

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, 364 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, MAY 27.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Bluffing. The art of bluffing is a favorite with Mr. Laurier. After threatening to oppose Mr. LaRiviere in his stronghold, we are told he is going to test Bishop Lafleche's influence in Three Rivers. Should he attempt this last forlorn hope, he will find out what an idol the old Trifluvian prelate is with his people. And, if Mr. Laurier were to run in all the constituencies where his opponents are formidable, he would have to subdivide himself into infinitesimal sections. But he does not mean what he says; it is all a game of bluff.

Is This Honest? The Free Press finds it strange that the Catholic Bishops should advise their flocks on the School Question, but it has no fault to find with the Rev. Mr. Hogg and other self-constituted preachers, who have no divine commission to show, when they lay down the law for the whole country. When Protestant ministers hold forth on purely political subjects, they are simply exercising a legitimate function; when Catholic clergymen speak guardedly on political subjects of vital import to religion, they are meddling with what does not concern them. This is an everyday specimen of Protestant logic: double weights and measures, an indulgent view of their own misdeeds and carping criticism of Catholic virtues.

This Is Honest. We are glad to see that the Free Press — which, of late, can be quoted for opinions good, bad and indifferent — has set its face like a flint against the North Simcoe firebrand. Our morning contemporary says: "Mr. McCarthy has no legitimate place in the politics of this country. If his friends claim that he is the leader of a new party, the obvious reply is that it is a party which can succeed only on the ruins of Confederation. He is waging a race and religious war, and whatever may be his ultimate aim the result of his success would be to destroy the compacts which are the very foundation of the union of the Provinces. No patriotic citizen can join him in a purpose of that kind. We think it is a most regrettable thing that any considerable portion of the people of this city should deem it consistent with their loyalty to the Dominion and their respect for the rights of others to countenance anything in the shape of a popular reception. The political managers who hope to profit from the renewal of the agitation will help it on all they can; that, unhappily, is expected; but that honest electors should allow themselves to be duped by them is beyond all comparison the most deplorable feature of the campaign." These are admirable words. Men like Mr. McCarthy, brilliant men who have more ability than conscience, are the only ones who make capital out of this carefully fostered agitation. For their selfish ends they set the whole country ablaze.

Dalton's Mug. It is a time-honored saw that people who live in glass houses should be careful not to throw stones at their neighbors. Mr. McCarthy would do well to look at himself in the glass before talking of our Hugh John's nose. Dalton is no beauty, the mug of him is a sad disappointment to those who fain would idealize their hero, they did not expect that vulgarly protruding mouth. Between nasal prominence and an abnormal projecting of the jaws there is this difference that the former is thoroughly human, often a badge of intellectuality, whereas the latter, scientifically called prognathism, is a distinctly simian trait.

Laurier's Catholicism. Replying to a correspondent who said Sir Charles Tupper had in Winnipeg appealed to the passions of a Protestant electorate, the Casket points out that what the Premier emphasized was, not Mr. Laurier's Catholicism, but his supposed intention to introduce a more drastic measure than the Remedial Bill. In attributing this intention to Mr. Laurier, the Casket thinks Sir Charles was unfair, since Mr. Laurier has never declared that he would do more than the Remedial Bill proposed to do. It then proceeds:

If Sir Charles Tupper or anyone else were to object to Mr. Laurier for Premier on the ground of his Catholicism, it would be doubly unfair. In the first place it would be an appeal to bigotry; in the second, Mr. Laurier's Catholicism is not so pronounced a kind as to make such an objection even plausible. Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who says that the issue in this contest is to down the Catholic Church, has expressed himself as quite satisfied with Mr. Laurier for Premier. If he satisfies Mr. McCarthy, that ought to silence all such objections.

In other words, if Mr. McCarthy, the bitterest enemy of Catholicism in the Dominion, does not find Mr. Laurier's religious convictions at all embarrassing, how can any other Protestant have a right to complain?

Evolution. Rev. Father Zahm lately published a learned work on "Evolution and Dogma," in which he attempted to show that St. Thomas Aquinas and St. Augustine both held the fundamental principle of organic evolution. The editor of the Casket has just completed a series of still more learned articles in which he proves beyond cavil that Father Zahm has either not understood these great writers or has not read them with sufficient thoroughness. The Antigonish editor gives numerous quotations from both the Angelic Doctor and the Bishop of Hippo. The latter says in his famous commentary on Genesis: "God alone is the author of every species of physical substance, from the highest to the lowest." It would indeed be difficult, as the Casket observes, to express in stronger language dissent from the Cardinal principle of evolution.

DALTON MCCARTHY'S VISIT.

Dalton McCarthy has been here and has gone again; the Laurier party in this city have fired their big gun and it is now in order for us to estimate for the benefit of our readers what the result has been. To do this we shall briefly sketch the principle features of the reception tendered the reckless agitator and of the mass meeting which he addressed. As we stated last week he was timed to reach here on the Queen's birthday the object evidently being to take advantage of the crowds of people who would be keeping holiday and might therefore be expected to line the streets for the purpose of seeing the man who has been such a disturbing element in the public affairs of Canada. A committee was formed two weeks ago to arrange a monster procession and it was promised through the press that the reception which would be tendered this "friend of Manitoba" on his arrival at the depot, and his progress through the streets to the place of meeting would show what a hold he has on the affections of the people. And this promise was kept to the very letter. The great Dalton when he stepped from the train was received by a mob the numbers of

which amounted probably to four or five hundred. On emerging from the car he was immediately seized on by half-a-dozen men who forced him into a chair which they raised on their shoulders and on which they carried him, much to his personal discomfort, over the route outlined by the committee, the nondescript crowd surrounding them and yelling to their hearts content, and very much to the amusement of the few onlookers who witnessed the proceedings from the sidewalks and the houses.

We really believe that the demonstration actually fulfilled the promises, although not the intentions, of its promoters and accurately shewed the hold Dalton McCarthy has on the affections of the people of Winnipeg. We hope the hero of the moment was satisfied, but if he felt as uncomfortable as he looked he has not taken away with him very rosy recollections of the occasion. The rink in which the meeting was to be held was at length reached by those who were carrying the chair and its occupant and by the attendant rabble. Owing to the heavy rains of the afternoon the programme of amusement which had been arranged to take place at the city parks had been abandoned, so those whose intention it was to take them in had, instead, turned their steps in the direction of the political meeting place, and the hall was consequently crowded. There was anywhere from three to four thousand people present — half of whom were evidently out of sympathy with the objects of the meeting although willing to pass away the evening listening to what might be said and ready to give the speakers a fair hearing. Mayor Jameson occupied the chair — thus breaking all Winnipeg precedents, for never before has a mayor of this city taken such a prominent part in a political fight and we venture to say Mr. Jameson will yet regret having done so. He opened the proceedings with a bitter speech in which he charged the church of Rome with being a political machine entirely out of touch with British institutions and eulogized Mr. Laurier as one who is to-day shouldering to shoulder with Dalton McCarthy waging war against the encroachments of that Church. He introduced Mr. McCarthy to the meeting whose rising was greeted by loud cheering on the part of, perhaps, half the audience, the other half remaining dumb. He at once plunged into the school question dealing exhaustively with what he called the constitutional aspect of the case. He rather staggered many of his friends by admitting that by the law of 1890 a right of the minority had been taken away, but he regained their good graces by arguing that it did not necessarily follow that this right should be restored inasmuch as very few laws were passed which did not interfere with someone's rights. He spoke very flippantly of the Privy Council saying that no doubt the simple people of Manitoba had as much respect and reverence for that body as he once had, but after all they were only a few old gentlemen sitting in London and thank God the people of Canada were a self-governing body and took no dictation from any source. Some in the audience, but we are glad to say, comparatively few, cheered even these sentiments, which it struck us were rather out of harmony with some of the streamers that adorned the building which abounded in professions of ardent loyalty to British institutions. Mr. McCarthy then attempted to explain away, without much success, the decision of the Privy Council, and proceeded to denounce in sneering tones the action of the Bishops of the Catholic Church. Considering that the Rev. Joseph Hogg occupied a seat on the platform, it struck many in the audiences that his remarks under this head might better have been left unsaid or if spoken applied with more force to the Winnipeg preacher than to the Quebec authorities. In this connection Mr. McCarthy warmly praised the stand taken by his ally, Mr. Wilfrid Laurier, who although a devoted son of the church would not receive dictation from meddling ecclesiastics, and then the orator went on to praise Mr. Joseph Martin and

to misrepresent the Hon. Hugh John Macdonald. This part of his speech fell somewhat flat for the audience evidently remembered that the courageous Dalton had declined Mr. Macdonald's challenge to meet him on the platform. These were the principal points of the speech, indeed with a few nasty sneers at Sir Charles Tupper and a good deal of windy claptrap, they were the whole of it. Mr. Joseph Martin followed, but we left the hall as he commenced to speak, and went home well satisfied that the advent of Dalton McCarthy here will have no material effect on the election unless it will be to open the eyes of many electors who have hitherto been blind to the dangerous forces which are behind Laurierism in this country. Thus good will in all probability once more come out of evil and after the 23rd of June next Mr. Dalton McCarthy will realize that his attempt to accentuate the race and creed trouble in Manitoba failed most miserably and that he only succeeded in adding strength and solidity to those who desire to see British fair play and the Constitutional rights of minorities forever safeguarded.

HOGWASH.

The Rev. Messrs. Hogg (Joseph and John) are in the habit of inflicting on their congregations, and, through the medium of the press, on the citizens of Winnipeg generally, their outlandish views regarding the questions of the hour, but they had a regular field day on Sunday of last week, and preached a sermon apiece in which they shewed the lively interest they are taking in the approaching elections by soliciting from their pulpits votes in the interest of that true Christian and model citizen who is running here in Mr. Laurier's interest, the "Hon." Joseph Martin. Of the Rev. Joseph's oration we have only to remark that it abounded in election claptrap and stump oratory of the most flimsy description, it was an insult to the intelligence of his hearers, and was so palpably childish that we sincerely pity those who had to listen to it and feel quite sure that far from being a boom for the Laurier candidate, as it was evidently intended to be, it has proved more of a boomerang. If the preachers go on at the gait set them by the Rev. Joseph Hogg, Mr. Martin will assuredly have good cause to exclaim "Save me from my ranting friends!" But if the Rev. Joseph made an absurd spectacle of himself and talked twaddle, what may be said of the utterances of the Rev. John? For our part we hesitate about saying anything for we are free to confess that in our opinion the less said on such an unsavoury subject the better. Our readers will understand our feeling if we give them a short quotation which is only one of many such choice morsels which appeared in the Tribune report of the sermon: —

"The Lord Jesus is my King, and every Christian man professes the same allegiance, and speaking for myself I would as soon strip myself of every claim I may have of being considered a subject of Christ's kingdom as give an atom of support to that nest of conspiring corruptionists called a government, whose misgovernment of a free and Christian people rests on our beloved land like a blighting curse."

Comment on such a speech is hardly necessary. The horrible blasphemy contained in it is so revolting and the abominable effrontery of the speaker so disgusting, that the words carry their own condemnation. There are, however, two or three reflections which we would briefly indulge in. The first is that the man whose righteous indignation at the iniquities of the government compels him to indulge in such tremendous denunciation is himself going to vote for, and was speaking in the interests of, the notorious Joseph Martin, and against the pure, clear, honorable citizen Hugh John Macdonald. Our second reflection is with regard to the "Reverend" gentleman's frequent declarations of loyalty to his King. We have only to say that the public simply have his word for this, and would be more ready to believe him if he would first show stronger evidence of his loyalty to the Queen, his earthly sovereign. He must know that Her Majesty over

her own hand and seal sent to the Dominion authority an order to immediately put into effect the finding of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council on the appeal of the Catholic minority, and yet he has been amongst the foremost of those who have declared their intention of resisting this decree, and in inciting the people to withstand it. When he shows himself ready to live up to the constitution of the land and to loyally support the authority of his Queen, then he may, if he thinks it necessary and proper so to do, shout himself hoarse in proclaiming his devotion to that King of Kings whose Holy Name he used with such reckless profanity throughout the whole of his speech. Our concluding reflection will be for the benefit of our readers at a distance. They may judge from the quotation we have made what manner of fight is being waged in this country by the opponents of the Government and of Catholic rights, and seeing what class of men are battling for Laurierism in this country they can draw their own conclusions.

THE PROTESTANT HORSE.

The Globe is astride the Protestant horse. Its columns must afford very interesting subjects for meditation to the Catholic electors of Ontario. In its issue of the 18th May, it gives its readers a synopsis of the collective pastoral of the Archbishops and Bishops of Quebec on the Manitoba school question, and while commending the moderate tone of their Lordships, it makes a direct appeal to the prejudices and passions of the entire Protestant electorate of the Dominion. In this appeal it does not scruple to misrepresent the actual facts and circumstances surrounding this very question. Why this should be necessary, it is difficult to conceive. It accuses their Lordships of acting differently in the New Brunswick school case in 1872, and falsely states that the cases are as widely different as they can well be. In the New Brunswick case, the Catholics, we deeply regret to say, had no legal status, the Highest Court in the Empire having so decided. In the Manitoba case, the same Court of last resort, decided that the Catholics have a legal status, and that Court has directed that their legal status be restored. Herein lies the difference between the two cases. It is, therefore, very dishonest of the Globe to thus try to deceive its readers. Its reasons for doing so are as contemptible as they are dishonest. Not content with deceiving its readers and appealing to the prejudices and passions of the Protestant electors of the Dominion, it further seeks to prejudice the English speaking Catholics of the Dominion against their Lordships of Quebec, by cunningly trying to impress them with the belief that the Hierarchy of Quebec were influenced in 1872 and in 1896 by racial, rather than by religious, reasons. This is unjust and unreasonable. In 1872, the New Brunswick case had not reached the Privy Council and the lower courts had decided against the contention of the Catholic minority. The Bishops of Quebec only acted with prudence, then, when they decided that:

"(1) Every Catholic is without doubt bound to disapprove the principle of the New Brunswick school act and even to get a remedy for this sad state of affairs by observing the rules of prudence.

(2) Such a Catholic is, however, free to choose in order to reach this desirable end the means which he judges to be the best of his knowledge with the least possible danger to the religious peace of the country.

(3) The constitutionality of the said act and the propriety of provoking the intervention of the Imperial Parliament or of the Federal Government are among the number of questions which are free in point of view of conscience, and our Catholic legislators can without violating religious principles vote in one sense or another."

Had they decided to force the issue without a judgment in favor of the Catholic contention, they would have been placing themselves in direct opposition to the Constitution and authority of the country, and that they could not do.

But in the present instance the case is entirely different. The Imperial Privy Council has decided that the Greenway Government, by the school act of 1890, did prejudicially affect the rights and privileges of the minority, and, in refus-