



"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTEREST OF ENGLISH SPEAKING CATHOLICS WEST OF TORONTO.

VOL XI, NO. 9.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 4, 1895.

{ \$ 3.00 per Year.
{ Single Copies 5 cents.

INTELLECTUAL COMBAT

Between Lawyer and Divine.

MR. EWART AND DR. CAVEN.

A Question of Moral Obligation.

IS THE PROVINCE BOUND BY TREATY?

From Toronto Globe.

WINNIPEG, Aug. 8.—(Special)—At a large meeting held in the Pavilion, Toronto, on the 11th March last, with reference to the Manitoba school case, Rev. Principal Caven, in the course of his address, said: "Much has been said of the binding nature of the act of 1870. The Manitobans of 1870 had no right to bind the Manitobans of 1895. The State was a living organism, and had no right to bind its future. Not only had the 12,000 Manitobans of 1870 no right to bind the future of the Province, but Great Britain herself had not that right. (Applause.) It was not immoral doctrine to assert that every community had a right to grow. Had those present a right to bind the people of 25 years hence? (A chorus of "No.") Each generation must make its own laws, and he trusted the doctrine that it was immoral to do so would not again be heard."

The following correspondence has taken place between Rev. Principal Caven and Mr. John S. Ewart, Q. C., with reference to the contention contained in the paragraph:—

Toronto, March 13, 1895.

MY DEAR DR. CAVEN—I enclose a clipping from the Globe, which I am informed accurately represents a part of your speech at the Pavilion last Monday.

Will you allow me to say that I think you are confusing two very different doctrines, and applying one of them (a sound one) to circumstances which the other (a very unsound one) is alone applicable to. The sound one—the one I think that you had in mind—is that in matters of mere legislation, not only cannot one generation bind another, but one Parliament cannot effectually, even as against itself, decree that its laws shall be unrepalable. Bentham, you will remember, particularly insisted upon this, holding up the ancestor fallacy to ridicule—ancestors, "whose skulls we toss about with shovels, and whose bodies only serve to give breadth to brocoli, and to aid the vernal irruption of asparagus." The other principle—the unsound one—is this, that a community cannot bind itself by agreement or promises for more than a generation. That this is not true follows from the assertion that "the State is a living organism." If it were not an organism—if it were not even in the rank of the articulate, but was a mere succession of separate and independent generations—the principle might be true. Being, as it is, an organism, it cannot be said that one generation promises or agrees for those succeeding it. The organism promises for itself, and is there to fill or repudiate its promises.

I am sure that while you will agree with Betham that Parliament, in mere matters of legislation, cannot declare its laws permanent, you will also agree with me that it would be highly immoral were the Province of Quebec to refuse to pay its 50-year debentures at maturity, on the ground that they were issued by a previous generation. Scotland, when it surrendered its own Parliament, and agreed to be represented by a small minority in a united Parliament, made various stipulations (one of which related to the freedom of the Presbyterian form of worship) as against the legislation which was to emanate from an Episcopalian Parliament. You will, I am sure, agree with me that it would have been, in the highest degree, immoral had that Parliament treated the bargain as binding only the existing generation. England recently transferred Heligoland to Germany. Are the conditions binding for a few years only? I feel satisfied that you agree with me as to both of these cases.

I think that it will now be seen that we have in the Manitoba case nothing to do with the first—the sound principle. It is not a question of Manitoba or Can-

ada repealing a mere piece of domestic legislation. It is a question of Canada's moral right to repudiate the terms of the bargain under which she acquired Manitoba. The facts of the problem are:—(1) that the territory belonged to Great Britain and not to Canada; (2) that Canada desired to annex the territory; (3) that there were about 12,000 inhabitants there, half Protestants and half Catholics; (4) that Great Britain required Canada to come to an agreement with these people before the annexation was consummated; (5) that an agreement was come to, and part of it provided that for the future the schools were to be Separate (this provision was then thought to be one which would more probably be of advantage to the Protestants than to the Roman Catholics, but that is immaterial to the problem); (6) that thereupon the agreement was put in the form of a statute which the Imperial Parliament confirmed; (7) that the clause embodying the agreement as to the schools being Separate was badly drafted, and when technically examined was held not so to provide; (8) nevertheless the existence of the agreement, and the intent to embody it in the statute are undoubted.

Now, I think you will agree with me, that, as a matter of morals, it is immaterial whether the agreement was properly transferred to writing or not; no honorable man would take advantage of a slip of a draughtsman in order to repudiate his true agreement.

And I venture to think, too that you will, upon reflection, agree with me in saying that such an agreement ought to bind Canada for more than a generation, even as England and Germany would be longer bound under the circumstances to which I have already referred.

I do not quite understand your reference to generations. I can hardly think that you mean that an agreement should bind a country for a generation, and then abruptly cease to do so. This would be something altogether new, and I think altogether arbitrary. How long, for example, would you estimate a generation to last—for 30 years, or until the youngest child then living died?

Surely the country is bound altogether, or not bound at all. Would you say then, that England, Germany and Canada could make the provisions referred to, gain advantage thereby, and immediately after, or even a generation after the consummation of the agreement, violate its terms without immorality? I am satisfied that such cannot be your opinion.

May I ask on account of the great importance of the subject that you will reply to me in such form as you would not object to have transferred to the press, in case either of us should think the correspondence had done anything towards illuminating a question which ought, if possible, to be made clear.

Yours truly,

JOHN S. EWART.

PRINCIPAL CAVEN'S REPLY.

Knox College, Toronto, March 14, 1895.

MY DEAR MR. EWART.—I regret that the many duties connected with the close of our session, do not leave me time to write any exposition or defence of what I said on Monday evening in the matter of the Manitoba schools in any shape for publication. With your exposition of principles in the communication which you have sent me I in substance agree. I take the liberty of enclosing the brief note of my Monday address that you may see that my eye was on the distinction which you properly make between treaty and legislation. (Paragraph four of notes.)

I have been so busy that I have not yet been able to read, except in part the report of your pleadings and of Mr. McCarthy's before the Privy Council of Canada. I read enough to see that you spoke with great ability and with full historical knowledge.

I may say just in a word, that in seeking to bring the situation under the sacred protection of treaty you fail, in my opinion, to take proper account of the fact that Manitoba herself wishes to be released from the conditions (so far as Separate Schools are concerned) under which she is said to have sought connection with the Dominion. There can be nothing corresponding to treaty obligations, therefore, on the part of the Dominion or of the Empire to hold her to these conditions, which were sanctioned entirely in the interest of Manitoba.

Had Scotland (to refer to the case you adduce) become Episcopalian and wished to be released from obligation to Presbyterianism, England would not have been bound to hold her to Presbyterianism.

Excuse this very hasty note. I should very deeply regret to speak or write a sentence on this question which would not be in favor both of justice and of peace.

Will you kindly return the enclosed notes, as I may have occasion to look at them again.

Very sensible of the courtesy with which you write, yours sincerely,

WM. CAVEN.

John S. Ewart, Q. C.

ILLOGICAL AND IMMORAL.

MY DEAR DR. CAVEN.—I have to thank you for your letter of the 14th inst., and am glad to find that we are substantially agreed upon the principles referred to in my previous letter.

The point which you think I overlooked is, that, as "Manitoba herself wishes to be released" from a condition under which she sought connection with the Dominion, and which was "sanctioned entirely in the interests of Manitoba," there can be no reason why she should not be released.

This argument, if you will allow me to say so, is fallacious in using the word "Manitoba" in two different senses. In the phrase "Manitoba herself wishes to be released," you mean the majority of Manitobans; but in the phrase, "sanctioned entirely in the interest of Manitoba," you mean the minority of Manitobans. I assume that the meanings which I attribute must be those you intended (although, no doubt, in the great pressure of your work you did not observe the effect) because no other meanings accord with the well-known facts. There can be no doubt that it is the majority only that desires the release; and there can be no doubt also that it was for the protection of the minority that the condition was made. If, then, we substitute these meanings for the word "Manitoba" in your sentence, we have the proposition that, as the majority wishes Manitoba to be released from a condition which was sanctioned entirely in the interest of the minority there can be no reason why Manitoba should not be released—a proposition which is transparently illogical, and, to my mind, highly immoral.

Protestants and Roman Catholics being in about equal numbers at the time of the Union, the provision made for the protection of the future minority was eminently fair. Time having placed the Catholics in the minority, the period has arrived when they as a minority have become entitled to the protection furnished by that provision, and that is the very time selected by the Protestants for an attempt to disregard the agreement. In other words, the very situation foreseen by Protestants and Roman Catholics alike, and consequently intended to be provided for, has arrived, namely, a majority desirous of imposing its ideas as to education upon the minority, and the majority, not being able to deny the agreement, seeks to cancel it. To my mind this is in the last degree immoral.

I have to apologize for the delay in sending you this reply. It was due to my journeyings to Winnipeg. I shall be very glad if you will take a similar or longer period, if necessary, for your next letter, should you think right to favor me with one, and should your engagements require it. I regard the statement in your Pavilion speech as one well calculated to have a very wide-spreading effect not only upon the question to which it was directly applied, but also upon the political conscience of Canadians. If they can be persuaded that such an agreement as the Manitoba one can be violated without immorality, the result (with the very highest and most unfeigned respect for your opinion) cannot, I believe, be other than most disastrous to the community. For this reason, and also because our positions have been taken publicly, will you allow me to urge that it is due to each of us, as well as to the public, that such explanations of our contentions as may in any way mollify or justify the divergent opinions should also be made public.

I should like to add the assurance that, whatever be the issue of our discussion, I shall not cease to regard you with

those feelings which your ability and kindness have won from all those who have the privilege of your friendship. Yours very truly,

JOHN S. EWART.

THE OPPOSITE VIEW.

Knox College, April 1, 1895.

MY DEAR MR. EWART.—Your contention as I understand it, is that the "agreement" between parties in Manitoba, which is represented in the school act of 1871, cannot be departed from by the Legislature of the Province without a breach of morality. I maintain the opposite. We do not differ on the great question as to the sacredness of treaties while their conditions hold. Nor, in this particular case, do we differ as to the power of the Dominion, under the Manitoba act, to instruct Manitoba to re-establish Separate schools, or to re-establish them itself, should Manitoba decline to do so. My position is that the agreement (as you term it) is not of such a character that either Manitoba or the Dominion is chargeable with immorality, should Manitoba alter the statute of 1871, and should the Dominion not intervene for its restoration.

No legislation of a State or Province, can be regarded as a treaty or an inviolable "agreement." Parties within a State cannot be contracting parties in the proper sense; to affirm that they can would be, I think, new doctrine. Treaties or conventions or agreements which have the characteristics of treaties are always between independent powers. If the legislation which is intended to satisfy parties in a state or to guard special interests is right in itself it should remain, but the mere fact of changing it implies no breach of contract or agreement—no immorality. If Manitoba in 1890 sees fit (from whatever reason) to abolish Separate Schools, which she established in 1871, she has broken no agreement which morality bound her to respect. She had a perfect right in 1871 to establish Separate Schools for Catholics and Protestants, and a perfect right in 1890 to change her school system. Individuals may have been guilty of bad faith in forgetting election promises (I know not), but the Province is free from blame.

The decisions of the Judicial Committee certainly rest on grounds quite inconsistent with the opinion that the act of 1871 was morally binding for all time or for any definite period, for the first decision held that the act of 1890 was *intra vires*, and the last decision does not say that the legislation of 1871 should be restored, but suggests something quite different. It is clear that if the repeal of the act of 1871 was morally wrong nothing could properly atone for this but the substantial restoration of that act.

When, in my first note, I say that "Manitoba herself wishes to be released" from conditions sanctioned entirely in the interest of Manitoba I do not use the term Manitoba in two senses and thus introduce a fallacy into my statement. In both instances by Manitoba I mean the Province as a corporate body—as a whole. No doubt both the acts referred to were supposed at the time they were passed to be in the interests of the entire Province. Your way of regarding the Province as a "minority" who entered into a compact or agreement I respectfully think leads you to wrong conclusions.

I should be greatly concerned to find that I had said anything which either directly or indirectly gives sanction to immorality; greatly concerned, also, to think that I had injured those who differ from me in their religious convictions. If it can be shown that Separate Schools are the best thing for Manitoba, or Canada, by all means let them be established, but if a system of education which declines to recognize ecclesiastical distinctions, and to bestow public money for sectarian purposes, is preferable—which is my earnest belief, surely no Province of Canada is in the predicament of being morally bound to perpetuate Separate Schools, whatever shall come to be the prevalent sentiment of its people upon that subject. If there are legal obstacles to a Province regaining its freedom of legislation the removal of these must, of course, be sought in a proper way.

I have a strong dislike to unnecessary publicity, but if you think that the interests of truth would in any way be

served by the publication of this correspondence (too hurriedly written on my part), I do not refuse permission.

Very heartily do I reciprocate the kind sentiments which you so courteously express in both your letters to me. Yours sincerely,

WM. CAVEN.

A TREATY AGREEMENT.

WINNIPEG, April 7, 1895.

MY DEAR DR. CAVEN.—I would be giving up a large part of my case did I agree to state the point in controversy in the narrow way that you have put it at the commencement of your letter.

If you will be kind enough to refer to my first letter you will find the "facts of the problem" as I understand them—facts which showed, as I think, the existence of a treaty between two parties not "within a State." In your answer of March 14th these facts were not questioned, but you suggest that there was a reason why Manitoba should be "released" from the agreement.

In your present letter you contend that there can have been no agreement or treaty, because "parties within a State cannot be contracting parties in a proper sense"—treaties and agreements are "always between independent powers." Surely you do not contend that the Ontario municipalities cannot make an agreement between themselves, or that Canada and South Africa cannot make a treaty by which each would be bound? And yet, if not, why could not Canada make an agreement with the inhabitants of a territory which formed no part of her domain, even though it belonged to the Empire—more particularly when the Imperial authorities required an agreement to be made before the union was consummated? Can it be contended that Canada could, in answer to the Imperial injunction to come to terms, enact those terms as part of a constitution for Manitoba, and in the next session alter those provisions because the contracting parties were not "independent powers"?

There was, then, I contend, a treaty or agreement. It was intended by all that this agreement should have been embodied in the Manitoba act. It was intended by this act to provide for Separate Schools in Manitoba in such a way that Manitoba would have no power to enact otherwise (Sir John A. Macdonald's testimony ought to be sufficient for this). A slip was made in the drafting and Manitoba, taking advantage of it, did otherwise enact. This, to my mind, is immoral, and these facts form the problem.

With reference to the fallacy in your former letter you object to my "regarding the Province as a majority and a minority." Permit me to say that I do not so regard the Province, but that when you used the word "Manitoba" I suggested that you must have meant to say, "in the interests of the minority." If you will look at the statute you will see that I was justified in so assuming, for the right of appeal is not given to Manitoba, but to the "minority" alone. Without this the point would be clear, for what reason could be given for the imposing a constitutional limitation in favor of a majority?

Perhaps an example will help. By the Confederation act the Province of Quebec is prohibited from changing twelve English constituencies for the Local Legislature. The Confederation Act was an agreement or treaty made by "parties within a State" in the same sense as were Canada and Rupert's Land—that is, they were both within the Empire. Now, if Quebec can find some loop-hole, do you think that she would be morally justified did she alter the boundaries of these constituencies and thus give the representation to the French? Could she fairly urge either (1) that there really was no treaty or agreement, because "parties within a State cannot be contracting parties in a proper sense"; or (2) that a province cannot be divided into a majority and a minority, and therefore, that Quebec, as a whole (which would mean the French), could properly vote itself clear of the limitation—that the provision, having been "sanctioned entirely in the interest of Quebec," there could be no reason why Quebec should not "be released from the agreement."

With reference to publication, I do not think that the correspondence, so far has Continued on page 3.

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY
WEDNESDAY
WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL
AUTHORITY.
At 184 James Street 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 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 accompanied 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, SEPTEMBER 4.

EDITORIAL COMMENT.

Mr. Ewart makes two very good points in the correspondence reproduced on our first page from the Globe. He proves that the agreement about separate schools was a real treaty, and exposes, with admirable lucidity, Dr. Caven's fallacious use of the word "Manitoba" in two opposite senses. Dr. Caven's contention, if reduced to a syllogism, would read somewhat in this way: A treaty ceases to bind when the party, in whose interest it was made, repudiates it. But Manitoba, in whose interest the school treaty was made, now repudiates it. Therefore the school treaty ceases to bind. Here the word "Manitoba" represents two different and opposite bodies: the Manitoba, "in whose interest the treaty was made" is the minority of Manitobans, whereas the Manitoba that "now repudiates" the treaty in the majority of Manitobans. Thus the syllogism contains four terms; which is contrary to the most elementary canon of logical inference. The connecting link being split in two, the chain of reasoning falls to the ground.

Were it not inexpressibly sad, it would be amusing to witness the zeal our friends on the other side display about the educational interests of Catholics, while all the time they are so neglectful of their own children right here in Winnipeg. Not half the Protestant children of this city attend any school. Start a hurdy-gurdy anywhere in the crowded streets between 9 and 12 A.M.; keep a dozen of those delightful instruments going at the same time in twelve of the thickly built districts; then count the children who will gather around the organ-grinders. We venture to predict that you will find more urchins out of than in school.

Nor is this prediction mere guesswork. It is founded upon daily observation in many parts of the city during school hours. It is also suggested as probable by the statistics we gave some two months since about the number of pupils in the Catholic and Protestant schools of Winnipeg, statistics which show that the Catholics, in proportion to their numbers, send almost twice as many children to school as the non-Catholics do. Yet we are ignorant and benighted, and they are enlightened and progressive!

Then, think what their schools cost. Mr. George Johnson, Dominion statistician, has lately shown that Manitoba expends proportionately more for public schools than any other province of the Dominion. Between 1888 and 1893 the cost per head of population has increased

in Manitoba from \$1.57 to \$2.02, while in Ontario, the great exemplar, the per capita cost has remained stationary at \$1.87. So, in spite of the fact that all the non-Catholic school children of this province had been, for three out of the five years Mr. Johnson considers, enriched by the taxes of Catholic parents without being crowded by Catholic schoolfellow's conspicuous by their absence, the national school expenditure rose more than 8 per cent. above the highest expenditure in any other province. Instead of gaining by our ill-gotten taxes, the Educational Department has been impoverished by them, just as the present government of Italy is poorer than ever after having gorged itself with the spoils of religion. A French proverb says that Papiet property is mortally indigestible: "qui mange du Pape en meurt." However, our rulers don't even make a wry face over the poison. At any other time there would be a popular revolution against the exorbitant school taxes, especially in the face of inadequate school accommodation. But now the Protestant masses are too highly worked up against Catholics to admit the terrible drain upon their purses. Put on the screws, gentlemen, you may tax to death the unthinking mob whom you have stiffened into fanaticism by your slanders. They will pay anything rather than confess that they have been duped.

Those who maintain that religious instruction may safely be relegated to the Sunday school have another difficulty to face in the dearth of the room. The Protestant Sunday schools of this city cannot hold half the Protestant children, probably not even one-third. It is admitted on all hands that the Protestant churches cannot hold more than nine thousand people. Now, the rooms used for Sunday schools are certainly much smaller than the churches, affording on an average only from one-half to one-third of the space provided in the churches themselves. Moreover, the non-Catholic children of school age in Winnipeg are, at a very moderate estimate, between eight and nine thousand. Therefore, not one half of them can find room in the Sunday schools. What becomes of the other half? What religious provision is made for them?

We have just this to say about the Free Press and its defence of its late editor: After we had shown how, under the editorship of Mr. St. John, who was nothing if not a man of details, an offensive two-column cartoon had been inserted in the centre of a contribution by the late Archbishop Tache, the manager wrote to us protesting that he made "careful inquiry and found that Mr. St. John was quite innocent of any intention to insult His Grace. He absolutely gave no directions as to the placing of the cartoon with the letter and no one connected with the paper had the slightest idea of having any significance attached" to such a strange proceeding. If this is not an apology, what is it? And, if it is an apology—which word Stormonth explains as "excuse, defence"—were we not bound in justice to publish, not the letter itself since it was "not for publication," but its purport? We had unwittingly wronged the innocent Mr. St. John in public; we were bound in conscience publicly to right that right. But, neither in our first attack nor in our subsequent explanation can an honest, fair-minded man detect what the Free Press, in its hot temper, accuses us of, viz., coarseness. We, were even very particular to say that we accepted the apology at its exact face valuation. Is it our fault if the Free Press now equivalently says that valuation is zero, since it says that it sent no apology?

The September number of the Catholic World has unusual weight and power. By far the weightiest and most momentous article that has appeared for many a month is Father Hewit's essay on the great work published last year, "Lex Mosaiica; or The Law of Moses and Higher Criticism," by Lord Arthur Hervey and fourteen other men learned in Holy Scripture. Father Hewit shows how the bubble of Higher Criticism has

effectually been pricked, so that "it is a monument of human folly that such a theory can have been received with anything but derision." Thomas O'Hagan, M. A., Ph. D., contributes a splendid review, profusely illustrated with portraits, of Canadian poets. The impression it left upon us was that Mr. O'Hagan's prose is far more suggestive and elevating than most of the verse he quotes. It is a pity that, writing for a Catholic magazine, he did not quote something Christian or even Catholic. His nearest approach thereto is a gentle rebuke to that materialistic, and therefore, contemptible versifier, William Wilfrid Campbell.

UNITED CANADA VS. WINNIPEG CATHOLICS.

Although "United Canada" is a pretentious name, it really represents all that is mean and contemptible in journalism. It is a jackal that feeds on the meanest carrion going, and when the putrid supply, for which it exists, is withdrawn, it skulks about and utters a howl of pain. In a recent issue, under the heading, "As others see us," that disgraceful sheet talks of Catholic journalism, as though it were something to buy and sell in the markets of commerce. The only part of the article that expresses a sentiment above the carrion standard has been stolen from another journal.

The Tories and Grits are an important factor in the existence of this "Catholic" journal. They are an autocratic crowd that are hard to please, and although United Canada has done its level best to please both, like the man and the ass, it has pleased neither of them enough to enable it to obtain enough of carrion to satisfy its hungry maw.

But bad as are the politicians, national, local or domestic, and much as they worry the soul—we beg pardon—the spleen of this "Catholic" (?) paper, they are by no means as troublesome as "the element which is so much more Catholic than the Pope. Winnipeg, for instance, has a fine crop of the class referred to."

Politicians are, no doubt a bad lot, and are sometimes most ungrateful, but they are generally pretty astute. Although not over particular about the company they keep, yet there is a limit to all things, and for the honor of Canadian politicians, we are glad that they draw the line at "United Canada."

"United Canada" could stand that and be fairly happy in the thought that some day or other the politicians, who, from all we hear, are not thinking seriously of raising their business standards, might come down to recognize it, in a business sense, of course; but the one bar to United Canada's happiness and prosperity is those Winnipeg Catholics, who are more Catholic than the Pope. For years United Canada was a disgrace to the very name of Catholic and the English speaking Catholics of Ottawa were deeply humiliated at the very sight of it. If it ever had a decent editorial, it was stolen from some other journal and palmed off as original. Its orthography, etymology and syntax were as bad as its theology, and its principles never got higher than "pap." At last its insanity reached a climax when it took the "corporal" of the Greenway government under its wing and published an interview which was both infamously false and coarsely insulting to the Catholics of Winnipeg. These Winnipeg Catholics, who declined to be lied about and insulted in the columns of United Canada, made their protest heard all over the country, and the exposure brought well merited infamy on that unspeakable rag.

The Catholics of Winnipeg made their protest so effective that United Canada is still reeling under the blow it then received. More than that, the Winnipeg Catholics were the direct cause of goading the deeply humiliated Irish Catholics of Ottawa into starting a newspaper which can fittingly represent their views, and which, instead of being a source of deep humiliation and disgrace to a refined and sensitive people, who, by nature and grace, are refined in feeling and sensitive of their honor, will

prove a source of just and, we trust, asting pride.

This is something which Winnipeg Catholics have done for Ottawa, and, although we could scarcely expect our co-religionists of the Capital, than whom it would be difficult to find more worthy representatives of our creed, to stand forth of their own accord and acknowledge the elevating influence which Catholic sentiment in Winnipeg has had upon them; yet, now that United Canada has feigned to sneer at us, we trust they will graciously acknowledge the debt they owe us.

Of course, Winnipeg Catholics could not bestow such a great favor on their co-religionists of the Federal Capital without earning the enmity of United Canada. But we can easily rest under its displeasure; we rather deem it an honor.

MR. SIFTON'S LETTER.

The Greenway Government have done so many shady and dishonest things in their treatment of the Catholic minority, that, when any explanations are asked of them, they are forced to lie outright, or to tell half the truth, which is equivalent to lying. A Mr. Macdonald, of Mount Dennis, we are told by the Toronto despatches, wrote to our pious and godfearing Attorney General, asking if the government of Manitoba had "seized \$15,000, the money set apart for (Catholic) school purposes, and applied such moneys for Protestant school maintenance, etc." Here is Mr. Sifton's reply:

"The sum of money mentioned has been accumulated by the late Roman Catholic section of the board of education by retaining a certain amount out of the annual grants, and when or soon after the change of government took place, both the moneys of the Protestant section and Roman Catholic section of the board of education were taken into the direct control of the treasury department of the government the sum above mentioned was paid over and dealt with as other school moneys. Perhaps it would be well to point out that the transaction referred to occurred before the school act of 1890 was passed, and had nothing to do with the change in the school system of this province, which subsequently took place. There is no connection between the two subjects, and the charge has been made by our opponents, simply to prejudice the discussion of the school question."

This is Mr. Clifford Sifton's way of lying about as shameless and disreputable a transaction as was ever perpetrated on the minority in this province. Mr. Sifton told half the truth and shielded the local government, but at a sacrifice which no honest man would be guilty of, the sacrifice of truth, honor and honesty. Let us tell the whole truth for the benefit of Mr. Macdonald and all others whom it may interest. For purposes of convenience and economy in the management of the affairs of the two sections of the Board of Education a clause was introduced, by the legislature of the province, into the school act, allowing both the Protestant and Catholic sections to reserve a portion of the government grant each year, to form a reserve fund, in order to meet certain legitimate expenses. Such reservation was to be confined within a certain percentage of the government grant. Both sections of the Board availed themselves of this privilege, and at one time the Protestant section had thousands of dollars in this fund. At the time the Greenway government came into power, the amount which the Catholic section had placed in reserve amounted to something under \$14,000, while the Protestants had none, having expended theirs some time previously. The local government asked that the Catholic section transfer this amount over to them, and when they demurred, the government assured them that they only asked it to be paid over as a matter of form, as they were adopting some new method of dealing with school funds, and promised the Catholic section, who alone had a right to the administration of these moneys, that they would return it again to them. The Catholic section of the Board of Education, believing that they were dealing with honest, honorable, truthful and reliable men, handed over the money. The government, when asked for its return,

as promised, made plausible excuses for retaining it until they passed the school act of 1890, by which the Catholic custodians of this money were legislated out of existence. Thus, by a low contemptible piece of business duplicity, which the sharpest Jew peddler, on lower Main street, would scorn to work off on a poor gentile, these "gentlemen" defrauded the Catholics out of a reserve fund which the school laws of the province gave them full power to accumulate and administer. These are the facts, Mr. Macdonald; this the whole truth, the sickening gentleman who wrote this letter to the contrary notwithstanding. When he says that the government, soon after it came into power, took over the moneys of the Protestant and Catholic sections, he stated a half-truth again. The Protestant section had no reserve fund to hand over, and by wording his letter in such phraseology, Mr. Sifton seeks to mislead his correspondent by implying that what was done to the Catholics was also done to the Protestants. This is both mean and misleading, as well as unfair, but is only what might be expected from a government capable of such an act of spoliation.

The very tricky attorney general says: "the sum above mentioned was paid over and dealt with as other school moneys." It was paid over on the distinct promise that it would be returned to its custodians. The government violated their promise and never paid it back. Although the Catholic Board was not abolished for a considerable time after they paid this money over to the government, and although they asked it to be returned to them as promised, the government never returned it. If, therefore, it was dealt with as other school moneys, if it was ever expended for educational purposes, it must have been in the interests of the Protestant schools. Why, then, did not the attorney general honestly answer Mr. Macdonald's question, and say "The government obtained this money from the Catholic section of the Board of Education under false promises, and then refused to return it. We dealt with it as we did with all other moneys of the Catholics, we paid it over to the Protestant schools which for appearance sake we call public schools. We did not seize it. They gave it to us and we kept it, and appropriated it to our own purposes." That would have been honest and truthful, and Mr. Macdonald would not have been left to believe that the Catholics were not robbed and deluded by his friends, the Manitoba government.

Mr. Sifton says this charge has been made by the opponents of the government simply to prejudice the discussion of the school question. Indeed! This charge, standing alone, should be sufficient to brand the government as a pack of imprincipled rascals, without any reference whatever to the school question itself. But poor honest and religious Mr. Sifton blaudly informs his friend, Mr. Macdonald, that that little harmless transaction was aside altogether from the school question "and the charge has been made by our opponents, simply to prejudice the discussion of the school question." What terrible fellows, these opponents of the government are! The school question, with all its details of basest treachery, violated promises, broken pledges and deepest duplicity, this innocent and harmless school question is sought to be prejudiced, by the opponents of the government by charging it with another equally treacherous act of spoliation! Was there ever a more wicked combination in this world of wickedness than these opponents of the good, the truthful, the honorable and the great Mr. Sifton. For shame! For shame!

Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills remove all obstructions, purify and give to the skin that beautiful clear and healthy look so truly admired in a beautiful woman. At certain periods these Pills are an indispensable companion. From one to four should be taken each day, until relief is restored. A few doses occasionally will keep the system so healthy, and the blood so pure, that diseases cannot enter the body. Dr. Morse's Indian Root Pills are sold by all medicine dealers.

ALBERT EVANS
281 Main Street.
Agent for Steinway, Chickering and Nordheimer Pianos. Cheapest House in the trade for Sheet Music, Strings, etc. Pianos tuned.

