

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT
Room 11, Grain Exchange Building,
EVERY WEDNESDAY BY
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.

The Northwest Review is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

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

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.
J. Barreau, Medicine Hat, N. W. T.

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."

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.

I therefore consider that you enter a good work and I pray to God that He will bless you in its accomplishment.

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

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic 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 controversy.

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 4.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

We regret to learn through the columns of our contemporary, the Providence Visitor, of the death of Sister Athanasius, of the order of our Lady of Mercy.

The Catholic Sentinel comes to us in a new dress, and looks very nice indeed. The Sentinel is a first class Catholic paper, and is doing excellent work for the cause of religion.

The government of official Italy now proposes to remove the exequatur and the placet to all Bishops and priests appointed to administer dioceses and parishes.

An Episcopalian clergyman, Rev. Charles Stirling, Vicar of New Malden, England, recently resigned his position on the ground that his church was becoming too "Romanish."

Says the Neepawa Register:—"Since this School Question first came up for discussion much has been written about majority and minority rights, but few there are who really know whether the Protestants or Catholics were in the majority when Manitoba entered confederation on the 23rd day of June, 1870.

The contrast between these reformers, of religion and the Popes who preferred to incur the enmity of Henry VIII and Napoleon I. rather than to countenance a violation of the laws of God, is well worthy of being carefully considered by those who regard the Protestant Reformation as the work of Almighty God.

that city by the enforcement of the enactment against immoral houses, have got the cart before the horse. Not by expelling the fallen women from their homes by law, but by converting the impure men who have led them astray, by religion, can the remedy be found.

Sir William Lawson is very strongly opposed to the retention of Uganda by the English. He puts the reasons of his opposition in this very emphatic fashion:

"Lord Salisbury claims for the forward policy the support of saints and patriots. I confess that I cannot see it in that light. What is there saintly in mowing down Africans with a maxim gun? What is there patriotic in making a railway to transmit the African chiefs—according to Captain Lugard—white donkeys, opera-glasses, and rat-traps? If Uganda were a paying concern, you may be quite sure that the African company would stay there."

Sir William evidently appreciates the ugly side of this affair. Captain Lugard simply employed Moslem methods of evangelization, and these against fellow Christians!

The Catholic American says:

So far have the members of the A.P.A. in Detroit advanced in the practice of the Gospel of Hate that they have boycotted the Catholic merchants. They will not buy from them nor from Protestant store keepers who are on friendly terms with them. They have discharged all their own Catholic employees, and have urged all who sympathize with them in their war against the Catholic religion to do likewise.

Our esteemed contemporary the Catholic Record thus describes a morganatic marriage. A despatch from Munich announces very much as a matter of course that Duke Ernest Ludwig, of Bavaria, contracted on the 23rd of November "a morganatic marriage" with the object of his affections, the Franlein Antonio Barth.

These morganatic marriages are of frequent occurrence in Germany between Princes and women of inferior rank, it being stipulated that the wife and the children shall not be entitled to the rank and possessions of the husband.

As a matter of course such a practice is allowed only under a Lutheran regime. It was positively allowed by Luther and his colleagues in establishing the Reformation in Germany that the Landgrave of Hesse should marry a second wife while his first wife was living, and a doctrinal decree was actually drawn up and signed by these first leaders of German Protestantism in which they attempted to show the lawfulness of such a course.

The little duties are trying in many ways. Generally they are the most important and cannot be dispensed with. There was a suicide once who gave as

his excuse that he was tired of the daily buttoning and unbuttoning; the act of putting on his clothes in the morning and taking them off at night had wearied him, as we may suppose, to the degree of insanity.

Father Faber implies truly that the little duties may be made a source of pleasure. How? By exactness we may find them a well-spring of cheerfulness.

Amongst the illusions entertained by a certain class of Catholics, there is none more pitiable than the notion that the truth requires a great number of defenders and friends. To these people number seems a synonym for force.

Now, true force, real power in the physical as in the moral order, consists in intensity rather than in extension. A greater volume of matter equally intense evidently produces a greater effect, not by reason of the increased volume, but by virtue of the augmented intensities contained in it.

Faith possesses a power of its own which it communicates to its friends and defenders. It is not they who give the truth power, but truth which charges them with its own vigor.

They imagine, with blinded good faith, that they are defending and propagating Catholicity. But by dint of accommodating it to their own narrow views and feeble courage, in order to make it, they say, more acceptable to the enemy, whom they wish to overcome, they do not perceive that they are no longer defending Catholicity but a thing of their own manufacture which they naively call Catholicity, but which they ought to call by another name.

There was a suicide once who gave as his excuse that he was tired of the daily buttoning and unbuttoning; the act of putting on his clothes in the morning and taking them off at night had wearied him, as we may suppose, to the degree of insanity.

The old year has departed and a new year dawned upon us, since our last issue. The year just closed has been an eventful one in many ways. At its opening, we were in the midst of a contention for our right to educate our children without having, at the same time, to support a system of schools in every particular and detail Anti-Catholic.

We felt quite confident that many who were in sympathy with a purely secular school system, and who, under honestly conducted means of attainment, would give it a hearty support, would simply revolt at the dishonesty, duplicity and treachery by which the Government accomplished its object.

AN ILLUSION OF LIBERAL CATHOLICS.
Amongst the illusions entertained by a certain class of Catholics, there is none more pitiable than the notion that the truth requires a great number of defenders and friends.

Now, true force, real power in the physical as in the moral order, consists in intensity rather than in extension. A greater volume of matter equally intense evidently produces a greater effect, not by reason of the increased volume, but by virtue of the augmented intensities contained in it.

THE QUESTION ANSWERED.
The Winnipeg Tribune, under the heading "A Question to answer," approvingly quotes the following from the Toronto Week:

Just what is that something in the atmosphere of a public school which a good Catholic should fear to have his children breathe, and just what is that quality in Catholicism which would be endangered by breathing that atmosphere?

Such is the delusion of which many of our brethren are the unconscious victims through a detestable contact with Liberalism.

They imagine, with blinded good faith, that they are defending and propagating Catholicity. But by dint of accommodating it to their own narrow views and feeble courage, in order to make it, they say, more acceptable to the enemy, whom they wish to overcome, they do not perceive that they are no longer defending Catholicity but a thing of their own manufacture which they naively call Catholicity, but which they ought to call by another name.

There are further reasons than this to prove that it is merely begging the question in setting up such a plea in regard to the different denominations. They could have had separate schools here if they wanted them, but they refused them, and agreed on a basis in every way satisfactory to themselves.

Having agreed on a basis of Protestantism acceptable to all the Protestant denominations, it follows, as a logical conclusion, that those schools are Protestant denominational schools, because they teach nothing that is objectionable to any Protestant denomination, but, on the contrary, everything that is acceptable to them.

Having disposed of this part of the Week's sophistries, we now turn our attention to its direct question: "What,

then, is the injurious element in the atmosphere of the public school which renders it impossible that they should be neutral, and to what particular article in the faith of Catholics is that element so antagonistic that they ought not to be asked to tolerate it?"

In our reply, we would say that much depends on what kind of a school our contemporary means by the word "neutral." Does it mean by "neutral" a school in which no religion is taught, and no God recognized; or does it mean a school in which the bible is read, and prayers said, and religious instruction given which is prescribed by and in every way acceptable to Protestants generally?

We are at a loss to know which of those schools the Week means, by the designation "neutral." Of course a genuine "neutral" school must ignore all religious teaching, for the simple reason that it is impossible to teach it, except under one of two forms, Catholic or Protestant.

But this does not seem to hold good with our contemporary, if we judge it by its rant about Anglicans, Pedobaptists, Baptists, &c., and we have no doubt it will be found among those who pretend to believe that a purely Protestant school may be logically called "neutral."

Well, we are opposed to "neutral" schools because they are godless, and to Protestant schools because they are anti-Catholic. Is not this a sufficient reason for any reasonable man? Is not the Protestant religion, which is taught in those schools anti-Catholic? Why is the word Protestant used, and what does it mean? Does not its very name mean a protest against Catholicity, and if so, are we not justified in calling that religion anti-Catholic? And yet, ye gods! the Week, a Protestant paper of supposed culture and intelligence, soberly and solemnly asks the question, "What, then, is injurious in the public (Protestant) schools, which a good Catholic should fear or object to? Why does not the wise and learned Week ask us at once, what is there in the atmosphere of the Protestant church injurious to the faith of Catholics, or what particular element is there in it antagonistic to Catholics?"

The Protestant churches and their teachings are objectionable to Catholics for the very same reason that Protestant schools are objectionable to us—viz.; because they are, in feeling, sentiment, teaching and action, opposed to us; they are anti-Catholic and teach that the church which we hold dear, and the teachings which we know to be true, are "damnable idolatries."

We believe that the teachings of the Catholic church are the infallible law, the voice of God, and we object to have them called "damnable." We object to have our children taught in a school in which this "injurious element" prevails. But we have another and a greater objection to these schools and it is this; they are not only, as in the case of purely secular schools, irreligious or godless, and as in the case of Protestant schools, anti-Catholic, but they fail to give that definite and true religious and moral instruction which the Catholic conscience of the parents of Catholic children deem to be essential to the proper religious development of their children.

Whether rightly or wrongly, that is the conscientious belief of Catholics, and it will not do for our Protestant friends to say that we are wrong in thinking so, because that would be assuming a right to judge us by their own standard of right. They may honestly think that it would be better for our children to be educated in Protestantism, but we do not think so and, inasmuch as the children are ours and not theirs, common sense and justice should tell them that their belief, if carried into practice, would be an intolerable interference with parental rights, which no civilized community could endure.

As well might they say that it would be better for Catholics to be Protestants and then turn around and tax Catholics to support Protestant churches. Could the Week see anything in such an atmosphere "injurious to the faith of Catholics?" Could the Protestant churches assume such a position towards Catholics without being charged with injuring the faith and destroying the liberty of Catholics? We think not, and yet this is, in fact, what they are doing to us when they require us to support Protestant schools, in which the Protestant religion is taught to all the children attending them. It will not do to say that Catholics need not be present at those religious exercises. Why should Catholics be placed in such a position, or why should they, any more than Protestants, be deprived of religious instruction? In one word, why should they be required to accept Protestantism or pay a heavy penalty for not accepting it. That is the exact position in which they are placed in Manitoba to-day. Yet such reputedly respectable papers as the Toronto Week has the supreme indecency to ask, "to what particular article in the faith of Catholics is that (Protestant) element so antagonistic that they ought not to be asked to tolerate it?" Should any French Canadian newspaper in the province of Quebec ask such a question of our separated brethren, we would be the very first to cry out, shame! There must be something radically wrong in the public conscience when such a question can be asked by one paper and approvingly quoted by another without bringing shame and disgrace on the papers.

platoon around it, that not all the legions of earth and hell combined could badge a single inch. They make no alliance, no compromise with a foe, whose single aim, disguised or open, is the destruction of the truth. They know the enemy is by nature implacable, and his flag of truce but a cunning device of treachery.

Of this we will become more and more convinced, if we consider that an alliance of this kind with a false auxiliary is not only useless to the good Christian in the midst of the combat, but moreover it is most of the time an actual embarrassment to him and favorable to the enemy. Catholic associations hampered in their onward march by such an alliance, will find themselves so impeded that free action becomes impossible.

Against such a course the la Civilita Cattolica, in some remarkable articles, has emphatically declared. Without the proper precaution, it says, "associations of this kind (Catholic) run the certain danger, not only of becoming a camp of scandalous discord, but also of wandering away from their true principles to their own ruin and the great injury of religion."

Now, true force, real power in the physical as in the moral order, consists in intensity rather than in extension. A greater volume of matter equally intense evidently produces a greater effect, not by reason of the increased volume, but by virtue of the augmented intensities contained in it.

THE QUESTION ANSWERED.
The Winnipeg Tribune, under the heading "A Question to answer," approvingly quotes the following from the Toronto Week:

Just what is that something in the atmosphere of a public school which a good Catholic should fear to have his children breathe, and just what is that quality in Catholicism which would be endangered by breathing that atmosphere?

Such is the delusion of which many of our brethren are the unconscious victims through a detestable contact with Liberalism.

They imagine, with blinded good faith, that they are defending and propagating Catholicity. But by dint of accommodating it to their own narrow views and feeble courage, in order to make it, they say, more acceptable to the enemy, whom they wish to overcome, they do not perceive that they are no longer defending Catholicity but a thing of their own manufacture which they naively call Catholicity, but which they ought to call by another name.

There are further reasons than this to prove that it is merely begging the question in setting up such a plea in regard to the different denominations. They could have had separate schools here if they wanted them, but they refused them, and agreed on a basis in every way satisfactory to themselves.

Having agreed on a basis of Protestantism acceptable to all the Protestant denominations, it follows, as a logical conclusion, that those schools are Protestant denominational schools, because they teach nothing that is objectionable to any Protestant denomination, but, on the contrary, everything that is acceptable to them.

Having disposed of this part of the Week's sophistries, we now turn our attention to its direct question: "What,

then, is the injurious element in the atmosphere of the public school which renders it impossible that they should be neutral, and to what particular article in the faith of Catholics is that element so antagonistic that they ought not to be asked to tolerate it?"

In our reply, we would say that much depends on what kind of a school our contemporary means by the word "neutral." Does it mean by "neutral" a school in which no religion is taught, and no God recognized; or does it mean a school in which the bible is read, and prayers said, and religious instruction given which is prescribed by and in every way acceptable to Protestants generally?

We are at a loss to know which of those schools the Week means, by the designation "neutral." Of course a genuine "neutral" school must ignore all religious teaching, for the simple reason that it is impossible to teach it, except under one of two forms, Catholic or Protestant.

But this does not seem to hold good with our contemporary, if we judge it by its rant about Anglicans, Pedobaptists, Baptists, &c., and we have no doubt it will be found among those who pretend to believe that a purely Protestant school may be logically called "neutral."

Well, we are opposed to "neutral" schools because they are godless, and to Protestant schools because they are anti-Catholic. Is not this a sufficient reason for any reasonable man? Is not the Protestant religion, which is taught in those schools anti-Catholic? Why is the word Protestant used, and what does it mean? Does not its very name mean a protest against Catholicity, and if so, are we not justified in calling that religion anti-Catholic? And yet, ye gods! the Week, a Protestant paper of supposed culture and intelligence, soberly and solemnly asks the question, "What, then, is injurious in the public (Protestant) schools, which a good Catholic should fear or object to? Why does not the wise and learned Week ask us at once, what is there in the atmosphere of the Protestant church injurious to the faith of Catholics, or what particular element is there in it antagonistic to Catholics?"

The Protestant churches and their teachings are objectionable to Catholics for the very same reason that Protestant schools are objectionable to us—viz.; because they are, in feeling, sentiment, teaching and action, opposed to us; they are anti-Catholic and teach that the church which we hold dear, and the teachings which we know to be true, are "damnable idolatries."

We believe that the teachings of the Catholic church are the infallible law, the voice of God, and we object to have them called "damnable." We object to have our children taught in a school in which this "injurious element" prevails. But we have another and a greater objection to these schools and it is this; they are not only, as in the case of purely secular schools, irreligious or godless, and as in the case of Protestant schools, anti-Catholic, but they fail to give that definite and true religious and moral instruction which the Catholic conscience of the parents of Catholic children deem to be essential to the proper religious development of their children.

Whether rightly or wrongly, that is the conscientious belief of Catholics, and it will not do for our Protestant friends to say that we are wrong in thinking so, because that would be assuming a right to judge us by their own standard of right. They may honestly think that it would be better for our children to be educated in Protestantism, but we do not think so and, inasmuch as the children are ours and not theirs, common sense and justice should tell them that their belief, if carried into practice, would be an intolerable interference with parental rights, which no civilized community could endure.

As well might they say that it would be better for Catholics to be Protestants and then turn around and tax Catholics to support Protestant churches. Could the Week see anything in such an atmosphere "injurious to the faith of Catholics?" Could the Protestant churches assume such a position towards Catholics without being charged with injuring the faith and destroying the liberty of Catholics? We think not, and yet this is, in fact, what they are doing to us when they require us to support Protestant schools, in which the Protestant religion is taught to all the children attending them. It will not do to say that Catholics need not be present at those religious exercises. Why should Catholics be placed in such a position, or why should they, any more than Protestants, be deprived of religious instruction? In one word, why should they be required to accept Protestantism or pay a heavy penalty for not accepting it. That is the exact position in which they are placed in Manitoba to-day. Yet such reputedly respectable papers as the Toronto Week has the supreme indecency to ask, "to what particular article in the faith of Catholics is that (Protestant) element so antagonistic that they ought not to be asked to tolerate it?" Should any French Canadian newspaper in the province of Quebec ask such a question of our separated brethren, we would be the very first to cry out, shame! There must be something radically wrong in the public conscience when such a question can be asked by one paper and approvingly quoted by another without bringing shame and disgrace on the papers.