

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, 582 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, NOVEMBER 27.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

We had made arrangements for an original report of the delightful entertainment last week at St. Mary's Academy, when the Nor'-Wester's excellent report appeared and by its comprehensiveness and judicious praise, dispensed us from any further effort. We are therefore happy to publish it with some slight modifications.

When the Nor'-Wester, the day before yesterday, awoke from its long slumber over the school question and reprinted with approval a fine article from the Montreal Star thereon, our reply to "Observer" was already in type. We now let it stand; for, though no longer needed as a stimulant, it explains the lethargy of the past.

Rev. Father Cherrier writes a strong, yet temperate letter to the Free Press, expostulating with Rev. Dr. King for the motion about Public Schools which he persuaded the Presbyterian Synod to adopt last Thursday, and urging the "able divine" to answer fairly and squarely the question of our constitutional rights to separate schools. We will reproduce this admirable letter next week.

After three days of prudent self-repression and consequent silence, it was lamentably unwise of the Tribune to break out against us as it did last Monday. Those of its readers who, being honest, always mistrust it, will be sure to look up our article on "Those Libel Suits," and will then discover that, far from containing "vulgarity," "clumsiness" and "studiedly dishonest innuendoes," it is a skillful and straightforward exposure of a shameless fraud, of which, of course, the Tribune does not let fall so much as a hint.

As there were several misprints in the Free Press edition of the Very Rev. Father Ritchot's letter in reply to Mr. Wade, we deem it advisable to reprint a correct version of this really valuable letter. It will live as an historical document when the circumstances that called it forth will have dropped into that contemptuous oblivion that rightfully belongs to their author. Let us hope that some enterprising searcher at Ottawa will act upon Father Ritchot's hint and hunt for the copy of the 'Remarks' handed to Sir George E. Cartier. That great statesman, with his ordinary habits, must surely have deposited in some safe place a document the importance of which he thoroughly realized; for, like every one else who has come to know Father Ritchot's

worth, he set great store by the sagacity and longheadedness of this devoted priest. If not in the records of some public department, the 'Remarks' may perhaps be found among the private papers of Sir George, who, it will be remembered started for Europe, never to return, only two years after the negotiations of 1870.

The Catholic Register of Toronto says: "The NORTHWEST REVIEW in a long and very interesting article furnishes proof that the Canadian Magazine published in its October number a contribution very offensive to Catholics. We give credit to our northwest contemporary for watchfulness and ability. However, to those of us who know the Canadian Magazine, no doubt can arise concerning its character. Some one has been misled, and there is not much after all for any designing fellow to boast of in deceiving an editor." The penultimate sentence is a trifle vague. We take it to mean that the Canadian Magazine has no anti-Catholic bias. So much the better; but is it not strange that Protestant editors know so little about the larger half of Christendom that any "designing fellow" can make them believe that Pius IX was once a lay Jesuit and Archbishop of Ravenna? A Catholic editor, who should allow a contributor to write, uncorrected, in his columns that the Rev. Dr. G. M. Grant was once a Fenian and Principal of Manitoba College or that the Rev. Dr. Wm. Caven set fire to the Parliament buildings of Montreal in 1849 and afterwards became a distinguished Quaker, would never hear the end of the ridicule his ignorance would provoke. Yet these blunders are not comparable to the fables Mr. Kinmount Roy palmed off on the Canadian Magazine. There have been Fenians. Somebody did fire the Montreal Parliament buildings. But nobody has yet discovered that mythical personage, the lay Jesuit. Moreover, Dr. Grant and Dr. Caven have not yet become historical personages; their biographies are not so easily attainable as that of Pius IX.

The foregoing is a case of "suggestio falsi." Of the cognate "suppressio veri" by our non-Catholic contemporaries we have a remarkable instance in the paragraphs that have appeared everywhere concerning the career of the famous musician, Sir Charles Hallé, who died in Manchester of the 25th of last month. Though the secular papers bewailed him as a great loss to the musical world, some even going so far as to rank him with Liszt, Chopin and other masters of harmony who have glorified our century, not one of them mentioned what was to him the most important event of his life, his conversion to the Catholic faith. Almost thirty years before his death he was received into the church by Father Galwey, S.J. One of his daughters is Sister Gabriel, of the Order of Charity. "His career," says the Ave Maria, "was marked by simple, unostentatious piety; and his charity is illustrated by an incident related by Bishop Bilborough at his funeral. Many years ago, it appears, the musician noticed that the postman was struggling along under an unusually large budget of mail and a heavier burden of liquor. The man had a large family dependent on him for support, and if his condition were discovered his discharge was certain. Moved by compassion for the wife and children, Sir Charles took the postman into his house, put him to bed, and then distributed the letters himself."

In one of Anthony Hope's most recent tales, "Uncle John and the Rubies," three occurs a witty repartee which is almost too good to be left buried in a short story. The Merridews and Marstons had been separated for forty years by a family feud, which originated in a duel Colonel Merridew fought with Sir George Marston, who had charged him to his face with stealing some valuable rubies Marston had brought from India as a present from a Maharajah. Sir George got a ball in his arm. Then the Colonel sued him for slander and got a verdict for £5,000. During forty years the Marstons maintained that, in spite of the ver-

dict, Col. Merridew did steal the rubies, which, by the way, had never been found, though the Merridew house and park had been thoroughly searched. The Colonel's grand-nephew now falls in love with Sir George's grand-daughter, and a reconciliation between their parents becomes absolutely necessary before the marriage. The Vicar, who is a man of great intellectual subtlety, is called in by the grand-nephew to prepare a formula of mutual concessions that will be acceptable to both the aggrieved parents. After long and deep thought for many days, the Vicar produces the following: "Although there was no reason whatever to think that Col. Merridew stole the Maharajah's rubies, yet any gentleman may well have supposed, and had every reason for supposing, that Col. Merridew did steal the Maharajah's rubies."

"That seems er— very fair and equal," said I, after a moment's consideration.

"I think so my dear young friend," said the Vicar complacently. "I imagine that it will put an end to all trouble between your worthy father and Sir Matthew [Sir George's son]."

"I'm sure it must," I agreed.

"I have modelled it," pursued the Vicar, holding out the piece of paper before him and regarding it lovingly. "I have modelled the form of it on—"

"ON THE THIRTY-NINE ARTICLES," I suggested thoughtlessly.

"Not at all," said the Vicar sharply. "ON PARLIAMETARY APOLOGIES."

CONFESSED.

Last week the REVIEW animadverted on a gross miscarriage of justice at the late assizes. The facts were and are that on the complaint of Mr. R. L. Richardson, editor of the Tribune, Mr. Thos. A. Bell, publisher of the Nor'-Wester, had been regularly committed by the police magistrate to said court for trial for criminal libel; the case was referred to by the presiding judge, in his charge to the grand jury, as one to come before that body, yet no indictment was presented nor anything further heard of the matter.

It was current that Mr. Richardson had in the meantime arranged with Mr. Bell that, if the latter would fasten the writing of the Nor'-Wester editorial containing the alleged libel upon Mr. Beaton, he would have the proceedings against Mr. Bell dropped, although the case had already passed beyond his proper control, and was at that time in the hands of the Crown and could be interrupted in its progress only by the Crown itself, represented by the Attorney-General. It is also a fact that Mr. Bell did take steps to prove Mr. Beaton the writer, and action was instituted against him and in due course he was also committed for trial. Unlike the Bell case, this ran its regular course until thrown out by the grand jury, the prosecution failing, notwithstanding the most strenuous efforts, to establish even a prima facie case.

The REVIEW held the opinion that the action against Mr. Bell had been stopped by the Attorney-General because Mr. Richardson had intervened; in short, that the Tribune editor had sufficient influence with the Provincial department of justice to stop the machinery for the administration of justice, if it served his purpose to do so. And what have we now? A practical confession that such is the fact from Mr. Bell himself, who, of course, knows all about it. Referring to a condition of things after Mr. Bell had been committed by the magistrate to the assize court for trial, the Nor'-Wester, Mr. Bell's own paper, says: "Mr. Richardson volunteered, on hearing from other sources that Mr. Bell had not written the article or known of its publication, to drop proceedings." Drop proceedings, forsooth! Who is Mr. Richardson, to drop criminal proceedings when it suits him? Here we have a virtual acknowledgment of the truth of all that has been suggested by the REVIEW. Mr. Richardson learned "from other sources" that Mr. Bell had not written the article. What other sources? Obviously Mr. Bell had carried out his part of the arrangement that was

understood to have been made between them, and as far as he could and to the satisfaction of Mr. Richardson had placed the writing of the article on Mr. Beaton. Having done this, the Tribune editor performed his part by staying proceedings against Mr. Bell. It had become a Crown case, with the Queen as prosecutor; it had passed entirely beyond Mr. Richardson, and was within the control of the Attorney-General's department, yet this editor of a Government organ was permitted to step in and interfere with the administration of the law by having the indictment suppressed after being inscribed for hearing before the grand jury. There has been nothing more scandalous than this in connection with the courts of the Province since they were established, and it is inconceivable that the incident can be allowed to pass without notice from the Bench.

THE POLICIES OF NEWSPAPERS.

In another column we publish a letter from "Observer," in which he deals with the policies of certain newspapers. This correspondent couples us with the Winnipeg Tribune, for the purpose of complimenting us on our consistency. Were it not well known that our policy is the direct antithesis of the Tribune's, we should feel inclined to enter a protest against a compliment linking us with such questionable company.

Our correspondent is very anxious to know why a certain paper declines to endorse the policy of its party, especially as it poses as the mouthpiece of that party. Evidently, "Observer" was educated in a separate school, and is, therefore, away behind the age, or he would not have shown so much simplicity as he does in asking such a question. Why, Sir, this is an age of "progress!" By that term we do not mean progress in virtue, in religion, or in those fixed principles of right and justice without which "Observer" would, no doubt, maintain that no sound policy could be evolved. By progress we mean what men call, "business" or "commercial enterprise." Newspapers are "commercial enterprises" and it is not "business" to adopt any policy or defend any principles, however good, equitable or just they may be, if by doing so, the money producing powers of the concern are impaired. Our correspondent seems to be able to grasp this progressive idea so far as the Free Press is concerned, when he says: "The Free Press I can understand, because it is the mouthpiece of a rich corporation and lives for its interests." If our correspondent will apply the same rule of conduct to the Nor'-Wester and the Tribune, which are printed and published on strictly "progressive business" principles, and live for the purpose of making money, and thereby serving the interests of the publishers, he will have grasped the situation and found the answer he has been groping after.

In this "progressive age," when money is the great motive power, the absence of which means political, social and commercial ruin, and when the possession of great wealth opens up the road to all, or almost all, the ambitions and comforts after which the age hankers, can it be a cause for wonder that this craze for wealth has corrupted the very well-springs of human action and rendered man, as it were, the slave of the most sordid of all the human passions? Any noble and generous sentiment, every principle of right and justice, all must be brushed aside, or quietly ignored, whenever they would prevent the acquirement of money, or in any way impede the business success of the concern.

Men's success in life is measured by this standard. In the eyes of the world, there is no greater crime than that of poverty; no higher standard of success than that of wealth. That hero who will do right for right's sake, let the consequences be what they may, is a fool in the eyes of the enlightened and progressive age in which we live, and he is told to cast aside such ideas as they are only a morbid relic of the past. Herein "Observer" will find the noble exemplar upon which many newspapers, as well as other commercial enterprises, shape their policies. We may say of them what the

Hebrew prevaricators said before the Golden Calf: "These be thy gods, O Israel!" Their 'progress' is a long step backward and downward towards paganism.

CORRESPONDENCE

WINNIPEG, Nov. 15th, 1895.

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW,
DEAR SIR,—Having been a diligent reader of your paper for years, I have at the same time watched the course taken by the Winnipeg dailies, and you will permit me to do you the justice of saying that your paper and the Winnipeg Tribune are the only ones that seem to pursue a consistent policy; for, as you are no doubt aware, though a policy may be consistent without being right, yet one cannot help admiring its consistency. The Free Press I can understand, because it is the mouthpiece of a rich corporation and lives for its interests; but what about the Nor'-Wester? I was induced to subscribe for it because I was told it was the mouthpiece of the conservative party. That party announces its determination to grant remedial legislation to the minority in Manitoba, provided that the local government should persist in refusing to give the relief demanded by the constitution as interpreted by the court of last resort. Nevertheless the Nor'-Wester, which poses as the organ of the Dominion Government, is as dumb as an oyster on the school question. Can you tell me the cause of this silence?

Yours sincerely,
OBSERVER.

THE POPE AND DR. LUNN.

Last week we published the letter of the Grindelwald Conference to the Pope. This conference was composed of Anglicans, Presbyterians, Congregationalists, Baptists and Methodists, and representatives of all these signed the letter, which was a reply in kindly spirit to the Holy Father's Apostolic letter to the English people. Dr. Lunn, the president, went to the Sovereign Pontiff officially on behalf of the conference, but the Pope declined to receive him in that capacity. He returned thanks for the kindly expressions in the address, but said that while he would be glad to grant an audience to Dr. Lunn personally he could not receive him as president of the conference. No interview took place.

This action of the Pope, who so greatly desires Christian Unity, may seem strange to some, but a little reflection will show that it was a wise precaution to prevent misunderstandings and false impressions. The letter which Dr. Lunn was commissioned to deliver officially, though couched in courteous language, contained an implied denial of Papal supremacy. This supremacy, being a dogma of the Catholic Church, it is plain that the supreme head of the Church could not entertain any proposals to unity that contained expressly or implicitly a denial of this dogma. He could do nothing that could be interpreted as a submission of this dogma to debate as a doubtful or unsettled truth. There need be no doubt as to the attitude of the Catholic Church in reference to the movement toward Christian unity. As to defined doctrines she is, and must be, uncompromising. If the Catholic be not the Church of Christ, union with her is undesirable, and to be avoided rather than sought. If she be the Church of Christ, as she claims, union with her must be on her own conditions. If the dogmas defined by her as revealed be not true she has erred, and if she has erred she is not infallible, and is in no way better than the sects that very properly admit their fallibility. A union with such a fallible and erring church would not tend to Christian unity if that unity is to be, as it most certainly should be, based on revealed truth. If, on the other hand, the Church has not and cannot err in defining what is revealed truth, it belongs to her to lay down the conditions of unity. She is in matters of doctrine altogether wrong or altogether right. If the former, no one should desire union with her; if the latter, all should desire it, and on her terms. To the Catholic mind the Pope is as surely the supreme head and ruler of the Church established by our Divine Lord as Mr. Cleveland is surely the President of the United States—the former by divine commission, the latter by human commission. What could be hoped from a treaty, proposed by some foreign government, in which it was stated or implied that Mr. Cleveland is not the President of the United States? If a foreign commissioner came to Washington with such a treaty in his pocket and the President knew it, what should be his proper course of action? Should he receive such a commissioner officially and submit his title to the Presidency to be discussed by him? Such conduct on his part would be convincing evidence that he was losing his mind. Looking from