

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XIV, No. 52.

WINDYBAY, MANITOBA, TUESDAY, JULY 18, 1899.

\$2.00 per year.
Single Copies, 5 cents.

DID THE POPE STRIKE AT A SHADOW?

The Casket.

That over-much protestation, which now, as in the days of Hamlet, is apt of its very self to arouse suspicion, is still being freely indulged in by the school in the United States whose views were aimed at by the Holy Father's recent letter on "Americanism." Over and over and over again they have protested that the thing condemned by the Vicar of Christ as Americanism is utterly and absolutely unknown in America, and, by inference, that, as we remarked at the time, the Papal Letter, through some unaccountable mistake, got into the wrong envelope and was addressed to Baltimore instead of to Paris. This is of course not very complimentary to the Holy See, but then the exigencies of the situation necessitate the sinister compliment.

It is not surprising that those persons should be aware that it would take not a little effort to convince the world that this mistake had been made, and that there was no Americanism in America; and so we need not be astonished at finding the assertion reiterated every few days. The recently established N-w Era, of London, which is of the school referred to—of the school of that clever and zealous but strangely erratic cleric in England, whose notions of the necessity of conforming to the spirit of the world have led him the length of publishing two nasty novels—has a letter from Paris—the city which recently entertained a distinguished dignitary from America—paying the successor of the Fisherman the further compliment of explaining that his Letter was obtained by intrigue and was all due to the desire of one or two obscure priests (in whose hands, by inference, Rome was a mere tool) for personal revenge. And further the same paper has an interview with the distinguished dignitary himself (whose name, out of respect for his office and to avoid giving scandal to the simple-minded, we have always studiously avoided mentioning in connection with these matters) reiterating for the thousandth time the statement that the Americanism condemned by the Pope is utterly unknown in the United States, and denouncing the rascals in France who fathered their spurious offspring upon America.

Now before we proceed to apply a very simple test to this oft-repeated assertion, let us say one passing word about this denunciation and repudiation of what is now claimed to be French Americanism. The most striking thing about the said denunciation and repudiation was the extreme lateness of their appearance upon the stage. There was not a word against so-called French Americanism, until the Pope's condemnation became a foregone conclusion. It was left to the doughty cleric in England to whom we have just referred, to discover—and that just a week or two before the blow fell, that the French translation or adaptation of the Life of Father Hecker was not a faithful reproduction of the original. But where was the vigilance of the American and only genuine Americanists

while, as they now claim, their book was being travestied, their principles perverted, and their prophet made to stand sponsor for all manner of novel vagaries in France? What were they doing? Why, rejoicing and making the world ring with their jublations over the attention which Father Hecker and American ideas were attracting there; chuckling over the alarm with which, as they said, these ideas were filling the staid old monarchists of Europe; filling the alleged Catholic press of America with the cock-and-bull stories of "Innominato" and his ilk, about how the Pope was studying American Catholicism as a model and was convinced that genuine Catholicism had at length been discovered (or invented); and talking openly of the future canonization of the first genuine American saint. All these we remember; they cannot easily be forgotten; but one word of protest or repudiation—who ever heard it whispered until the case went to Rome and the possibility of a condemnation began to appear?

Let us now test the truth of the assertion that the opinions condemned by the Holy See are not and have never been entertained by any Catholics in the United States. Space does not permit the collocation of numerous passages from the Pope's Letter with extracts from the book referred to. Such a proceeding would prove very instructive on this point, but we cannot at present follow it far. We shall, however, place in juxtaposition a few passages. The following is from the Holy Father's Letter:

"He alone could wish that some Christian virtues be adapted to certain times and different ones for other times who is un-mindful of the Apostle's words: 'That those whom he foreknew, He predestined to be made conformable to the image of His son, Romans viii, 29. Christ is the teacher and the exemplar of all sanctity, and to His standard must all those conform who wish for eternal life. Nor does Christ know any change as the ages pass, for He is yesterday and today and the same forever,'—Hebrews xiii, 8. To the men of all ages was the precept given: 'Learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart.'—Mat. xi, 29.' 'To every age has He been made manifest to us obedient even unto death; in every age the apostle's dictum has its force: 'those who are Christ's have crucified their flesh with its vices and concupiscences.' Would to God that more now-a-days practised these virtues in the degree of the saints of past times, who in humility, obedience and self-restraint were powerful, 'in word and deed'—to the great advantage not only of religion, but of the State and the public welfare.

"Nor should any difference of praise be made between those who follow the active state of life from those others who charmed with solitude, give themselves to prayer and bodily mortification. And how much, indeed, of good report these have merited, and do merit, is known surely to all who do not forget that the 'continual prayer of the just man' avails to placate and to bring down the blessings of Heaven when to such prayers bodily mortification is added."

Now without one word of comment, and with the simple request to the intelligent, candid,

honest reader to compare them, we place beside this the following passage from the Introduction to the original Life, written by the very dignitary himself who, as we have seen above, is assuring the people of England that the condemned opinions are utter strangers in America:

"Each century calls for its type of Christian perfection. At one time it was martyrdom; at another it was the humility of the cloister. To-day we need the Christian gentleman and the Christian citizen. An honest ballot and social decorum among Catholics will do more for God's glory and the salvation of souls than midnight flagellations or Compostellan pilgrimages.—(p. xii.)

We have double-led the last sentence, but beyond doing this we offer no comment. As another manifestation of much the same spirit we might quote, from page 407, Father Hecker's words, as given by his biographer, to a young priest who, after returning from Rome to the United States, complained of the difficulty of finding time for prayer:

"Don't be such a baby," said he [Father Hecker] "Look around and see how much work there is to be done here. Is it not better to make some return to God?—here in your own country—for what he has done for you, rather than to be sucking your thumbs abroad? What kind of piety do you call that?"

The scriptural incident of Mary and Martha will readily occur to the reader's mind.

One more comparison or contrast. This is what the Biographer says on the subject of vows in religious communities:

"With regard to stability, men of stable character need no vow to guarantee adherence to a divine vocation and men of feeble character may indeed vow themselves into an outward stability, but it is of little fruit to themselves personally, and their irremovability is often of infinite distress to their superiors and brethren. The episcopate is the one religious order founded by Our Lord, and its members are in the highest state of evangelical perfection; yet they are neither required nor advised to take the oath or vows of religious orders. (p. 300.)

Here are a few words from the Holy Father's reference to the subject:

"From this disregard of the evangelical virtues, erroneously styled passive, the step was a short one to a contempt of the religious life which has in some degree taken hold of minds. That such a value is generally held by the upholders of new views we infer from certain statements concerning the vows which religious orders take. They say vows are alien to the spirit of the times, in that they limit the bounds of human liberty; that they are more suitable to weak than to strong minds; that so far from making for human perfection and the good of human organization, they are hurtful to both; but that this is as far as possible from the practice and the doctrine of the Church is clear since she has always given the very highest approval to the religious method of life."

We might make many such collocations on these and other points; and should the provocation continue, we may yet do so.

For the present, however, we think we have brought together enough to enable the candid, honest reader to know what to think of the assertion that the condemned opinions were unknown in America.

THE CASE OF JOSEPH MARTIN.

Montreal Star.

Poor Joe Martin is in hard luck, out at the coast. He has not only been asked to resign his portfolio in the Provincial Cabinet, lost caste amongst his political friends, seriously offended against etiquette, but, it is said, is to be charged with champerty. We all know that Joseph is of that pugnacious nature which is not at peace and contentment unless in a continual disturbance, and that he will say and do things that seem intolerable to quiet people, but we doubt if any one ever dreamt that he is or could be guilty of champerty. He generally has a crisis or rumpus with him, or is within easy reach of either, but we never heard of his having any champerty, or anything of that sort. Of course, not one man in a hundred knows off-hand what this champerty is, and, perhaps, that is the reason this stormy petrel of the wild and woolly west would not be suspected of it. It isn't bigamy, or the Italian for threshing machines, as they have them in West Elgin, or anything to eat or wear. It isn't even running in a cold deck on an unsuspecting coterie, or a Sydney Fisher kind of temperance mixed drink. It bears no resemblance to a gerry-mander, or the Ottawa platform of 1893 as it looks now-a-days. In fact, the average citizen might guess a score of times, and not strike the right meaning. The easiest way would be to consult a lawyer or a dictionary, and, the latter being the cheaper, is, perhaps, the most advisable way to get at it. But different dictionaries may give different versions, and so The Star falls back on its old stand-by, Blackstone, who has a greater reputation than Hon. Mr. Mills or Solicitor-General Fitzpatrick as a legal luminary, and this is what the late lamented Mr. Blackstone tells us that champerty is:

"A species of maintenance, being a bargain with a plaintiff, or defendant, to divide the land or other matter in suit between them if they prevail; whereupon the champertor is to carry on the party's suit at his own expense. The purchase of a suit or of the right of suit."

The charge is, according to the British Columbia newspapers, to be investigated by the Law Society. It would not be fair to discuss how much champerty the notoriously quarrelsome statesman has concealed about his person, and whether he ever dealt in that sort of thing at all, or even knows what it is if he saw it. We wish merely to remark that we hope there is no truth in the charge. His sphere of bickering usefulness, or uselessness, as one may view it, may be gone in British Columbia, but what a glorious future awaits one of his pugnacity and obstinacy out in the Yukon amongst Mr. Sifton's official and other pets, and what a whale of a time he would have

the day of his arrival in Dawson in making things unpleasant for those whom the Parliament of Canada would not disturb. Mr. Martin has raised merry Cain in two provinces. Let us hope that he gives the Yukon and Mr. Sifton and the gang a turn before he withdraws entirely from the disputatious pleasures of public life. The most enjoyable ruction of his whole career lies before him.

GOLDWIN SMITH ON THE U. S. WAR BLUNDERS.

The Bystander is sorry to think that he has differed from some of his readers in the line he has taken with regard to the Spanish-American war and the present treatment of the Filipinos. If he is accused of hostility to the American people, his answer is that he has half the American people on his side, and had the whole of them, except a violent section in congress, till they were misled and maddened by the false story of the "Maine." No American name is better or more favorably known in this country than that of Mr. Cleveland, who has steadfastly opposed the war and everything to which it has led.

The business of a journalist is not with the objects of diplomacy, but with plain truth and justice. Truth compelled him to say that Spain had made every concession in her power, and that fair time ought to have been given her for the redemption of her pledges, when war was forced upon her for the purposes of a political party by the men at Washington, who had the president in their hands. Truth compelled him to say that the charge against the Spanish authorities of blowing up the "Maine" was manifestly false, and that the use made of it was shameful. Truth compelled him to say that the Americans had no claim whatever to the country or to the allegiance of the Filipinos, and that to treat those people as rebels, butcher them and ravage their country was a manifest breach of right as well as of humanity. Truth compels him to say that all these declamations about taking up the white man's burden of duty, propagating civilization, and extending the reign of law with fire and sword, are but the stale and hollow pretenses of violence and rapine. On this subject the Bystander has used no language stronger than that of the most patriotic Americans and of the most respectable organs of the American press.

What the consequences of Imperialism to the United States will be begins now to appear. Neither the bloodshed nor the waste of money which will swallow up any increased profits of Cuban or Filipino trade for many years to come are the worst. The worst are the depravation of American character and the conversion of the American commonwealth on which new hopes for humanity had been built, into a vulgar imitation of the war powers of the old world. Expansionism is openly trampling on the principles of the declaration of independence, and if it gets the upper hand, government of the people, by the people and for the people will assuredly perish from the earth.

Don't forget the great pilgrimage to St. Anne's a week from to-morrow. See advertisement.