

## 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.  
All Postage is paid by the Publisher.

P. KLINKHAMMER,  
Publisher,

THE REVIEW is on sale at the  
following place: Hart & McPherson's,  
Booksellers, 364 Main street.

### ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application.  
Orders to discontinue advertisements must  
be sent to this office in writing.  
Advertisements unaccompanied by specific  
instructions inserted until ordered out.  
Address all Communications to THE  
NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box  
508, Winnipeg, Man.

## The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 26.

### EDITORIAL COMMENT.

**The Remedial Bill.** The Remedial Bill is now before the Canadian House of Commons. It gives us back, substantially, the school rights of which the iniquitous 1890 School Act despoiled us. We are, therefore, fairly satisfied with the provisions of the present Bill, and we hold that all true friends of the Constitution and of the Catholic minority ought to support this measure. We have reason to hope that the majority of the Conservatives and all the Catholics of the Liberal party will vote for a Bill which will consolidate our great Canadian Confederation by a striking example of justice and fair-play. We do not know if Sir Donald Smith came on a special mission: but we are in a position to state that His Grace the Archbishop has not been called upon either to accept or to refuse a compromise. The furious way in which our local rulers have denounced the hierarchy would make it impossible for Mgr. Langevin to move in the matter. There is, then, no hope except from Ottawa. Opposition to the Remedial Bill would imply a wish to keep the Catholic minority in the state of unbearable suffering which has weighed so grievously upon them for the past six years.

**The Latest Dodge.** Mr. Sifton has given notice of a motion looking towards concession of Catholic claims in school matters. He and his artful dodgers. Their only object is to defeat the Remedial Bill by an apparent generosity which will seem to make so great an effort unnecessary. If they could once stave off that Bill, they would turn round the next moment and rend us with satanic glee. They are and have always been traitors to every bond and promise. We know them too well ever to trust them in anything. What they fear is that Ottawa will deliver us from their cruel bondage forever. God grant our friends there may not be deceived by the wiles of these trimmers.

### PROTESTANT TOLERANCE?

It was Dr. King, we think, who said that, a Christian at the teacher's desk could do a great deal in forming the principles of the pupils. No doubt a good Presbyterian at the teacher's desk could do a great deal in elevating the standard of John Knox; but it would not have the effect of elevating in the mind of the Catholic pupil, the sanctity of the Catholic Church. Catholics would be at the mercy of these teachers, because it would be impossible for a Catholic teacher to get any employment in the Public (Protestant) schools.

Lest our readers and the public should doubt this, we subjoin the following from the Minnedosa Tribune, a Protestant journal:

"A Turk, a Jew or an Atheist, may teach a Manitoba rural school, it seems, 'but not a Papist.' So it has been decreed by several school boards near Minnedosa, who refused the application

of a teacher solely on the above ground, although otherwise acceptable and fully qualified. It was thought Manitoba schools were purely secular and that no religion could be taught in them."

### "PROTESTANTISM IN POWER."

To the Editor of the Northwest Review.  
Sir,—A Week or two ago you devoted a sharp but not ill-natured article to some remarks made on the above subject in a letter to your contemporary the Free Press. My object in that letter was not to attack either party but to try to show the position of both. In passing I may further say that I have never assumed that I was the intellectual king or sage of Wawanesa, but as "the voice of one crying in the wilderness." In the article in question you say "a religion which Huxley and Renan dreaded as their most dangerous foe in the field of pure thought and which is daily winning its way among highly cultured minds can hardly be afraid of true education." The first portion of the above quoted sentence is I think a most unfortunate statement and should I think read "a religion," and I apply the term to both religions whether Catholic or Protestant, "that dreads Huxley and Renan as their most dangerous foes." If this is not the case why are the works of these men and others in the same strain placed in the Index Expurgatorius and all good Catholics forbidden to read them. Why when Paul IV in 1559 promulgated the Index Expurgatorius of prohibited books was it found necessary that not less than forty eight editions of the Bible should be included in it, sixty one printers put under the ban, and all their publications forbidden? Is it not plain that toleration either of men or books was altogether irreconcilable with the principles of the Roman See and that if any faltering took place in carrying out this determination the control of Rome over the human mind would be put into the most imminent jeopardy? I admit that the Catholic Church is daily winning its way among highly cultured minds. But are there not two sides to the shield? I am told that there is a town in England situated on a hill one end of which drains into the Bristol the other into the English Channel. During a shower of rain a man stationed at each end would think that all the sand from the town was coming his way. For the town, place the Bible the so called authority of the Protestant sects. It is a dead authority with no living paramount authority to interpret it, for each man thinks he can do so for himself. The result is there are two streams flowing from the so called authority one to Catholicism, the other to rationalism. Both parties are therefore claiming a rush of adherents. The two poles may be illustrated in the case of the two Newmans. John Henry and Francis W. Newman, both highly cultured men, both with lives unsullied by a single breath of calumny, and both deeply imbued with a profound religious instinct. Yet where are these men? The former was one of the brightest stars in the firmament of the Catholic Church, the other the exponent of that deep religious rationalism which like the Catholic Church is daily gaining adherents in all parts of the world. The Protestant sects are hard pressed as may be seen in the fervid attempts to resuscitate the dry bones by a pseudo-Catholicism called Ritualism and by the employment of pulpit mountebanks to draw congregations as seen in the States. Turn to the Established Presbyterian Church of Scotland. What do we see? Painted windows, organs with an organist and choirmaster and "O, tell it not in Gath," in St. Giles' Cathedral in the High Street, Edinburgh, an old Catholic structure, we find in a little chapel an angel in marble holding a font in which to baptise Presbyterian babies. In that same church I once heard Dr. Cameron Lees preach from the text: "What profiteth a man if he gain the whole world yet lose his own soul?" What was his interpretation? "What profiteth a man if he gain wealth and position and yet feels that amid all the pomp and glitter he is but a poor craven fellow after all." A lady who was present remarked to my wife that "it

was the most Christless sermon she had ever heard." To me it was one of the straws which show how the wind is blowing, a rationalism but thinly veiled. Yet I believe that the church of Scotland is more firmly rooted in the hearts of the people than ever, for they are half unconsciously with it moving on with the times. A religion is the effect of civilization not civilization the effect of religion. I will close this lengthy letter with a quotation from the writings of a man, one of the most extraordinary and most beloved of the men of this age, recently dead.

Brother, believe me, I respect thy creed, And in mine inmost shrine of reverence bow Before the men of strong firm-jointed thought, but to fling Damnation round against all other creeds, And plant myself, draped in most fine conceit, And laced in orthodoxy all compact, A model for all forms of thought that be, Is not my fashion, and should not be yours. Think in thy groove; 'tis safer footing so For thee, and all with thee who love to live Soft-fleshed with the fond familiar shell Of customed old tradition; but refrain From blasting me to my own nature true, Who love the broad free range and shifting scene And still must strive beyond myself to gain Some point of vantage, nearer as I deem To God and to the wide far-reaching scope Of his rich varied plan. A little bird Cage-born and bred may love to dwell secure Within the wires, and wisely shrink from swells Of way winds, and vans of venture stirred In unfamiliar fields; fear saves the weak; But the storm-nurtured freedomer of the air Will scorn to breathe where chains have lamed his wing. Farewell! Your creed may nevermore be mine; I hold one God, but many forms divine: Yours best—so be it—but I may not bind My heart to worship only in one kind; Nor, where flowers prink the mead with Let one bright bloom usurp my wondering view; And they are wise who love with like regard Both and this, where to choose is hard. Leave me, dear friend, the luxury of my error. To think that creeds are but a broken mirror, With thousand suns for one that lights the And one truth imaged in a thousand lies.

I am Sir,

Yours faithfully,

H. AUBREY HUSBAND,  
Wawanesa, Feb. 14 1896.

[Of course, our saying that Dr. Husband was the sage of Wawanesa and deemed himself "King of his intellectual world" was only a bit of harmless chaff, which the Doctor good-humoredly keeps up by calling himself "the voice of one crying in the wilderness," although he is quite aware that St. John the Baptist, whose words he modestly applies to himself, cried out a very definite message, "make straight the way of the Lord," while the viewy Doctor dilates upon the beautiful divergence of a thousand ways.

Even were it true that the Catholic Church dreaded Huxley and Renan as its most dangerous foes, it would not follow that our statement: Huxley and Renan dreaded us as their most dangerous foe—was incorrect. One dangerous foe often meets with an equally dangerous antagonist. But, as far as Renan is concerned, he was quoted not because he ever was very dangerous, the fellow was too superficial and maudlin to be really dangerous; but because he won a great name for himself in this age of shallow theorists. Huxley's case was vastly different. He was a close and accurate reasoner. The chief trouble with him was that his first principles were utterly devoid of foundation. His system was like a beautiful temple built on a quicksand. Now, as most men do not go to the foundations of any system, he was really dangerous because of his apparent logic and cohesiveness. Hence the Church would have been perfectly justified in banning his works, though, in point of fact, we are not aware that she ever did so by any official insertion of his name in the Index Expurgatorius.

With regard to that famous Index, Dr. Husband seems to think that no Catholic is allowed to read any book therein inscribed. This is a mistake. If a Catholic of Dr. Husband's ability is known to be well grounded in the faith and wishes to read prohibited books with a view to refuting them (and he ought to have no other intention if he really is a believer), he can easily obtain general leave to do so. The principle of the Index is applied in all well-regulated communities. Obscene publications are not even allowed to go through the mails. Obscenity is only one form of immorality. Irreligion opens the way to all forms of immorality, though some of its professors observe the exterior morality which the traditions of Christianity impose upon their sense of decorum. The law dams

one of the streams that flow from the source; the Church closes the poisoned source—a far more logical and effectual process.

If Paul IV did condemn 48 editions of the Bible and 61 printers—an assertion which we cannot verify as it is unsupported by any reference—it was doubtless because those editions and other publications were heretical. All Protestant editions of the Bible are mutilated and misleading. Freedom to imbibes error is licence, not liberty.

As to Dr. Husband's contention that rationalism, no less than Catholicism, claims distinguished adherents, we never said it did not. When the Archangel Michael contended with the Archangel Lucifer, the latter was followed by a vast number of distinguished adherents, which does not prove that Michael was wrong. All depends on the motives of the adherents.

The instance of the brothers Newman aptly illustrates our view of the relative merits of the two parties. John Henry Newman, before he became a Catholic, was the foremost man in the non-Catholic world; he is one of the greatest masters of English prose; everything he has written bears the impress of a supremely gifted mind; Disraeli could say of him that his secession from Anglicanism had dealt the Church of England "a blow from which she still reels;" he is more read and admired now than during his long life. On the other hand Francis William Newman, though very learned and versatile, though the author of some thirty volumes on the most varied themes, has produced absolutely no impression upon the nineteenth century; not one of his thoughts has ever gone round the world; few literary men can name one of his works offhand. The parallel between the two brothers, first noisily proclaimed by Mr. Justin McCarthy in his sketchy "History of Our Own Times," is rather a contrast than a parallel, the contrast between a man of genius with rare mental poise and an erudite crank.

The rest of Dr. Husband's letter calls for no special comment except this sentence: "A religion is the effect of civilization, not civilization the effect of religion." To this unproved affirmation we oppose the following: A false religion may be the effect of a surface civilization; but true civilization is the flower and fruit of a true religion.

One word more about the doctor's poetical quotation. It is saturated with the current errors of rationalism. "Brother, believe me, I respect thy creed;" and yet you rank it among "a thousand lies." Well, we don't respect yours at all; we have nothing but contempt and hatred for false creeds. Your person, your honesty of purpose we respect and love; but your errors we abominate. We hold that there must be but one objective truth, that our doctrines can be proved with almost mathematical precision, that the sentiment "I hold one God, but many forms divine" is arrant fudge, and that the approval of two contradictory propositions stultifies the human mind.—Ed. N. W. R.]

### INJUSTICE OR CIVIL WAR.

This is the ultimatum of the Toronto World:

"Are the Manitoba minority justified in demanding that the Dominion shall exrite revolution and civil war in order to right their grievance?"

"The Manitoba minority and those who support them, ought to make a distinction between what the country ought to do and what the country can do."

"Canada cannot enforce separate schools on an unwilling province."

"If the attempt be made rebellion will follow and possibly civil war, in which the school dispute will disappear behind the larger issue of race and creed."

"While the Dominion of Canada sympathizes with the Manitoba minority, and while it recognizes the justness of their grievance, yet we are satisfied this country will not undertake to remedy that grievance, if the process means a war of races and civil rebellion, and when carried to its logical sequence that is exactly what it does mean."

The World is a newspaper published in Toronto by Mr. McLean, M. P., and, of course, partakes, in a large degree of the local narrowness and bigotry of that city. Toronto is, par excellence, the most bigoted and intolerant city in Ontario, or, for that matter, in Canada. It is an ultra loyal city, in the sense in which Orangeism interprets that word—that is, it is truly loyal to the Queen and Constitution, so long as it can have everything its own way; but the moment its path is crossed, especially by Papists, it is ready to kick the Crown and Constitution into the Boyne, and declare civil war.

Well, there is as much danger of civil war over the Manitoba School question, as there is of annexation to the United States. In the first place, men who are capable of inciting race and religious wars for the purpose of holding on to the sweets of office, are generally the most arrant cowards, who would never expose their precious skins to any danger. The World does not know anything about Mr. Greenway and company, or it would never have ventured on its civil war scare. Imagine Messrs. Greenway and company running the risk of decorating with their graceful bodies some of the many telephone poles that ornament the streets in front of the parliament buildings! These honorable gentlemen are much too loyal to their own personal safety and too patriotic to their monthly salaries, ever to expose themselves to the violent curtailment of either. Civil war is, no doubt, a serious alternative; but history supplies us with many brilliant instances where civil war has not been an unmixed evil.

In our opinion, civil war would be infinitely preferable to the acknowledgment that the Constitution of Canada is powerless to maintain and uphold the rights and liberties of all her citizens intact. Civil war, even though it should sacrifice the lives of such loyal and patriotic gentlemen as Greenway, Sifton, et al., would be of small consequence to the happiness and prosperity of Canada, beside the fact that the constitution of the country, the very title deeds of our liberties, would be ignored and trampled upon, to gratify the evil passions and intolerable bigotry of at best, a small and insignificant army of demagogues and their dupes. However, there is not even a chance of civil war, and the man who talks of it is beneath contempt; but, even if civil war were the only alternative of a violation of the Constitution inflicting a grave injustice on a minority in any part of Canada, that dread alternative might be faced with equanimity. The Constitution of our country is the title deed of our rights as Canadian citizens and law-abiding subjects of the British Crown. The maintenance of that Constitution inviolate, should be the loyal ambition of every lover of his country, regardless of race, party or religion. Let it once be known that the Constitution can be ignored and its compacts violated; that it is powerless to maintain equilibrium in the scales of justice; that it cannot protect all the rights of its citizens; that the protection it grants minorities depends, not upon the citizenship, but upon the religion of the minority; that minorities, when Protestant, shall be protected, but when Catholic shall be sacrificed; let such an impression go abroad and a deadly blow is dealt to the stability, peace and prosperity of this fair land.

We have no fear of any such calamity overtaking the charter of our liberties; but the base public immorality of the proposition of the Toronto World is a blot upon Canadian journalism. The restoration of the rights of the minority should not excite revolution, or civil war, unless the maintenance of the Constitution and obedience to lawful authority is a just cause of revolution or civil war. If Canada "cannot enforce separate schools on an unwilling province"—that is, cannot enforce obedience to the Constitution and the authority of the Crown, then, in the name of common sense, of what use is the Constitution? "If the attempt be made rebellion will follow and possibly civil war." Well, if rebellion and possibly civil war be the only choice the unreasoning majority