

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN WINNIPEG, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY. Northwest Review Office, No. 40 Mary Street. P. KLINKHAMMER, Business-Manager.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Bookellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Booksellers, 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, MAY 15.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

The Hon. Mr. Costigan's speech, which we reprint in another column, sets forth with the speaker's chivalric honesty the Protestant origin of separate schools. He has the serene courage to speak of the "great" province of Quebec; great indeed she is in tolerance and charity as compared with other big, but not great, conglomerations of Canadians, who have liberty on their lips and despotic tyranny in their hearts.

In reprinting the Northwest's articles on Mr. Fisher's prophetic views about the school question, and the same honorable gentleman's speeches at Fort Ellice and Russell, we do not pretend to endorse all these views. We concur in the spirit rather than in the letter of them. Mr. Fisher has always been a consistent advocate of fair play; no popular cry has ever been made him swerve from justice as he views it.

Father Cherrier's letter, answering Dr. Bryce's Brandon speech, will be found weighty and convincing, calm and conclusive. Even the breezy Doctor seems to have felt that, as he had to reply to Father Cherrier, he must be less noisy and more argumentative. However, though he asserts that Father Cherrier's averages are struck on a wrong principle, he merely asserts this, he does not attempt to prove his assertion in any way. Father Cherrier, on the contrary, proves his principle to be the only fair one and thus knocks the bottom out of the Doctor's whole case.

The A. P. A. has had a monster meeting at Milwaukee, where it affirmed a long catalogue of false propositions. Albeit the Catholic Church is nowhere mentioned therein, it is everywhere understood and stabbed at in the dark. And yet the only true Church will bury the A. P. A. as it has buried thousands of other lying associations. The Church will, in particular, never accept the monstrous assertion that justice is based on the votes of the majority. These votes may be a handy way to self-government; but the votes of a million fools are outweighed by the silent protest of one wise man. By maintaining this truth against all the mobs in the world, the Church helps mankind to remain free from the most slavish of despotisms, the tyranny of the rabble.

The noise of the "Corporal" has gone out into the ends of the world; witness the Liverpool Catholic Times:—

There is in Canada an edition of Mr. Matthews, who, speaking as a Catholic, assured the Protestants of Birmingham that it was wrong for his co-religionists to protest against the disabilities imposed by the Emancipation Act. The name of the Canadian Matthews is Mr. John O'Donoghue, of Winnipeg. He appeared as a Catholic before the Dominion Parliament in opposition to the Separate schools, thus going against Bishops, priests, and people. The comment of the Antigonish "Casket" upon his action is:—"If the Manitoba Government could have got an equal number of nominal Catholics to play the part of Judas Iscariot before the Dominion Cabinet, they would not have relied upon one."

Our distinguished Archbishop has been criticized for quoting a Montreal judge who said he always noticed the superiority of lawyers trained in Catholic Colleges. The

observation is almost a truism in the bar of the province of Quebec. It is only a phase of the broader statement, made over and over again by men who are impartial and have seen both sides, that a graduate of a Catholic College, who has had two years of philosophy, is more than a match, in point of logical acumen and reasoning power, for an average graduate of any non-Catholic institution in the world. The same superiority is manifest in the Ottawa parliament, where the Catholic members, as a body, are far more cultured and better mental fencers than the non-Catholic contingent. Of course men of great talent and ability will make their mark in spite of wrong systems of culture; we are only arguing on averages, and on this basis we maintain that the Catholic system of training in philosophy produces far better results than the non-Catholic system of optional courses in which many-sided erudition counts for more than mental gymnastics. The one really trains the mind; the other only stores the memory. The above remarks were suggested by the Hon. Jas. E. P. Prendergast's speech last Thursday. His vast superiority, in culture, refinement and adherence to the question at issue, was clear even to strangers who, not knowing our brilliant St. Boniface representative, wondered who was this man that stood out in such strong contrast to the rambling roughness and the ignorant crudeness of most of the non-Catholic members.

Though the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury on the question of reunion says there is no hope of it so long as Rome holds to her present doctrines, his refraining from naming Lord Halifax and the other Anglicans who desire reunion shows the respect generally felt for the Ritualist wing of the Established Church. And indeed it were difficult to overestimate Lord Halifax's high character and complete sincerity or the intensity of the longing for reunion with Rome among an influential party in the church of England. The order of the Holy Redeemer, a society of Anglicans, openly avows its intention to bring back England to Roman Catholic unity. The following lines are from one of its hymns, to St. Thomas Becket:

Glorious Martyr, hear us praying, Far from Peter's see we roam; See thy flock, St. Thomas, straying; Gather them and lead them home!

By thy last grand prayer of anguish Ere thy spirit passed home, Lead our England, lead thy England Back to St. Peter's see at Rome!

Meanwhile the Ritualist party are undermining the chief foundation of the sixteenth century revolt. The Reformation was built largely on the basis of the legitimacy of divorce; and now the Romanizing Anglicans are proclaiming the Catholic and only true doctrine that absolute divorce with permission to remarry is unchristian. Lately, at an aristocratic marriage in London a ritualistic parson rose in the body of the church and objected to the performance of the ceremony on the ground that the bridegroom—the son of a baronet, Sir Theodore Brinckman, and, from a worldly view-point, a most eligible person—was a divorced man. "The aristocratic congregation," says the New York Sun cable, "was greatly shocked at the idea of anybody interfering. As the officiating clergyman had received his fee, and a fat one, the ceremony was duly performed. It has since been learned that the protest was organized by the Duke of Newcastle and other leaders of the ritualist party, and is a part of a new policy by which they intend to shame the clergymen of the church of England into refusing to marry divorced persons, no matter for what causes their first unions were severed by the law. The discussion, thus sensationally initiated, is raging in the press and Synods, and the Ritualists loudly proclaim their intention of supporting disestablishment and the disendowment of the State church rather than see it sanction any longer these 'blasphemous, adulterous unions.'"

BRUCE'S BRANDON BREAK.

For the first time in the course of our five years' tilt with our dearly beloved antagonist, the illustrious and modest Doctor Bryce, we have succeeded in piercing his pachydermatous envelope. He has uttered a cry of pain, not in the way common to ordinary mortals who exclaim that they are hurt, but in the Bryconian flapdoodle way, by declaring that we are beneath his notice. Then, why did you say so, Doctor dear? Why did you not continue that policy of silent contempt which—we confess it in all sincerity—we have ever admired in you as the index of a self-denying soul? The commonplace man, who is passion's slave, wears a thin skin upon him, smarts under the lash, and flies off at a tangent when he is attacked. What we have always viewed in Dr. Bryce with reverent envy is the exact opposite, his absolute imperviousness alike to the shafts of ridicule and to the home-thrusts of convincing argument. Hitherto he has never allowed such trifles to impair his singleness of purpose. To be sure, that purpose is not a very lofty one. His aim is to reflect public opinion, to be a popular hero. Others prefer the approval of one great and good man to the smiles of a passion-swayed multitude. There is no accounting for tastes. But, to his chosen purpose Dr. Bryce has, up till now, been as true as the needle to the pole. So impressed have we been with this sublime imperturbability of his that we have more than once caught ourselves in the act of wondering what a magnificent saint he would have made, had he chosen to tread the paths of recti-

tude and holiness. Directness, keenness of perception, untiring activity, the power of concentration, the mental perspective which relegates unimportant and irrelevant matter to the background, all these gifts are his.

How, then, has it come to pass that the imperturbable Doctor has so far forgotten the thickness of his skin as to use, in his Brandon speech last Wednesday, such language as we have read in the Free Press report, doubtless inspired, if not written, by himself? He spoke of us as "an insignificant paper called the Northwest Review. This paper was a literary patchwork, coarse and clamorous, and it owed a debt of gratitude to the lecturer for affording the subject of thirty or forty of its articles for the past four or five years." What can have prompted him thus to break his long and magnanimous silence? To our mind the explanation is easy. He was surrounded by a host of admirers, who do their infinitesimal thinking in battalions and never think for themselves, who look upon him as their favorite champion because he flatters their ignorant prejudices, who consider him a great authority in matters religious, historical, literary and scientific. To them he felt he could unbosom himself as he had never done before. Under such circumstances a man's long pent-up feelings seek their natural vent. Now, nothing is more natural for one so situated than to stigmatize in others his own besetting sins, especially when his hearers cannot suspect that these are his pet delinquencies. Hence it is, we venture to think, that he singled out these four great accusations to hurl them at our devoted head: (1) insignificance, (2) literary patchwork, (3) coarseness, (4) clamorosity. For he is thoroughly at home in them all; he knows all about them.

1. Insignificance. In Dr. Bryce's eyes this is a most terrible charge. When he wishes to dismiss some importunate objector, he thinks he has said all that need be said when he calls him an insignificant or obscure person. To be unknown, to occupy no visible space in the public eye, is to him the greatest of torments. His recent utterances in Winnipeg having been treated as insignificant, he lies him to Brandon where no one can say him nay, and where he can once more attract attention. As to our own insignificance, how comes it that the learned Doctor should be so assiduous in reading our humble sheet? Although he is not on our mailing list, we had heard that he never failed to scan our insignificant pages with his bald eagle eye; but we never realized till this day how he keeps count of everything we have written about him. Is it possible that we have written "thirty or forty articles" on the Doctor's interesting personality? Not having time to consult our files and add up, we take his word for it. By the way, to anticipate the next charge, were all these articles "literary patchwork"? If so, then they must have borrowed their patching from their subject. One proof of our insignificance is that twelve thousand copies of one of our articles, garbled of course, were printed and distributed by our enemies during a late Algoma election.

2. Literary patchwork. Here is another of Dr. Bryce's specialties. Of patchwork in history, literature, travels and science he has a vast and varied personal experience. This might be construed as faint praise for an ambitious professor; but it is a very soft impeachment against a newspaper. Provided the latter chooses and credits the patches properly, it cannot be blamed therefor.

3. Coarseness. Here we bow to Dr. Bryce's superior achievements. We admit that we like to call a spade a spade and that we have occasionally handled him without gloves; but, on examining our conscience and memory, we cannot recall anything in our language that at all approximates Dr. Bryce's memorable comparison of the dearest convictions of Catholics to the loathsome equine disease called glanders.

4. Clamorosity means noisiness, and who can hold a candle to the obstreperous Doctor in this matter of noisiness? Who has been beating the big drum on the school question for the past five years, if not the Doctor? Who has crowded over the first decision of the Privy Council half as loud as the Doctor? Who has carried his blatant voice to the very ears of that august tribunal, so as to excite the hilarious astonishment of the judge who marvelled that Dr. Bryce wanted the Catholic religion to be something entirely different from what it is? No, Doctor; we have not the slightest hope of rivalling you in noisiness. But does it not strike you as somewhat contradictory that we should be, at one and the same time, both noisy and insignificant? If we are insignificant, you surely cannot be disturbed by utterances that no one notices. The same question suggests itself as to your two other charges. If our patchwork deserves the epithet you apply to it and is really literary, how can it be coarse? However, once more we admit your greater experience in these matters; perhaps you can reconcile these apparent contradictions.

OUR YOUTHFUL BRAGGART.

The Victoria Generalist says:—"Mr. Sifton, the Attorney-General of Manitoba, was supposed to be quietly and seriously deliberating upon the course which he and his colleagues in the government ought to pursue on the school question, went to Haldimand and made that question the theme of a series of stump speeches. Those speeches showed that, as far as he was concerned, the adjournment of the

Manitoba legislature was a sham, He required no time to deliberate. He had made up his mind, and he was determined to do his best to prevail upon the electors of Haldimand to condemn the Dominion government for the course they had pursued in the matter. His efforts were not crowned with success. He, in fact, failed most conspicuously. It is evident that the electors of that county were not charmed by Mr. Sifton's eloquence nor convinced by his arguments. He had to return home a greatly disappointed man.

He, it appears, had placed great reliance upon the Orangemen of Haldimand. He evidently believed that when he raised the standard of opposition in that county and appeared as the champion of what he called Manitoba's rights, the Orangemen would regard him as a hero and vote for the McCarthy candidate to a man. When he found that his stirring appeals had fallen flat on the ears of the Ontario Orangemen he was greatly disgusted, and when he visited Montreal after the election gave free vent to his feelings. This is how he spoke of the Orangemen whom he had failed to convert;

"Mr. Sifton," writes the interviewer, "evidently feels very bitterly against the Orangemen. He does not think that the resolutions passed by the lodges in support of Manitoba are worth a snap of the fingers, and when asked if he thought they were unreliable as a political factor, he replied: 'On the contrary, they are very reliable—to shout for you, and go out and vote for your opponent. I know where they are. They are quite reliable. The Orangemen came to our meetings and applauded. Apparently they were enthusiastically in favor of Mr. McCarthy—and I must say that some of them really worked and voted for him—but most of the men who shouted the loudest at our meetings went out and voted for Montague. It is pleasant to go with the big crowd, you know.'"

Mr. Sifton in his anger and disappointment is unjust to the Orangemen. Whatever may have been the feelings of the men of that order want of steadfastness and sincerity has not been among them.

REV. FATHER CHERRIER

Answers Rev. Dr. Bryce's Latest Speech at Brandon.

To the Editor of the Free Press.

Sir,—I regret that your report of Dr. Bryce's lecture in Brandon is not given verbatim, for as I propose to answer the reverend doctor in the columns of the Free Press, I would have liked in justice to him to do so with the full text of his remarks before me. Under the circumstances I shall limit myself to a few points only, about which there can hardly be a possibility of error on the part of your reporter, whom I know to be as a rule, very accurate.

1. Bill of Rights.—The reverend doctor may say what he likes and throw as much of a slur as he chooses on what he calls the doubtful evidence obtained from the Rev. Father Ritchot's diary but there will still remain facts which are beyond the possibility of a doubt such as: (a) the discussing of the school question by the delegates and the members of the Dominion government committee and the final agreement arrived at by both; (b) the acceptance or ratification by the local legislature of Manitoba of the terms agreed upon by the Dominion government committee and the delegates; (c) the sanction of the same by the Dominion and the Imperial authorities. The doctor pays a poor compliment to the enlightenment of the Protestants who were inhabitants of Manitoba in 1870 when he reproaches them with having yielded to an undue influence, for had they been as educated as the doctor says the thousands of to-day are, they would have acted very differently. Whilst I am willing to let the descendants of those pioneers swallow and digest as best they can the bitter pill administered them by the learned doctor, I shall, however, say this much in answer—that if education, as he seems to understand it, is to lead to such an unjust and unfair treatment as that which he would fain see extended to the Catholic minority of the province, I, for one, admire the good sense of the people of 1870 much more than the high-toned education of the now ruling majority in Manitoba. In 1870 the inhabitants of the country did not understand religious liberty in word only, but, conforming their mode of action to their avowed principles, they respected each other's conscience not only in churches and homes, but even in schools which are to a great extent the church and the home of the young.

Without following the learned doctor in his appreciation of the remedial order, suffice it to say in answer to the No. 1 statement of your report that the Privy Council, after going fully into the case as laid before them, have decided that the Catholics have a grievance. The "substantial" distinction made by the learned doctor did not apparently disturb their Lordships in finding the existence of the grievance, as regards statements Nos. 2 and 3, the doctor can say that the public schools are of Protestant origin, but I am equally free, and with much more reason, to say that by the law of 1890 the schools to be attended by Catholic children would lose the Catholic character which the constitution grants and guarantees to these schools. It is not to Doctor Bryce nor any of the other members of the Advisory Board, but to Holy Mother Church that we Catholics look for the amount of religion to be imparted to the minds and hearts of the young; and we consider that man a Protestant, whoever he may be, who will pose as a judge against the church to limit her in such religious teaching. If the other denominations can agree, as they have in the past, upon some infinitesimal quantity of religion in schools, I will not object to their feeding on such a starving system, although I can easily foretell the evil results of it; but I can safely state that this will

never satisfy the craving of Catholics for religious instruction. We are willing to give any civil instruction that our government may demand from us, but never shall we, as long as we remain protected by the Constitution, permit any sacrilegious encroachment upon our rights to religiously educate our children in the manner the church teaches us they should be educated.

As statements numbers 4, 5 and 6 all have reference to the case from a mere material point of view, I shall answer them as if they constituted one argument only. As yet we remark at the outset that it is a practical impossibility to have a human law so perfect that it will never cause any one to suffer. That the old law was open to amendments every one will readily agree, but why remedy an evil by another still greater evil? Unless the doctor considers that it is no evil to privilege the Catholics of all the rights and privileges they had enjoyed prior to 1890, he should before endorsing the local government's action have given his just and fair consideration to the fact that he does not really help the community by making a large portion of its members suffer greatly in order to bring relief to a few scattered settlers in remote parts of the province. So much the more so because the latter evil would eventually have disappeared by the coming of new settlers, whilst the evil inflicted on the Catholic minority is one beyond remedy.

Mr. Ewart in his plea for the Catholics has simply done what the Rev. Bryce also did. D. would have undoubtedly done as well under similar circumstances. We had been unjustly and unfairly deprived of so many rights and privileges guaranteed by the constitution; what less could we do than demand the entire restoration of those rights and privileges? Should anybody ever be caught and convicted of having robbed, say the Rev. Dr. Bryce, of \$5,000, would the doctor be satisfied with asking the thief to make restitution of \$1,000 only, or, perhaps better, rest perfectly contented when he is told that the money was stolen not because of any ill-feeling whatever against the doctor, but simply to enable the thief to come to the rescue of a few poor sufferers lost in some remote parts of the country.

Dr. Bryce says my averages were made on a wrong principle. So far the learned doctor, I am pleased to remark, has not questioned the accuracy of my figures; all he finds wrong with me is the principle of my averages. Am I mistaken when I suppose that the legislative grant is made for the spreading of instruction and education among the young. In other words the government invests as it were so much money in the children of the province with the hope that there will eventually be some return in the formation of good citizens. Therefore it is clear that the money voted by the legislature is primarily for such children as attend school; and if it were practicable I would say that the average attendance at school is the only truly just and fair basis of apportionment. But this is exactly the principle on which I have made all my averages. Then the only assailable part of my statements would be that my figures were given the money which it voted for the purpose for which I take it such money was voted, merely for the education of the children of the province. The fact that the Protestant ratepayers taxed themselves, because they would it, (remark that well) more than we did is no proof that the Catholics were in any way better treated at the hands of the government than their Protestant fellow citizens. To illustrate the case: If I receive a sum of money from any government to carry out in part a certain portion of a work which I am in duty bound to accomplish, I may certainly hire men at the salary which it pleases me to give them, and I may also spend as much additional money in putting up expensive buildings as I may choose for the carrying out of the work in question, and nobody has any right to find fault with me for that. But because my neighbor who has also a similar contract to fill succeeds in doing his work equally well with men equally qualified although hired at a lower salary, and in houses for which he has spent less money than I did; am I to act with jealousy and say that this neighbor has received more assistance than I did at the hands of our common master? Certainly not. Well then, let Dr. Bryce praise his Protestant fellow-citizens for their pride in putting up very expensive school buildings, or let him grieve that the Protestants lack the devotedness found particularly in our religious communities the members of which teach not for the sake of a salary, but for the love of God and country, and I shall find no fault with him. But that all this can read unjust and unfair the principle upon which the government grant was made in this province prior of 1890 I cannot admit; nor can I, therefore, in spite of my good dispositions towards the reverend doctor, withdraw any of my statements, nor agree with him in the conclusions which he endeavors to draw from his own figures. I leave it to the honesty of our common fair-minded hearers or readers to judge between the learned doctor's arguments and figures and those of your humble servant.

A. A. CHERRIER, P. P.

Winnipeg, May 11.

LIST OF SUBSCRIBERS

To the fund for a presentation to Archbishop Langevin in souvenir of his Consecration.

- N. Bawlf, \$50; la Banque d'Hotelaga, \$25; Dr. J. H. O'Donnell, \$10; Gerald F. Smyth, \$10; James Redmond, \$10; D. Smith, \$10; C. A. Gareau, \$10; J. K. Barrett, \$10; E. Cass, \$10; W. Plaxton, \$10; Thomas Kelly, \$10; O. Monchamp, \$10; A. McKinnon, \$10; P. Gallaher & Son, \$10; James R. Wynne, \$10; Barré Bros, \$10; J. A. Richard, \$10; C. A. Green, \$10; S. M. Barré, \$10; W. Walsh, \$10; L. O. Genest, \$10; Mrs. G. F. Galt, \$10; McPherson & McMullen, \$10; M. Conaway, \$10; R. C. McPhillips, \$10; Jas. Haverly, \$10; Mrs. J. Furlong, \$10; W. Jordan, \$10; F. E. Gautier, \$10; D. T. Lennon, \$10; E. D. Deegan, \$10; E. L. D. Thomas, \$10; E. C. Egan, \$10; Burke Brothers, \$10; J. J. Egan, \$10; W. Doherty, \$10; J. J. Golden, \$10; E. G. Barrett, \$10; R. M. Harrison, \$10; C. E. Kavanagh, \$10; H. L. Chabot, \$10; M. E. Hughes, \$10; Dr. Dame, \$10; Martin Kelly, \$10; J. O. Day, \$10; M. Healey, \$10; J. Redmond, \$10; T. O. Dunouchel, \$10; N. Chevrier, \$10; Alex. Carroll, \$10; Joseph Carey, \$10; Joseph Barré, \$10; H. H. Martineau, \$10; A. McGillis, \$10; Joseph Fahey, \$10; W. V. O'Connor, \$10; Louis Bouché, \$10; Thos. Coyle, \$10; J. D. McDonald, \$10; R. Driscoll, \$10; T. Tessier, \$10; P. Shea, \$10; A. St. Laurent, \$10; J. A. Brooks, \$10; M. de Pontalis, \$10; Mrs. A. T. Beecher, \$10; H. A. Costigan, \$10; Arthur Green, \$10; M. Lafrance, \$10; J. J. Tomlinson, \$10; W. McDonald, \$10; D. Bawlf, \$10; A. McDonald, \$10; C. J. Redmond, \$10; J. A. Miller, \$10; P. O. Donnell, \$10; Mrs. J. J. Kilgour, \$10; W.

- Bawlf, \$10; L. Emma, \$10; D. H. Ulman, \$10; Governor Lawlor, \$10; Mrs. Guilmette, \$10; A. H. Kennedy, \$10; A. Lussier, \$10; Dr. A. E. Versailles, \$10; E. McKeown, \$10; Mrs. Hannon, \$10; W. Dunn, \$10; Joseph Cauchon, \$10; J. H. Torrey, \$10; Mrs. A. H. Bertrand, \$10; M. C. Simon, \$10; P. Cane, \$10; Mrs. A. W. Law, \$10; Jos. Brault, \$10; C. J. McNeerney, \$10; H. Brownrigg, \$10; Mrs. McPhillips, \$10; M. A. Fiset, \$10; Frank McPhillips, \$10; R. Murphy, \$10; W. Gladwith, \$10; Madame de Baurvey, \$10; F. H. Hughes, \$10; H. B. Bridges, \$10; J. Nagle, \$10; K. McDonald, \$10; J. Burman, \$10; Madame Aury, \$10; A. P. Courtin, \$10; A. Bourneault, \$10 cts.

BUSINESS COLLEGE COMPETITION.

Award of Medals at the Meeting of the Literary on Friday. The results of the semi-annual competition for medals and prizes was made known at the last meeting of the Winnipeg Business College Literary society Friday afternoon. A good programme was provided, the most interesting part of which, however, was the presentation of the awards by the secretary, Mr. G. W. Donald. The following are the successful competitors: For best kept set of books, silver medal, won by E. R. James, of Rosser; 2nd, copy of "Expert Book-keeping," won by D. W. Reid, of Golden, B. C. For most improvement in writing, silver medal, won by W. H. Sinclair, City; 2nd, copy of "Self Instructor in Penmanship," won by W. J. Beaton, of Portage la Prairie. For accuracy in shorthand, silver medal, won by P. H. Allen, City; 2nd, choice of a number of shorthand works, won by Miss McFarlane, City. The work of the students in the different departments was highly spoken of by the examiners. The next examination will take place in the fall.

Literary Competition.

THREE HUNDRED DOLLARS OFFERED IN PRIZES.

BY THE DR. WILLIAMS' MEDICINE CO., OF BROCKVILLE, ONT.

The Above Amount Will be Divided Among the Writers of the Best Five Original Stories.—The Competition Open to All Bona Fide Residents of Canada.

With a view to assisting in the development of literary talent in Canada. The Dr. Williams Medicine Co., of Brockville, Ont., will award prizes amounting to \$300 among the writers of the best five short original stories submitted in the competition as follows:— For the story pronounced the best \$100 will be given; For the second best \$75. For the third best \$60. For the fourth best \$40. For the fifth best \$25.

The competition is open to residents of the Dominion of Canada, who have never won a cash prize in a story competition, and is subject to the following rules:— Each story to contain not more than three thousand words. The writer of the story shall affix a pen name, initials or motto to his or her manuscript, and shall send with the manuscript a sealed envelope bearing on the outside the pen name, initials or motto attached to the story, and containing inside it the full name and address of the writer thereof. We impose no limitations whatever as to the nature of the topic written upon, and the scene of the story need not necessarily be laid in Canada, although competitors must be residents of Canada, as above stated. Stories entered in the competition must be written on one side of the paper only, and when possible should be typewritten. Manuscript to be sent flat or folded—NOT ROLLED.

All stories for competition must reach the Dr. Williams' Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont., on or before the first day of July, 1895, and should be marked "For Literary Competition."

Decision will be made as follows:— All stories submitted will be referred to a competent committee who will decide which are the best five stories. These stories will then be published in pamphlet form, which pamphlets will be distributed throughout the Dominion, and each will contain a voting paper upon which readers will be invited to express their preference. The story obtaining the highest number of votes will be awarded the first prize. The one obtaining the second highest number will be awarded second prize, and so on until the five prizes are awarded.

The voting will close on the first day of December, 1895, and the committee will then publish the names of the successful competitors and the order of merit. Unsuccessful manuscripts will be returned when stamps are sent for postage. The five stories selected are to become the absolute property of the Dr. Williams' Medicine Co. with their copyright in perpetuity.

The decision of the committee and the counting of votes to be absolute and final, and all persons entering the competition agree, by doing so, to accept the decision of the committee and the Dr. Williams' Medicine Co. as final on all points whatsoever.

Correspondence in regard to unsuccessful MSS, declined, even when stamped envelopes are sent; and stamps so sent (for any other purpose than the return of the MS, at the time of first sending) will be put in the poor box.

The Dr. Williams' Medicine Co. will take all precautions to safe-guard MS, entrusted to their care, but in no case do they assume any responsibility for fire, accident or loss of unsuccessful MS. Authors are therefore advised to keep copies.

The stories must be original. Any one sending copied matter will be liable to punishment for fraud, and a prize of \$25 is offered to the first person who points out the fact that any story passed by the committee is otherwise than original, in the unlikely event of such an oversight occurring.

All stories entered in the competition must be addressed to the Dr. Williams' Medicine Co., Brockville, Ont., and marked on the envelope "For Literary Competition."