judgment against the province and it is with us both the Local and Dominion governments will have to deal, and until they deal fairly, squarely and justly by us and satisfy us, they need never expect the Manitoba school question to be settled. Mr. Laurier may appoint a commission, and that commission may come up here and look wise and awe-inspiring; but what to investigate; what to report on, we fail to see, for what is there that has not already been investigated and reported on by a much wiser and more impartial tribunal? The Dominion Government appointed the Supreme court as a commissioner to investigate and decide. Their decision was referred to the Privy Council and that august commission of investigation decided that the Catholic minority had a grievance, in that their schools had been abolished, and that that grievance must be removed. The grievance consists in the abolition of Catholic schools. How can it be removed except by the restoration of Catholic schools.

The Catholic minority here are not suppliants for justice. They came before the people of Canada armed with a judgment of the highest Court in the Empire and demanded the rights and privileges guaranteed them by the constitution of Canada, interpreted by the Queen's Privy Council, and bearing on its face the Queen's most gracious command that it be forthwith obeyed. That is our position. If Messrs. Laurier and Greenway think that we will accept, at their hands, the toleration which is granted to our co-religionists in Nova Scotia, who have no legal status, no constitutional guarantees, no Privy Council judgment at their back, they have utterly failed to gauge the temper of the minority that has, for six years, against tremendous odds, so nobly struggled for its rights. Again we name our terms: Catholic schools or nothing.

THE TRIBUNE'S FLOP.

We congratulate the Tribune on its recent flop to French domination. We never thought that the day would come when the Winnipeg Tribune would be found among the defenders of the French