

NORTHWEST REVIEW

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
TUESDAYWITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORITY.

At St. Boniface, Man.

REV. A. A. CHERRIER,
Editor-in-Chief.Subscription, - - - - \$2.00 a year.
Six months, - - - - \$1.00.The NORTHWEST REVIEW is on
sale at R. Vendome, Stationer, 300
Main St., opposite Manitoba Hotel.

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.

AGENTS WANTED.

Agents wanted, in town and country
places of Manitoba and the Northwest,
who shall solicit and collect subscrip-
tions for the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Very
liberal terms made known on applica-
tion to the Publisher.Address all Communications to the
NORTHWEST REVIEW, St. Boniface, Man.

Northwest Review.

TUESDAY, JANUARY 18 1898.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Our translation of the Holy Father's Encyclical was made in this office directly from the Latin original. We have collated it with four other English translations, the *Tablet's*, the *Catholic Times*, an English version sent to the Archbishop of St. Boniface and read last Sunday in St. Mary's Church, and copious extracts given in *Free Press* telegrams. These four versions seem to have been made with constant reference to, if not directly from, the French authorized version, and therefore suffer from the too free-and-easy tendency of French translators. An example will make our meaning clear. The Holy Father writes: "Non sumus nescii, emendari aliquid ex ea lege cooptum." The other translators write: "We are not unaware that something has been done to amend the law." The *Catholic Times* comes nearer to the original by translating "some measures have been undertaken." The Pope does not admit that anything has actually been accomplished; he merely acknowledges that something has been begun, *aliquid cooptum*, and so we translate: "a beginning has been made of amending something in that law."

Our heartiest congratulations are hereby tendered to Mr. Arthur Preuss, the editor of *The Review*, St. Louis, on his having received so encouraging a letter from the private secretary of His Eminence Cardinal Satolli. The Cardinal, who has passed unscathed, but not untaught thereby, through the fire-works of American Liberalism, sends his congratulations for the good work accomplished by Mr. Preuss and his editorial staff, and wishes them every prosperity for the future in the noble cause of supporting the truth and the dignity of the Catholic Church in America. These words will send a chill down the spinal column of some self-satisfied critics who rank Mr. Preuss among the "vitriolic brethren;" but these same words are almost as delightful to us as they must be to the clever and earnest editor of *The Review*, whose weekly improvement in breadth of treatment, accuracy of information, soundness of Catholic instinct, and spiciness of healthy humor is a never failing source of glad surprise.

On the other hand, we regret to learn that Mr. Preuss's health is not at all good. Much as we should miss him, yet, for the sake of continued usefulness, we venture to suggest that he might write less himself—in his issue of Jan. 6th as many as five articles are signed by him—and leave the bulk of the work to his many and able collaborators, subject, of course, to his own corrections and annotations.

Commenting on the remark we made last week about the suppression of Father Jette's name from the list of Judge Jette's three children, the *Free Press* suggests that "a more reasonable, perhaps a more charitable explanation would be that the fact of there being a son is not generally known." This is truly childlike and bland. When a pressman sets out to get a list of a famous man's children, and then states that those children are only two, one a married and the other an unmarried

lady, and all the time everybody in Montreal knows that there is also one son, a singularly able priest, not unknown, by the way, to the examiners of the University of Manitoba, that pressman must either be a fool or a knave. But really we don't see why the *Free Press* should feel hurt. It is not responsible for the omissions that may occur in its telegrams. That one in particular must have been purposely mutilated before it left Montreal by some narrow-minded bigot.

The *Free Press* publishes the following item: "A letter has been received by a Catholic gentleman of this city from a high clerical authority, who attended the late meeting with the ablegate at St. Paul, in which it is positively asserted that the Canadian Bishops have been forbidden to publish any letter or comment of their own in connection with the Pope's Encyclical."

That the "high clerical authority" of this no doubt "prominent" Catholic gentleman should have been misinformed is not so surprising. What is really astounding is that our leading journal should allow such an item to figure in its columns four days after the news had been wired here that the acting Archbishop of Quebec had published, with the Pope's encyclical, a letter of his own which, as the text, received here the evening before the printing of this *Free Press* item, shows, is considerably longer than the Papal document, of which it gives many a comment and an excellent summary. If the *Free Press* "City and General" man did not remember its own telegram of the beginning of last week, he might surely have remembered the *Tribune's* editorial note thereon of last Tuesday: "Mgr. Begin—the Administrator of the Archdiocese of Quebec—'one of the fire-eating clericals of the east, is already talking about the 'victory we shall win,' in connection with the revived school question." To call the gentlest of prelates a fire-eating clerical is in the *Tribune's* usual style of inaccuracy, but at least it was aware that Mgr. Begin had published a letter and comment of his own.

The *Missionary Record* for January is quite up to the mark for brightness and interest. It contains several extracts from our columns. The kindly editor very delicately hints that perhaps our contributor, who wrote the obituary notice of the late Father General Soullier, O.M.I., may have been mistaken in stating that Mrs. Eckel had mentioned Father Soullier in her book, "Maria Monk's Daughter." We have consulted that contributor, and he himself is not quite sure of his recollections in this particular, nor can he verify them, as Mrs. Eckel's book is not within his reach. But he is perfectly clear that Very Rev. Father Soullier was well acquainted with Mrs. Eckel at or about the time of her conversion, that he said so there and then to the clergy who accompanied him in his visit to the Blackwell's Island hospital, and that his unintentional witness to her veracity dispelled all idea of imposture. And this is the only point he meant to make.

The Encyclical "Affari Vos."

This latest pronouncement of our admirable Pope has been welcomed as a message of peace by the organs of most opposite opinions. The *London Times*, which was the first to publish the summary afterwards cabled across the globe, says: "It is firm without being either arrogant or minatory.... We do not know that the sturdiest of Protestants could reasonably have expected him to do more for the cause of religious and political peace in Canada than he appears to have done. On the question of principle it was hardly possible for him to give way. It has been decided too often and too conclusively by his predecessors and is supported too consistently by the tradition of his communion." The *London Daily News* observes: "The settlement arrived at by the Dominion and Manitoba Governments is declared to be inadequate from the Catholic point of view, and His Holiness exhorts Catholics to demand their rights. But meanwhile they are not to refuse partial concessions. Very sensible advice this seems. Catholics are to continue to cry out for the whole loaf, but meanwhile to accept the half loaf, or such other pieces as they can get."

The *Quebec Chronicle* admires the Holy Father's thorough acquaintance with the true state of the question. "The Protestants of Quebec," it says, are in the full enjoyment of their separate schools, and even if these were not guaranteed to them by a solemn compact, they would have no cause bitterly to regret any attempt at intervention. The *Chronicle* can only repeat what it has already so often said on this subject, that the Protestants of

Quebec are in duty bound, in consideration of British justice and fairplay, to grant to other minorities the privileges which they themselves enjoy."

In striking contrast with these honest opinions from Protestant sources is *La Patrie's* shameless distortion of the Holy Father's words: "The Pope," says Mr. Tarte's organ, "invites the governments to persevere in the path upon which they have entered through love of justice." The Pope does not address the governments at all. He does not even assert that the government have entered upon any path "through love of justice"; he merely says, with diplomatic reserve, that he has no reason to doubt their love of fairplay; which means, to those who can read between the lines, that the dishonesty of their motives is "not proven."

Mr. Tarte, who has so often affirmed that the school question was settled for ever and aye and that Catholic children should sit on the same benches with Protestant children, is now confronted with Leo XIII's distinct declaration that the question is not in any sense settled and that schools must be regulated in full accord with the profession of the Catholic faith.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier will need to tax all the resources of his marvellous ingenuity to explain away that famous saying of his that everybody, "except the extremists," was satisfied with the "settlement." The Pope, and therefore now all true Catholics, including Sir Wilfrid himself who would resent being called anything else, fall into that awkward category of extremists.

The Sovereign Pontiff is not content with one condemnatory epithet, he uses three: "quam legem ad sarcinam damna condidere, ea manca est, non idonea, non apta." When he says, "if anything be granted by law, etc. (si quid lege vel usu, etc., tribuatur)," he implies that no substantial offer of concessions has yet been made.

The Bishops are praised without the slightest reservation; their conduct is lauded as a striking proof of their vigilance and true episcopal zeal. On the other hand, the faintest possible praise is doled out to the Governments; they have begun a little something, and it is not proved that they were not actuated by a love of justice. The contrast between the two commendations could not well be greater.

This Encyclical gives Catholics a splendid vantage-ground. They can henceforth yield a point here and there because they are backed by the Pope; and, as the latter has solemnly re-affirmed the plenitude of their school rights, people cannot say that they are too exacting when they ask for more, since the Pope himself has said, "multo majora—much more" is what we have a right to demand. But of course no concessions can be accepted which imply the maintenance of the system of neutral, "godless" schools.

Extract from The Tablet's editorial of Jan. 1st.

The following passage, with which the *Tablet* concludes an instructive editorial on "Pope Leo and Manitoba," confirms Archbishop Begin's explanation that the partial satisfaction we are advised to accept must be such as shall not clash with the principle of separate schools.

That the Pope should deplore the Manitoba legislation of 1890 and decline to sanction the compromise arranged by Sir W. LAURIER was a forgone conclusion. The principle of the separate Catholic school has again been asserted in the face of the world, and the Catholics of Canada are urged to come forward and help the minority in Manitoba to keep up their own schools wherever their numbers make that at all possible. But there is not a word which can be construed into an encouragement to those who would wrest the Manitoba school grievance to the purposes of a party, and so kindle the embers of religious strife all over the Dominion, and bring about an open feud between the Catholic Church and the Liberal Government. Uncompromising in his rejection of the principle of the "mixed school," the HOLY FATHER has treated the Liberal leaders and their efforts to bring about a settlement in a spirit of the largest charity and forbearance, and shown himself singularly mindful of the difficulties which beset their position. He acknowledges that already something has been done to relieve the situation, and is willing to credit all concerned with the best intentions, and still trusts that there sense of fairness will in the end lead them to deal an equal justice equally to all. Meanwhile, Catholics are exhorted to accept "a partial satisfaction" as an instalment of their claims. This cannot, of course, be taken to mean that they should accept the "Laurier-Greenway com-

promise," otherwise there would be no need for the separate schools which they are urged to keep up, but no doubt refers to cases in which the smallness of the Catholic population makes a separate school out of the question. In such cases such concessions as security for proper school books or the presence of a Catholic teacher should be gladly welcomed. When we remember the critical position of parties in Canada, the justice of the Catholic cause and its many disappointments, and how welcome a more aggressive note would have been to many, it must be admitted that Pope Leo in his patient and statesmanlike utterance has shown himself a very Prince of Peace. While his counsels of moderation will no doubt be taken to heart by the Catholics of Canada, we may be permitted to hope also that his desire for a permanent peace will find generous acknowledgment both in Winnipeg and in Ottawa.

Mr. Laurier and the Encyclical

For Mr. Laurier, the Canadian Premier, and his friends the Encyclical creates a situation which will test their good will towards the Catholics and the Church. The Privy Council, it will be remembered, decided that according to the Constitution the province of Manitoba could not deprive the Catholics of their denominational schools, and accordingly a remedial order for redress was passed by the Federal Government. Mr. Greenway, the Manitoba Premier, refused to yield, and the Dominion Government, then carried on by the Conservatives, brought in a Bill rendering compulsory the restitution of their rights to the Catholics of Manitoba. Mr. Laurier, at the head of the Liberal opposition, opposed the Bill and succeeded in defeating it. A dissolution of Parliament followed, and the school question was the main issue. Mr. Laurier, whilst denouncing the Conservative policy, acknowledged that the Catholics had a grievance and promised to remedy it if returned to power. He obtained a decisive majority, and the result was the "Laurier-Greenway Settlement," which prohibits religious teaching during the regular school hours, but empowers the school trustees to make a certain provision for it if the parents so desire. Mr. Laurier, accompanied by Mr. Charles Russell, visited Rome after the Queen's Jubilee and had an interview with the Holy Father, in the course of which, it may be taken for granted, the school question was fully discussed. On his return to Canada Mr. Laurier declared that Leo XIII. was by far the most interesting man he had met in his European travels, and he spoke with great warmth of his judicial temperament. Will he now obey his Encyclical as a good Catholic ought to do? If he does not, a period of trial lies before him.—CATHOLIC TIMES.

The Holy Scripture.

Rev. Father Drummond at the Immaculate Conception Church.

Speaking at the church of the Immaculate conception on Sunday evening before a crowded congregation, the Rev. Father Drummond, S. J., continued his series of instructions on the holy scriptures. He dealt especially with the canon of the Old Testament, and briefly touched also on the canon of the New. Explaining that the Catholic church held that seven more books were inspired than Protestants accepted, he went exhaustively into the evidence that could be produced to show the canonicity of those books, and in a masterly manner criticized the position regarding these taken by non-Catholics. A great reason why Catholics accepted those books was the testimony of the Lord and the apostles in the New Testament, three hundred out of three hundred and fifty citations of the Old Testament in the new being borrowed from the Septuagint, in which all those books were included. But their real reason for accepting them was the testimony of the Catholic church, the united voice of the church speaking with the living authority of the society instituted by God to be the infallible guide of men in the way of truth. That was their reason for accepting those books, and they had also historical proofs that they must have been accepted formerly by the Jews. As to the New Testament, Protestants held it as Catholics did, but they were not logical in doing so, for the same reasons that led them to reject the seven books of the Old Testament applied with equal force to several books of the new. Christians could not have any other guide as to which were the inspired words of God but the Catholic church, and that was why St. Augustine, who was so learned in matters spiritual and theological, said: "I would not believe the scriptures themselves unless the Catholic church were to tell me they are the scriptures," and that was the way all should look upon the word of God. The rule of Catholic faith was the written and the unwritten word of God, and it was the living voice of the church which told them where that written word was to be found.—FREE PRESS.

An important opinion

On the School Question by the
Attorney-General—The federal
Parliament still has
Jurisdiction.

Nor'Wester.

Since the issue of the Pope's Encyclical, and in view of the consequent possibility of the School Question again coming before the Dominion Parliament in some form or other, it has been an interesting point of consideration among constitutional authorities as to what extent, if at all, the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament to deal with the matter has been affected by the Laurier-Greenway compromise.

The Nor'Wester submitted this point to the Hon. J. D. Cameron, the Attorney-General, on his return yesterday in the form of the following question:—

"What is your opinion on the constitutional point raised by the Mail-Enterprise that, owing to His Excellency in his speech from the Throne last session having stated that the School Question was settled, and owing to Parliament having accepted that settlement as a fact in its address in reply, Parliament has divested itself of jurisdiction to enact remedial or other legislation respecting the educational affairs of this Province, unless the matter is re-opened by the Governor-in-Council as the result of a new petition to that authority from the Manitoba Minority?"

To this the Attorney-General, having considered the matter, replies as follows:—

"I do not consider it likely that the Courts would hold that Parliament could divest itself of its jurisdiction to pass remedial legislation simply by the adoption of a resolution. It seems to me that at least there would have to be some positive statutory enactment and it would have to be borne in mind, even then, that such an enactment might be repealed. The question is further complicated by the fact that the Act of 1890, which was originally petitioned against, has been modified by successive material amendments."

The Attorney-General's opinion is an important and interesting one. If it is correct, the School Question is still unsettled so far as Parliament is concerned, and will remain so until the Province complies with the Remedial Order, or until the Dominion Parliament enacts some legislation on the subject or until the Remedial Order, which gives Parliament jurisdiction, is repealed. This position of affairs is a very anomalous one. It is clear that the Province cannot boast of restored autonomy in the matter of education until this difficulty is straightened out by the jurisdiction of the Federal Parliament in the matter being positively closed. It is also evident that, the so-called settlement not having affected the position of Parliament in the matter at all, there is bound to be trouble for Sir Wilfrid Laurier when Parliament meets. Either some of the Catholic members will move Parliament to implement the Remedial Order by legislation, or some of the Equal Rights members will press to have Parliament divested of jurisdiction by the repeal of the Remedial Order. The Government will find itself in a nice dilemma, whichever contingency happens.

The Pope and the Manitoba School Question.

The Encyclical on the Manitoba School Question which has been issued by the Holy Father is of those masterly and at the same time uncompromising documents which reveal both his firmness and his diplomatic ability. As was to be expected, he rigidly insists on the rights of the Catholics to denominational education, but he does this with such tact and skill that even those who disagree with the claims he puts forward are loud in praise of his moderation and reasonableness. The "Daily News" agrees with the "Times" in stating that the Encyclical displays practical wisdom of a high order. His Holiness commends the action of the Canadian Bishops, and exhorts the faithful to continue the agitation for their rights, but in the meantime not to reject partial concessions. The "Laurier-Greenway Settlement" was, he admits, a well-meant attempt to solve the problem; still the concessions it makes to the Catholics are altogether inadequate, and his Holiness directs that if it be not sufficiently improved, the Catholics must found schools of their own under the authority of the Bishops. The Pope's decision is based on the report of Mgr. Merry del Val as Apostolic Delegate, and its decisive terms and conciliatory spirit constitute a notable tribute to the success with which that Prelate discharged his mission.

Rev. Father Beaudin, O.M.I., has been obliged to return to St. Boniface Hospital on account of liver trouble.