

**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 places: Hart & McPherson's, Booksellers, 364 Main street; and R. D. Campbell's, Bookseller, 532 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.

**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.

A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town.

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

**The Northwest Review**

WEDNESDAY, DECEMBER 4.

**EDITORIAL COMMENT.**

By way of reply to the Tribune's "studiedly dishonest innuendoes"—Ananias, we thank thee for that phrase in which thou hast limned thyself to the life—about Reverend Father Ritchot and perjury, we reprint from a Dominion Blue Book a recent affidavit of the Reverend Father on the very question at issue. If the Tribune does not copy this affidavit as an apology, Father Ritchot may invoke the strong arm of the law.

The Catholic Review of New York reproduces in full our recent article on eight undeniable facts in the Manitoba School case, which would form a very appropriate object of inquiry, should a commission be appointed. These facts will be remembered, bore on certain well-known declarations of Messrs. Greenway and Joseph Martin. Many thanks to our distinguished contemporary for thus directing attention from side-issues to the very heart of the matter.

The Rev. Dr. King comes in for a good deal of healthy criticism in his resolutions. Rev. Father Cherrier appeals to his sense of honor, fairplay and Christian charity, thereby implying that, unlike many of his supporters, he is capable of rising to the heroic level of confessing his error. Our editorial exposes the Rev. Doctor's misuse of the word "unsectarian" and retorts the argument against him. Mr. Ewart impales him on the shafts of relentless logic, and, when the learned Professor of philosophy attempts to defend himself by subtle distinctions and erudite limitations, the keen lawyer pins him repeatedly and implacably to the main point, dismisses with a word of explanation the pretentious quibble of Mr. T. Wardlaw Taylor, Jr., and incidentally impresses one with the radical impotence of a lifetime of professorial logomachies when arrayed against native ability in the service of the right.

**DR. KING'S RESOLUTIONS.**

The Presbyterian Synod has, as usual, passed some resolutions on the Manitoba school question. This action of the Synod surprises no one. For the last five years it has fairly revelled in that harmless recreation, vainly imagining that it was exercising a great influence on public opinion, even going so far as to send some of its resolutions to the Judges of the Imperial Privy Council and afterwards shamelessly to boast that its infamous conduct in thus corruptly approaching the highest court in the realm had the effect of influencing their Lordships' judgment in the Barrett case. As, in the present crisis, there are

no Privy Council Judges to approach with corrupt intent, and as the Dominion Government has declared his intention to follow the Constitution and remove the grievances of the minority if Manitoba fails to do so, would it not be well for the Rev. Dr. King to delegate Dr. Bryce to send these resolutions to every member of Parliament with the threat that, should they do justice to the minority by removing their grievances, the Synod of Manitoba would resent it and turn them out at the next election? The Rev. Doctor succeeded so admirably in this species of terrorism with the Greenway Government when it contemplated abolishing both Catholic and Protestant schools and establishing secular schools pure and simple, that we do not wonder at this disciple of John Knox, with canny Scottish instinct, imagining that his threadbare resolutions would have the same effect on the Dominion Government.

The reverend doctor's resolutions, as an expression of the Presbyterian synod, derive all their importance from the fact that Dr. King introduced them and that they express his own views. Had they been introduced by Dr. Bryce, or some similar unimportant member of the Synod, the same resolutions would pass unnoticed, or, if noticed, would create no interest outside a few Presbyterian Church members; but coming from Dr. King, they will necessarily have a greater effect on the public mind, from the fact that he is known as a thoughtful, and, according to his light, a sincere man, who is singularly free from the customs and methods of the demagogue.

How a thoughtful philosophical man, like Dr. King, should talk of any form of religion as "unsectarian" is more than we can understand. Let us suppose, for instance, that the religious instruction prescribed by the Advisory Board was Episcopalian. Would it not be sectarian to Presbyterians, Methodists etc? If the State adopts a system of religious instruction, that is neither Methodist, Presbyterian nor Episcopalian teaching, would it not be sectarian to each of these sects, just in proportion to the nearness, or remoteness of its teaching as to their own?

Is an unsectarian system of religion possible among the sects? If not, how comes it that Dr. King says that the thing is possible?

Here is the Rev. Doctor's solution, and it is most ingenious:

"If there was the right man or right woman in the teacher's desk, there was a great deal in the reading of the Bible and the prayer." Ah! Dr. King, is that honest to the other sects? Is that man or right woman! For RIGHT read PRESBYTERIAN, and the reader will grasp the Rev. Doctor's meaning. But what about the Catholic pupil's chances in the hands of such a RIGHT good Presbyterian teacher? What lessons of truth would you expect him to draw from such a fountain? That Presbyterian teacher is taught to believe that the Pope is "the man of sin," and the Catholic Church "the scarlet woman, etc." With such a man "in the teacher's desk, the Bible and the prayers" would mean much from the Presbyterian point of view; but from the Catholic point it would mean death to the faith of that Catholic child. We have been there, doctor, and we know all about it, and we say that we respectfully decline, with thanks, your RIGHT man or right woman, as the teacher of our children. The fact is, doctor, that you can offer us no unsectarian form of religion; and you have unwittingly told us so in that short sentence.

**DALTON MCCARTHY.**

Fifteen years ago, when Sir John Macdonald was getting on in years, and the leaders of the Conservative party were forced in prudence to consider the question of succession, the name of Dalton McCarthy was received with a good deal of favor. It was well known that he was a man of considerable ability in his profession, and a trusted friend of the Conservative chieftain in the House of Commons and in the Province of Ontario. He occupied the presidency of the Conservative Association for Ontario and was consulted by his leader on all mat-

ters of great political importance. That he did not enjoy a seat in the cabinet was no fault of his leader, for it was there for him whenever he chose to accept it. It was natural that the party, especially, from Ontario, should look forward to the time when their leader should occupy a first place in the council of the nation. But their idol was, unfortunately, of the earth earthy. He was formed in a narrow mould and when the time came to test him, he was found lamentably wanting in those qualities of head and heart which go to make "a man of light and leading." To a statesman of Sir John Macdonald's perspicacity, the character of this man must have stood revealed, and with it the danger he would be to his country, should the fortunes, or rather misfortunes, of politics place him at the head of the Conservative party. The old chieftain, whose patriotism was a ruling passion, could not contemplate such a calamity with indifference. He, therefore, cast about him for a leader capable of holding in check the dangerous ambitions of Dalton McCarthy. Down by the sea, such a man was found, in the person of the late Sir John Thompson. The advent of this great Catholic acted on Dalton McCarthy as a red rag on a bull. All the littleness of the bigot came at once to the surface and a natural jealousy seized upon him. This found vent in the celebrated Jesuits' Estate discussion in the House of Commons, during that debate, Sir John Thompson made such mince meat that the victim never recovered from it. The clever, logical, dispassionate and incisive arguments of Sir John Thompson wounded the professional pride of his opponent, by making him appear ridiculous to the people of Canada. Great was the triumph of Sir John Thompson, but greater was Dalton's humiliation. Since that time he has identified himself with every unpatriotic and narrow movement against Catholics. Race and religious wars have sprung up wherever his voice has been raised. He is a political Ishmaelite in a country where, had he been wise and patriotic, moderate and just, he could have been an honored leader.

For some time this man has had his knife into the Government and has, time and again, challenged it to open up Cardwell to electors. No sooner is the constituency opened than Mr. McCarthy places a candidate in the field who represents his own narrow views. From a political platform he had the execrable taste to drag from the tomb his old political opponent, Sir John Thompson, and charge him with entering public life for the purpose of forwarding the temporal interests of the Catholic church through His Lordship the Bishop of Antigonish. This was a base falsehood uttered against a dead man, by one who would never have dared thus to accuse him in life. Mr. McCarthy cowardly defames a man whom the Queen honored in life and revered in death, and whose memory Canadians love to reverence.

Although the success of his candidate in Cardwell would be a blow to the Government, and would, therefore, help to bring about its humiliation, yet so dangerous and unpopular is the policy of Dalton McCarthy, and so subversive of all that is good and desirable, that Mr. Laurier had to bring out a candidate of his own, lest the country should suspect him or his party of sympathizing with Dalton. We are told that this action of Mr. Laurier incensed McCarthy; but, nevertheless, it was good politics as well as good statesmanship for Mr. Laurier to repudiate him and his policy of racial and religious hatreds. It is a glorious thing to contemplate the fact that, in our beloved Canada, men of the Dalton McCarthy type are political impossibilities.

**THE GRAVE OLD FREE PRESS.**

Since the Free Press has passed into the hands of the C. P. R., it is very amusing to watch its transparent attempts at being independent. The dear old thing has been trying to be the friend of both the Greenway Government and of the Dominion Government at the same

time. This has proved a most difficult task, and we often pitied the Manager of that commercial concern, because his labor was so arduous, though his motives were so evident that every one could divine them.

However, lately, things have become much easier for the dear old lady. She has come to the decision that the Dominion Government, being addicted to "wobbling" very much of late, is giving indications of going to pieces. Our contemporary tells us: "It has wobbled over everything it has touched, even the Manitoba school question." But the wobbling over which the Free Press' masters are most concerned is that increased mail subsidy. Had the Government not wobbled so much over that interesting item, or rather over the payment of it, without authority from Parliament, the dear old Free Press could forgive even its wobbling on the school question.

This latter point seems to cause our dear old contemporary a great deal of trouble. The cause is to be found in its anxiety to keep in with the Greenway crowd. The expectation of another subsidy, we suppose, is the power that moves it. That school question is becoming "a grave situation" for the province, because the Dominion Government has been wicked enough to say that, if Greenway does not obey the mandate of the Privy Council and remove the grievance of the minority within a certain specified time, it will do so itself because, in the words of the Finance minister, "the compact of Confederation must be carried out." The honor of that sensitive and patriotic gentleman, Mr. Thomas Greenway, has been outraged by the Remedial Order, and he cannot, in justice to himself, or the province, recognize any interference from the Dominion. He simply defies the Federal Government, but in doing so seems not to realize that he is defying the judgment of the Imperial Privy Council, and the constitution under which he is entitled to hold the authority he is exercising as first minister. But, while the dear grave Free Press sees in all this "a grave situation," it finds much relief and sunshine in the policy of Mr. Laurier. It says:

"There is another view of it. Mr. Laurier has said that he would not coerce Manitoba; but he has also said that he believes in separate schools, and would like to see the separate school system in Manitoba re-established."

What a dear, obliging man is Mr. Laurier! He said he would not coerce Manitoba, although he believes in separate schools. It is very kind of Mr. Laurier not to coerce Manitoba, notwithstanding his devotion to separate schools and his desire to see them re-established in Manitoba. Of course it would be unfair to hold Mr. Laurier responsible for what the Free Press says about his policy on the school question. Mr. Laurier could restore to the Catholic minority all their rights without coercing Manitoba, if Manitoba would obey the constitution under which she holds her rights of provincehood in Confederation, but if she persistently refuses to obey the mandate of the Imperial Privy Council and declines to remove the grievances of the minority—grievances for which she is alone responsible, and in the creation of which her government violated every pledge given to the minority—how is it possible for Mr. Laurier, or any other man charged with the administration of the Federal Government, to remove these grievances, without coercing Manitoba? Does the stolid old Free Press not see the absurd position in which it places Mr. Laurier? Mr. Laurier is, no doubt, a very clever and persuasive gentleman, who is not given to making himself very clear on the School question; but, much as we admire his ability to hide his policy on this matter, we cannot see how he can restore separate schools, in which he believes so fully and so lovingly that he would like to see them re-established, without coercing Manitoba—that is, assuming, as the Free Press assures us, that Manitoba is determined to resist the Remedial Order and to refuse to remove the grievances under which the minority are suffering. Wake up, old lady, and try to reason coherently—

**EXTRACT FROM "PROCEEDINGS IN THE MANITOBA SCHOOL CASE.**

Heard Before Her Majesty's Privy Council for Canada, February 26th to March 7th 1895—Ottawa Government Printing, Bureau 1895." Page 112; Exhibit A.

In the matter of the appeal of the Roman Catholic minority of the Queen's subjects in the Province of Manitoba to His Excellency the Governor-General-in-Council, from two certain acts of the Legislature of said province, being chapter 37 and 38 of 53 Victoria, intitled respectively: "An Act Respecting the Department of Education," and "An Act Respecting Public Schools."

I, Noel Joseph Ritchot, of the Parish of St. Norbert, in the Province of Manitoba, parish priest of the Roman Catholic church, make oath and say:

1. I was a resident of the Red River Settlement in and prior to the year 1870, and resided then as now about nine miles from the present city of Winnipeg.

2. I was one of the three delegates that were sent from the said Settlement in that year to negotiate with the Government of the Dominion of Canada as to the terms upon which Rupert's Land and the Northwest Territories were to be united to Canada. The other two delegates were Judge Black and Mr. Alfred H. Scott.

3. The instructions I received were in writing and consisted of three documents. True copies of two of these documents are hereto annexed and marked with the letters A and B, and the third was a bill of rights (Exhibit B), the seventh clause of which was as follows: "That the schools be separate and that the public money for schools be distributed among the different denominations in proportion to their respective populations according to the system of the Province of Quebec."

4. I received these documents together and I never received any other bill of rights than the one aforesaid. The other delegates had with them at Ottawa bills of rights similar to the one aforesaid.

5. The said delegates had frequent and protracted conferences with Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir George E. Cartier who had been appointed a committee by the Canadian Government for the purpose of negotiating with us, which conference extended to the second day of May.

6. During the said negotiations the said committee submitted to the delegates a draft of a bill containing the terms upon which they were prepared to consummate the union. This bill contained 26 clauses and the 19th thereof was an adaptation of section 93 of the British North American Act.

7. Upon the margin of the said draft bill I wrote my comments or remarks opposite each of the sections. Opposite the said clause 19 I wrote as follows:

"Cette clause est la meme que celle de l'Acte de l'Amerique Britannique du Nord, confere, je l'interprete ainsi, comme principe fondamental le privilege des ecoles separees dans toute la plenitude, et en cela est conforme a l'article 7 de nos instructions."

Which is equivalent in English to,— "This clause being the same as the British North American Act, confers, so I interpret it, as fundamental principle, the privilege of separate schools to the fullest extent, and in that is in conformity with article 7 of our instructions."

8. I returned to the said committee the said draft bill with my remarks and comments written thereon as aforesaid and with the said memo. opposite the said clause 19.

9. After the conference with the delegates were completed Sir George E. Cartier on the third day of May introduced into the House of Commons the bill which afterwards became the Manitoba Act.

10. Shortly afterwards I returned to the Red River Settlement carrying with me a copy of the said Act which on the twenty-fourth day of June I presented with some verbal report of my mission to the Legislative Assembly. After a short discussion the following resolution was amid cheering unanimously passed:—

"That the Legislative Assembly of this country do now, in the name of the people" accept the Manitoba Act and decide on entering the Dominion of Canada on the terms proposed in the Confederation Act."

11. The copy of the bill of rights which I received as aforesaid prior to my departure for Ottawa I retained in my own possession until the trial of Lepine in 1874 for the murder of Thomas Scott. At that trial I was called as a witness and did as such produce to and