The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN

WINNIPEG,

WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

Northwest Review Office, No. 40 Mary Street.

P. KLINKHAMMER,
Business-Manager.

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

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application.

Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.

Advertisements unaccompanied by Specific instructions inserted until ordered out.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES.

All Postage is paid by the Publishers.

The NORTHWEST REVIEW $2 a year, $1 for six months.

Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTHWEST REVIEW for $10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time.

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

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town.

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

Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published.

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

NOTICE.

The editor will always gladly receive (1 ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a PARTY character. (2.) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3.) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4.) NOTES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MAY 1.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

As may be seen on our first page, Father Cherrier answers Dr. Bryce in a way that must carry conviction to every fair-minded man, woman or child. His retort courteous about statistics is especially telling.

The Nor'Wester's financial difficulties have been pounced upon by the Free Press and Tribune as a theme for attack upon their rival. It is not so much the editorial successes of the latter as its fairness to Catholics and its stand on the school question that have brought down upon it the proverbial kick administered to the dead lion by the living ass. But, happily, in this case, the lion was not dead but only sick.

Read the fair and forcible letter of the Rev. Robert Ker, late Anglican Rector of Trinity Church, Quebec, and now Rector of St. Catherines. This Church of England parson is manly enough to admit that he had made a great mistake until he began to examine the question for himself. And now he is so taken with the reasonableness of the Catholic view that he individually — for of course he cannot be sure of what any other Anglican parson may hold — would be glad to see a parochial school established in every Anglican parish.

It is amusing to read of Mr. McIntyre recommending to teachers. "The Wild Flowers of Canada" as an authority in botannical lore, when the very title seems to be a misnomer, if we judge by the fact that our American exchanges are full of the very same advertisements with the very same illustrations for a book called on the other side of the line "The Wild Flowers of America." How accurate must be the information contained in a book which is equally saleable as a local floral handbook in New Orleans and Edmonton!

Not a few papers are guilty of deliberately appropriating as their own the New York or Chicago papers' cabled correspondences. We once saw one of these correspondences published, doubtless by an oversight, in the Montreal Star as paid telegraphic news. But it is reserved to the Tribune to appropriate such despatches and embody them, without any acknowledgment, in an editorial. This it did not later than Saturday last, when its only decent editorial was filched bodily from Harold Frederick's and George W. Smalley's cables to the N. Y. Times and the N. Y. Tribune respectively. Fourteen lines of the Winnipeg Tribune's article are simply copied, witout invested commas, from Mr. Smalley's clever but untrustworthy and always anti-Catholic telegraphic correspondences.

Three elderly maidens were nodding approvingly at every bitter anti-Catholic sentiment in Mr. Pedley's lecture, when suddenly the Rev. Hugh said: "There is one thing, however, I like about Catholics." Before he could explain what it was, the three elderly maidens shook their heads and said in a snappy undertone audible to a Catholic nearby: "That's bad." Anything in praise of Catholics is gall and wormwood to the zealous acidity of such charitable Christians. What Mr. Pedley did go on to praise was the economy of Catholics, a thing these thrifty old maids would no doubt admire in any one else.

The Editor of the Gladstone Age published some time ago in his own paper an account of the public meeting called by himself to protest against a local clergyman's fanatical onslaught on separate schools. One gentleman, opposed to the editor's honest views, asserted that several Catholics favored the present system. Immediately Mr. Doherty, the only Catholic in Gladstone but a host in himself, rose and said: "Name them." The answer was: "Mr. John O'Donohue." Only one and nothing more. "Several" might mean a hundred or so; in this case it meant the eternal, ever-recurring nobody who is trotted out as a prominent Catholic.

A propos of "prominent" men, a really prominent and fervent Protestant, who, (never having read Father Young's book) thinks the whole world would be much better if it were Protestant, said to us the other day anent Mr. Pedley's unfair stand on the school question: "The fact is these noisy clergymen don't care a row of pins for separate or any other schools. All they want is to hit at your church through the separate schools." Just so; there is so little positive truth in Protestantism that the chief interest of Protestant sermons centres in attacks upon Catholics.

We hope the Rev. Dr. Orr is not responsable for the Free Press summaries of his two or three lectures on Kant, Hegel, Schleiermacher and other transcendental worthies. We were told in the reports that these lectures were so clear that any intelligent "sermon-taster" could understand them. Perhaps they were; but the summaries thereof were about as clear as the water of our Red River in the dog-days. Any good encyclopedia, Appleton's for instance, gives a far more intelligible account of the vagaries of those German spinners of philosophic moonshine. Dr Orr makes hardly any attempt to refute these high-sounding aberrations of great but misguided intellects. The reader that is unprovided with sound principles of rational philosophy puts down these summaries with a vague admiration of what he cannot see the folly of, and thus he finds the very groundwork of revealed religion quaking beneath his feet. Such a result is but natural when what is miscalled "Philosophy" is merely a colorless recital of the opinions of every crank who has succeeded in imposing on ambitious but unbalanced minds. Could not the learned Doctor have shown the unreasonableness of Kant's Pure Reason, the groundlessness of Hegel's flimsy though elegant fabric, the utter emptiness of Schleiermacher, at his best, merely an eloquent rhapsodist who has not produced the slightest effect upon the largest and most logical school of philosophy in the world?

THE PREMIER'S GREAT SPEECH.

Sir Mackenzie Bowell's references to the Manitoba school question in his speech at the opening of the session were manly and straightforward. He began by reviewing the circumstances of Mr. Blake's motion in the House of Commons to remove the question altogether from the political arena. When, at this point, Mr. Scott interrupted him to say that Mr. Blake made a mistake, Sir Mackenzie, without attempting to defend the measure, praised his good intentions. Then he went on to review the conduct of the two parties in Manitoba with regard to schools, saying:

"My hon. friend says that in 1871, when the separate school act was enacted by the province of Manitoba, they then understood what they were doing. I quite agree with the hon. gentleman, and it is a matter of satisfaction to me to know that the Conservative party in 1871 were in power in Manitoba and that they were desirous of maintaining intact the obligations into which they had entered when that province came into the Confederation, and it may also be a satisfaction to the hon. gentleman to know that it was his party that was in power in 1890 when they violated the agreement into which they had entered when Manitoba became a province of the Confederation. So it has been from the beginning with that party. If the minority in any province expects to have its rights preserved, whether that minority be Roman Catholic or Protestant, it will have to look to the Conservative body, which has controlled Canada since Confederation with the exception of five years. Minorities will have to look to the Conservative party to maintain these rights. Although I am not an advocate, nor I am in favor, per se, of separate schools, yet I hold that the word of the sovereign, when pledged, no matter whether it is in accord with my particular sentiments or not, should be held inviolate in the governing of the country."

These last are truly noble words, in vivid contrast to the bragging and blustering of Mr. Sifton. Sir Mackenzie, directly afterwards, gave the following most valuable account of the consistent stand he and others took in the debate of 1871:

The honorable gentleman referred to the debate which took place in 1871, and he stated quite correctly the opinions held by the then members of the House of Commons. I remember the discussion very well, and I took the same position then as I take to-day and the same position that I maintained in 1863, when I was defeated in my own county. I stated to my constituents that if the question was whether we should establish separate schools in this country or not, I would vote against them, but the separate schools having been established, I would not be a party to depriving the minority of the rights that they had acquired under the constitution which governed them. I expected that the honorable gentleman would do as Mr. McCarthy did when he argued the question before the privy council, point out how I had voted on that question. I remember that debate. Mr. McDougall stated distinctly that the passing of the act with that amendment would be a perpetuation of the separate school question in Manitoba. Mr. Chauveau, Mr. Cauchon and others took the same line, and it proves to my mind and it must prove to every reader of that debate, this important fact, that when the resolutions were introduced, admitting Manitoba into the Confederation, it was believed at that time, that we were granting the same rights and privileges to the Roman Catholics of Manitoba that had been granted to the minority in Quebec, and to the minority in Ontario in relation to schools. It was for that reason, believing that we were conceding to that province what they did not then have, that I recorded my vote as I then did, and I trust the day will never arrive when the party with which I am connected will violate any agreement into which they have entered, and that the minority who did not obtain their wishes at that particular time should not forget that this country has to be governed by the majority and in the interests of the whole, and not in the interests of a few. I might enlarge on this question, but I do not think it necessary to do so."

Coming down to later events, the premier thus vindicated his position with regard to the Jesuits' Estates act and the action of the Government in the whole history of the Manitoba school case:

"The government took the strictly constitutional course in reference to the Manitoba School act. I am a very strong believer, as Mr. Blake is, in provincial rights, and it was for that reason that I was obliged in 1888 to record my vote (nearly getting defeated by my constituents subsequently for doing so) in support of the contention of the province in regard to the Jesuits' Estates act. I believe that the province of Quebec had a perfect constitutional right to pass that act, that they acted within their powers. They were disposing of their own moneys, and I took the view that it was none of my business in what manner they chose to dispose of those moneys. Consequently, I refused to support the motion seeking to condemn the government for not disallowing the legislation of the province in that regard, but I hold that the same principle must be applied to the whole of the legislation and administration of the country. Under the very principles embodied in this resolution of Mr. Blake's, the Manitoba school case was referred to the Supreme Court of Canada. That court decided that the school act of the province was ultra vires. The honorable the leader of the Opposition says that everybody knew that, or that, if they did not know it, they did not understand the matter. Notwithstanding this statement on his part there was a considerable diversity of opinion on the point, and we find that when the case came before the Lords of the Privy Council in England, they decided that the school act was intra vires, that the legislature of Manitoba had a perfect right to legislate as they had done. Then arose the question of the right to appeal to the Privy Council of Canada for remedial legislation or interference. That again when to the courts in Canada, and our supreme court decided that the minority had no right of appeal. Then the matter was laid before the judicial committee of the Imperial Privy Council, who declared that while the act which had been passed by the legislature of Manitoba in 1890 was within the powers of the legislature, the people of Manitoba belonging to the Roman Catholic faith, having no rights, either by law or practice, in respect to separate schools at the time of the admission of Manitoba into the confederacy of 1870, that act had infringed upon the special privileges conceded to the minority by the provincial legislature in 1871, and that, therefore, the minority had a constitutional right of appeal to the Privy Council of Canada.

"The government lost not a day in summoning the parties interested on either side to appear before the committee of the privy council of Canada, there to argue the question in its various aspects pro and con. It was not a week afterwards before the remedial order was issued, asking the legislature of Manitoba to give to the minority those rights and privileges of which they had been deprived. I do not know that the hon. the leader of the Opposition stated it, but it has been stated here and throughout the country, it was stated in the debate on the address in the other house that that remedial order meant nothing. Then in the very next breath we were told that the government had issued a dictatorial order to the province of Manitoba. The opinions of those who are in opposition to the government on this question are as diversified as the colors of the chameleon."

After some further remarks on the inconsistencies of the Liberal party, Sir Mackenzie concluded with this weighty pronouncement:

"I hope sincerely with the mover and seconder of the address that the people of Manitoba may see their way clear to settle this question among themselves, and to relieve the parliament of Canada from the serious obligation which will devolve upon them otherwise. It is a very serious matter for the government of the Dominon to undertake to deal with a question which affects solely any one section of the country."

"If the people of Manitoba are patriots they will keep this question out of the arena of Dominion politics, but if they desire to continue flinging fire-brands among the electorate of this country (who, I am sure, are desirous of living in peace and harmony) they will reject all overtures and act upon the suggestions of those who are leading the opposition throughout the country. I can only say that, when the time comes, if it should come, for action by this government, the people of Canada will find that the present administration are quite prepared to assume the responsibility which may fall upon them, no matter what the result might be."

There is a ring of sterling honesty and firm purpose in this fitting close of a great speech. However much we could have desired a more explicit assurance that the matter will be settled this session, still we are too profoundly impressed with the premier's manliness and sincerity to entertain any misgivings as to the remoteness of the time "for action by this government." The man who acted so promptly in sending the Remedial Order, and who speaks so plainly and nobly can hardly be hatching a scheme for delaying justice till after a general election, when, the Conservative party having once more triumphed on the strength of promises, might snap its fingers at entreaties to fulfill them. He must surely know that the Catholics of the Dominion have been duped too often to be duped this time again, and that if nothing is *done* before a general election, that election will very likely prove a Waterloo to him and his.

CATHOLIC THRIFT.

We print in another column Mr. Maxim's striking testimony to the morality of Catholic Spaniards. He speaks of the Basque provinces, the country of St. Ignatius Loyola, where to this day the Jesuits are held in high esteem. Mr. Maxim, be it said by way of explanation, at first sight seems to condemn all missionaries; but his subsequent remarks show that he means only Protestant missionaries; and in fact their work, considered as a means to the conversion of the heathen, is a lamentable and most expensive failure.

We now quote Mr. John R. Spears, who writes about Costa Rica in the New York Sun of April 21st, merely premising that practically the entire population of Costa Rica is Catholic.

"Of all the parts of the Spanish main which I have seen there is none in which observers imbued with the pride of race and the prejudices of civilization will receive ruder mental shocks than in Costa Rica. For it greatly disturbs observers of that kind—travellers of Saxon blood, especially—to unlearn their knowledge of things that are not so."

Mr. Spears instances the Yankee's conviction that all the people of the tropics are unthrifty, nay downright lazy. He might have added that the Yankee Protestant as well as the average Protestant everywhere is ignorantly quite sure that all the Catholic countries of Central and South America are wretched holes. But what is the reality?

"A week's stay in any country is too brief for any study of it and yet it is quite enough to enable one who will seek the facts to learn, astonishing and incredible as it may seem, that the Costa Ricans are among the most industrious, thrifty and prosperous people on earth. Nowhere in the United States can a region of like extent and population be found that can make so good a showing in those matters which Yankees are supposed to prize most —industry, thrift, and wealth."

He meets in the second-class cars poorly dressed and barefooted men, who ask him to change a hundred dollar bill for bills of smaller denomination, or who turn out to be farmers with $2,700 a year in cash over and above all the food for themselves and their families. And, when he asks them why they don't buy shoes and fine clothes, their answer is that they leave finery to their wives, as for themselves they would feel uncomfortable in fine clothes and would be laughed at by their neighbors who have seen them as they are all their lives.

Mr. Venecio Garcia, one of the wealthiest men in Costa Rica, who began life as an apprentice to a jeweller in the United States, said to Mr. Spears:

"Everything that you will hear about the wealth of the barefooted class in Costa Rica is true. It is a bad thing for us who have large estates, because we can get no laborers. It is a good thing for the nation, of course It is a fact of which I may say I have personal knowledge that *three-fourths* of the families of Casta Rica are worth $10,000 each or more."

Although Mr. Garcia spoke of Costa Rica dollars, then worth about 45 cents in gold each, yet this showing — three-fourths of the families worth $4,500 each — is simply marvellous. Why, right here in Winnipeg, with 32,000 non-Catholics as against hardly 3,000 Catholics, three-fourths of the families are not worth, in clear surplus, 4,500 cents each. Yet they won't go barefooted, not they! Neither will they pay their just debts; but both the man and the woman will borrow rather than look shabby and will never stint themselves in money for vain or dangerous amusements. Is this Protestant progress? Show instead of substance, pretence in lieu of reality.

Mr. Spears says the prosperity of Costa Rica is due originally to a priest, Padre Velarde, who planted coffee, distributed the berries to farmers and preached the gospel of coffee-growing as much as he preached the other gospel.

Mr. Spears' testimony is doubly important from the fact that he could not help feeling uncomfortable in Costa Rica. "The traveller from the States" — he means the Protestant traveller — "finds himself in Costa Rica everywhere regarded as a heretic. The peon will be polite enough, for he is by nature [is it not rather by religion, for the peon is a half-breed? Ed. N. R.] of gentlemanly instincts, but he is prejudiced against heretics." Mr. Spears thereupon compares the Costa Ricans to the people of Hatteras Island, off the coast of North Carolina, who are all Methodists and who are prejudiced against people who play cards. But he forgets to tell us if the Hatteras people are well off, which they certainly are not, and if they are surly and impolite, which, in common with many non-Catholic country folk, they probably are.

Another Honest Protestant Minister.

To the Editor of the Mail and Empire.

SIR,—I fear, like a good many others, I have not paid that attention to the Manitoba School question which perhaps it deserves. In a general way I thought that somebody was making a villainous attempt to coerce the people of Manitoba to abandon an excellent school system in favour of a system which had been all but universally condemned. This appeared to be the correct view, for I found a Conservative journal urging the uprising in Ontario in favour of "civil and religious liberty," or rather its equivalent, the Manitoba School system. Remembering that it is wise to haste slowly, I thougt it might just be as well before mixing my "war paint" to try, in the first instance, and discover the facts, a preliminary which people occasionally dispense with. Now, assuming that the case, pro and con., has been fully presented by Mr. Ewart and Mr. McCarthy before the Privy Council—and it would be unfair to suppose that any material fact has been omitted—the whole matter appears to be simple enough, and it is by no means difficult to reach a definite conclusion on the main points in the controversy.

To put the matter as plainly and as simply as possible, the Protestants of Manitoba have apparently reached the conclusion that the less religion they have in their school the better for themselves, and if the better for them it inevitably follows that it must be better for everybody else. Even the little which Manitoba offers as religion is so diluted that they have reached the further conclusion that it is very wrong for anybody to oject on any grounds whatever. I will not, of course, pretend to say they have not made an honest attempt to exclude God out of the school curriculum. I believe they have; but I am equally clear that they have attempted to coerce the minority into the acceptance of a sort of hodge podge, which is "neither fish, flesh, fowl, nor good red herring." Just imagine a cross-country teacher trying to work out the following novel kind of religion.

"To establish the habit of right doing, instruction to moral principle must be accompanied by training in moral practices. The teacher's influence and example, current incidents, stories, memory gems, sentiments in the school lessons, examination of motives that prompt to action, didactic talks, teaching the ten commandments, etc., are means to be employed."

The next step is apparently to call this latest educational folly a "National School System." And coercive Acts are passed by the Local Legislature compelling all and singular to adopt the new educational code. The minority contend that they have inherent rights — rights of conscience, rights of contract, rights of compact and constitutional rights, which have been infringed upon by this godless legislation. They claim further that while minimizing religion to the vanishing point may be all right for the Protestant majority, it is not right for them, and that so far as they are personally concerned, they cannot in conscience dishonour God, nor divest themselves of the responsibility He has placed upon them for the proper training of their children. To this it is answered, your schools are bad, your teachers are not qualified, and time that ought to be devoted to the study of algebra and euclid is given over to the little catechism, or some other absurdity of your religion. Well now, suppose that the schools of the minority are as bad as they are represented, who suffers by it? Certainly not the majority. In truth, the treatment accorded to the minority in this instance is a striking illustration of the common interpretation of civil and religious liberty, namely, a liberty to do as I do, because my view of the matter must be right, while your view is unquestionably wrong. I honour the minority for their faithful adherence to the unassailable right of a parent to have his child taught religion as a prime necessity of all education, and it is nothing short of disgraceful to find professing Protestants quite prepared to barter away religion to secure a purely Godless system of education which is working untold misery on this continent at the present moment. Speaking candidly as a clergyman of the English Church, but only speaking for myself individually, I would gladly see a parochial school established in connection with every parish and mision of our Church. Why is it that churchmen have taxed themselves for the maintenance of such schools as Bishop Ridley's College in this city; Trinity College School, Port Hope; Bishop's College School, Lennoxville; and many similar institutions under the auspices of the Anglican Church? The answer is that the pupils attending those schools might have, first of all, a religious training, combined with the best possible primary education.

The plea of the Manitoba minority is a reasonable and righteous one, and the Dominion Government will strengthen itself with all right-thinking people by insisting upon their grievances being adjusted. In the meantime, if the school system of the minority is a bad system nobody will suffer but themselves; at any rate it is better they should suffer than be forcibly compelled to abandon their conscientious convictions, particularly on a question that includes the interests not merely of the here, but of the hereafter.

Yours, etc.,
ROBT. KER,
Rector, St. Catherines.

The Rectory, March 8th.

Fair Statement of the School Case By the Victoria Colonist.

After a surfeit of violent, ignorant and inflammatory articles on the Manitoba school question published in the eastern press, it is quite a pleasure to find that the Victoria Colonist throughly understands the whole question, and is also able to couch its conclusions in temperate language. In an editorial in its issue of March 26, headed: "Not contradictory," it discriminates between the two findings of the judicial committee of the Privy Council upon the cases, *as set before them*, and finds that there was no conflicting judgment rendered. This has always been our contention, and we have tried to present our views to our readers as clearly and as forcibly as possible. Perhaps, the words of the Colonist will carry more conviction, so we quote its presentation of the case:

"The questions submitted to the committee in the two cases are altogether different. On the first case the principal, in fact the only material question, which the commitee had to decide was — had the minority in Manitoba separate schools at the time of the union? If they had, the school law was *ultra vires*, if they had not, then the legislature of Manitoba was competent to enact any law respecting education that the majority believed to be suitable to the circumstances of the country."

The question which the committee had to consider when the second case was submitted to them was: have the Roman Catholics of Manitoba a grievance? They had under the law of the province separate schools for nineteen years. Had they a cause of complaint when the legislature, against their will, abolished their scools and compelled them to pay for the support of schools of which they did not approve and to which they could not with a good conscience send their children?"

Surely no one can fail to see, from this clear presentation, that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council could decide as they have done without stultifying themselves, as it is claimed by some wiseacres they have done!

Another article published on the 2nd instant is headed "No Compulsion," from which we quote as follows:

"It does not take a great deal of study to master the main points of the question, but they must be mastered before anyone can form an intelligent opinion upon it for himself, or can undertake to instruct other people with respect to it. If he reads what has been written on the subject by competent persons he will find that there has been no invasion of the rights of the people of Manitoba. No government or other authority has endeavored to force upon them anything that they were not fully authorized to propose. Every step has been taken, so far, under the constitutional law of Manitoba; and, more than that no one in Manitoba questions the soundness of the decisions of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Roman Catholics of the province admit that the School Law of 1890, which took from them their denominational schools, is constitutional, and the Manitoba advocates of undenominational public common schools are ready to allow that the Roman Catholic minority have the right, under the constitution, to appeal to the Governor-General-in-Council against any school law that in their opinion affects them injuriously. Mr. Dalton McCarthy, who was the counsel for the Government of Manitoba before the committee of the Privy Council, fully admitted that the decision of that tribunal was sound in law. It will have to be allowed that when the Roman Catholic minority appealed to the Governor-General-in-Council they did what they had a perfect right to do under the constitution both of the Dominion and of the Province of Manitoba.

The only question on which there is any room for dispute is, was the Government of the Dominion bound to give a decision in accordance with the decision of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council? Could they not have told the appellants that they neither could nor would do anything for them? There are some who take this stand. Mr. Ewart, who perhaps knows more about the Manitoba school question than any other man in this Dominion—or out of it for that matter—in the letter from which we have already quoted, says "they could not."

"The government has given a decision, and what has been its effect? Simply to refer tho whole matter back to the legislature of Manitoba. This is what the law both of the Dominion and the province of Manitoba directs. The government of Manitoba are told that 'it seems requisite'—to His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council—'that the system of education embodied in in the two acts of 1890 aforesaid shall be supplemented by a provincial act or acts which will restore to the Roman Catholic Minority the said rights and privileges of which such minority have been so deprived as aforesaid, and which will modify the said acts of 1890 so far, and so far only, as may be necessary to give effect to the provisions restoring the rights and privileges . . . hereinbefore mentioned,"

The decision of the Governor-General-in-Council has been submitted to the legislature of Manitoba. There has been in the proceedings no invasion of the rights of the province. The government has followed the law as closely as they possibly could. The legislature of Manitoba is free to carry out the directions of the Gevernor-General-in-Council or to disregard them. There is no compulsion or threat of compulsion. If the legislature of Manitoba does not enact the remedial legislation recommended, then the law of Manitoba directs that "the Parliament of Canada may make remedial laws for the due execution of this section and of any decision of the Governor General-in-Council." The sentence we have quoted is from subsection 3 of section 23 of the Manitoba act.

The reader sees that from the beginning to the end of the proceedings in the matter of the Manitoba schools there has been nothing done but what the laws of Manitoba direct—and that consequently the rights of the people of the province as regards education, have been carefully considered and rigidly respected from first to last.—Nor.'-Wester.

"The Virgin Mother."

"The Virgin Mother," a recent work by the Rt. Rev. A. C. Hall, D. D., Episcopal Bishop of Vermont, represents the high-water mark of Protestant devotion to the Blessed Virgin, says the Ave Maria. Some of our Anglican friends have loudly proclaimed and boldly defended the prerogatives of the Queen of Heaven, but here for the first time an Episcopal bishop in the United States allows her the title of Mother of God. "Mary," says Bishop Hall, "is truly the God-bearer—Theotokos. This title was contended for by the church, not so much for her honor, as to protect the truth of the Incarnation. She is the mother, according to His Human nature of Him, who is God. Yes; it is not the highest of created intelligences that is born to her; then the gulf between creature and the Creator had not been bridged over; then heaven and earth had not been really united. No; it is God who shows Himself in our nature,—the very and eternal Son of God, 'by whom all things were made.' He, and none other, was made Flesh and dwelt among us, and manifested a glory that could belong to none other than the 'Only-Begotten of the Father, full of grace and truth,"

The Bishop's book is tender and reverent, and we hope it will win many souls to the love of Mary. It is a pity, however, that Bishop Hall, who has evidently studied and profited by the writings of the Fathers of the Church, should not have looked deeper into them. He would not then have referred to the "vulgar idea of Transubstantiation," — the only offensive words we have found in the book. — Catholic American.