

NORTHWEST REVIEW

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.

At 188 James Avenue East. WINNIPEG.

Subscription, - - - - \$2.00 a year. Six months, - - - - \$1.00.

P. KLINKHAMMER, Publisher.

The NORTHWEST REVIEW is on sale at the following place: Hart & Co., Booksellers, 364 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.

AGENTS WANTED.

Agents wanted, in town and country places of Manitoba and the Northwest, who shall solicit and collect subscriptions for the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Very liberal terms made known on application to the Publisher.

Address all Communications to the NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

Northwest Review.

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 23.

TERMS OF OUR SETTLEMENT.

THE CATHOLIC PLATFORM

- 1 Control of our schools.
- 2 Catholic school districts.
- 3 Catholic teachers, duly certificated, but trained in our own training schools as in England.
- 4 Catholic inspectors.
- 5 Catholic readers, our own textbooks of history and descriptive geography, and full liberty to teach religion and comment on religious questions at any time during school hours.
- 6 Our share of school taxes and government grants, and exemption from taxation for other schools.

NOTICE.

We have mailed to all subscribers who are behindhand with their subscription, a circular urging immediate payment of arrears.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Educated Blackguards.

Very remarkable speech made by Mr. F. W.

Russell at the Public Morals meeting in this city a fortnight since. We reproduced that admirable discourse last week; but there are passages in it that will bear repeating and the entire drift of it is strikingly practical. It was a temperate yet forceful refutation of the two false theories that legislation is a cure-all and that mere mental information makes men moral. Laws without a healthy public opinion become a dead letter. An enlightened mind may wallow in sin and crime. To prove this latter proposition, Mr. Russell pointed to the lamentable failure of modern education in stemming the tide of immorality. "Look at London," said he—and he prefaced this with the remark that, being himself an Englishman, he would refrain from attacking other nations when he could draw a lesson from his own native land—"It is not many years ago that a state of things was revealed there which would have disgraced ancient Babylon and made pagans blush. The veil was drawn aside for a moment and a cancer revealed which was eating into and corroding the very heart of the great English empire, which boasts itself the most civilized and enlightened on the face of the earth. Were the offenders poor, ignorant and uninstructed? Were they men whose minds had no training? No, Sir, but on the contrary many of the educated, the refined, the cultured were implicated in the most nefarious practices. Education had not taught them virtue, and worldly wisdom had

not made them spiritually wise. Yet this is but an example, an illustration, of the truth that learning is no match for debauchery and that secular knowledge cannot cope with the spirit of uncleanness, nor hurl the idol of passion from its throne."

The Only Remedy.

Mr. Russell then went on, very delicately, to draw the obvious inference. If mere learning is unable to cope with the lusts of the flesh, religious and moral training becomes an imperative necessity. Without mentioning the burning question of separate schools, the eloquent speaker alluded to them in a way that no intelligent hearer could misunderstand. Here are his golden words:

"Our people must be trained from the cradle up; the little ones must be taught to abhor uncleanness and to reverence chastity, and if we are really zealous for the good cause let us, when we see people struggling to provide the means of training up a God-fearing and virtuous generation, encourage them by all means, and certainly put no obstacle in their way. Society has rights in this matter and is entitled to demand of the state laws for the suppression of vice and immorality and that these laws be carried out, but both society and the state have duties also, and they signally fail in one of the most important when they do anything to hamper parents who believe that, whilst knowledge is great power, yet without religion it is worse than useless, inasmuch as it will be used to work evil, and that, whilst ignorance may be a temporal calamity, there is a worse evil, namely, a misdirected, perverted and impure life."

Infinitely worse indeed. Better an ignorant, illiterate Catholic who knows the chief truths of his religion than the learned voluptuary whose disbelief in God comes from the rottenness of his soul. The latter knows a great many things that are of tenth-rate importance; the former knows a few great truths of the very first order and of the widest possible scope. How gently Mr. Russell puts it to the hypocrites who pretend to be religious-minded and yet thwart Catholic efforts for religious schools! Yes, gentlemen, if you were really zealous for the good cause, if you were not simply advertizing yourselves by making a fuss about public morality, you would encourage by all means in your power Catholics who are struggling "to provide the means of training up a God-fearing and virtuous generation." But you prefer, as Squeers preferred, to starve your children and then cure them of starvation by occasional doses of brimstone and treacle. People cannot live on brimstone and treacle; it is an essentially transient diet.

A Ludicrous Interpolation.

Our subscribers and friends of St. Pierre Jolys must have been sorely puzzled when they tackled our last week's report of their great meeting of the 6th inst. After the proofs had been corrected the page-makers, by some unaccountable oversight, inserted in the middle of the St. Pierre report the unmelted type of a previously published report of the Winnipeg protest. The mistake was noticed too late for rectification last week; but we reprint the St. Pierre report in the present issue by way of amends for an unfortunate slip.

Help From Goldwin Smith.

In a recent letter to the press Professor Goldwin Smith shows how well he understands our position on the school question. It must be humiliating to weak-kneed Catholics to read such expressions as the following from the latitudinarian but appreciative professor: "The thoroughly devout Catholic, no mere safeguards or hours reserved for doctrinal teaching will satisfy. He wants the Catholic atmosphere, the Catholic surroundings. He wants the child's whole character moulded upon the Catholic model. Nor is it very easy to see how you are justified in compelling him to send his child to your school, as you must do

when you take from him, by the school-tax, the means of sending his child to a school of his own." We earnestly commend this passage to the consciences of those deluded politicians who, while professing the Catholic faith, imagine that "hours reserved for doctrinal teaching will satisfy the thoroughly devout Catholic," i.e., the only consistent and logical Catholic.

He Takes It All Back.

The distinguished Professor sees the facts and recognizes the reasonableness of our stand; but, as the Archbishop of Rupert's Land said of the "Settlement," he presently "takes back with one hand what he gives with the other." This is Mr. Goldwin Smith's lame defence of that which he had previously admitted it was not easy to justify: "Our public school system, overriding paternal right and conscience, rests on considerations of public policy superior to natural justice." What an admission! So, according to this great non-Catholic authority, the public school system really overrides paternal right and conscience. We Catholics have always thought and said so, and it is gratifying to find our sentiments echoed so exactly by one who is as far removed from Catholicism as he can well be. But is there not a flavor of delicate irony in the further statement that considerations of public policy are superior to natural justice? Does it not smack of sarcastic comment on the universally admitted axiom that "honesty is the best policy"? The sequel of the Professor's plea would seem to support this interpretation: "To bring it (public policy) into exact harmony with natural justice is as impossible as to square the circle. In legislating to satisfy the requirements of public policy, you must get as near to natural justice as you can, and put up with the divergence that remains." This evidently implies that the divergence between Catholic schools with a Catholic atmosphere all day long and public schools with a premium set on irreligion because of the contemptuous half hour thrown to religion at the far-end of the day is only very slight, so slight that there is a real harmony between these two opposites, only not a very exact harmony. Is Professor Goldwin Smith indulging in an elusive joke?

THE ARCH-COERCIONIST.

The "Tribune" tells us "there will be no coercion under Mr. Laurier." This is one of the stock phrases of our persecutors but it assuredly deceives no one. All the world knows that in going back on his promises and playing into the hands of a tyrannical majority in this Province the Dominion premier is just now engaged in one of the most dastardly acts of coercion it is possible to conceive, inasmuch as he is trying to force upon a loyal and God-fearing minority a system of education which he knows is abhorrent to them, and which it is tyranny of the worst kind to try to enforce. He knows that we have right and justice on our side, for during the late election he repeatedly expressed himself to this effect; he knows that the constitution of the country makes it his duty to see that we are protected in the enjoyment of our rights, and he knows that the course he is now engaged in is not only false and treacherous but an act of despotism which we must go back to the old penal days to find the like of. Here in Manitoba is a people suffering for conscience sake, and in Ottawa there is a so-called statesman who having it in his power to end the persecution not only refuses to do his duty but actually assists in perpetuating the outrage, his hope evidently being that the victims will be forced by the intolerable nature of their burden to accept that which he offers them. The man who does this is not only a coward, and a traitor to his religion, his nationality, and the constitution of the country, but he is the arch-coercionist of the age, and as such merits the contempt of all right thinking men.

MR. FORGET.

Last week we pointed out that Mr. Tarte had named a Mr. Forget as one of the representatives of the Catholic minority of Manitoba whom he had consulted in connection with the school "settlement." We stated that we knew no one of this name who was entitled to speak on behalf of Manitoba Catholics and we asked whether the minister really referred to the civil servant and creature of the government named Forget who lives at Regina. In reply we have received the following letter:—

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW. SIR, In an editorial article which appeared in your last issue, enquiry is made as to whether I am one of the gentlemen named by the Hon. Mr. Tarte as having been consulted in connection with the recent negotiations over the school question; and if so, when and under what circumstances I became entitled to pass as a representative of the Catholics of Manitoba. As a reply is no doubt expected, let me say at once that it is quite possible I may be the party referred to by the Hon. Minister; for, in conversation with him, I frankly admitted the settlement was the best that could possibly have been made under the circumstances. I am of the same opinion still, and with a great number of as good and sincere Catholics as some who loudly protest against the settlement. I cannot but regret that it should apparently have been determined not to give it a fair trial. In conclusion, let me assure you and your readers that in the expression of the above opinion, there was no intention on my part, as there is none now, to speak for or on behalf of the Catholic majority of any other place. No such inference can, I believe, be drawn from the remarks of the Hon. Minister. It is true, however, that an impression may have been created that I was a resident of Manitoba. In a narrow sense I am not; but when it is considered that my jurisdiction as Indian Commissioner extends over the Province of Manitoba as well as the Territories, and that Regina, where I reside, is within the diocese of St. Boniface, I think no very great wrong has been done. I am Sir, Yours etc., A. E. FORGET.

Regina, 19th December 1896.

It will be seen that Mr. Forget states he may have been the party referred to because he "frankly admitted (to the minister) the settlement was the best that could have been made under the circumstances." How did he know this, and even if he is able to prove it who is he, anyway, that his opinions should have any weight in the matter. If Mr. Forget could sell his opinions for what he thinks they are worth and buy them back at the estimate put on them by people who know him, he would get rich. He says "I am of the same opinion still." No doubt he is, for as we said last week, he is a creature of the government, and like the famous vicar of Bray he will keep his position no matter who reigns, and change his opinions just as often as he may find it necessary in order to suit his masters. He adds "I cannot but regret that it should apparently have been determined not to give it (the settlement) a fair trial." We all know that this is mere humbug, he don't care a cent one way or the other, but he thinks it will pay him to so express himself and thereby to stand in with the powers that be. With regard to the later part of his letter we desire to say that the minister distinctly made it appear that the Mr. Forget he was referring to was a resident of Manitoba. The writer of the letter admits that an impression may have been created that he is a resident of Manitoba and says "In a narrow sense I am not." What does the man mean? If not in a narrow sense in what sense is he "a resident of Manitoba"? We will answer our question by saying—in no sense at all. He does not live in Manitoba, he never did live here, it is an impertinence on his part to even insinuate that he has the slightest right to speak for Manitoba Catholics, and in a word, so far as we know anything of him, he is one of the very last men in the world whom any body of self-respecting Catholics would choose as a spokesman or representative.

WHO ARE THEY?

Will Mr. Forget please tell us who are the "good and sincere Catholics" who think the "settlement" is the best that could have been made under the circumstances. If he means Manitoba Catholics we tell him he is not speaking the truth. It is known that there are one or two Catholics in Manitoba who from being out and out opponents of any settlement which would not restore separate schools have, since the government arrangement has been made public, turned a complete somersault, gone entirely back on their record of the past few years and rendered themselves utterly contemptible in the estimation of those

who are familiar with the stand they took in days gone by. We are ready to admit there are one or two such men in Manitoba, but although they may call themselves Catholics we may assuredly claim that they are neither "good" nor "sincere." A good Catholic and a sincere one is one who will maintain Catholic principles at all cost and under all circumstances, and not one who will change his Catholic principles with every change of Government. We repeat therefore there are no "good and sincere Catholics" in Manitoba who think that the "settlement" is the best that could be made, and Mr. Forget has no more reason to claim that there are any such than Mr. Tarte has for naming him as a Catholic of influence and standing in this Province.

THE CORNWALL ELECTION

We need not say we have been disappointed at the result of the Cornwall election—but at the same time we are by no means surprised. The general rule in Canada is for the government to win all bye-elections and when we call to mind the nature of the campaign that Mr. Laurier and his followers carried on in this instance, many reasons can be found why it would be almost impossible for the opposition candidate to succeed. We can all remember how Mr. Laurier during the general election last June went through Quebec falsely stating that Sir Charles Tupper had sneered at the idea of a French Canadian being Premier of Canada—and now in Cornwall we see that he has been making statements equally false but at the same time admirably calculated to gain votes. He told the Catholic electors that under the school "settlement" the Catholics of Manitoba would have separate schools, their own teachers, religious instruction to suit themselves, and in fact led them to believe that we would have all we ask for and are entitled to. To the Protestants he said they would decide by their votes whether Manitoba was to be coerced or not. In this way he confused the issue so far as the school question was concerned and to clinch the matter members of his Government promised the expenditure of vast sums of money in the constituency and the early completion of great public works. This was the way in which the election was won. There will be, sooner or later, a day of reckoning for the political frauds who make use of such reckless means to attain the end they have in view—and for the good of Canada that day can surely not come too soon.

THE ST. BONIFACE MAYORALTY.

The following is from the "Tribune": If His Grace and the clergy who took such an active part in the St. Boniface mayoralty election were only able to carry it by a majority of 17, notwithstanding the fact that it was run on the school settlement, it is quite evident that there is a great lack of unanimity among the Roman Catholics on the question of school settlement. Our enemies are heartily welcome to any satisfaction they may be able to extract from the result of the election which is here referred to. On the morning of election day a NORTHWEST REVIEW representative was stopped by a prominent supporter of Mr. Bétournay and requested to deny in our columns in the most explicit terms that the school question had anything to do with the contest. This gentleman also informed us that Mr. Bétournay had himself that morning emphatically repudiated the rumour which had gone abroad that he was opposed to His Grace the Archbishop in this matter, and our informant added that almost all the supporters of Mr. Bétournay were sound on the question, that they were practically a unit in supporting the Archbishop, and that they were simply opposing Senator Bernier because they thought Mr. Bétournay was entitled to the office after his service in the Council and from a municipal point of view would make a good mayor. We intended to give this statement to our readers, and leave it to their consideration without any comment, but after what has been said in the "Tribune" and the "Free Press" it may not be amiss if we tell them that their efforts to