

The Northwest Review

IS PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT 178 PRINCESS STREET. EVERY WEDNESDAY BY

E. J. DERMODY & CO. J. K. BARRETT, LL.D., Editor-in-Chief.

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 in the Northwest. 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 conferring. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in the 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.

OUR ARCHBISHOP'S LETTER.

ST. BONIFACE, May 10th, 1893.

Mr. E. J. Dermody,

DEAR SIR,—I see by the last issue of the Northwest Review that you have been instructed by the directors of the journal with the management of the same, "the company for the present retaining charge of the editorial columns."

I need not tell you that I take a deep interest in the Northwest Review which is the only English Catholic paper published within the limits of Manitoba and the Territories. I hope that you will obtain a remunerative success. It is enough that the editors do their work gratuitously, it cannot be expected that the material part of the publication should remain without remuneration.

I therefore strongly recommend to all Catholics under my jurisdiction to give a liberal support to the Northwest Review. It has fully my approval, though, of course, I cannot be responsible for every word contained in it. The editors have no hesitation in giving me full liberty to say what they wish and in the way they like best. The sole control I can claim is over the principles they express and I have no hesitation in stating that the principles announced by every sound Catholic in this country.

I therefore consider that you enter a good work and I pray to God that He will bless you in its accomplishment.

Yours all devoted in Christ, ALEX. ARCHBISHOP OF ST. BONIFACE, O. M. I.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 28.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

Lent is with us, a season of prayer and repentance, a time set apart wherein to enter into one's self seriously, and meditate on the things for our eternal good. The mercy of God awaits us, and is always at hand, but it is not perpetual. Lo! He cometh as a thief in the night. Shall He find our house unprepared. When rified of its precious jewel, the soul, justice not mercy awaits us. Make this Lent as if your last and it will be made well.

A correspondent asks the Catholic for authentic information as to when Mgr. Satoelli will be created a Cardinal, and who will succeed him as delegate. Truthfully the Catholic does not know, and if the Holy Father did impart his mind to us on this matter it would be sub sigillo. As this is Lent, the Catholic would suggest to its correspondent to sanctify the holy season by repressing his curiosity. He will rest easier and be in a better frame of mind for his Easter duty.—Pittsburgh Catholic.

"Christ had sympathy for the workingman, but Christians have none," exclaim certain socialistic orators. This is a palpable absurdity. Christians have sympathy for workmen. A man calling himself a Christian and not having this sympathy, practically, is no Christian. His actions give the lie to his profession. It is not every man who shouts "Lord! Lord!" who will enter into the kingdom of heaven. See what the Christians are now doing for the unemployed and poor in this city and all over the continent.

The appropriateness of the church's ritual for all occasions has been the wondering theme of admiration in all tongues and every age. Recently a newspaper office was blessed in Canada. This unusual ceremony was performed by a Canadian prelate. The place was at Three Rivers, the date January 23rd, the name of the paper, Trifurion. The Monsignor, after having recited the customary prayers, made a tour of the different departments, which he blessed, while he recited the penitential psalm, the "Miserere." Could a more appropriate selection be made for the Catholic newspaper?—Pittsburgh Catholic.

Etymological critics find fault with the Century's dictionary definition of the word "jag." It is there defined "as much

liquor as one can carry, as to have a jag on: hence, a drunken condition." The critics contend that the definition is subtly and vitally inaccurate, that a man with "a jag" on is not drunk, that he has not taken more than he can carry, and that it is only after he has taken too much that he can be properly spoken of as having a "load on." If we would be accepted as an authority we would throw our weight of influence to the Century's definition. The word "jag" it is proven finds its origin in a part of England where packhorses are still in use, and the local name for the pack horse mode of transportation is "jagging." Now a man who drinks to excess is literally speaking a "pack-horse." He is loaded down, not only with his surfeit of vile and abominable gluttonous, but with all the hideous train of evils that flow from drink. The Century's definition must stand as correct. The moral is—don't be a pack-horse—avoid the odious "jag." There is more meaning in the word than good mortals wot of.

THE REGINA "STANDARD" AND THE P.P.A.

Our genial contemporary, the Regina Standard, has come to the front as a champion of the P.P.A. It takes exception to the remarks of the Canadian Presbyterian for saying that it could not understand "just why people assembled to protest against Roman aggression and defend Protestantism should register under assumed names and sit behind closed doors." The Standard gives a reason for this that is beneath its intelligence and unworthy of its general manly course. Its plea is that the Protestant Protective Association is but the antidote to the poison of hierarchical influence, with which the body politic has been permoted. After indulging in a little clap-trap nonsense, it says,

"It does not therefore seem so very strange that an organization that owes its existence to that influence, and whose avowed object is to fight against it, should be conducted with a certain degree of secrecy." "We should imagine that a paper of the intelligence of the Standard would scorn to use it. Surely it is not among the ignorant rabble that prate about the Roman hierarchy. Is it not an insult to the intelligence of its readers to compare the distinguished men who compose the Roman hierarchy with such an outrageously un-Christian and despicable outfit as the rabble who constitute the P.P.A. ? It is equally insulting to say that the actions of the noble men who constitute the Roman hierarchy require such an antidote as the P.P.A. What must be the blunted feelings of decency and the stupendous ignorance of the man who could pen such a sentence? Does the Standard know anything about the history of the body of men it thus insults ?

The only reason it can have on its side for doing this is the fact that the Catholic hierarchy is always on the alert to exercise its influence for the spiritual good of its people. In everything that affects their rights and liberties as a body, what more natural, nay more, what more imperative than that the Catholic hierarchy should take a deep interest. Surely our contemporary does not intend to charge the Bishops of the Catholic Church with seeking to in any way injure Protestants, either in their person, reputation, property, character, or means of earning an honest living, because they take an active part in guarding the interests of their people? Do not the Protestant ministers do as much for their own flocks? Because the Catholic hierarchy inspire a deeper reverence from their people than Protestant ministers can ever hope for from their flocks, is that a reason why they should be denounced by the Standard or that it should excuse the principles of so anti-Christian an organization as the P.P.A.? Will the Standard say that the greater influence of the Catholic hierarchy over its people than that exercised by its own ministers over their flocks may not, and, in fact, does find its true reason in the difference of the faith of Catholics and Protestants? Protestants, by the very nature of their principles, do not believe that their ministers are Divinely commissioned guides, hence they believe or reject their teaching in the exact ratio of its suitability to their tastes or prejudices. We don't blame them for doing so. It is the logical result of their religion. Where there is no authority there can be no obligation to obey. With Catholics this is entirely different. We know and firmly believe that the Church is the infallible custodian of God's laws unto man. We believe that the Bishops of the Church are the successors of the Apostles and hold the Divine commission which Jesus Christ gave to his Apostles. As we hold in respect, love, and reverence the Queen and her Ministers, because they represent the temporal and civic authority, so also do we hold in reverence, love, and respect the Bishops of the Church who represent the spiritual authority of the Church. And because we believe this, and because the Bishops of the Church, realizing the responsibility of their high office, as the guardians of the spiritual interests of their flocks, perform their duties with becoming zeal, must they be insulted by a jealous and ignorant rabble, and must

the press, the forum, and even the pulpit be brought into play to denounce them, until "the aggression of the Roman hierarchy" has become a pet phrase in the mouths of brainless nobodies, who, if asked the meaning of the term could not explain it? What are the real facts of all this talk about the aggression of the Roman hierarchy? Listen, and we will tell you. Our separated brethren, either not understanding the philosophy of our faith, or out of pure jealousy and malice, are constantly making assaults on something which we hold as an essential to our rights and liberties as free citizens of a free country. These assaults are generally aimed at something which is of such vital interest to our faith and honor as Catholics that it calls for a condemnation because of its injustice effect on our freedom. Politicians, no matter of what party, are ready either to perpetrate the injustice or supinely look on while the other fellows are doing it. When politicians are false or indifferent to the most sacred rights of our people; when everything looks dark and threatening; when all the world is against us, we know that their is one body that will be true to us. All is not lost because we have at our head men who are in deep sympathy with us; men who stand ready to make any sacrifice for us even to their very lives. These men are our noble and glorious hierarchy. Instead of being aggressive, they are forced to repel aggression. They are patient and long suffering, enduring much for the sake of peace and public harmony, but when the time come to speak they are not wanting either in courage or a proper sense of their sacred duties to their people. And for doing so, after being forced to it by the aggression, the bigotry and the intolerance of some and the absolute indifference of others, they are charged, forsooth, with the faults of others, and ignorant or malicious journalists tell us that that vile, unchristian and diabolical P. P. A. is an antidote to the influence of these holy men's lives. The character of these men's lives needs no defence at our poor unworthy hands. Their lives make up much that is great in the annals of noble and patriotic deeds and duties unselfishly performed. Even the very men, who for political, business or other unworthy motives, abuse them, are forced in their heart of hearts to admire them and pay a silent tribute to the virtue and christian nobleness of their lives. They may prate about "the aggression of the Roman Hierarchy," they may say vile things of them and cowardly insinuate something worse, but when they come into contact with them, they shrink into the littleness of self and involuntarily realize that they are in the presence of men who are their superiors in virtue, culture and everything else that is great, good, and noble, and, for the time, they are forced to render to them the homage which vice pays to virtue.

RECEIVED IN SILENCE.

The telegrams from Toronto bring us the news that Mr. Macallum, the P. P. A. representative in the Ontario Local Legislature was introduced to Mr. Speaker and took his seat amid profound silence, "a thing," adds the despatch, "unknown in the history of the House." This is only what we would expect to occur in a body like the Legislators of Ontario. No doubt there were some representatives in that House who were, in their hearts, more or less in sympathy with the P. P. A. movement, but so shameless and so despicable have those men and their principles become, that people of intelligence and education involuntarily shrink from public contact with them. While some may be quite willing to use those men and turn their cowardly modes of action to their advantage, yet when it comes to publicly and openly endorsing them or any of their known representatives, those very men who use them, shrink from the task as a man would shrink from some deadly viper. There is nothing surprising in this. Public men are largely selected from the best educated and best informed men in the community and, being such, they cannot but know that the P. P. A. is both in its principles, modes of procedure, and cowardly secrecy, an organization which no honest man or respectable citizen could identify himself with. They are aware of the fact that the P. P. A. is made up of the rabble element in the community, an element so ignorant and grossly illiterate this and credulous that they are ready to believe any story that their designing leaders may see fit to tell them about the Catholics and their Church. Nay more, themore ridiculous and untenable the story the easier it is to make those fools believe it. And yet we have in this country journalists that parade themselves as intelligent and loyal exponents of public opinion; men who would have us believe that they are loyal and faithful subjects of our country; men who prate about equal rights to all, actually defending the principles, aims and objects of this most cowardly and contemptible association. Although they know that this association's great mission is to deprive their Catholic fellow-citizens of every right of citizenship and reduce them to the very depths of inferiority—nay more, to actually deprive them and their families of their daily bread, by refusing them even the most menial

employment, yet, week after week, these loyal and intelligent journalists defend and applaud those social anarchists—those destroyers of the very soul of confederation. But, perhaps it is because the P. P. A. is aiming at the destruction of the Catholics that they are thus applauded. Perhaps these journalists and other admirers of the P. P. A. are among those benighted Protestants who are so faithfully and graphically described by a Protestant clergyman, the Rev. G. A. Carstenson, rector of St. Paul's Protestant Church in Indianapolis. He said:

"I firmly believe there are Protestants who would rather see the city flooded with reeking dens of the vilest iniquity than witness the work done by the Little Sisters of the Poor; I believe there are Protestants who would rather see the city given up to the rankest corruption than hear of these Daughters of Divine Love perform daily deeds of charity. Can anyone tell me that the grand men who minister to the Catholic congregations in this city are the foul personages depicted by this underhand and back-biting society of cowards, or that they are endeavoring to sap the foundations of society? Never! They are noble minds, pure hearts and great souls, incapable of such deeds, and even a suspicion of them.

Charges and invectives like those of the P. P. A. are no new thing for the Catholic church. She has borne them for centuries. The Catholic church, exultant, exalted and triumphant, will live and bless the world in spite of these cowardly enemies and assassins, on and ever disseminating the " Gospel of Jesus Christ. These harmless little pellets emitted with venomous purpose will fall back harmless as homeopathic pills against the rock of Gibraltar, and the Catholic church will go praying for those who despitefully abused and persecuted her, and will firmly establish her claim to the blessing of Him who said the church should be blessed when all things would be said against it for His sake. "He that despiseth you despiseth Me, and he that despiseth Me, despiseth Him that sent Me." Let these men have a care lest a curse, not of Rome, but a curse of an offended God come upon them. Know-Nothingism was trumped down in its own infancy, and in its most radical of extremists, are traitors to their country. They are un-American. Destruction will surely come to all who set themselves up against God's messenger."

And speaking of the conduct of some newspapers he says:

"Another number of this same paper published recently what purported to be a Papal Encyclical, but the phraseology was so awkward that even an ordinary intelligent Protestant could detect the internal evidences of forgery. The Independent and the Christian Union, two leading Protestant papers, exposed the fraud, but if any retraction has been made by the editor of the Loyal American it has escaped my observation. In any event, the publication was a mark of dense stupidity or gross unfairness on the editor's part. The papers mentioned are to be honored for their fairness and justice in denouncing such culpable methods; but I have wondered why most Protestant editors have held their peace. Can it be that their peace means approval? Why does not the Protestant pulpit speak out more plainly for fair play even towards an advertisement? Suppose a society of Catholics should conspire to disqualify Protestants from holding public office, should circulate slanders, and disseminate libels about Protestant Christians, ministers and laymen, men and women, what a cry of just and indignant protest would go up from evangelical pulpits! Is it possible that in the eyes of the Protestant ministry the end justified the means?"

We commend the above noble sentiments of an honest Protestant minister to the careful study and consideration those ministers who have not the Christian charity and love of the Master to speak out against such cowardly methods and to those journalists who find excuses for defending them.

A LAME EXCUSE.

The Port Arthur Sentinel tells us that things political are very much mixed in that quiet little place, but it also tells us that the P. P. A. has grown strong there, owing to "the bitterness of a few men (Catholic) who have carried their personal grievances to the priest. While we cannot say how that may be about "the few men," knowing the priest of Port Arthur to be a wise, just and peace-loving man, we have no hesitation in saying that anything which he advised has its fountain in justice and charity. The habit of which many of our exchanges have of blaming Catholics for the existence of that hell born P. P. A. is getting very nauseating. If Catholics will not let those fellows walk over them, spit upon them and destroy their liberties, must they be charged with the responsibility of all the low fellows' rascalities? This thing has gone far enough. Let the Sentinel in the interests of peace, harmony and justice, take its inspiration from that great Statesman, Sir Oliver Mowat, and denounce it. That will be of more practical benefit to the country than trying to find excuses for it in the conduct of others.

People troubled with sick and nervous headaches will find a most efficacious remedy in Ayer's Cathartic Pills. They strengthen the stomach, stimulate the liver, restore healthy action to the digestive organs, and thus restore speedy and permanent relief. One hundred domestic servants are killed annually in England in the process of window cleaning. An invention recently patented is a window of which the outside may be cleaned without exposing the cleaner to any chance of a tumble.

There can be no doubt that a timely use of Ayer's Cherry Pectoral would prevent many serious throat and lung troubles.

THE DECISION OF THE SUPREME COURT.

When the minority in this province brought their appeal, in the school case, before the Governor-General-in-Council, that body, after hearing counsel, prepared six questions covering the appeal and referred them to the Supreme Court for a reply as to the powers to act of the Governor-General-in-Council. The opinion asked for did not amount to a judgment as it was merely advisory. No matter how the court decided, the government was not required, by the decision, to follow its advice. The decision is certainly not one to inspire much confidence in the mind of the government because of its contradictory nature. We are not learned in the technicalities of law, but, if we can grasp the meaning of our mother tongue, we are forced to confess that it is somewhat bewildering to follow either the meaning or the philosophy of that decision. For instance, three of their Lordships answered five of the questions in the negative—that is against the contention of the minority, while the other two answered in the affirmative, or in our favor. On the third question which is as follows:

"Third—Does the decision of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in the case of Barrett vs. City of Winnipeg, and Logan vs. City of Winnipeg, dispose or conclude application for redress, based on the contention that the rights of the Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union, under the statutes passed by the province, have been interfered with by the two statutes of 1890, complained of," the majority of their lordships decided in our favor.

This question is very vital to an intelligent understanding of the whole question, and on it we find their Lordships in our favour. Mr. Chief Justice Strong and Justice Fournier and King answered this vital question in the negative, thus affirming that the decision of the Privy Council did not debar the Catholics from redress, based on the contention that the rights of the Catholic minority, which accrued to them after the union, under the statutes passed by the province, have been interfered with by the statutes of 1890." To most ordinary men this decision implies a contradiction. We are told by a majority of their Lordships that the Catholics have no right of appeal to the Governor-General-in-Council, and again we are assured by a majority of the judges that the decision of the Privy Council did not preclude or deprive the minority of the right of appealing to the Governor-General-in-Council. But if a majority of the court say that the Privy Council judgment did not deprive us of the right of an appeal, how comes it that a majority of the court decide that we have no right of appeal? If this does not imply a contradiction on the part of the learned judges, then we are sadly mixed. What is the value of the right to appeal to the Governor-General-in-Council by the minority if the Governor-General-in-Council has not the right of listening to the appeal. The government must be as much at sea as ever, so far as their powers are concerned, and we presume they will look for light to the Privy Council. We see by the despatches that the government are going to carry it to the Privy Council in England, and if they are really seeking for light, after reading the decision of the Supreme Court, we cannot much blame them. The case, being, therefore, *sub judice*, we presume that a further and fuller criticism would be considered in bad taste. Whatever the law may be decided to be, by the tribunal of last resort, there can be no doubt as to the justice of the case of the minority. Had the minority in Manitoba been Protestant instead of Catholic, the Governor-General-in-Council would not be consulting the courts for the purpose of settling legal technicalities. His Excellency's advisors would realize, in very short time, that the peace of the country and their own safety required that all doubts as to their powers in the matter of appeal and redress be laid aside and they would hasten to give the relief as a matter of justice, peace and safety. However, as we are *only Catholics*, that is, beings whose legal status and rights must be ascertained by process of law before the expediency of granting us simple justice can be even considered, we must be content to wait and hope on until it may please our kind masters to either grudgingly cast us the boon we ask for, or in lieu thereof, recommend us to the paternal friendship and clemency of Tom Greenway.

Didn't Fool Him.

A cook in a cheap boarding house in New York played a little game on a grumbling boarder (a newspaper humorist) by serving him a piece of sole leather instead of beef-steak.

"You've changed your butcher," Mrs. Hasche," said the boarder, looking up at the landlady, after seeing two or three minutes on the leather.

"Same butcher as usual," replied the boarding mistress, with a patronizing smile. "Why?"

"Oh, nothing much," said the humorist, trying to make an impression on the steak with his knife, "only this piece of meat is the tenderest I have struck in this house for some weeks."

If a good policy to patronize the merchant or mechanic who is the most liberal in his efforts to assist in building up the community.

The Jesuit in Fact and Fiction.

The Rev. Thos. Ewing Sherman, S. J., son of the late General Sherman lectured on "The Jesuit in Fact and Fiction" before an immense audience in Chicago a few days ago. Father Sherman said "I am not ashamed to stand before an audience of Americans and say I serve a Spanish knight and gentleman, the founder of the Jesuits, St. Ignatius de Loyola. I recently read in an American magazine that the Jesuits were a band of men who conspired, and who would have to be banished. Would you banish Marquette, who first travelled this country from Northern Wisconsin to the Mississippi, which he discovered, and who was the first white man to set foot in Chicago? Would you banish Carroll, who signed the Declaration of Independence, or de Smet, who was first to carry Christianity among the Rocky Mountains. Think of this before you say you'll banish from free America the sons of Loyola who dare to bear the name of Jesus Christ."

He then proceeded to describe the character of St. Ignatius de Loyola—a soldier at the siege of Pampeluna, fighting almost single-handed against great odds; then, wounded, lying on his couch, how he determined to become a soldier of Christ and destroy the demon's work by loyalty, faith and submission to authority.

"In the civil war, in the midst of one of our most trying battles," said Father Sherman, by way of illustration, "our Union officers fled the field—may God forgive them? Next day the regiment they belonged to was formed in a hollow square, the recreant officers were marched in, had the shoulder straps torn off them, and then the drummer boys drummed them out of the camp. That's the way the soldier Phil Sheridan treated the coward officers and that's the way the soldier Ignatius Loyola would treat the cowardly Christians."

Loyola was illiterate; he could not decline or conjugate verbs; therefore when his great idea seized him, he was content to sit as a little child on the school benches to learn the elements of Latin grammar. His zeal carried him away, he was tried by the Inquisition and put into prison; they could not understand him; these ecclesiastics were so cautious as not to allow every Tom, Dick and Harry to stand up and expound the word of God. Loyola knew enough to do it, but they did not know it. He went to Paris and encountered the same difficulties. At Rome he was accused of heresy by the Augustinian monks, and he demanded a trial; he insisted that his little body of followers should be free from the aspersions of false doctrine.

Describing the training of a young Jesuit, Father Sherman said he was 22 years old when he entered the order. He was sent as a novice to the English House of Manresa, near London, where novices were employed at gardening, helping in the kitchen, and other occupations calculated to take human pride down; it was necessary, every one who entered into religion thought he was going to convert the world, that he was a second Paul. There were certain rigid rules to be followed, every hour's work being marked by the tinkle of a bell. Father Sherman made the audience laugh by recounting his experiences as a haymaker at the Manresa Novitiate and his startling alteration of the rules in order to make the work successful.

After a course of five years' philosophy the postulant was sent to assist in the schools, and then he met the problem of life in America—the American boy! He began to wrestle with character; the school room was the drill ground of the Jesuit, and the years spent by him there gave experience which was invaluable in his after life. Then he got four long years studying theology.

"At length comes the grand mystic day when he is lifted up, when the Holy Spirit comes upon him in all its fulness, and he is invested with power to call the Christ child down into his open hands, to give men their spiritual food and to wipe sins from the souls of men."

Refuting the charge that the Jesuits did not favor liberty, he described how, 250 years ago, when King James of England arrogated to himself almost divine power in making laws, the Jesuit Bellarmine Suarez attacked the King, maintaining that the power lay with the people, who gave it to whom they pleased, and that absolutism was fatal to liberty. Henry of Navarre himself took up the cudgels in favor of the Jesuits when it was proposed to expel them from France.

He retorted to the charge that the Jesuits were a wealthy order, constantly accumulating money for themselves, by a foolish, ignorant statement, too ridiculous for contradiction. The principles of the order were poverty, chastity and obedience. When the English man-of-war Victoria went down the officers and men acted up to their orders to the very last. "If the captain of that vessel did his duty would you have a soldier's soul stand before an audience and apologize for his disobedience?" Here the applause was cyclonic.

"Comrades, loyal comrades, in life and death I hail you," concluded Father Sherman, apostrophizing the members of his order, "men true to Him who gave up His blood, and who work for Jesus in fact and not in fiction."

Cheap Rates to California.

The Northern Pacific Railroad company has put into effect a series of low round-trip rates to California points. Tickets are good until July 15th, 1894, and are good for stop over under certain conditions.

These rates will enable those desiring to do so, to spend the winter in Southern California, or to visit the mid-winter fair to be held at San Francisco. This latter event will undoubtedly be second only to the World's Fair, and will repay a visit as it will exhibit the resources and capabilities of California.

The rate to San Francisco and return via Portland from Winnipeg, Portage la Prairie and Brandon is \$80.50. For a further information apply to Chas. A. Fee, Gen'l. Passenger and Ticket Agent, St. Paul, or H. Swinford, General Agent, Winnipeg, Man.