

Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED WEEKLY.
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORITY
AT WINNIPEG, MANITOBA.

Subscription per annum \$2.00 a year
in advance \$1.50

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.

Address all communications to the
NORTHWEST REVIEW
P. O. Box 617.
Phone 443.
Office: 210 McDermot Ave., Winnipeg, Man.

SATURDAY, JULY 22, 1905.

Calendar for Next Week.

- July
- 23—Sixth Sunday after Pentecost. Our Lady of Succor.
- 24—Monday—Our Lady of Mount Carmel (transferred from the 16th inst.). Vigil.
- 25—Tuesday—St. James, Apostle.
- 26—Wednesday—St. Anne, Mother of the Blessed Virgin.
- 27—Thursday—Votive office of the Blessed Sacrament.
- 28—Friday—St. Nazarius and his companions, Martyrs.
- 29—Saturday—St. Martha, Virgin.

MR. TENNANT CHALLENGES

DR. BRYCE'S MYTHICAL WITNESSES.

The following most interesting sequel to the Tennant-Bryce incident ament Father Lestanc appeared in the Winnipeg Tribune of July 13. As Dr. Bryce will not, because he cannot, produce his two or three mythical witnesses, the incident is probably closed with another big black smudge on the doctor's reputation.

To the Editor of the Tribune.

Sir—Would you kindly allow me space in your valuable columns to supplement my recent letter to you, giving certain correspondence between the reverend doctor and myself in regard to a statement made by him in his fictitious history of Winnipeg, viz:

"That the Rev. Father Lestanc and William O'Donohue fled to the United States on the arrival of the troops at Fort Garry, and spent the winter ('70 and '71) at Pembina planning mischief."

Before entering upon the subject matter to be dealt with in this letter would you please publish the following correspondence:

Dr. Bryce's Letter.

Winnipeg, July 4, 1905.

Mr. J. F. Tennant.

My Dear Sir—Your letter was awaiting me when I returned from the west last night.

Since I wrote you I have seen two men who were both stationed at Pembina in September, 1870, and who both say that Father Lestanc was then consorting with O'Donohue.

One moreover states that he saw Pere Lestanc in St. Albert, some years afterwards, and he says the father referred to having met him in Pembina at the time stated.

I expect to hear from two more eye-witnesses. Will you allow me, however, to ask how you have got into this controversy. I understand you are a Dominion official. I should think it would be better for you not to have anything to do with such a controversial matter.

If you are patient and I receive the further information I speak of I will let you know of it. I am yours truly,

(Signed) GEORGE BRYCE.

"A Veiled Meaning."

Gretna, Man., July 6, 1905.

Dr. George Bryce, L.L.D., Winnipeg. Rev. and Dear Sir—Your letter of the 4th inst., came to hand last night's mail. The morning mail of the same day, the correspondence was sent to Winnipeg papers for publication in vindication of the slandered name of the Rev. Father Lestanc.

I gave you fair and ample opportunity to make the reparation due to the name of the Rev. Father Lestanc, but you would not avail yourself of it.

Your letter contains a veiled meaning, and your question suggests another if I may be permitted to ask it. Why should it be better for me as a Dominion official to keep out of such a controversial matter?

I remain, Rev. and Dear Sir,

Yours truly,

J. F. Tennant.

The reverend doctor does not seem to appreciate my boldness in calling

in question his truthfulness. He says: "Will you allow me, however, to ask you how you got into this controversy. I understand you are a Dominion official. I should think it would be better for you not to have anything to do with such a controversial matter."

I have not the slightest objection to inform my rev. friend "how I got into this controversy." A certain learned and restless busy-body in Winnipeg undertook for a consideration to write a history of Winnipeg. When a man undertakes such a task it is generally supposed that he will avoid fiction, and deal only in facts. As soon as he made the statement, "that the Rev. Father Lestanc and William O'Donohue fled to the United States on the arrival of the troops at Fort Garry, and spent the winter ('70 and '71) at Pembina planning mischief," the Rev. Father McCarthy, a living witness, took him to task for it and later supplemented his denial of the fiction by a detailed statement from the Rev. Father Lestanc himself showing where he actually spent that particular winter. Notwithstanding this our self-created historian proved as unreasonably factious as he had been glaringly fictitious. He never withdrew the statement and it stands as history, false history, of course. I was simple enough to imagine that if I wrote the historian a polite letter, and pointed out to him the actual facts and gave him the names of living witnesses, all of whom were reputable gentlemen, he would be convinced and do simple justice to a brother clergyman whom he had unintentionally (I had supposed) injured in his character, both as a clergyman and a loyal citizen of the country.

That, Mr. Editor, is my reason for being in this controversy. I knew that the statement of Dr. Bryce regarding Father Lestanc was glaringly false. I thought that all I had to do was to call his attention to this and he in his character of historian and clergyman, would at once correct it. He has failed to do so. He has also failed to prove that his statement is worthy of belief. The learned doctor has been assured:

1. By Rev. Father McCarthy, a living witness, that his statement is false.

2. The same rev. gentleman further assured him that the Rev. Father Lestanc spent that winter hundreds of miles away from Pembina among his people in the Northwest Territories.

3. He gave furthermore the statement of Father Lestanc himself setting forth all his movements during that particular winter.

4. He has also my denial of the truth of his statement. I have furnished him with the names of other highly respectable witnesses as to the veracity of my denial.

In the face of all this, this historian and clergyman persists in reiterating his false statements. Let your readers read his letter of July 4. He says: "Since I wrote you I have seen two men who were stationed at Pembina in September 1870 and both say that Father Lestanc was then consorting with O'Donohue."

Now, sir, I have only one statement more to make. I have given the names of my witnesses. I can produce statutory sworn evidence if necessary as to the truth of what I say. Let Dr. Bryce do the same. Let him trot out his mythical "two men who were both stationed at Pembina, etc." Let us have the name of the man who met Pere Lestanc at St. Albert some years afterwards and who says that the father referred to having met him in Pembina at the time stated. Let him produce these men and I promise you that I will supply a sworn statement from the maligned priest that this man lies.

There is only one of two things for Dr. Bryce to do: either produce his witnesses or withdraw his charge against Father Lestanc. If he fails to do this he will stand before the people of Canada as a slanderer and a trifier with truth—two qualities unbecoming to an historian.

With regard to his implied threat about my being a Dominion official, I shall take no notice. It is the kind of weapon that the Doctor best understands how to wield. I have yet to learn (except from the doctor) that a man loses his rights, either civil or religious, because he is a Dominion official. That kind of "Bryonian flapdoodle" has no terror for me.

J. F. TENNANT.

Gretna, July 12, 1905.

Refused Publication.

Note—I sought to have the previous correspondence in the Free Press, the journal that published Dr. Bryce's history of Winnipeg, and copy was sent by the same mail, July 5, to the Tribune, Telegram, Free Press and Northwest Review. All opened their

columns to the correspondence in the interests of truth and justice, excepting the Free Press which gave the following reason for not doing so:

Winnipeg, July 8, 1905.

J. F. Tennant, Gretna.

Dear Sir—Failure to publish your correspondence does not imply any unwillingness on the part of the Free Press to give these letters publicity on account of their contents. They were in fact in the printers' hands when the Tribune came out on Thursday containing them. Their publication was then cancelled in accordance with a rule of the office.

Yours truly, J. W. DAFOE.

THE REV. MR. STARBUCK.

(Sacred Heart Review)

Our younger readers, not familiar with the history of the Christian Church, may get erroneous ideas from the Rev. Mr. Starbuck's learned efforts to do even handed-justice to "Catholic and Protestant Persecutions." We do not mean to imply that the Rev. Mr. Starbuck intends to give a wrong impression, for we know that he is incapable of harboring such a thought. It must be remembered, however, that the Rev. Mr. Starbuck is a Protestant and it is reasonable to suppose that his interpretation, his estimate of the facts of history, especially those of the great rebellion called the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century, must be colored more or less by his religious leanings and convictions. It could not well be otherwise, nor need we suppose even that the reverend gentleman is conscious of such a bias. This predilection has shown itself more than once in his historical papers, and it mildly crops out in his paper this week. In this paper he deals with "the three prevailing religions," and presents them as "equally intolerant." This comparison of the three—sometimes he gives us four and five—"prevailing religions" is somewhat confusing to a Catholic who knows only one. A Catholic does not understand how three or four or five religions, which have so little in common anyway, can fairly be compared. Only one of these religions, namely, the Catholic religion, at the time this comparison is instituted—say the pontificate of Pius IV.—had any age; only this one had performed any service to the human race; this alone had exercised any controlling influence on the thoughts, or helped to mould the ideas, of the Christian world; only this religion had concrete existence by the influence it exercised on the social, civil and political institutions of civilized Europe. In these relations, therefore, there seems to us to be no room for comparing the Catholic religion with any other. But the greatest offence is the comparison between what he calls Catholic and Protestant persecutions, forgetting that every country in Europe, at this time, had been Christianized and civilized by the Pope, that their laws and institutions were based on Catholic ideas, that these countries were all one family with the Pope at their head, and that the people of each country, believing religious unity to be an essential condition of the peace and prosperity of the nation, enacted repressive laws against any thing or person that might seek to break this religious unity. For ages these were the prevailing ideas; for ages these legal enactments were in force. Is it fair to describe the operation of these laws as persecution? It would be more just to so describe our own laws against the Mormons. At any rate we see how unfair it is to compare the wild, lawless, and fanatical outbursts of so-called religious zeal of this period with the operation of laws, ancient and universal,—laws which represented the sober, settled, and religious convictions of the great mass of the people regarding the need and advantage of religious unity. Another fact which distinguished Catholic from Protestant persecutions is that kings and princes from purely selfish motives espoused the cause of the so-called Reformers, that they might thus enrich themselves by confiscating Church and ecclesiastical property. The religious motive was conspicuous by its absence. Again, in persecuting Catholics, as more than one Protestant historian notes, Protestants were acting not only against the universal law of Europe, but also in violation of their own principles. Even the anti-Catholic Bryce upbraids them with this inconsistency. He says: "A church which does not claim to be infallible is bound to allow that some part of the truth may possibly be with its adversaries. A church which permits or encourages human reason to apply itself to revelation has no right first to argue with people and then

punish them if they are not convinced. The Protestants welcomed all the aid the temporal power could give. The actual consequence was that religion began to be involved with politics more closely than had ever been the case before. Persecution, which might at least be palliated in an infallible Catholic and Apostolic Church, was peculiarly odious when practised by those who were not Catholics, who were no more apostolic than their neighbours, and who had just revolted from the most ancient and venerable authority in the name of rights which they now denied to others. In the Protestant, persecution becomes at once a crime and a folly."

We shall call attention to one more fact just now alluded to by Bryce, which, more than aught else, distinguished the new religions from the Catholic, namely, the supreme power civil governments exercised over them Bryce says: "The Sovereign, as in England, or the majority as in Holland, the Scandinavian countries and Scotland, or each German prince, claimed the right of establishing within his territories the creed he adopted." This was the pagan principle; the citizen, body and soul, belonged to the State. In opposition to this principle; the Church waged a conflict for three hundred years against pagan Rome; during the Middle Ages against Christian kings and princes; during our own day against Catholic and Protestant governments. This principle, for which the Church thus contended, namely, the independence of religion and the supremacy of the spiritual order, is one of vital importance, and belongs to the essence of the Christian Church. No body of men, be they ever so good and worthy personally, who betray this principle should be compared to the Catholic Church.

For all these reasons, therefore, we submit that it is at least misleading, and not exactly true to the facts of history, to institute such comparisons as the Rev. Mr. Starbuck makes between the "three prevailing religions," and then to find as a result of this comparisons that all religions were "equally intolerant." We do not wish to be understood as standing sponsor for the wisdom of the laws enacted during those times. The people of every age and country have the right to enact their own laws, and the mildness of those laws will generally represent the progress which a people has made in Christian civilization.

As to the charge made this week against Pius IV. we are unable to find any historical foundation to support it. It should be remembered, also, that the Waldenses, to whom allusion is made, became, about thirty years prior to this, Protestant in principle and practice. The Rev. Mr. Starbuck himself has more than once shown—what Protestant scholars now generally admit—that the Protestantism of this era was, above all, militant and political, and that in whatever country it got foothold it sought by force to overturn the existing institutions, civil and religious. We presume that it is entirely true that Protestantism at this time was kept out of Italy, if not out of southern Europe, by the vigilance and firmness of the Popes. Was not this a service to humanity and one of the greatest the Popes ever rendered? As to Ireland, our reverend collaborer never tires of saying a good word for that country. "No, the Irish never persecuted, but when they had the power they had no one to persecute. When they did not have the power, they endured a persecution which by its diabolical ingenuity and ferocity was never surpassed, and which ought of itself to discredit the claim to superiority of the new Protestant gospel.

CONSIDERATIONS ON CATHOLICISM BY A PROTESTANT THEOLOGIAN

CCCLXI.

We have seen, in examining the "Republican" correspondent's assertion that thousands of admirable men and women have been tortured and murdered at the instigation of Rome for re-

Church, Convent and Altar Construction a Speciality

Twenty Years of Experience

L. DE JURKOWSKI
ARCHITECT

Office, 416 Manitoba Ave., Winnipeg

Give us a call when you want anything in English, French or Polish Books, Stationery, Fancy Goods, Church Ornaments, Religious Articles, Toys, Pictures and Frames at lowest prices. Beautiful assortment of Prayer Beads from 5c. up to \$17.00.

M. E. KEROACK,
Cor. Main & Water Sts. Winnipeg
also at St. Boniface.

Boyd's Chocolates and Confections

They sell best wherever the best is sold. The purity and delicious quality of these sweets have made them the most popular confections in the west.

THE W. J. BOYD CANDY CO.
WINNIPEG.

MOSQUITOES

We have the only original sure death remedy for these pesky creatures. Wise's Mosquito Lotion will prevent their attack, and will also relieve their bites. Odor not unpleasant except to mosquitoes.

DIRECTIONS: Smear on exposed parts and sprinkle on pillow at night.

Price, 15c and 25c per bottle

H. A. WISE & CO.

DRUGGISTS

414 Main and Cor. Portage & Young

We have a choice List of both

Improved Farm and City Property for Sale

Estates economically and judiciously managed. We give special attention to the sale of property listed exclusively with us.

DALTON & GRASSIE

REAL ESTATE AGENTS

Phone 1557

48 Main Street

Why be Tied to a Hot Kitchen?

USE A

GAS RANGE

and you have heat only where, when and as long as you want it.

Call and see these stoves before buying.

AUER LIGHT CO.

Telephone 236. 215 Portage Avenue

Office 'Phone 1239.

Clark Bros. & Hughes


UNDERTAKING

2 Ambulances in Connection.

Office and Chapel

186 JAMES STREET.

WINNIPEG, MAN.



Extra Pale Beer

FINEST QUALITY

THE RICHARD, BELIVEAU CO., LTD.
Sole Agents, 330 MAIN ST., WINNIPEG.