

**The Northwest Review**

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY.  
At 184 James Street East.  
**WINNIPEG.**

**P. KLINKHAMMER,**  
Publisher,

Who alone is responsible for payments, and to whom all accounts are payable.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Bookellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Bookellers, 408 Main St.

**ADVERTISING RATES.**

Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing. Advertisements unaccompanied by Specific Instructions inserted until ordered out.

**SUBSCRIPTION RATES.**

All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The NORTHWEST REVIEW \$2 a year, \$1 for six months.

Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTHWEST REVIEW for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time.

Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest. Write for terms.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The NORTHWEST REVIEW is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association.

Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published. Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

**NOTICE.**

The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a PARTY character. (2) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in North Western Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4) NOTES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notes will prove of much benefit to the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

**The Northwest Review**

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14.

**EDITORIAL COMMENT.**

A kind subscriber from North Dakota, while paying his subscription, on the 9th inst. adds: "I wish all our good Catholics appreciated the value of your paper. One thing pleases me greatly, and that is the energy with which your great Archbishop keeps up the struggle for your rights, for your schools. I trust you will continue as in the past to help him faithfully."

Language should be used to represent not to distort facts. Call our system of tax-supported schools "national," "public," "Protestant" or "Catholic," but never call them "free." That cannot be free for which a tax is paid. A truism this, no doubt; but one on which the current frauds of the circumambient Protestant atmosphere make it necessary to insist. The only really free schools in the world have been and still are endowed and managed by Catholics. The Eternal City before 1870 was full of them, primary schools, academies, colleges, universities, where the tuition was entirely gratuitous and no tax was levied for them. There is at least one such Catholic college in America, Creighton College, Omaha, founded and endowed by the Creighton family. Should some generous millionaire take it into his head to subscribe twenty thousand dollars (\$20,000) a year for the Catholic Schools of Manitoba, they might then be made absolutely and really free.

The "Free" Press is mistaken when it insinuates that our remarks on its late editor were inspired by the Roman Catholic authorities of St. Boniface. No doubt our general policy is subject to their approval; but we alone are responsible for such personal observations as we choose to make. And, since Archbishop Tache's name is lugged in by our morning contemporary as presumably averse to our affixing any stigma, it may be as well to remind the present editor that his predecessor was the only journalist that censured the late Archbishop while his remains were yet unburied. Even the Tribune respected the illustrious dead; the "Free" Press alone sneered at his whole policy as a failure.

Shortly after Mr. Molyneux St. John took charge of what had been till then a great newspaper, Archbishop Tache was allowed to publish in its columns an historical review of education in Manitoba.

The editor could not well refuse so valuable a document; but he defiled it in his own mean way. Let any one consult the Manitoba Morning Free Press of November 10th, 1893, and he will find Monseigneur Tache's four columns of most interesting matter polluted in the very centre by a vile caricature, the only purpose of which is to make the Archbishop ridiculous. Two drunken fellows, one a ragged tramp, the other somewhat more stylish in dress, are being taken to the lock-up, handcuffed together. The ragged one says to the other: "We may be disgraced, but any one can see we're well connected, eh?" This was evidently intended as a fling at Archbishop Tache, who, in those very columns surrounding the ignoble caricature, spoke of the first two governors of Manitoba and of Mr. Molyneux St. John's appointment in 1870 as clerk of the legislative assembly. No other motive can explain the intrusion of so large an engraving—4 inches by 4½ inches—into a contribution which the editor complained of as being already too long. There was certainly nothing artistic in the picture, and nothing particularly clever in the joke. It was just a sample of the editor's favorite form of gibe, a cowardly insult sufficiently obvious to well-informed persons and yet obscure enough to admit of plausible obscuration by the insulter. An honest workingman said to us on seeing this daub of slime on the Archbishop's noble work: "It makes me sick at the stomach. What a blackguard that new editor must be!"

**MR. EWART AND HIS CRITICS.**

When the Winnipeg Tribune undertakes to belittle or abuse any man, as it did John S. Ewart, Esq., the able and learned Queen's Counsel, who has made himself famous as a defender of the Catholic minority in the Manitoba School Case, every honest and intelligent man, who knows the critic and the man criticised, will be provoked to laughter. Mr. Ewart has been a sore thorn in the sides of the brawling broods of bigots, whose chief arguments against the cause he champions are appeals to fanaticism, religions and racial hatreds and the most transparent sophistries. The whole motley crew, those of them at least, who have a shred of shame and modesty in their composition fear Mr. Ewart more than they do sin; while that section of them represented by the Tribune, the writer of the Tribune article, the erratic Bryce, et al, positively hate and fear his scathing and powerful pen more than anything else in life. The snickering, sneaking coward, whose heart is full of malice, but whose fear of ridicule is as great as his malice, hates anything or any one who acts as a curb to his favorite, though un-Christian pastime. Such cowards fear, hate and abuse the authors of their humiliation. They never argue. That is not a part of their programme. Argument requires intelligence, knowledge and a fairly good cause. But when the cause, the motives, and the facts are all bad, what is left to the critic but abuse? Mr. Ewart has brought more humiliation on these poor aspiring nobodies than any other man in Manitoba. They have wriggled like a wounded serpent under the lash of his stinging satire, his incontrovertible facts and his trenchant, clear-cut arguments. That dealer in borrowed phrases, bad facts, and therefore, bad arguments, the breezy Bryce, could and no doubt would oftener parade his cheap wares before an ordinary and applauding public, were his soul not filled with a proper fear of Mr. Ewart. The whole Tribune article, which is full of abuse and a sickly attempt at satire, does not attack one of Mr. Ewart's arguments. It dismisses the letter with the remark that it is beneath notice. The Tribune says:

"As a 'controversialist,' however, Mr. Ewart is somewhat of a joke. As an example of his 'controversial' style, here are the concluding paragraphs of his last communication:

If, because of 'this latest revelation' I am to wash my hands of the whole business without any unnecessary delay, and leave the Jesuitical work . . . to be done by the Jesuits, shall I not, if I take up the other side, have to furnish myself with potsberds instead of soap?

A short answer in a steady, bass voice, will much oblige." Instead of "a short answer in a steady, bass voice," as Mr. Ewart requests, the Tribune article heaps upon his devoted head a column of abuse. Abuse is not argument, dear Trib, and we would not advise you to publish Dr. Bryce's contributions as editorials. Bad as the reputation of the Tribune is, in that line, we infinitely prefer its own views to these of the erratic doctor.

**THAT PARALLEL.**

In commenting on Mr. Ewart's recent able and crushing reply to Mr. Pringle, the "independent Free Press" acknowledges that "it is a severe arraignment of the arguments used from the Protestant standpoint," and admits that "many of these arguments, more zealously than wisely put forward, can be severely handled by an acute controversialist like Mr. Ewart." But with a strange perversity of argument, it asserts that Mr. Ewart's reply is beside the mark. Why? Because it does not "allay the growing feeling of irritation that is clouding a calm consideration of the question!" It would require more than human effort to allay the feelings of irritation which have been aroused, not by Mr. Ewart's crushing reply, but by the inflammatory utterances of those zealous, but unwise advocates of a narrow and bigoted policy in educational affairs. Mr. Ewart is in no way responsible for this irritation. Let the "Free" Press place the blame where it rightfully belongs. It will have to bear its share of censure.

The "Free" Press says that Mr. Ewart's parallel between Mgr. Gravel and the Presbyterian Synod is defective. Why? Because "Mr. Pringle says the Imperial Privy Council was corruptly approached"! Most intelligent people will doubt this, and all unprejudiced men, who have examined the letter of His Lordship Bishop Gravel, know that the thought of approaching the Imperial Privy Council corruptly was never entertained for a moment. But the reason given by our contemporary for the absence of a parallel between the two cases is strangely at variance with the actual facts. The "Free" Press says that Mgr. Gravel's "representations to the colonial minister were made secretly—at least we first heard of them from Bishop Gravel—but the representations of the Presbyterian Assembly were made by resolution, published at the time." Now, what are the facts? Bishop Gravel never suggested to any one to approach the Privy Council, either corruptly or otherwise. All his suggestion amounted to was that, inasmuch as the honor of the Crown was involved in the promises made by Earl Carnarvon to the Catholic settlers of the Red River, these pledges could not now be violated without reflecting on the Royal word. Surely there was nothing corrupt in reminding Her Majesty's minister that the honor and integrity of the Crown were pledged to the Catholics of the Red River, that they were to be allowed the peaceful enjoyment of their schools! This was not done secretly by the Bishop. It was done in reply to the wish of his ecclesiastical superiors.

But in the case of the Presbyterian Synod, while it is true that the resolutions, as passed, were made public at the time, it is false to say that the resolutions contained any intimation that they were to be sent to the Privy Council. These resolutions were SECRETLY sent to the Lords of the Privy Council, for the direct and admitted purpose of corruptly biasing their judgment in the case then pending before the court. No one outside of the Synod knew that these resolutions were secretly sent to the judges until sometime after the judgment was given. Had not Dr. Bryce, in a moment of weakness, and for the purpose of indulging in a little vain boasting, let the cat out of the bag, the public would now be in ignorance of the fact that a large religious denomination, or a few canny members of it, had the indecency and brazen effrontery to send to all the judges of the highest court in the Empire copies of certain resolutions

for the avowedly corrupt intention of prejudicing the case of the minority then *sub judice*, and afterwards to boast that their corrupt and imprudent action had had the effect on their lordships which was contemplated by the Synod. The suggestion of Bishop Gravel pales into insignificance before the impudent and audacious action of the Presbyterian Synod, in secretly and with corrupt intent approaching a bench of judges who had pending before them a case involving the constitutional liberties of the minority in Manitoba.

The cases were not paralleled in any way. That is strictly true. The Bishop was asked to give his views to the Propaganda on the question. It was quite natural that the church authorities at Rome should like to know the real inward facts of the case, because it was one affecting the religious liberties of the Catholics. It was also proper that that information should be sought from a Canadian Bishop. Idle curiosity never has a place in the government of the Church; therefore, this information was sought merely for the purpose of ameliorating, if possible, the condition of her persecuted children in Manitoba. There is nothing unusual in this. It is done every year by the Common Father of the Faithful. Our glorious Pontiff, Leo XIII, has raised his voice in the courts of Russia, Germany, Austria and even among the heathen notions of the East in behalf of his persecuted children. Why should he not do so for his faithful children in Manitoba? And how could he do it without first ascertaining the real facts? These were asked of Mgr. Gravel, and that prelate gave a fairly accurate account of the whole affair, and in doing so, he called the attention of the Cardinal Prefect to the fact that the colonial secretary of the British Government had pledged the Royal word, that all the rights of the Red River settlers to their property and schools would be scrupulously preserved, provided they came into the confederation compact; his lordship stated that, in confiscating our schools, the local government had disregarded the sacredness of the Royal pledges, and he suggested to the Cardinal Prefect the propriety of reminding the present colonial minister of the pledges given by his predecessor to the Red River settlers in the name of the Sovereign, and added that this might have a beneficial effect on the judgment of the Privy Council. What was there wrong in this? Where was the attempt to corruptly approach the judges of the Privy Council? Surely it was only right that the judges of the Privy Council should know that the action of the local government in confiscating our schools was a violation of the Royal promises made to us at the time of the Red River troubles. Were the judges of the Privy Council as indifferent to the honor of the Crown as the local government of Manitoba, such representations to the British Colonial Minister would be fruitless. But there is nothing to show that the suggestion of the bishop was acted upon. It was merely a suggestion embodied in the report. That is all. It did not attempt to interfere with, or curtail any right or privilege of any class of persons in Manitoba.

The action of the Presbyterian Synod was entirely different. No rights of the Presbyterian body were assailed, nor in any way threatened. The passing of these resolutions was an act of hostility from a religious denomination, which the boastful Dr. Bryce claims to be the largest in the Northwest, against another religious denomination, numerically weaker, who were contending for their rights; but the sending of these resolutions in a secret, underhand manner, to the very judges who were sitting in judgment on the rights of the minority was the most dastardly and villainously cowardly act that marks the whole long list of villainies perpetrated on the Catholic minority of this province in the name of religion and liberty. It is not to be wondered at that among a denomination of professing Christians, capable of such an act of gross and indecent corruption, one should be found capable

not only of giving away the secret of their shame, but actually of coarsely boasting that their dastardly action was successful in corrupting the highest court in the Empire. The Chief Justice of Manitoba was a member of that Synod. He was present when Dr. Bryce made the shameless boast that the resolutions of a former synod were sent to the judges of the Privy Council with corrupt intent and that the judges were influenced by them. We never heard that the Chief Justice said one word of reproof to the erratic and boastful doctor, or attempted to defend the honor of his imperial brothers from the slur cast upon them, although he was reported as actually speaking in defence of the resolutions then before the synod. Since the Chief Justice of Manitoba could see nothing amiss in the conduct of the Presbyterian Synod, nor anything derogatory to the honor or dignity of the court of last appeal in that boast, it would be interesting to know what he thinks of the tempest in a teapot over the suggestion of Bishop Gravel. The "Free" Press is quite right in saying that between the action of the Presbyterian Synod and the innocent suggestion of Mgr. Gravel there is no parallel. Only, the "Free" Press means that the latter was wrong and the former right, whereas the truth is that Bishop Gravel did an honest, straightforward deed and Dr. Bryce a mean underhand one, of which he afterwards boasted.

**REJOICING REGINA.**

The two weeks just passed in Regina have been daily and hourly filled with moments replete with events interesting from many standpoints, and, of course, the great "Fair" was at once the attraction and mainspring around which both people and things revolved. The well informed Winnipeg dailies, as of course, our local papers, have kept the reading public so well posted upon all that happened during those days, that little can now be said in the way of news.

It may not be out of place, however, to say that in every department where Catholics and Catholic institutions were represented, the red tickets, diplomas, etc., were awarded in their direction rather more numerous than may be comforting for disciples of the P. P. A. The industrial schools of Fort Qu' Appelle, St. Albert and High River, sent each a brass band, composed almost entirely of Indian boys, and their playing, while furnishing a very pleasing feature of the Fair, won them prizes in the order named.

In several items of school work the Qu' Appelle Indian school pupils won prizes in open competition with the public schools, which facts speak well for their teachers, Messrs. Dennehy, Brangan and Stack, and of course the good Sisters. The schools and convents of St. Albert, Prince Albert, Calgary, St. Boniface and Winnipeg all had their eloquent work on exhibition and material reward in every case crowned their efforts. Among the many Winnipeggers actively engaged in work and play about the fair grounds none worked harder or more effectually with the pencil than did Mr. O'Connell Powell, of the Nor'-Wester.

Amidst the bustle incident to the fair week Catholics looked anxiously forward to the visit of His Grace Archbishop Langevin, and though it is to be regretted His Grace's stay extended only over a few hours, on Sunday very much of spiritual consolation and instruction was crowded into that short space of time. Following is the Nor'-Wester's report of His Grace's visit:

From the Nor'-Wester, Aug. 5th.

Early on Sunday morning quite a number of Winnipeggers accompanied their friends of Regina to the railway station to bid welcome to His Grace Archbishop Langevin, of St. Boniface. His Grace was to have arrived the day before, but for some unforeseen circumstance failed to put in an appearance. Better late than never, however, and all were glad to welcome him. Unfortunately his visit was cut short, for he took the east bound express the same day.

At 10.30 o'clock an Indian boys' band serenaded the Archbishop in front of the presbytery. Then all entered St. Mary's church where a solemn High Mass was sung. By the bye, the choir acquitted themselves very creditably. The pastor, Rev. Father Sinnett, preached a brief, but appropriate sermon.

At 3 o'clock in the afternoon confirmation services were held. The children and others who were to receive the sacrament were seated in the front pews