

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, Bookellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Bookellers, 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 carry 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, APRIL 17.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Verily, "there's a Divinity that shapes our ends, rough-hew them how we will." We blamed "that snip of a Sifton" for going to Haldimand, whereas we ought, as the event shows, to have praised him for ensuring by his presence the great Conservative victory of this very day. Had Sifton not gone to Haldimand, Sir Mackenzie Bowell might have rested on his oars or slept while the enemy made headway; but, because the flippant Clifford chose to talk nonsense at Hagersville and elsewhere, the Conservative leader was roused to put forth his whole strength, and behold the result: Montague secures almost nine times the majority of his last election.

Read the letter of the Rev. Alfred Andrews, Methodist Minister of Minnedosa, on the School question. It is one of the finest things that have yet appeared. Mr. Andrews divides with Mr. Farquharson and Mr. Grant the honor of being the only thoroughly sincere Protestant Ministers in Manitoba. By the way, what splendid defences of our position have been written by Protestants! Not to speak of the admirable articles ever and anon appearing in the Nor-Wester, what true Catholic can ever forget the four years of valiant fighting in our behalf by Mr. W. F. Luxton in the Free Press before the paper became a C.P.R. tool?

We publish in another column of this issue a letter from Mr. F. W. Russell, which very ably and effectually disposes of United Canada's challenge to any member of the Catholic Truth Society to come out over their [his] own names [name] and justify their resolutions. We shall see whether United Canada will have the manliness to give it a place in its next issue.

Would United Canada kindly inform us what it means by "Castle back"? What is the meaning of the following sentence: "A so-called Catholic, newspaper in Winnipeg, which is simply a civil service fly sheet, is not pleased with United Canada."

Is it the Catholic, the newspaper or Winnipeg that is not pleased? If United Canada said: "The Catholics of Winnipeg are not pleased, etc.," it would have said truly.

John D. Grace, Editor of United Canada, writes a letter to the Free Press of this city, which the latter published to-day April 17th. Mr. Grace is evidently hard hit. He feels that the solid ground is trembling beneath his feet. He disclaims any responsibility for Mr. O'Donohue's opinions. He boasts of the late Archbishop Taché thanking him for the help he gave the cause, and trusts he will merit the regard of that great prelate's successor. Unfortunately the letter is so full of confused and erroneous views about religion that there is little hope of such a man ever becoming able to edit a decently Catholic paper. He unwittingly proves himself quite worthy of championing such a man of straw as the "Corporal."

HERE IS THE PROOF OF IT.

In our article of last week, entitled "The Catholic Truth Society vs. United Canada," we asked, referring to its editor: "What kind of a head guides the utterances of that journal? Such a man has no head to direct him, whatever his pretensions to grace may be." We herewith append, as proof of our statement, the following

editorial taken from its issue of the sixth instant, just as it appeared, including orthography, etymology, and syntax, to say nothing of cheek and impudence. Here it is, just as it appeared, except the italics, which are ours:

"We never before knew just how easily the English speaking Catholics of Canada were roused. A small handful of obscure, servile politicians in Winnipeg tried recently in a treacherous low way to stab URRID CANADA from behind a sign board society, and we are more than gratified at the way the people hastened to resent it. What is the result? The condemnation had scarcely gone forth, when letters came to this office from scores of honest laymen and from two of the most distinguished Bishops in Canada assuring us of their confidence and continued support. The Ontario prelate said in substance: 'Treat them Winnipeg hirelings with contempt.' The New Brunswick dignitary, no doubt remembering the school troubles of that province, wrote in the most complimentary terms and concluded by saying: 'Take back nothing.' Over a hundred communications have been received since the *Guardian* of the church and schools in Winnipeg issued their last Encyclical on the question of how a Catholic newspaper should be conducted.

"We again challenge any member of the so-called Truth Society of Winnipeg, of recognized standing, to come out over their own names and justify their resolutions. We are quite conscious of the fact that this is a season of prayer, and peace making with God, but an effort has been made to do us an injury and an injustice, and we therefore challenge our accusers to show cause for having committed the sin of slander."

We reproduce this "literary gem" with many humble apologies to those easily roused English speaking Catholics of Canada and to "them" two most distinguished Bishops in Canada. That Ontario prelate's language, to say the very least, is as unlike a distinguished Bishop as it is ungrammatical, thus pointing to the origin of the article. We would advise United Canada, the next time its bad conduct requires the manufacture of bogus certificates from distinguished men, to get some one to pen their alleged sentiments in language somewhat in keeping with their high character and in correct English.

"TREAT THEM WINNIPEG HIRELINGS WITH CONTEMPT."

"Treat them Winnipeg hirelings with contempt." This is the elegant language which United Canada informs us one of the most distinguished bishops of Ontario used to it about the members of the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg. We wish to say right here that we firmly believe that United Canada, in its vain endeavor to recover from the ignominious position in which it placed itself, has been insane enough to add to its former guilt, the further crime of dragging in "the Ontario Bishop" and ascribing to him language as unchristian as it is ungrammatical.

Let us give our readers our reasons for this firmly fixed conviction that United Canada has been audacious enough to try to bring a bishop of the Catholic Church in Ontario into contempt. To do this we must examine into the motives and causes which could make a bishop in Ontario use such language to a Catholic society enjoying, as this one does, the approval of the Archbishop of the diocese in which it exists. Why should a bishop in another province, hundreds of miles removed from Winnipeg, call the members of a Catholic society "hirelings"? Surely these Catholics must have done something so very grievously wrong that its guilt extended beyond the limits of endurance and called for drastic interference from outside the diocese where they lived! Let us examine into the facts and try to ascertain just what the Catholic Truth Society actually did to merit such condemnation from abroad. For five years the Catholics of Winnipeg, in common with the rest of the province, have been fighting valiantly for their schools, against a cruel and relentless majority. After twice fighting their way to the foot of the Throne, the highest court in the realm decided that their rights were invaded and that the Privy Council of Canada had to hear their appeal. The Privy Council of Canada set a day for the hearing of this appeal, and one John O'Donohue, the only open foe of the Catholic schools, claiming to be a Catholic, left for Ottawa for the avowed purpose of making a statement prejudicial to the Catholic cause, before the Governor-General-in-Council. The Catholics of Winnipeg, outraged at the audacious impudence of this man, whom they had, on several public occasions, denounced for presuming to speak in their name, met in mass meeting and again repudiated him and his impudent vagaries, at the same time wiring to their counsel the action they had taken. Mark well, this was the action of the Catholics of Winnipeg in public meeting assembled, and not the action of the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg. Despite the fact that United Canada was well aware of not only this action of the Winnipeg Catholics, but also of the fact that they had on many previous occasions repudiated this same O'Donohue, it deliberately, maliciously and stupidly took O'Donohue into its columns, and granted him an interview in which he managed to insult, in his usual ignorant manner, the Catholics and clergy of this province. Not content with granting this interview, United Canada not only ignored the action of the Catholics in repudiating O'Donohue, but

actually affected to treat his utterances as a revelation of fact until then unknown or suppressed. This conduct was so glaringly unfair to the Catholics of Manitoba and was so calculated to prejudice their cause in the eyes of the Catholics of the Dominion, by making it appear a national rather than a Catholic cause, that the Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg took the dishonest position of United Canada in hand and in very clear and effective language exposed the whole business. This they did in the interests of Catholic Truth, and, we may add, that in doing so they received the approval and thanks of His Grace, the Most Rev. Archbishop Langevin. These are the plain, unvarnished and simple facts of this whole controversy with United Canada. Again, we ask, what wrong did they do to the interests of the church or religion to cause a bishop of the Catholic church in Canada to call them "hirelings," only worthy of contempt? The fact is no bishop ever did so, and United Canada has deliberately, falsely and with an ignorance truly appalling, charged a bishop of Ontario with using language which would be a disgrace to any Catholic of refinement or culture. The Catholic minority of Manitoba have every reason to be grateful to the Catholic hierarchy of Canada for the moral support they have given us at all times in our struggle for our schools. They have unanimously petitioned the Government for our relief; they have done everything possible to aid us, and we can never thank them for it as they deserve. Only quite recently, Mgr. Langevin, in the presence of many of them, spoke in the most flattering terms of these "Winnipeg hirelings," and declared that "he was proud of them." To what depths of infamy has United Canada descended in trying to make one of Mgr. Langevin's episcopal brothers in Ontario describe those men as "hirelings" whom he described, in the presence of many Archbishops and Bishops, as "men who can go before the whole Dominion and say: 'Here are we, the Catholics of Winnipeg, and we have been faithful to our Catholic programme.'" Turning to the distinguished Archbishops, Bishops and Clergy, Mgr. Langevin said: "My Lords, Venerable Priests and Clergy, you have oft-time met those who have pleaded the cause of Catholic education; you have met them in many places, even at the seat of Government at Ottawa, but here to-day you see before you those who are not only the defenders of the cause in words and in documents, but you see those who have actually stood the brunt of battle. I wish to present to you to-day this noble population of St. Mary's parish, and let us not forget the equally noble parishioners of the Immaculate Conception. I tell you, my Lords, Most Reverend Archbishops, Right Reverend Bishops and Honorable Members of the Clergy, I am proud to-day of my children. They have battled nobly. The fight has been a hard one, but even in the face of the hardest circumstances they have not faltered or been for a moment discouraged. No! They went on, and to-day we are at the point of triumph."

"Treat them Winnipeg hirelings with contempt," is rather strong language to use against men whose Archbishop can so highly praise them.

WHAT A SHAMELESS FARSE.

Everyone who has followed the general record of the Greenway government for the past six years would not expect much of statesmanship at its hands, but every man of moderation and common sense, to say nothing of common decency, cannot but feel humiliated at the conduct of Mr. Clifford Sifton, the law adviser of the Crown and the government of the province, in going to Ontario and, from a political platform, announcing the policy of the government of Manitoba on the school question "and appealing especially to the Orangemen of Ontario to aid with their ballots and their influence the people of Manitoba" in their resistance to the commands of the Highest Court in the Realm. Every friend of Manitoba and of good government must feel his blood tingle with shame at the gross indecency of Mr. Sifton in stating from a political platform that the government were going to deny to the minority the rights which they were asked to restore.

It will be remembered that the Hon. Mr. Greenway, premier of Manitoba, on the receipt of this order, a few weeks ago, solemnly asked the House to adjourn until the 9th of May in order to enable his government to take into their serious consideration the "Remedial Order" and prepare a reply thereto. Every man of moderation, who loves his province and, therefore, wishes to see wise and prudent counsels prevail, was pleased at this action of Mr. Greenway and looked forward with interest and anxiety to the re-assembling of the House, to learn what decision it might arrive at on this momentous question. All felt that Mr. Greenway's course was deserving of praise and that a calm review of the whole question would bring, at least, a spirit of moderation, hitherto conspicuous by its absence, to bear on the question. The remarks of the premier, in emphatically declaring that his was the first authorized announcement on the school question, and thus ignoring the inflammatory and dishonest language of Sifton et al, used on this question during his prolonged absence through illness from the House, added strength to the belief that the leaders of the government, at least, realized the gravity of the situation and intended to deal with it in a just and statesmanlike spirit. But if Mr. Greenway ever entertained such feelings as those we have mentioned they are rudely dispelled by the grossly indecent and impudent conduct of his attorney general at Hagersville the other evening. We feel sorry for Mr. Greenway. He

has been singularly unfortunate in the selection of his attorney generals. In 1889, Mr. Joseph Martin, his first attorney general, announced at Dalton McCarthy's meeting, in Portage la Prairie, his determination to abolish Catholic schools, without consulting him, the premier, and now, Mr. Clifford Sifton, his second attorney general, has announced at the same Dalton McCarthy's meeting at Hagersville, his determination to make the legislature refuse to grant relief to the Catholic minority, despite the decision of their Lordships of the Privy Council and the demand of the Governor-General-in-Council. We presume Mr. Sifton, like Mr. Martin, has made this announcement without the sanction of the first minister, because we refuse to believe that the premier would sanction such a grossly outrageous and indecent mode of procedure as the one adopted by Mr. Sifton. There are many who believe that Sifton is forcing the first minister to adopt his views on this question, in the hope that, should he refuse, he (Sifton) may drive him from public life and get his job, and those who know the thoroughly unscrupulous character of the Attorney General and his overreaching ambition will not find it at all difficult to believe this view to be correct. But Mr. Greenway holds the key to the position and can easily clip the wings of his ambitious Attorney General, by relieving him of the position he has disgraced by his recent utterances. But will Mr. Greenway do this? We doubt it. He is quite conscious that he is surrounded by more than one traitor, who would like to oust him; but he has not the courage to take the initiative and do the bouncing himself; hence it is that such men as Sifton can treat him with contempt. We would like to remind the Hon. Mr. Laurier, that this Mr. Sifton, who appears on P. P. A. platforms and appeals to the Orangemen of Ontario to help him to rivet still tighter the chains of persecution on his co-religionists and compatriots in Manitoba is his first lieutenant in this province, and we would strongly advise Mr. Laurier to take the earliest opportunity of discarding him. Mr. Greenway, in his weakness for retaining office, may not have the courage to discard Sifton; but Mr. Laurier cannot afford to keep such a man in the office of chief adviser and first lieutenant to himself, without injuring his cause in the eyes of the rest of the Dominion.

AN HONEST METHODIST

One of the Best Statements of Our Case ever Presented to a Fair-Minded Public.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—No words express how deeply I regret to differ from my brethren fellow-ministers in the Methodist church, who have preached and written on the burning question of the Manitoba schools. But as I see it, so must I write.

When a resolution was brought up in the Methodist conference in 1890, expressing high approval of the act that had recently passed the legislature, I had the unpleasant notoriety of being the only person who uttered one word of opposition. I did so, not because I foresaw its bearing on the constitution of the province, but from having had a five years' residence in Quebec, and having seen the working of the Protestant school act of that province. I felt alarmed at the moral effect which our school act would have in Quebec. If here in the province of Manitoba where the Catholics have had separate schools for about eighteen years, just because we were in majority, our government, without any mandate from the electorate, swept them away with surprising haste in legislation; how would the Protestant minority in Quebec be likely to fare at the hands of their Catholic fellow citizens? We have always boasted of Protestant fair play, yet in this case the might does the right, and justifies itself by saying: "there is no wrong done to anyone." But who says there is no grievance? The majority. Are we in a position to decide for them? How deeply they feel the wrong is plain from the fact that for the past four years they have been supporting their own schools, while being at the same time called upon to pay taxes to support schools which very few of their people utilize.

Let me be misunderstood, let me say plainly that I believe with all my heart in one system of schools, and I really see little to complain of in our present excellent public schools. Were I a Catholic I should endeavor to persuade my brethren in that church to use them, because, unless they do, their children will be forever placed at a disadvantage as to education, in comparison with those who are educated in the public schools. But since Catholics do not see it in this light I cannot even by my silence seem to be a party to coercing them.

COERCION.

It is amazing to hear gentlemen posing as the champions of fair play, talking about the Roman Catholic hierarchy of Quebec attempting to rule this province. Had they taken away any rights of ours, and we were endeavoring now to regain them, we might take this position. The real contention is, that we Protestants have taken what the highest court of this great empire has decided was their right, according to the declaration of the constitution, and they are seeking its restoration in a legal and regular manner. But we stand, saying "hands off, we have done you no damage, and no relief therefore can be allowed," and with uplifted hands, cry out "no priestcraft can be allowed to check Manitoba."

THAT ORDER.

Sir John Thompson, before the submission of the case to the Privy Council, sent a respectful request to the Manitoba government to make provision for relief. But this was rejected entirely. In their attitude before the subject was thoroughly understood by the people, and before the Privy Council had spoken, the government was sustained at the polls. This, not as a party measure, for all felt that this was much more than a mere approval of either Liberal or Conservative policy. Now, with increased knowledge of the legal position, the Governor-in-Council having

clearly decided that remedial measures ought to be enacted, have asked the Manitoba government to alter the act of 1890, so far as justice requires, and restore the separate schools as they were before 1890. I am very glad the house has adjourned, in the calm moments of reflection it is to be hoped that a crisis may be averted.

Suppose the old statute of 1871 should be restored, with provisions for definite qualification of teachers and public inspection of schools, what hardship would thus be brought upon the Protestant majority? The property of Catholics would be taxed to support their own schools, and they would have a fair proportion, and no more could be asked, of the government grant.

That it would be better for all to be educated together, seems highly desirable; yet, if the minority concerned think it otherwise, surely we have slender ground to set aside law and justice to accomplish our purpose, however laudable it may be in itself.

There is little weight in the argument that Mennonites, Germans and others may also seek separate schools. No one seriously thinks these would ever be established. Besides along these lines of action only the great division between Catholic and Protestant has ever been legally recognized, and no other is likely to be introduced, and the permanent healing of even this breach can only be done by kindness and fair treatment, and this, I believe, our Protestant people will be ready to accord when the excitement arising from heated declamation shall have subsided and a calm and deliberate view of the situation be taken.

ALFRED ANDREWS, Methodist Minister, Minnedosa, April 10th, 1895.

A Distinguished Protestant on Catholic Countries.

That prolific writer and scholarly critic, the Rev. Charles C. Starbuck, Congregational minister, contributes a signed criticism of Father Young's "Catholic and Protestant Countries Compared," to the New World quarterly. We think the large number of our readers who have doubtless already perused that convincing defence of the superior results of Catholic civilization will be pleased to have the judgment upon it by so eminent a Protestant critic laid before them. He says of it:

"The substance of this book consists in a tremendously effective array of quotations from Protestant writers, believers and unbelievers. They are quite sufficient to turn the coarse impudence and calumniousness of popular libelers of Roman Catholicism to despairing silence, if anything were capable of changing the nature or abating the effrontery of these ribalds. . . . He [Father Young] succeeds abundantly, but by quotations, in showing that in many points of popular happiness, kindly intimacy between the high and low, sexual morality, equal division of the land, devotion to the Christian ideals of character above possession and eternity above time, many Catholic countries stand decidedly above many or most Protestant lands. He urges with cogent force that our lack of authoritative power to bring home to the masses the decisions of Christian faith and morals induces a sad measure of spiritual impotence, which is felt more and more painfully in Protestant countries, as the lingering force of ancient Christian tradition dies away. He brings facts and statistics and reminders enough for an ample justification of President Woolsey's half-expressed wish that in view of the lack of pedagogical power in Protestantism it might be desirable that Catholic influence should increase among our masses, and save the Christian family in large regions, indeed the population itself, from the danger of extinction. He shows that in many parts of Catholic Europe, if there is comparative night, it is, as Carl Hase said of the century in Germany before the Reformation, 'in many respects a sacred night.'"

The sentence omitted from the foregoing and replaced by dots is as follows: "That part of the work which depends on the author himself is worthy of very little respect, and of no confidence whatever." Having acknowledged in such unqualified terms that Father Young has succeeded beyond all question in proving the two theses he proposed to defend, viz: that the multitudinous attacks by Protestant orators and writers of every class upon the religious, intellectual, moral and social life of nations under Catholic influences have been made wholly without warrant of truth; and that in all worthy respects, in view of the attainment of true Christian civilization, Catholic countries have been and are even at the present day, despite the "rage of the heathen and the vain imaginings of the people," far and away superior to "many or most Protestant lands," we will allow Professor Starbuck to hold what opinion he chooses about "that part of the work which depends on the author himself." We venture to say, therefore, that to careful readers of Father Young's own text, whether they be Protestants or Catholics, the expression of such an opinion of it would hardly do more than to provoke a benign smile, since he fails to sustain this curiously interjected damnatory clause by any illustration whatever.

What does surprise us not a little is so learned a writer as the Andover critic, is to find him immediately shifting the issues, and berating Father Young for failing to discuss those facts and aims among both Catholic reformers and people prior to the so-called Reformation which contributed in so lamentable a measure to make that unwise rebellion against the doctrinal and moral magistracy of the Christian Church possible.

Mr. Starbuck's sudden change of the subject is not unlike the method resorted to by Protestant controversialists generally! Did any Catholic apologist ever attempt to explain and prove to an inquiring or objecting Protestant hearer, say for example, the doctrine of the Real Presence, purgatory, or what not, who, when he had conclusively proved it, did not find himself suddenly interrupted with some such a decoy question as: "But what have you got to say about Galileo? or the Spanish Inquisition, or the Massacre of Saint Bartholomew?" Discussing the causes of the Reformation was evidently quite beside Father Young's purpose and wholly un-called for.

But then we must indulge Mr. Starbuck a little in this, his sounding a mild

counter-blast in the ears of his Protestant audience, tingling as they must be under his rather stunning encomiums of Father Young's triumphant proofs.

Our many Catholic readers to whom the views of the Reverend Paulist Father are doubtless well known concerning the possibility of the salvation of Protestants incalculably ignorant of the Church, and of their ability to make acts of saving divine faith—propositions defended most forcibly by him, as we remember, in a newspaper controversy a few years ago—will wonder to hear Mr. Starbuck call him a "bigoted sectarian, who has exposed himself to the condemnation which the bull *Unigenitus* pronounces upon those who shall deny that the grace of God may be given out of the Church."

We commend to Mr. Starbuck's more careful perusal the opening pages of Father Young's chapter on "Poverty and Pauperism."

We ourselves find little cause for wonder that Father Young, while carefully avoiding condemnation of Protestants as individuals—some well merited lashes given to certain notorious slanderers expected—has no good word to say for Protestantism. The wide open eye of any unbiased and intelligent reader of history must see plainly enough that whatever of really good influence Protestantism may claim for the defence of the Christian name and of fundamental Christian doctrines, for the sustaining and propagation of Christian ideas of civilization and true social progress, is to be credited not at all to what is denominated Protestantism, as being the denial of Catholic principles, but wholly and solely to that mighty force of Catholic tradition bound up with the very language and social customs of the people which the Protestant outbreak was unable to extinguish among its adherents at its beginning. What practical results have to be recorded against Protestantism as the force of that tradition has become more and more enfeebled among the peoples whose civilization it has made itself responsible for is just what is so thoroughly exposed in Father Young's book. Mr. Starbuck says the same when he writes: "He (Father Young) urges with cogent force that our (Protestant) lack of an authoritative power to bring home to the masses the decisions of Christian faith and morals induces a sad measure of spiritual impotence, which is felt more and more painfully in Protestant countries, as the lingering force of ancient (Catholic) Christian tradition dies away."

May this first noteworthy criticism coming from a Protestant source of this most important and timely work be followed by others no less discriminating, honest and courageous.—N. Y. Catholic Review.

Father Lambert's Name Taken in Vain.

The incomparable Father Lambert, author of "Notes on Ingersoll" and "Tactics of Infidels," is now editor of the New York *Freeman's Journal*, that historic paper, founded by the doughty MacMaster. It appears that a foreign apostate priest, one of whose names happens to be Lambert, is trying to pass himself off as the great, the unapproachable Lambert, the only Catholic priest whose books have been published, at its own expense, by the Methodist Book Concern of Toronto, as by far the best reply to flippant and shallow but brilliant Col. Ingersoll. This is how the real Father Lambert disposes of the fable.

"NOT THE MAN."

A correspondent writing under date of March 12, 1895, from Kingston, Jamaica, British West Indies, says: "It is announced in our dailies that Father Lambert, the priest who wrote the book, 'Notes on Ingersoll,' has renounced the Catholic Church, and been accepted as a minister by the Wesleyan Conference of this island, now in session at Montego Bay."

The writer requests us to correct the false report, as he thinks it is calculated to do harm. We willingly do so, although Achilles Lambert Lopec has imposed on us in the way of letter writing and telegraphing. We have had to reply to inquiries from many parts of this country, from Canada, from England and from Australia. Archbishop Corrigan had to telegraph a denial to Newcastle-on-Tyne, England, where a preacher was making use of the false report. We take this occasion to thank him for his prompt reply to inquiries from that town. The preacher was, we believe, in good faith, as he cabled us and prepared an answer, and also cabled to Rome. We received other dispatches and letters from Newcastle-on-Tyne and judge that there was quite a heated discussion there on the subject. And now comes this letter from the West Indies. We do not say that Achilles Lambert Lopec originated or encourages this false report, but we can generally tell his geographical whereabouts by the letters of inquiry we receive.

We assure our esteemed contemporaries of Jamaica—the Gleaner, Gall's News Letter, Colonial Standard and Dispatch and Jamaica Post, that we are a Roman Catholic, a Papist, and, with God's grace, will remain so until the curtain falls, and hides from our vision forever this hazy, feverish scene. Being of a logical turn of mind, there is for us beyond the lintel of the Catholic Church no stopping place, no lodgment, short of downright infidelity. It is a toboggan slide. If the Catholic Church is not of divine institution Christianity is a delusion, a superstition, for the Catholic Church is concrete, historical Christianity. Were the Catholic Church to cease to be it would be but a short time when Christianity would be as dead as the religion of ancient Egypt, and its tenets would be a subject of interest only to the inquisitive antiquarian. It would require a new Champollion-Figeac to unlock the mysteries of its symbolism. Catholicity is to Protestantism what the affirmative is to the negative, when the affirmative ceases to be, the negative loses its reason to be, and passes away as a shadow when the body that cast it ceases to be. Whatever of positive or affirmative truth there is in Protestantism is found in Catholicity. All else of it is negative, which, as a basis of religion, is worse than a foundation of quicksand. No thing, no institution, can live on negations. They constitute at best but a Barmecide feast, and are inferior even to the bitter dust of Dead Sea apples.