

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

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

VOL. XI, No. 50.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, JUNE 17, 1896.

\$ 2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

THE CANADIAN BISHOPS AND THE EDUCATION CRISIS.

From The Tablet.

It is owing to something more than a purely fortuitous coincidence that the same question is simultaneously agitating the British Islands and the Dominion of Canada, with a like result of shifting the political landmarks, and substituting fresh frontiers for the old lines of party demarcation. Liberalism moves everywhere towards the same goal, guided, whether consciously or unconsciously, by those who adopt its livery at any particular moment, towards the ideal prefixed for it by the leaders and creators of the Continental revolution. That ideal is the control of the human conscience by the manipulation of human power in the interests of secular or irreligious education, since the two things, though separable as phrases, are shown in practice to be identical. To assert that in the training of the young there can be neutrality as regards the principal subject of human thought, is one of the modern sophisms used to confuse the issue by the adoption of a misleading catchword. That the bulk of the London School Board teachers are unfortunately practically infidels, was sufficiently shown by the indignant protest of the great majority when asked last summer to impart to the children under their charge, in conformity with the requirements of the existing law, some instruction in the fundamental truths of religion. The prevalence of such opinions among them illustrates the spirit in which the Education Act is administered, since it shows that the negation of Christianity must be regarded as a qualification for the position assigned to them. While in all other subjects of the state curriculum some test of competency is imposed, in religion alone is it regarded as tyrannical to demand any proof of the adequacy of the teaching. Yet it is to a system thus perverted to the wholesale inculcation of atheism that many nominally Christian parents are content to entrust the education of their children, while the whole Liberal party in England is committed to its maintenance in the name of freedom and progress.

Here then, in this country, as in Canada, comes the crux of religion and politics effacing the old party distinctions, by the introduction of a new and broader ground of difference, going to the roots of all convictions and beliefs. And as the Irish Catholics have shown that they hold their allegiance to their Church on this question higher than fidelity to their party, we may hope that the Catholics of Canada will in the coming struggle, display an equal loyalty to their hereditary faith. For in the Dominion, too, they have, in Ontario, been Liberals, and must here, too, sacrifice the old ties of habit and expediency to the higher loyalty of conscience. The occasion is one of supreme importance to the future of this country and their religion, since it is a clear case of the illegal oppression of their co-religionists by a tyrannical local minority. For religious minorities in Canada, unlike those similarly situated in this country, have their right to denominational education safeguarded by the constitution itself, expressly framed to meet the contingency which has now arisen. While this right has been scrupulously respected in the Catholic Province of Quebec in regard to the Protestant minority, it has been ruthlessly trampled on in Manitoba, where the preponderance of numbers is the other way. As our readers know, all attempts to induce the Provincial Legislature to redress the acknowledged wrong having been contumaciously resisted, the Dominion Government introduced a bill into the Federal Parliament to override the illegal contravention of the Constitution, and restore the rights of Catholics as guaranteed to them under the solemn and binding Act of Federation. That Bill, introduced by a Conservative and Protestant Government, and opposed by the leaders and bulk of the French-Canadian Liberal party, as a contravention of provincial rights, to which they are committed, was eventually lost, after having passed the second reading, by the obstructive tactics of the Opposition, during the last days of an expiring parliament. The dissolution which followed has brought the country face to face with the prob-

lem, and the general elections which will take place at the end of June, will be decisive on this momentous question. The issue between secular and religious education is complicated by that of Federal versus Provincial right, while the tariff question also divides the parties, the Liberals being, as their name implies, in favor of free trade, and their rivals, of protection. The result will depend on the proportions in which the electors on both sides transfer their votes to their former opponents, in obedience to the new considerations involved. The Catholic support gained by Sir Charles Tupper in Quebec and other districts where the French Canadians are numerous, may be counteracted by the withdrawal from him of an equal or larger number of voters in Ontario and throughout the West generally, where the Orange or ultra-Protestant element is in the ascendant. All the machinery of bigotry and intolerance will be set in motion to defeat and discredit the Government, and the Great Dominion will be torn from the Atlantic to the Pacific by the religious dissensions which the New World has inherited from the Old. The old boundary posts are swept away, and in the new situation created no one can tell to what extent personal prejudice or conviction will prevail over party discipline or opportunism. The position taken up by M. Laurier, the leader of the French Canadians, is, from a Catholic point of view, indefensible, since he maintains his right to exercise private judgment on a question in which the interests of religion are directly involved. He has, therefore, elected to go to the country as the opponent of the Bill for the relief of the Catholics of Manitoba, on the ground of its being an infringement of his view of Provincial rights, a fetish which he thus sets up above the obligations of good faith, of public law, and of the Constitution to the observance of which the recalcitrant province is solemnly pledged.

The Catholic Bishops, on the other hand, have entered the arena in defence of the principles of religious education, so flagrantly violated in the case of their co-religionists in Manitoba. Their views have found voice in a striking sermon in which Mgr. Lafleche, Bishop of Three Rivers, condemned Mr. Laurier's speech in moving the rejection of the Remedial Bill, as the utterance of a rationalistic Liberal, formulating a doctrine entirely opposed to the teaching of the Catholic Church, viz., that a Catholic is in his public life set free from the obligations of religion. He quoted with equal reprobation, the declaration of another French Canadian candidate, who, while acknowledging that Mgr. Langevin, Archbishop of St. Boniface, had a right to deal with the Remedial Bill from a religious point of view, repudiated his title to dictate its treatment from a national, constitutional, or political standpoint. This dictum the Bishop condemned as pure Liberalism, denouncing the principles professed by both these gentlemen as diametrically opposed to Catholic teaching, and declaring that on his fulfilment of the duty of warning them of their error, depended the salvation of his own soul, and of all those committed to his charge. Referring to the assassination of President Carnot, as a striking example of the results of modern education, he went on to instruct his hearers and all the Catholics of his diocese to lay aside party feelings, and give their votes only to candidates pledged to support the Remedial Bill accepted by the Bishops. This address which cannot fail to exercise considerable influence on the result of the elections, has caused a great sensation throughout Canada, and has evoked a storm of angry feeling in the Liberal camp. The organs of the party in their comments on the challenge of the Bishop of Three Rivers, ring the changes on the the old shibboleths of spiritual dictation and the separation of politics from the sphere of religion. Their diatribes will have little effect on the minds of the mass of French Canadians, who will on this occasion, we are confident, show themselves Catholics first, and political partisans only in a second and subsidiary sense. They cannot hesitate in a case involving the subjection of their race-fellows and co-religionists to the most odious of all tyrannies, that invades the sphere of conscience and violates the sanctities of religious conviction. The settlement of

the question by a decisive majority is the more desirable as behind the electoral and parliamentary campaign, forming the present phase of the crisis, looms the still more serious constitutional conflict between the contumacious Legislature of Manitoba and the authority of the Federal Government. Manitoban intolerance may indeed prove to have been the evil genius of the Dominion, in raising a question thus fraught with possibilities of disruption. Should the local majority, after the adoption of the Remedial Bill by the new Parliament, still refuse to give its provisions effect, the strain on the relations between the province and the Federation will have reached the breaking point. There would remain for the central authority only the choice between the extreme measure of armed intervention, and tame confession of its own impotence in presence of an act of overt rebellion against its decree. Already the French Canadians are asking to what a constitution serves whose provisions cannot be enforced, and the secession of Quebec is discussed among the possibilities of the future. It is obvious that if the Dominion have no power to compel compliance with the act by which it is constituted as such, it ceases to have any real existence, and survives in name and on sufferance alone. There is, however, good ground for hoping that if the Canadian Catholics do their duty and secure a decisive preponderance in the present juncture, they will not only redress the wrongs of their co-religionists, but lay the sceptre of disintegration by showing that might as well as right is on their side.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir,—We have seen in a recent issue of the Tribune, a letter signed by one James Stewart, of Prince Albert, in reference to the Separate School Question in Manitoba. He predicts that some trouble of a similar character may soon arise in the Territories and he indulges in a lot of the old abuse of "Rome" and the "hierarchy," etc. With so much of his letter we do not propose to deal. Mr. Stewart is entitled to his opinions and it matters very little anyway what they may be—but he has made reference to an application of some of the supporters of the separate school here asking to be changed to supporters of the public school. He has made, in this connection, several statements which are not true, and these we desire to point out.

We are the persons who applied to be so changed and may be supposed to know quite as much of the facts as Mr. Stewart. He says, in describing the system of Separate schools in the Northwest Territories, that "they are controlled by the Roman Catholic clergy." That is not so. By our school law, the minority, whether Catholic or Protestant, may establish separate schools and the law is precisely the same whatever the religion of the minority may be, e. g., at Duck Lake, the separate school is Protestant.

The same law applies to separate schools as to public schools—trustees elected in the same way—inspected by same government inspectors—teachers must have certificates and separate school teachers must pass the same examinations as public school teachers, and the teachers are chosen and hired by the trustees in all cases.

The clergy have no control over either public or separate schools except so far as their advice may be considered by the trustees.

His next statement is that these schools are "conducted chiefly by nuns and others who have no qualification recognized by the board of instruction." This is not true—every teacher must have a certificate—the nuns who teach here must have certificates of first and second class.

He next says that "they receive their appointment from the bishop or priests." That this statement is incorrect is obvious from what we have already said.

He then says "the whole trouble seems to be that the Roman Catholic bishop insists upon running the separate schools according to his own sweet will, having an eye to the handling of the funds and letting education look out for itself." This contains a shameful untruth.

It was never suggested by those appealing that the bishop interfered or thought of interfering with the funds. Under the law he could not if he wished, any more than the clergymen of Mr. Stewart's church could with the public school funds. The bishop was in favor of having the nuns retained as teachers; some of us thought that a male teacher would be the better, especially for the larger boys, and we are still of that opinion.

Now, why does Mr. Stewart interfere with what does not concern him? No one asks him to send his children to the nuns or to contribute to the separate schools; we have not asked him to champion us, we can take care of ourselves.

Hitches will take place in all schools; there have been troubles in the public schools here, followed by the discharge of two or three teachers yet no Catholics write to the papers about it—it was none of our business.

We trust that you will give this letter an insertion so that errors may not go uncontradicted.

As to Mr. Stewart's philosophical opinions we have nothing to say.

Yours respectfully,

(Signed.) C. DE LAGORGENDIERE.

H. LACROIX,

LOUIS VALADE,

ODILON ST. DENIS,

G. W. LACROIX.

Prince Albert, N. W. T., June 10, '96.

MR. J. S. EWART AND REV. JOSEPH HOGG.

The following letter was handed to the Free Press for publication simultaneously with the same letter sent to the Tribune. The Free Press did not insert it, upon the ground that it was a communication in another paper. But as the Tribune seems to have declined it, we give it publicity, in fairness to Mr. Ewart.—Editor Free Press.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—Rev. Joseph Hogg has done well to allow more than two weeks to elapse since my criticism of his "Vote for Jesus" and Joe Martin sermon, and to make his reply in the columns of a newspaper in which the criticism did not appear. He has thus gained the immense advantage of speaking to persons who either never read, my letter, or who have probably forgotten the point taken in it.

In his sermon Mr. Hogg made certain statements as to the school law of Quebec, and added: "Let the Roman Catholic minority be treated in Manitoba as the Protestant minority are treated in Quebec, and even every true Orangeman in the province would espouse their cause."

In answer, I appended to each of his three statements of the Quebec law the phrase, "That is not true." I then, in nine paragraphs, summarized the Quebec law, giving the numbers of the sections of the code, to assist confirmation; and I offer on behalf of the minority in Manitoba, to accept less than the minority in Quebec enjoyed.

After two weeks Mr. Hogg replies. He does not attempt to support a single one of his statements—not one; and he does not attempt to deny a single one of mine. He says nothing about any of them. That is the advantage gained by delay.

But he has to say something, so he changes the issue, and makes further assertions as to the Quebec school law.

He says, first: "In the case of industries whose stockholders are Protestants, and this is said to be the case with nine-tenths of the industries of Montreal, the taxes are not divided between Protestants and Catholics, but go wholly to the support of Roman Catholic schools." Once more, I reply, That is not true. Such taxes are divided "in the same proportion as the government grant for the same year is divided." See the Code, Sec. 2143.

He says, secondly: "Why should the bishop alone have the power without consulting other denominations, to rearrange the boundaries of the parish, so that one in which there was enough to support a dissentient school, may be so divided that such a school cannot be maintained, according to law, and the Protestants are obliged to support the

public schools in reality the Roman Catholic schools." Again, I say, that is not true. The lieutenant-governor-in-council alone has the power to "alter the limits of existing municipalities, or erect new ones." See the code, section 1973. Further, there are provisions by which the dissentients in two adjoining municipalities may unite (1989, 1990, 2083, 2085), and by which a dissentient in one municipality may subscribe to a school in a neighboring municipality (1993, 1995).

He says, thirdly: "Surely those cannot mean what they say, who affirm that the minority in Manitoba would be perfectly satisfied with the educational privileges that the Protestant minority have accorded to them in Quebec." Can the force of contradiction go further. Mr. Hogg does pretty well when he asserts the law to be that which the statutes say it is not (that may be a foolish oversight, and I am glad to believe that it is) but when he takes to affirm that the Catholics will not accept that which they unconditionally assert they will accept, he utters mere foolishness without the oversight.

To my charge that Mr. Hogg objected to the appropriation of any public money to sectarian purposes, and yet raised no objection to the Presbyterian church getting thousands of dollars annually, he replies that I do not seem to have read what "the Tribune reported me as saying further, viz., that public funds should not be given to one denomination, when the same could not be extended to all denominations." I read in the Tribune the following: "See to it as God will enlighten you, that the money of the province is never appropriated to sectarian purposes"; and I said that the Presbyterian church took thousands of dollars annually (\$15,000 for one school alone), to help it to instruct Indian children, not only in secular subjects, but in Presbyterian dogma! Mr. Hogg now defends this. He says:

1. "The government employs these denominations to carry on the schools which it is bound by treaty to provide for the Indian children." That is not true. There is no such treaty.

2. Again, he says: "The work of carrying on those schools as undertaken by the government was a comparative failure," and so the Presbyterians were asked to conduct them. In Manitoba denominational schools are an abomination—inefficient, extravagant, tending to division and disintegration, and so on; but a little further west, what an untold blessing? East of the boundary, let the government abolish the Catholic schools, and itself control education; but west of it cannot we see the Protestant schools are the only thing possible—that government there is a mere stupidity? Surely "none but the wilfully blind can fail to see the vast difference," as Mr. Hogg says, between such cases!

Now, Mr. Hogg, we may, and we do, differ as to the school question. Do we differ, also, as to the moral duty of a man who has publicly misstated many facts relating to it, to acknowledge his error, and to make such redress as he can? In my former letter I asked you to state that your assertions as to the school law were entirely wrong—that you had "utterly misled your congregation." A city newspaper urged you in the same direction. You take no notice of these appeals, although your silence as to every one of such assertions shows that you are convinced that you had fallen into mistake. You have now added two further statements, and can easily satisfy yourself, with the help I have given you, that these are also untrue. Give us an example, may I not ask you, of the way a Christian minister ought to act under such circumstances. Do not be more ashamed to "vote for Jesus," than for Joe Martin!

JOHN S. EWART.

—Free Press, June 11.

A Chance to Make Money.

I have berries, grapes and peaches, a year old, fresh as when picked. I use the California Cold process, do not heat or seal the fruit, just put it up cold, keeps perfectly fresh and costs almost nothing; can put up a bushel in ten minutes. Last week I sold directions to over 120 families; any one will pay a dollar for directions, when they see the beautiful samples of fruit. As there are many people poor like myself, I consider it my duty to give my experience to such, and feel confident any one can make one or two hundred dollars round home in a few days. I will mail sample of fruit and complete directions, to any of your readers, for eight-cent two-cent stamps, which is only the actual cost of the samples, postage, etc., to me.

FRANCIS CASEY, St. Louis, Mo.

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. KUJNKHAMMER,
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, JUNE 17.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Sursum Corda. The decisive moment is at hand. In another week the die will be cast, the irresponsible multitude will have exercised, for weal or woe, that redoubtable power of voting which its flatterers call an inherent right. The destinies of our fair Dominion just now hinge upon the pivotal city of Winnipeg; and who knows how many fluctuating wills may, by leaning one way or the other, determine the direction in which that pivot shall turn? In view of this uncertainty—for though our prospects are undoubtedly bright, the issue of an election in which such forces of mind and passion are opposed must be an uncertainty—would it not be well for those of our readers whose faith in God is strong to lift up their hearts to Him and pray that he may illumine the intellects and strengthen the wills of those waverers on whose votes, by a strange irony of universal suffrage, rests the result of the struggle?

The Cloud Of Witnesses. What the voters need is rather honesty of purpose, righteous will-power than enlightenment. Except for the wilfully blind the amount of light focussed upon the School Question in the last six years is quite overwhelming. The contrast between the impenetrable fog of passion and prejudice on the one side and the ever-growing radiance of fresh and fresh illumination on the other reminds us of the darkness that might have been felt with the hands in the land of Egypt as contrasted with the lights that played around the children of Israel in their dwellings. From the first the Catholic point of view has been stated over and over again with irresistible cogency and clearness not only by our clergy and laity but especially by a host of sincere Protestants. For more than three years Mr. Luxton in the Free Press wielded his trenchant pen in our defence, producing a series of articles which constitute a veritable arsenal of arguments for Catholic schools from a common sense Protestant standpoint. Hon. Senator Bernier, in the Upper House, gave utterance to several exhaustive and eloquent statements of our case; so did Mr. LaRiviere and many other Catholic members, each viewing the question from his individual point of view and all agreeing in the manifest justice of our cause; but here we are especially concerned with our non-Catholic champions, such as the Hon. David Mills and the Hon. James Fisher. The former rivets our rights to the bed-rock of the Constitution, the latter politely yet potently expostulates with his leader, Mr. Laurier, and points out how impregnable is our position. Greatest of all, however, and practically invincible is our resourceful counsel Mr. John S. Ewart. Not content with his unanswerable and unanswered volume on the Manitoba School Question, he is ever on the breach, hurling back with terrific force the missiles of the enemy,

whether that enemy be a chivalrous knight-errant like Mr. Pedley or an orotund swaggerer like Mr. Wade. He is the only man that ever succeeded in silencing the irrepressible Dr. Bryce. And now, as his letter in this issue shows, he has driven the Rev. Joseph Hogg into a very tight corner. Fancy a respectable clergyman waiting more than a fortnight before replying to an honest, straightforward challenge from Mr. Ewart, and then not attempting to support a single one of his own statements, nor to deny a single one of Mr. Ewart's, but flying off to something else and finally adding two further statements that are ludicrously false. That's what comes of clinging desperately to a bad cause, for which there has never yet appeared the ghost of a rational argument, nothing but appeals to ignorance, bigotry and passion.

Catholic World. One of the best things in this June number is "A Saint," the apparently true story of an act of delicate forbearance and triumphant mercy done by a monk of our own time. The tale is told by one who, if he ever becomes thoroughly converted, will have to disown many of his past writings. H. M. Sweeney is at her best in "Subject to change." "Montmartre and the Sacred Heart," by Rev. John M. Kieley, chats summarily of the Basilica, Blessed Margaret Mary, and of the doctrinal basis of devotion to the Sacred Heart. As Loyola and his first companions laid the foundation of the Society of Jesus on the very spot where the great Byzantine basilica stands to-day, we are treated to a very good portrait of St. Ignatius. Walter Lecky replies with admirable frankness and point to Mr. Henry Childs Merwin's recent strictures on the Irish in America Life. Speaking of the occasional and unimportant faults on which Mr. Merwin unduly enlarges, Mr. Lecky says it is "ignoring the beauty of Apollo to scan a wart on his toe."

TRUST THE TRUSTWORTHY.

Before the next issue of the Review goes to press the electorate of the Dominion will irrevocably decide which of the two great political parties shall be entrusted with the government of the country for the next five years, and we feel, therefore, that it is our bounden duty, as the organ of the persecuted Catholic minority of Manitoba, to address to our readers our final word of counsel and appeal, so that whatever the result may be we shall have the satisfaction of knowing that we have been true to the trust reposed in us and have done all we possibly could for the great and holy cause we have so much at heart.

We start out with the assumption that throughout the country there are multitudes of Catholics who are eager to help the Manitoba minority in their educational struggle, but there are some, no doubt, who are at a loss to know how their support can best be given under the circumstances. We would respectfully refer them to the recent pastoral letter of their Lordships the Archbishops and Bishops of Quebec whose eminently practical suggestions, if properly understood, can leave no one in doubt as to how he may promote the cause. It may be said that our battle, which has been raging for six long years, has now reached its most acute phase, and every friend of Catholic education and Catholic rights who desires to be accounted a good and true soldier, should endeavor, regardless of all other considerations, to do his part well and manfully. Candidates seeking the support of the electorate should be made to understand how strong is the feeling amongst Catholic citizens that the rights of which the minority in Manitoba have been deprived should be immediately restored to them; that fair play is all that is demanded, but that a full measure of fair-play will be insisted on. In a word, we would say, let every Catholic when casting his ballot at the coming election remember first and before everything

else that he is a Catholic, and let him prove himself to be a Catholic generously and energetically, not only as a mere professor of the faith by words, but as one who is ready to act, and willing to sacrifice all other considerations when the interests of his religion and the rights of his co-religionists are at stake.

This being the undoubted duty of the Catholic electors of the Dominion we trust it may not be considered out of place on our part if we take the liberty of offering a few suggestions as to how that duty may best be fulfilled, and the cause of Catholic education in Manitoba best promoted. We would say, then, that each voter will have to consider the claims of the candidates appealing for his support from two standpoints—first of all looking into his personal qualifications, his promises and his past record, and secondly considering him as a representative of one of the great parties each of which has also a record and is making promises for the future. With regard to the candidates personally we can, of course, only speak in general terms, but we do say most emphatically that those who were members of the late house and opposed the passage of the Remedial Bill must, notwithstanding any fine promises they may make, be looked upon with the very gravest suspicion as men who once had a chance of assisting in rendering us substantial justice, but who for party considerations basely betrayed us into the hands of our enemies. But of the two great parties and the two great leaders we may speak more definitely and to the point. As we have often said before when the last judgment of the Privy Council was given we felt assured that our period of persecution was virtually at an end, for it seemed to us that should Mr. Laurier's Manitoba friends, the Greenway Government, remain obdurate and refuse to obey the judgment, the Dominion Parliament would with alacrity and practical unanimity proceed to exercise the power vested in them under the constitution and give us relief. The Dominion Government promptly took the preliminary steps and plainly showed they were determined to face their responsibility, and notwithstanding the abominable agitation which was at once set on foot throughout the country by those men who are hostile to everything Catholic and continually make war against us, we did not feel in the least alarmed, for we believed that when the measure would be brought in it would receive the support not only of Government members, but also of every Catholic in the house regardless of party affiliations and likewise the support of many other Liberals who are not Catholics. Bitter then was our disappointment when the event proved that the very man who should have been our warmest friend adopted a role which filled our worst enemies with the greatest glee. We say that when the Hon. Mr. Laurier moved the six months' hoist he deliberately attempted to kill a bill which would have given us a fair and just school law, and when he failed in this he went from one infamy to another by conspiring with the P. P. A. members, the McCarthyites and the rest of our sworn foes to so obstruct the measure that it could not become the law of the land. This is the record of the Laurier party on the Manitoba school question in the last parliament, and what is their position before the people of the country to-day? In Quebec, it is true, Mr. Laurier is promising that if returned to power he will bring in and pass a more stringent measure of relief than that proposed by the government, but in making such a promise he is wilfully trying to deceive the people, inasmuch as he is perfectly aware that he could not under the constitution do any such thing. In Ontario he has persuaded Sir Oliver Mowat to lend him his name and although Sir Oliver has done this in only a half-hearted-way, it is the strongest card Mr. Laurier has played, and would undoubtedly help him to win the game if its effect had not been entirely neutralized by the placing in the field in the Province of Manitoba, as the two leading Laurier candidates, Mr. Dalton Mc-

Carthy and Mr. Joseph Martin, who are plainly in the confidence of their chief-tain and who never lose an opportunity of enlogising him for the liberality of his views, his sympathy with Protestant ideas, and his determination not to force on the people of this province a system of schools which although wanted by the Catholics will, they say, never be voluntarily given by the Protestant majority. This is the whole status of the Laurier party on the Manitoba school question, and we simply ask our readers to compare it with the manly, straightforward course of the Government at the last session, and their open and unqualified announcements in Manitoba as well as in Quebec regarding the future. Having done this, every Catholic will, we feel certain, be forced to the same conclusion as that which we have reached: viz., that Mr. Laurier and his motley following are, looked at from any point of view, not to be trusted, and that both the past and the present furnishes abundant evidence that the best and wisest course to adopt is to entrust the present government with the settlement of the matter.

In the name therefore of the persecuted Catholics of Manitoba, in the name of the outraged constitution of the Dominion, we solemnly ask our readers to seriously ponder on what we have here and elsewhere written, and giving their confidence to those who have once proved themselves our friends, say to those weak-kneed politicians who have already once betrayed us, and shown themselves to be our treacherous enemies and the tools of the Manitoba Government in their defiance of the Privy Council: "We cannot trust you, your past record is against you, and we should not be worthy of the traditions of our fathers in the faith, who in days of persecution replied with heroic simplicity even in the presence of death, 'I am a Christian, I am a Catholic,' if we allowed any paltry party consideration or temporal good to induce us to leave our Manitoba brethren to your tender mercies."

UNWORTHY OF CONFIDENCE.

Mr. Joseph Martin is, as we have often pointed out, Mr. Laurier's trusted lieutenant in this country. Passing one of his committee rooms a few evenings ago we caught a few sentences of a speech he was delivering before an audience of a couple of hundred men and boys there assembled who evidently thoroughly appreciated his denunciations of Sir Charles Tupper whom he described as the champion of the Roman Catholics, and who loudly cheered his allusions to the Hon. Mr. Laurier, whom he referred to as the bold defender of Protestant ascendancy in Manitoba and the sole hope of those who are opposed to the encroachments of the insidious church of Rome. There may be some of our readers who will still find it hard to believe that Mr. Martin can have any claim to speak authoritatively of his leader's views and inmost sentiments, but they will do well to bear in mind that from the day when Mr. Laurier ostentatiously introduced Mr. Martin to the House of Commons as member for this City, these two politicians have been on terms of the greatest intimacy, and when speaking here in 1894 Mr. Laurier pointedly declared that Winnipeg's representative was his personal and valued friend, and that he felt honored in having such an able, devoted, and reliable lieutenant. In addition to this Mr. Martin is to-day endorsed by the Liberal press of the Dominion, it is said that he will have a seat in the cabinet Mr. Laurier is to form, and only last week an open letter was addressed to the people of Winnipeg by the Editor of the Globe urging them to return to Ottawa this pillar of the party. This, being the case we once again ask our Eastern readers what confidence can they place in Mr. Laurier, and what do they think the Catholics of Manitoba may hope for if he comes to power and forms a cabinet out of such material as Mr. Joseph Martin, taking into consideration at the same time the claims of

his other friend and Manitoba candidate—Dalton McCarthy. Reflection on such points as these have forced us to the conclusion, and we say it with regret, that the once great and respected Liberal Party has by its present alliances forfeited all claim to confidence, and if there is one section of the community more than another which must look upon it with the gravest suspicion it surely is the Catholic electors who have so much at stake in the election which is to be decided next week. From their point of view the Liberal Party is, to say the least, most unfortunate in its plan of campaign, in the combinations it has formed, and, above all, in its leader, who has, certainly, in this crisis not developed those strong points which his friends looked for and which are absolutely indispensable in a statesman who aspires to govern a great country like the Dominion of Canada. That exceedingly well-informed English journal "The Liverpool Catholic Times," which has so nobly battled for Home Rule and for Catholic educational rights in England, says in its last issue to hand speaking of the Canadian elections:—

"The Liberal organs affect to be highly indignant because their Leader, Mr. Laurier, has been called 'a rationalistic Catholic' by one of the Bishops. But his attitude on the Education Question has most decidedly laid him open to the charge of want of fidelity towards the Church. The reform which the Catholics demand in Manitoba is not a mere question of politics; it is simply a question of remedying injustice. Mr. Laurier however knowing the strength of Protestant bigotry, resolved to pander to it in the hope of securing a majority at the elections. We are inclined to think that he will find himself misled by his calculations."

So think we, too. The people of Canada as a whole will have no use for a man who is willing for his own selfish reasons to forget his duty to his country and his religion, and to unite with those who in order to harass and oppress a loyal and law-abiding minority, have deliberately defied Her Majesty's Privy Council. Such perfidy as Mr. Laurier has been guilty of is too transparent to deceive any but those who are wilfully blind, and we have every confidence therefore that on the 23rd June Mr. Laurier and his dear friend and ally, Joseph Martin, will receive such a lesson from the electors that their fate will for many a long day stand as a warning to those in the public life of Canada who may be tempted to make a political football of the Constitution of the country and the sacred rights of the people. Let every Catholic elector do his part in making the lesson as complete and effective as possible by strenuously opposing Laurierism and the Laurier candidates, and by doing their best to secure the return of members who follow the lead of Sir Charles Tupper—a statesman who has the desire and the will to see the provisions of the constitution enforced to their very letter and who stands before Canada to-day as one who will face any risk rather than shirk his responsibilities or desert the oppressed.

THE ISSUE IS CLEAR.

The promise of Sir Oliver Mowat to go into the Liberal ministry at Ottawa which Mr. Laurier will form, if returned to power, was intended to reassure those electors whom the Liberal leader's course on the Remedial Bill had disgusted. Considering, however, that Mr. Laurier's following includes Mr. Dalton McCarthy and Mr. Joseph Martin, whose claims he would also have to consider in forming a cabinet, the taking in of Sir Oliver Mowat will not, we believe, be sufficient to reassure those Liberals of Ontario who believe in Remedial Legislation as a sure cure for the evil condition of things in this Province and who have lost confidence in Mr. Laurier. When such men as Messrs. Taillon and Angers are prepared to stand or fall by the honesty of the Conservative party in this matter the elector who can still doubt must be a very stubborn

fellow indeed—but no one can be blamed for refusing to trust the settlement of such a serious question to a party which, although it includes Sir Oliver Mowat, contains among its leaders the very men who have been the authors of our troubles and whose sole aim is to perpetuate the persecution under which we have suffered.

educate and bring up their children in accordance with their religious convictions, while they themselves interfere with what should be none of their business. The Catholic hierarchy have never in the history of Canada, attacked any right or privilege of their Protestant neighbors, while these Protestant bodies, who denounce them so vigorously, have been exercising their full influence to deprive Catholics of the very rights and privileges they claim for themselves.

HARD ON MR. MILLS.

The Honorable David Mills is, without doubt, the ablest and most learned constitutional lawyer in the ranks of the Liberal party, or, in fact, in Canada. He was a member of the Liberal government of the late Hon. Alexander Mackenzie and his adherence to Liberal principles has never been questioned.

And, now, what do we find? No sooner did the Conservative speakers confront and confound the grit demagogues of Winnipeg, who tried to deceive the electors by saying that the government of Canada was not bound by the judgment of the Privy Council to grant relief to the minority, by quoting from Mr. Mills' constitutional speech, than Mr. Joseph Martin reads Mr. Mills out of the Liberal party by declaring that that gentleman's policy was not the policy of the Liberal party.

when the leader of the party sets him the example? Mr. Laurier has a different set of principles and a different policy for every province in the Dominion on the school question and on the tariff—may more, he has a different policy for every constituency in each of the provinces. Read his speeches as reported in the Globe, his own organ.

CONFIRMS 700.

Fifty thousand people gathered in the streets of that section of Chicago's great west side known in the Catholic geography of that city as the Holy Family Parish, Sunday afternoon to witness the magnificent procession escorting the 700 children, the majority of whom were little girls dressed in white, who were to receive the sacrament of confirmation in the church of the parish in West Twelfth street.

A. P. A. Twisters.

"It is a remarkable coincidence that every town thus far struck by a tornado had one or more A. P. A. lodges in it. The very elements are trying to wipe them off the face of the earth."

St. Ann's Academy. (KAMLOOPS, B. C.)

Re-opened on the 28th of August. Pupils attending the institution have every facility of perfecting themselves in the French and English language. Gratuitous lessons are given in plain sewing and fancy work, while great attention is paid to the training and department of the pupils.

WORTH THEIR WEIGHT IN GOLD

Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills.

Grand Deputies for Manitoba. Rev. A. A. Cherrier and Dr. J. K. Barrett. Winnipeg, Man. District deputies for Manitoba. F. W. Russell, Winnipeg; Edmond Trudel, St. Boniface.



Meets at Unity Hall, McIntyre Block every 1st and 3rd Wednesday. Spiritual Advisor, Rev. Father Guillet; Pres., A. H. Kennedy; 1st Vice, R. D. Coyle; 2nd Vice, M. E. Hughes; Treas., N. Bergeron; Rec. Sec., H. A. Russell; Assistant Rec. Sec., M. E. Hughes; Fin. Sec., D. F. Allman; Marshal, E. Laporte; Guard, G. J. McNeary; Trustees, J. O'Connor, T. Jobin, G. Gladish, E. L. Thomas and R. Murphy.

Branch 163, C.M.B.A. Winnipeg. Meets at the Immaculate Conception School Room on 1st and 3rd Tuesday in each month. Spiritual Advisor, Rev. A. A. Cherrier; Pres., A. H. Kennedy; 1st Vice, M. Buck; 2nd Vice, J. A. McInnis; Treas., P. Klinkhammer; Rec. Sec., P. O'Brien; Assistant Rec. Sec., A. Macdonald; Fin. Sec., Rev. Father Guillet; Trustees, J. O'Connor, T. Jobin, G. Gladish, E. L. Thomas and R. Murphy; Representative to Grand Council, F. W. Russell; Alternate, Dr. J. K. Barrett.

Catholic Truth Society of Winnipeg. Meets every Monday at 8 p. m., at 123 Water Street. Honorary President and Patron, H. S. Grace; Archbishop of St. Boniface, O. M. L.; Chief Ruler, L. E. Goss; Vice Chief Ruler, R. Murphy; Sec., J. Brennan; Fin. Sec., H. A. Russell; Treas., Geo. Germain; Trustees, J. A. McInnis, K. D. McDonald, and Jas. Malton; Representative to state Court convention, J. D. McDonald; Alternate, T. Jobin.

ST. MARY'S COURT No. 274. Catholic Order of Foresters. Meets 2nd and 4th Friday in every month, in Unity Hall, McIntyre Block. Chaplain, Rev. Father Guillet, O. M. L.; Chief Ruler, L. E. Goss; Vice Chief Ruler, R. Murphy; Sec., J. Brennan; Fin. Sec., H. A. Russell; Treas., Geo. Germain; Trustees, J. A. McInnis, K. D. McDonald, and Jas. Malton; Representative to state Court convention, J. D. McDonald; Alternate, T. Jobin.

ALBERT EVANS. 281 Main Street. Agent for Steglaway, Chickering and Nordheimer Pianos. Cheapest House in the trade for Sheet Music, Strings, etc. Pianos tuned.

St. Boniface College. This College, situated in beautiful and extensive grounds, is a large and commodious four-story building provided with electric light and an excellent heating apparatus. The Faculty is composed of Fathers of the Society of Jesus, under the patronage and control of His Grace the Archbishop of St. Boniface.

20 Miles to Procuere Medicine. Winfield, Ont. W. H. COMSTOCK, Brockville. DEAR SIR.—Am selling your "Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills" in this locality. I have customers who come 20 miles for the sake of getting Morse's Pills. This speaks for itself as to their value. I use them in our family with "the most satisfactory results."

NORTHERN PACIFIC R.R. Through Tickets. ON SALE VIA Rail, Lake and Ocean S. S. Eastern Canada, British Columbia, United States, Great Britain, France, Germany, Italy, India, China, Japan, Africa, Australia. DAILY TRAINS. SUPERB EQUIPMENT. Close Connections. Choice of Routes. For tickets and further information apply to CITY OFFICES, 486 Main Street, Winnipeg.

Table with columns: North Bound, Read up, South Bound, Read down, STATIONS, Freight No., 1st Daily, 2nd Daily, 3rd Daily, 4th Daily, 5th Daily, 6th Daily, 7th Daily, 8th Daily, 9th Daily, 10th Daily, 11th Daily, 12th Daily.

Table with columns: East Bound, Read up, West Bound, Read down, STATIONS, Freight No., 1st Daily, 2nd Daily, 3rd Daily, 4th Daily, 5th Daily, 6th Daily, 7th Daily, 8th Daily, 9th Daily, 10th Daily, 11th Daily, 12th Daily.

PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE BRANCH. Stations marked—have no agent. Freight must be prepaid. Numbers 103 and 104 have through Pullman vestibuled Drawing Room Sleeping Cars between Winnipeg and St. Paul and Minneapolis. White Plains... Oakville... Curtis... Portage la Prairie Flag Station.

