

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 disseminate 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.

The following gentlemen have been appointed agents of the Northwest 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.

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

The Northwest Review

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

ST. BONIFACE, Dec. 12th, 1887. 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."

I need not tell you that I take a deep interest in the Northwest Review which is the only English Catholic paper published within the limits of Manitoba and the Northwest Territories.

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

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on a religious, moral, or political subject of local importance, (2) LETTERS on any subject, (3) NEWS of interest to the Catholic community, (4) NOTICES of public events, (5) NOTICES of the death of prominent persons, (6) NOTICES of the birth of children, (7) NOTICES of marriages, (8) NOTICES of deaths.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 18.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Father Clark, S.J., asks the question: "Why believe in the pool of Bethesda and reject the waters of Lourdes?"

The Montreal Gazette says: The Pope has declined to receive Senor Vallera, the Spanish envoy, on account of his having written immoral novels. The world will overlook the official discourtesy for the sake of the good example.

A Grit Hamilton paper says that the subscriptions to the Toronto memorial to Sir John Macdonald only amount to \$3,185. They now amount to \$10,000, and that sum could be easily doubled if it were necessary.

Rumour now has it that the Pope intends conferring a red hat on Archbishop Logue of Armagh, instead of Archbishop Walsh of Dublin, as previously reported.

In other words, the Primate of Ireland, not the Primate of Ireland, is to be the recipient of His Holiness' favour.

"Protestantism was an experiment, and it has proved a hideous failure." This is not the declaration of any Catholic divine, but an opinion expressed the other day by a young Episcopalian minister of New York who, however, is still experimenting with the failure by endeavouring to galvanize Ritualism into a real religion.

The German police have prevented Father Cathrein, S. J., one of the most distinguished preachers and writers of the German Province of the Society from delivering a lecture on the labour question at Cologne. This outbreak of activity against the Jesuits, who have delivered many such lectures in Germany in the last few years, is possibly the result of the irritation felt in official circles at the opposition of the Centre party to the new Army Bill.

Mr. A. McGillis, the efficient and indefatigable secretary of the Irish Home Rule committee forwarded to Senator Smith and Hon. S. H. Blake the handsome sum of \$227.00, which will be sent to the Hon. Edward Blake, M. P., for Longford, Ireland.

special manner, to Messrs. McGillis, McPhillips and Col. O'Phelan who were indefatigable in pushing forward the good cause. Of those three gentlemen, we think Mr. McGillis deserves special praise because, while the others were doing a work in the interests of their countrymen, the secretary, who is not an Irishman, was performing a humane work. The Review congratulates all these gentlemen on the happy result of their labors.

The church of England, Synod has no use for the prohibition crank, as its vote, on the Mullock resolutions, proves. It is a pity that an otherwise good cause should be retarded by the extreme crankiness of its chief advocates. Temperance is a grand thing, but it should be advocated in a temperate manner. Let us have temperance in all things!

Archbishop Ryan, of Philadelphia, who was one of the committee that drafted the resolutions on the educational question adopted by the Metropolitan at New York, states the Catholic objections to the public schools concisely and correctly by saying: "If Catholics are not satisfied with the public school system of our country it is not because those institutions are devoted to education, but because they do not go far enough in the mission of training or calling out the powers of the soul."

In this week's issue we give the final editorial of our esteemed and able contemporary, the Church Progress on liberalism in religion. We consider that Church Progress has rendered a great service to religion in thus giving these timely and able articles to the public. We have had nothing at heart but the purest interests to the cause of religion, in giving them to our readers and we have reason to believe that they have generally appreciated them.

Our esteemed contemporary, The Month of New Westminster pays the Review, the following compliment: "The Northwest Review deserves every credit for its pluck; the editor is not asleep."

Thanks! we can reciprocate by saying that we are always delighted with the appearance on our table of our Monthly visitor. The only objection we have to it, is its name. We would suggest that the Month become a Week. However, we wish our contemporary a happy and prosperous new year and hope it may meet with all the success which its ability and enterprise so richly merit.

A very curious kind of Words and Works, and the vast majority of editors and preachers of the sects, are apparently scared at "the Pope" establishing his "government in America?" The drowsy people must have very lazy intellects, and be terribly behind the time. Why "the Pope" came here with Columbus, and his "government" was the first lesson in our civilization that "America" knew, as well as the first lesson in civilization that the barbarous forefathers of these curious people had in the forests and fens of England. "The Pope's government" of the soul is here, came here with Columbus, and will remain here until mankind leaves for the General Judgment.

It seems to have escaped the Liberals that it is a moral impossibility for the compromise school propositions to have expressed the mind of the Pope. The Holy Father has told us that secular and religious instruction must go together; the new plan tells us they need not; the Holy Father has told us that to separate one from the other is really to wish that the minds of Catholic youth should remain neutral in their duties towards God; the new plan tells us that secular may be divided from religious instruction; the Holy Father has told us that the church has always condemned mixed and neutral schools; the new plan tells us that the church recognizes and approves them. Do the Liberals see the moral impossibility involved?—Church Progress.

So J. D. Cameron is the lucky man. Well, it can make little difference to us who was selected and we are as well pleased that it is the Hon. J. D. Cameron as any other. But what about the rural districts? Have they no claims on Greenway, or does the Premier think that he is of sufficient weight to represent the farming interests? We have ministers from Brandon, Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg in the cabinet, but no one from among the farmers. Yet this is pre-eminently the home of farmers. But that does not matter when Mr. Greenway has portfolios to dispose of, and why should it? The farmer is good enough to record his vote, and, dear knows, he has been doing it most obsequiously for some time back. What more is wanted of him? Nothing! But, aside from all this we would like to know how the government came to overlook the claims of Mr. P. C. McIntyre. Judging from the intellectual capacity of the Cabinet, we should think that it is very weak on educational matters, and Mr. P. C. McIntyre's long experience on the school Board of Winnipeg, should qualify him for the position of Minister of Education. Now, we are of opinion that the great P. C. has been very unjustly used and the people of Winnipeg, whom he served so long in educational matters, should not allow their old and faithful servant to be overlooked in this way by an ungrateful government.

THE LATE FATHER ANDRE.

It is our sad duty to have to record the death of that great and good missionary priest, the Rev. Father Andre, O.M.I., of Calgary, N.W.T. The Rev. Father was a native of France, and, like so many of her devoted and noble sons, left home and friends and country to devote himself, with all the ardor and zeal of a holy missionary, to the evangelization of the Indians of the great unexplored Northwest. In the year 1861 he came to the Red River Missions and at once entered upon his arduous missionary work among the Indians and half-breeds in the immediate neighbourhood of the present city of Winnipeg. The Calgary Tribune, in speaking of the Rev. Father's labors in this country, says:

"After completing his course for the priesthood, he was sent to take part in the Red River missions in the year 1861, and was successively employed in the work of inculcating the doctrines of Christianity among the Indians and half-breeds of St. Boniface, Pembina, and St. Joseph's. While at the last named place, the rebellion of the Sioux against the United States Government broke out, and Father Andre was employed by the Washington authorities to treat with the Indians, a mission he fulfilled so successfully as to induce them to lay down their arms. In the year 1867 he was sent to Saskatchewan to work among the Crees, and while here the great smallpox epidemic broke out, and he won the admiration and regard of every one by his fearless attendance on the afflicted tribe, often having to bury the dead with his own hands. He next established the missions of the south branch of the Saskatchewan, building the missions of St. Lawrence, Duck Lake, and Batoche. He also started a mission at Prince Albert. In 1887 he came to Calgary, where he made himself respected and revered by all denominations by his kindly nature and the wide reach of his attainments. Not only was he a fine scholar, being perfectly familiar with several languages, but he possessed a grasp of history, politics and the sciences which few men attain. For a number of years he was a member of the Episcopal Council of St. Albert, and it may be truly said that no clergyman ever labored more acceptably in the Territories."

It was our happy privilege to intimately know our late revered friend, Father Andre, and we can feelingly speak of his many noble traits of character. He was frank and open in his manner, and fearless in the discharge of all his duties. He loved his dear Indians with all the tenderness of a Father, and when his mortal illness seized upon him, his last injunction was "make no fuss about me but bury me in the cemetery alongside of my dear Indians." He devoted all the energy and ability of his laborious life to them, and he did not wish to be separated from them in death. The evangelization of the Indians was his work upon earth, and is now his crown of glory in Heaven. It is lives like thine, O dear departed friend, that make up the visible glory of the Church. It is men like thee, whose lives of sacrifice, devotion and humility, wring from the enemies of our holy religion their unwilling tribute of praise, and prove to scoffers that the Church that can produce such men is indeed divine and holy. In the sight of the superficial and the worldly, thy life of poverty, hardship and indefatigable labor among these poor despised Indians, those ungrateful children of the plains, contains no lessons to emulate, but in the sight of God, it is not so. He who rewards the giver of a glass of cold water in His name, has marked, in the book of life, all thy labors and sufferings among His children, and has rewarded thee. For the past three years the Review has received many marks of kindness at thy hands, and we now gratefully and sorrowfully lay the tribute of our love and our tears at thy feet. Requiescat in pace.

Thanks! we can reciprocate by saying that we are always delighted with the appearance on our table of our Monthly visitor. The only objection we have to it, is its name. We would suggest that the Month become a Week. However, we wish our contemporary a happy and prosperous new year and hope it may meet with all the success which its ability and enterprise so richly merit.

A very curious kind of Words and Works, and the vast majority of editors and preachers of the sects, are apparently scared at "the Pope" establishing his "government in America?" The drowsy people must have very lazy intellects, and be terribly behind the time. Why "the Pope" came here with Columbus, and his "government" was the first lesson in our civilization that "America" knew, as well as the first lesson in civilization that the barbarous forefathers of these curious people had in the forests and fens of England. "The Pope's government" of the soul is here, came here with Columbus, and will remain here until mankind leaves for the General Judgment.

It seems to have escaped the Liberals that it is a moral impossibility for the compromise school propositions to have expressed the mind of the Pope. The Holy Father has told us that secular and religious instruction must go together; the new plan tells us they need not; the Holy Father has told us that to separate one from the other is really to wish that the minds of Catholic youth should remain neutral in their duties towards God; the new plan tells us that secular may be divided from religious instruction; the Holy Father has told us that the church has always condemned mixed and neutral schools; the new plan tells us that the church recognizes and approves them. Do the Liberals see the moral impossibility involved?—Church Progress.

So J. D. Cameron is the lucky man. Well, it can make little difference to us who was selected and we are as well pleased that it is the Hon. J. D. Cameron as any other. But what about the rural districts? Have they no claims on Greenway, or does the Premier think that he is of sufficient weight to represent the farming interests? We have ministers from Brandon, Portage la Prairie and Winnipeg in the cabinet, but no one from among the farmers. Yet this is pre-eminently the home of farmers. But that does not matter when Mr. Greenway has portfolios to dispose of, and why should it? The farmer is good enough to record his vote, and, dear knows, he has been doing it most obsequiously for some time back. What more is wanted of him? Nothing! But, aside from all this we would like to know how the government came to overlook the claims of Mr. P. C. McIntyre. Judging from the intellectual capacity of the Cabinet, we should think that it is very weak on educational matters, and Mr. P. C. McIntyre's long experience on the school Board of Winnipeg, should qualify him for the position of Minister of Education. Now, we are of opinion that the great P. C. has been very unjustly used and the people of Winnipeg, whom he served so long in educational matters, should not allow their old and faithful servant to be overlooked in this way by an ungrateful government.

WHAT DOES HE MEAN? His Lordship, the Bishop of Rupert's Land has just delivered his annual charge to the clergy and lay members of his flock in synod assembled, in which he has treated of the question of primary education. It is not our purpose to make a general comment on this address. We will select, from time to time, such of the statements made by His Lordship, as may appear to us to need special comment. In the course of his address, His Lordship said, as reported in the Free Press:

For a Christian state to set itself against this (religious instruction) seems a dishonoring of God and disastrous to its best interests. But in enforcing the necessity of religious education there must be no depreciation or disparaging of the very best secular education. No one can desire to return to a state of things common enough not long ago, when there was little instruction of any kind even of a religious character. This is practically the case among those Roman Catholics, whose ignorant condition and large proportion of criminals are sometimes thrown against the friends of religious education. We must confess that we are somewhat at a loss to understand what object the bishop could have in thus insulting Roman Catholics? His Lordship so indefinite in his remarks about us? Who are "those Roman Catholics, whose ignorant condition and large proportion of criminals are sometimes thrown against the friends of religious education?" Does he allude to the Catholics of Manitoba; or has His Lordship been recently reading over the early history of the English church "as by law established" and meditating on the rather vigorous beauties of the penal laws passed by his own country for the benign purpose of enforcing on Roman Catholics the tenets of the Church of which he is a chief pastor, some few

hundred years ago, when it was a penalty for a Catholic priest to exercise the functions of his holy office among the people, or for a Catholic teacher to educate them? Surely, under such circumstances, His Lordship could not be cruel enough to blame "some" of the unfortunate Roman Catholics of those early days for their "ignorant condition?" Was it their fault or their misfortune? Was the fault fairly chargeable to them? His Lordship does not seem to view with any great alarm that the Government of Manitoba is using a penal code of its own, to make the Roman Catholics of Manitoba ignorant, by robbing them to educate Protestants!

If the bishop of Rupert's Land did not mean to apply his remarks to and insult the Catholics of Manitoba what did he mean? Let us examine his remarks of a few days ago in the light of a previous statement, made by himself, and see how the one squares with the other. In his charge, to the synod of the Church of England, in October 1889, the bishop said: "The Catholic church alone continued to have separate schools. I may be mistaken, but I am of opinion that this privilege has been so worked as to give it an undue denominational advantage. I mean, that being enabled to supply the primary education of its members, it has been helped to give cheaply a higher education than has drawn to it Protestant children, more particularly girls." Here we find His Lordship jealously complaining that the Catholics were not only supplying a primary education but were actually supplying such a superior and highly acceptable higher education for their children, that it was even attracting and bringing to them Protestant children. Surely a people that can and does give, not only a good primary education, but such an admirable "higher education" that even Protestant children flock to their higher schools, cannot be "among those Roman man Catholics, whose ignorant condition and large proportion of criminals are sometimes thrown against the friends of religious education." And yet such, at least, is the accusation contained in His Lordship's remarks about us! If the editor of the Review might be permitted, in the immortal language of the Rev. John Hogg to the Free Press, "to whisper in the bishop's ear," we would suggest that it would be more in keeping with His Lordship's dignity, when making such insulting allusions about Catholics, to be more definite in his statements. His Lordship should also try to be consistent. It is not, to say the least, edifying to the general reader to find one of "the pillars in Israel" making sweeping and indefinite statements against Roman Catholics that are here clearly shown to be inconsistent with former definite statements. Next week we will comment on other statements contained in His Lordship's address.

WHENCE OUR DOCTRINE ON LIBERALISM COMES.

In as much as our articles on Liberalism have evoked hostile criticism from some of our contemporaries and others, a word as to the authoritative weight they should carry with them will not be amiss. We, therefore, take pleasure in placing before our readers and our critics the source whence we drew the body and substance of the doctrine on Liberalism, expounded in these columns for the past eight months.

In 1886 there appeared in Spain a little work under the title *El Liberalismo es Pecado*: "Liberalism is a sin," by Don Felix Sarda y Salvan, a priest of Barcelona and editor of a journal called *La Revista Popular*. The book excited considerable commotion. It was vigorously assailed by the Liberals, a Spanish Bishop, of a Liberal turn, instigated an answer to Dr. Salvan's work by another Spanish priest. Both books were sent to Rome praying the Sacred Congregation of the Index to put Dr. Salvan's work under the ban. The following letter, under date Jan. 10, 1887, from the Sacred Congregation itself explains the result of its consideration of the two volumes:

Most Excellent Sir: The Sacred Congregation of the Index has received the denunciation of the little work bearing the title "*El Liberalismo es Pecado*," by Don Felix Sarda y Salvan, a priest of your diocese; the denunciation was accompanied at the same time by another little work entitled "*El Proceso del Integrisimo*," that is "a refutation of the errors contained in the little work *El Liberalismo es Pecado*." The author of the second work is D. de Pazos, a canon of the diocese of Vich. Wherefore the Sacred Congregation has carefully examined both works, and decided as follows: In the first not only is nothing found contrary to sound doctrine, but its author, D. Felix Sarda merits great praise for his exposition and defense of sound doctrine therein set forth with solidity, order and lucidity and without personal offense to anyone.

THE C. M. B. A. IN CANADA.

There is, unfortunately, existing in Canada a difficulty in C. M. B. A. matters which has been brought about by the bad faith of the Supreme Council of the association. For some years the grand council of the C. M. B. A. in Canada has been petitioning to the supreme council, a body resident in the United States and holding its charter under the laws of the State of New York, for a separate beneficiary. This has been steadfastly refused until the last meeting of that body, held in the city of Montreal, last October. Prior to the date of this meeting, the grand council of Canada became incorporated under the "Friendly Societies Act" of the province of Ontario and it became a necessity for the branches situated in Ontario to control their own beneficiary funds. This necessitated the Canadian organization outside of the province of Ontario, to decide whether they would remain with the Ontario members or withdraw and unite themselves with the supreme council. They, in common with their Ontario brothers, wished to retain fraternal intercourse with their American brethren, but decided that they would remain with the grand council of Canada. It was felt that, as Canadians, they should stand together, so far as a separate beneficiary was concerned. The supreme council had no other course open to them than to accept this Ultimatum, but in doing so stipulated with the grand council of Canada that any province, having the required membership, might be granted a charter and become a separate and independent council within the limits of said province. This was agreed to by the grand council of Canada and it entered upon its duties on the 1st January with a separate beneficiary.

In the province of Quebec an agitation was at once commenced, by a few branches, for a separate grand council in that province, and, although those dissentients only represented a small minority of the membership in that province the supreme council granted them a charter. By this act the supreme council sought to coerce the majority in Quebec to submit to the will of a small minority and to sever it from the Canadian jurisdiction to which it wished to remain affiliated. It does not require any amount of intelligence to understand that when the Canadians agreed to the provisions authorizing the supreme council to grant a charter to the membership of any province, it did not contemplate that that charter was to be

granted to an insignificant minority but to the majority. His Grace, the Archbishop of Montreal, therefore, very prudently and justly refused to give his sanction to such a procedure. This is as it should be. The church in Canada cannot be expected to permit a small minority, acting in the interests of a foreign controlling power, which is actuated by a foolish desire to injure the organization in Canada, to coerce the majority and hence has denied, at least so far as the Archbishop of Montreal is concerned, to give it any sanction. The supreme council in giving a charter to a minority representing not a quarter of the branches, which it seeks to control, has been guilty of a flagrant breach of faith with Canada, and we sincerely trust and firmly believe that the church authorities, who are deeply interested in the welfare of the Canadian members, will not give the seal of her sanction to any such disreputable procedure on the part of an alien authority.

There is sometimes a droll side to serious subjects, and to see some of our esteemed contemporaries sharpening their lilliputian darts to find a final cushion in their own avoirdupois could not but provoke a smile. But we bear no malice; we are in perfect good humor. If it is heaping coals of fire on the heads of adverse critics to show them that the doctrine on Liberalism, which we have been expounding, has been approved and praised by the Sacred Congregation of the Index, we only pray the burning may awaken them to a realization of their own precarious situation, and that they may yet live to thank us for rousing them to the sense of their danger. Seriously, Liberalism is the latest heresy, as fatal as any that has in the past afflicted the church of God, and Catholics in this country are especially exposed to its malignity. Our object in putting D. Sarda's exposition of the subject before our readers was simply to point out their danger, first by tearing off the mask which usually disguises the monster of Liberalism, and secondly by giving some practical rules for guidance amidst the perplexities of the way in a country where every step is beset with a menace to the faith.—Church Progress.

granted to an insignificant minority but to the majority. His Grace, the Archbishop of Montreal, therefore, very prudently and justly refused to give his sanction to such a procedure. This is as it should be. The church in Canada cannot be expected to permit a small minority, acting in the interests of a foreign controlling power, which is actuated by a foolish desire to injure the organization in Canada, to coerce the majority and hence has denied, at least so far as the Archbishop of Montreal is concerned, to give it any sanction. The supreme council in giving a charter to a minority representing not a quarter of the branches, which it seeks to control, has been guilty of a flagrant breach of faith with Canada, and we sincerely trust and firmly believe that the church authorities, who are deeply interested in the welfare of the Canadian members, will not give the seal of her sanction to any such disreputable procedure on the part of an alien authority.

WHENCE OUR DOCTRINE ON LIBERALISM COMES.

In as much as our articles on Liberalism have evoked hostile criticism from some of our contemporaries and others, a word as to the authoritative weight they should carry with them will not be amiss. We, therefore, take pleasure in placing before our readers and our critics the source whence we drew the body and substance of the doctrine on Liberalism, expounded in these columns for the past eight months.

In 1886 there appeared in Spain a little work under the title *El Liberalismo es Pecado*: "Liberalism is a sin," by Don Felix Sarda y Salvan, a priest of Barcelona and editor of a journal called *La Revista Popular*. The book excited considerable commotion. It was vigorously assailed by the Liberals, a Spanish Bishop, of a Liberal turn, instigated an answer to Dr. Salvan's work by another Spanish priest. Both books were sent to Rome praying the Sacred Congregation of the Index to put Dr. Salvan's work under the ban. The following letter, under date Jan. 10, 1887, from the Sacred Congregation itself explains the result of its consideration of the two volumes:

Most Excellent Sir: The Sacred Congregation of the Index has received the denunciation of the little work bearing the title "*El Liberalismo es Pecado*," by Don Felix Sarda y Salvan, a priest of your diocese; the denunciation was accompanied at the same time by another little work entitled "*El Proceso del Integrisimo*," that is "a refutation of the errors contained in the little work *El Liberalismo es Pecado*." The author of the second work is D. de Pazos, a canon of the diocese of Vich. Wherefore the Sacred Congregation has carefully examined both works, and decided as follows: In the first not only is nothing found contrary to sound doctrine, but its author, D. Felix Sarda merits great praise for his exposition and defense of sound doctrine therein set forth with solidity, order and lucidity and without personal offense to anyone.

THE C. M. B. A. IN CANADA.

There is, unfortunately, existing in Canada a difficulty in C. M. B. A. matters which has been brought about by the bad faith of the Supreme Council of the association. For some years the grand council of the C. M. B. A. in Canada has been petitioning to the supreme council, a body resident in the United States and holding its charter under the laws of the State of New York, for a separate beneficiary. This has been steadfastly refused until the last meeting of that body, held in the city of Montreal, last October. Prior to the date of this meeting, the grand council of Canada became incorporated under the "Friendly Societies Act" of the province of Ontario and it became a necessity for the branches situated in Ontario to control their own beneficiary funds. This necessitated the Canadian organization outside of the province of Ontario, to decide whether they would remain with the Ontario members or withdraw and unite themselves with the supreme council. They, in common with their Ontario brothers, wished to retain fraternal intercourse with their American brethren, but decided that they would remain with the grand council of Canada. It was felt that, as Canadians, they should stand together, so far as a separate beneficiary was concerned. The supreme council had no other course open to them than to accept this Ultimatum, but in doing so stipulated with the grand council of Canada that any province, having the required membership, might be granted a charter and become a separate and independent council within the limits of said province. This was agreed to by the grand council of Canada and it entered upon its duties on the 1st January with a separate beneficiary.

In the province of Quebec an agitation was at once commenced, by a few branches, for a separate grand council in that province, and, although those dissentients only represented a small minority of the membership in that province the supreme council granted them a charter. By this act the supreme council sought to coerce the majority in Quebec to submit to the will of a small minority and to sever it from the Canadian jurisdiction to which it wished to remain affiliated. It does not require any amount of intelligence to understand that when the Canadians agreed to the provisions authorizing the supreme council to grant a charter to the membership of any province, it did not contemplate that that charter was to be

granted to an insignificant minority but to the majority. His Grace, the Archbishop of Montreal, therefore, very prudently and justly refused to give his sanction to such a procedure. This is as it should be. The church in Canada cannot be expected to permit a small minority, acting in the interests of a foreign controlling power, which is actuated by a foolish desire to injure the organization in Canada, to coerce the majority and hence has denied, at least so far as the Archbishop of Montreal is concerned, to give it any sanction. The supreme council in giving a charter to a minority representing not a quarter of the branches, which it seeks to control, has been guilty of a flagrant breach of faith with Canada, and we sincerely trust and firmly believe that the church authorities, who are deeply interested in the welfare of the Canadian members, will not give the seal of her sanction to any such disreputable procedure on the part of an alien authority.

There is sometimes a droll side to serious subjects, and to see some of our esteemed contemporaries sharpening their lilliputian darts to find a final cushion in their own avoirdupois could not but provoke a smile. But we bear no malice; we are in perfect good humor. If it is heaping coals of fire on the heads of adverse critics to show them that the doctrine on Liberalism, which we have been expounding, has been approved and praised by the Sacred Congregation of the Index, we only pray the burning may awaken them to a realization of their own precarious situation, and that they may yet live to thank us for rousing them to the sense of their danger. Seriously, Liberalism is the latest heresy, as fatal as any that has in the past afflicted the church of God, and Catholics in this country are especially exposed to its malignity. Our object in putting D. Sarda's exposition of the subject before our readers was simply to point out their danger, first by tearing off the mask which usually disguises the monster of Liberalism, and secondly by giving some practical rules for guidance amidst the perplexities of the way in a country where every step is beset with a menace to the faith.—Church Progress.

granted to an insignificant minority but to the majority. His Grace, the Archbishop of Montreal, therefore, very prudently and justly refused to give his sanction to such a procedure. This is as it should be. The church in Canada cannot be expected to permit a small minority, acting in the interests of a foreign controlling power, which is actuated by a foolish desire to injure the organization in Canada, to coerce the majority and hence has denied, at least so far as the Archbishop of Montreal is concerned, to give it any sanction. The supreme council in giving a charter to a minority representing not a quarter of the branches, which it seeks to control, has been guilty of a flagrant breach of faith with Canada, and we sincerely trust and firmly believe that the church authorities, who are deeply interested in the welfare of the Canadian members, will not give the seal of her sanction to any such disreputable procedure on the part of an alien authority.

There is sometimes a droll side to serious subjects, and to see some of our esteemed contemporaries sharpening their lilliputian darts to find a final cushion in their own avoirdupois could not but provoke a smile. But we bear no malice; we are in perfect good humor. If it is heaping coals of fire on the heads of adverse critics to show them that the doctrine on Liberalism, which we have been expounding, has been approved and praised by the Sacred Congregation of the Index, we only pray the burning may awaken them to a realization of their own precarious situation, and that they may yet live to thank us for rousing them to the sense of their danger. Seriously, Liberalism is the latest heresy, as fatal as any that has in the past afflicted the church of God, and Catholics in this country are especially exposed to its malignity. Our object in putting D. Sarda's exposition of the subject before our readers was simply to point out their danger, first by tearing off the mask which usually disguises the monster of Liberalism, and secondly by giving some practical rules for guidance amidst the perplexities of the way in a country where every step is beset with a menace to the faith.—Church Progress.

COMMUNICATIONS.

The Review Endorsed.

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Sir,—As an occasional reader of your very spirited paper I must say you hold my admiration to an extreme, and I cannot but re-echo the concluding sentence of your article headed, "It did not Work;" in your paper of Dec. 21st. It is safe to remark, it never shall. It occurred to me on the moment, if you had fully weighed those eight words with which you conclude, "and we shall have it sooner or later." What a beautiful expression of Catholic sentiment? What confidence in the present, what hope in the future—what faith in our destination? Surely, we shall have it sooner or later. Did not Cromwell say on one occasion "thank heaven there is not a papist in all England to-day?" Persecution has always strengthened the church, but our enemies have never yet perceived that, and time smiles in mimicry at those of the past, not mere nonentities, but men of empire. It is not so very long ago since the cloud was raised from the brow and the imperial smile of disdain lit up the visage of the little Corsican as he enquired, "what is the old man (the Pope) saying, does he mean to say the arms will fall from the hands of my soldiers?" The elements are often used in punishing the intriguing children of men. Did they not fall,—did he not fall, as no monarch fell before? Now, as then, the occupant of the Chair of Peter, turns his gaze on the cross of Calvary and says, "mea culpa." Education has always been her war cry, from the first; to it, each division and subdivision of the army of Christ have rallied. Her clarion notes shall cease only, when her mission shall have been accomplished. Sooner or later! Yes, the Catholic church yesterday, to-day and to-morrow—the Church of Bethlehem, the Church which saw Nero perish, and Atala fall, the church of the Victorian era—Church of the future—the only Church, which, in retrospect, shall survey the wilderness of the age. STUDENT.

Competition is the Life of Trade.

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Competition is necessary, competition is useful, competition is the cause that an immense progress has been made in every line of business; because a merchant, for instance, likes to show to his customers a better merchandise than his neighbor's. And of course, people of all means, profit by this. It would be useless to wade into this part of the subject for every one admits it, and moreover, every one can easily see that to take away the competition, and to establish monopoly is a kind of persecution which the people may submit to, perhaps, but unwillingly. Now, let us apply those principles to education.

Before 1890 R. C. schools used to exist as well as Protestant. Though in some places poor, though their teachers have been ill-treated by the "*Chique Sheet*," they were able to compete peacefully with any others; and the best proof of that assertion is: 1. the great success of the students of St. Boniface college at the University; 2. the most enlightened men of Winnipeg and its neighborhood have sent and still send their daughters to St. Mary's Academy. Why then should the Roman Catholics be deprived of their right to compete in the field of education? Is it not a gross injustice to the people at large to deprive them of the right to enjoy the benefit which naturally comes from such a competition? Surely I can go to the Catholic schools, if I choose to do so. And as the Government has no right to compel me to patronize one store more than the other so it would appear that it has no right to set up a particular school and compel me to patronize it and pay for an article which I do not want.

But no; Greenway with a loud voice which echoed specially in temples of fanaticism said: "Nothing but Protestant schools; away with those R. C. schools, for they might overshadow our Protestant institutions. No competition, but monopoly. Monopoly, you see, will give us money and thus were treated the R. C. schools, Laws, Constitution, Obligation of conscience, natural rights: all have been despised; and the Catholic Manitobans cannot enjoy any more the benefit of competition. Poor enlightened (?) Government!! A VOICE FROM ONTARIO.

Doctors say that the apple is an excellent nerve tonic, as it contains more phosphorus in proportion than any other fruit or vegetable.