

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.

P. KLINKHAMMER,
Publisher,

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following place: Hart & McPherson's, Booksellers, 364 Main street.

ADVERTISING RATES.

Made known on application.
Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing.
Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out.
Address all communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MAY 13.

CURRENT COMMENT.

Severe But True. The Casket, of Antigonish, which has been all along one of the ablest advocates of our school rights, has

this pointed paragraph in its issue of April 30th: "In the hearing of the thousands gathered at Sohmer Park, Montreal, the other night, Mr. Laurier declared that his sympathies were all with the Catholic minority in Manitoba. It will be peculiarly comforting to the Catholic minority to learn of this, and all the more so that Mr. Laurier has so recently given in Parliament such unmistakable tokens of devotion to their cause. It is justice, not sympathy, that the minority seek. The sympathies of Pontius Pilate were all with the meek and holy One who stood before his tribunal. But that, alas! did not prevent him from delivering the "just man" over to the Jews."

The Head And Front. Speaking of Mr. Dalton McCarthy's refreshing outspokenness in his animosity against the Catholic Church, the same admirable paper says:

"Let it be borne in mind that the Manitoba school question is of Mr. McCarthy's creation—Messrs. Martin and Greenway played in perfect tune, but they were only second fiddle. Let it also be remembered that the failure to pass the Remedial Bill is due to Mr. McCarthy. He pulled the wires and Messrs Laurier & Co. jumped. Whence it will be easily understood that every vote given against the Government at the general election will be given for Mr. McCarthy."

The Casket editor likewise shows that, since, during the late session, the Government was ruled by the Opposition, which was ruled by the Third Party, which was ruled by McCarthy, Dalton alone has reason to be thoroughly satisfied with the result of the sixth session of the seventh Dominion Parliament.

The Prince Of Tricksters. If mere cunning and consummate skill in the art of subterfuge were likely to influence the electorate of Canada, Mr. Dalton McCarthy would be simply unapproachable. The Revised Hausard, just out, gives the verbatim report of a scene, March 17th, in which Dalton wins by sheer trickery. He had said to the Government: "You are to force your followers to eat dirt, if you can, and many of them will do it for a consideration," when the Speaker called him to order. Thereupon quoth Dalton: "I bow to the Speaker's ruling. He says that the followers of the Government will not eat dirt." Mr. Speaker then explained that he censured Mr. McCarthy's statement "that the supporters of the Government would do certain things for a consideration." Mr. McCarthy went on: "As to the latter part of the statement, it seems I am out of order, and I beg your pardon, Mr. Speaker, and at once withdraw the expression. The rumors, we see, are all fiction. We read the newspapers so frequently that we get imbued, perhaps, with the statements they make. I apologize for that statement. It is not true, Sir, I am

quite certain, that there are a great number of members now hanging on the skirts of the Government, demanding compensation for their vote, in the shape of office." Some honorable members: "Order, order." Mr. McCarthy: "It is not true; I say it is not true. I could give you the names; but it is not true, and I am bound not to do it." An honorable Member: "What are you talking about, then?" Mr. McCarthy: "What am I talking about? I am taking it back." Sir Charles Tupper: "I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, whether it is competent for an honorable gentleman to shelter himself by a subterfuge and a side wind, and at the same time to utter a gross libel upon the members of this House." Then, the Speaker having been appealed to by Mr. Edgar to say whether Sir Charles was in order, the latter said: "The statement I made was this, that the honorable gentleman had uttered a gross libel upon members of this House, and he has been obliged to withdraw that. What I objected to was, that by any subterfuge he should endeavor to repeat it, and to fix it upon members of the House." Mr. Speaker ruled that the word "subterfuge" was out of order. Amid several interruptions by other members, Mr. Foster pointed out most accurately that Mr. McCarthy's phrase, "I could give you the names," constituted a direct imputation, which he could not cover up by saying just afterwards, "It is not true." Whereupon Mr. Speaker said: "If the honorable member for North Simcoe meant to continue the imputation that he first uttered, by his subsequent remarks, these latter are out of order." Without deigning to offer the apology which this second summons of the Speaker called for, Mr. McCarthy replied as if he were the arbiter of the whole discussion; "Honors being easy, I do not think we will pursue this matter any further. I do not wonder that the leader of the House has got libel on the brain at the present moment." But Mr. Edgar, Mr. Laurier and other members did pursue the matter further, and called upon the Secretary of State to withdraw the words "subterfuge and libel." Sir Charles Tupper maintained that he was strictly in order in calling attention to the fact that Mr. McCarthy, "by putting his language in that hypothetical way, was continuing to impute the charge he made at first." The Speaker having ruled that Sir Charles should withdraw the word "subterfuge," the latter said: "I have no objection to substitute the word 'device' for 'subterfuge.'" Mr. Laurier asked whether that was "such language as the leader of the House should use." Mr. Speaker answered that the word subterfuge "was not a parliamentary term and is one which the leader of the House, I am quite sure, will withdraw." Some honorable Members: "Take it back." Sir Charles: "I have withdrawn it." Some honorable Members: "Take it back." Mr. Foster: "He has already withdrawn it." Finally Mr. McCarthy closed this scene of wrangling with the craft of a Machiavel and the virtuous assumption of a Puritan, although he was himself the chief offender: "Mr. Speaker," he said, "I suppose it is not unnatural that the leader of the House should claim exemption from the rule that governs the rest of us. Under the circumstances, I, for my part, am not going to enforce or insist on the honorable gentleman doing what perhaps a humbler member, guided by the ordinary principles which regulate man and man, would feel impelled to do without the dictation of the chair." And yet he, in spite of the dictation of the chair, had craftily contrived to repeat and intensify his charge, while throwing the blame on Sir Charles Tupper.

A Collective Letter. The Archbishops and Bishops of the Province of Quebec have drawn up a collective letter on the attitude of Catholic electors during the coming contest. Though the Archbishop of St. Boniface has not signed this pronouncement, His Grace is understood to have inspired it, and it

is known that the entire hierarchy of the Dominion approve it. The Faithful are urged not to vote for any candidate who does not pledge himself to support remedial legislation. This is not a question of politics but of a sacred religious duty involving the eternal interests of Catholic youth. The same principles will be found fully developed in the extracts we print on our first page from a similar letter of the Catholic hierarchy in England. True Catholics, the world over, are of one mind on this vital issue.

SIR OLIVER'S LETTER.

Sir Oliver Mowat as the head of the provincial government of Ontario has proved a great success, and we are free to confess that we have been amongst his greatest admirers. We are glad to think therefore that for at least some time to come he will remain in the position he has so long filled with such credit to himself and satisfaction to his fellow citizens, for, as his entry into Dominion politics depends upon Mr. Laurier's success at the coming elections, there is, in our opinion, little reason to fear that the Province will soon lose his services. However it is not to speculate on this point that we have referred to Sir Oliver but to allude to one passage in his recent letter to Mr. Laurier wherein he endorses the liberal leader's attitude on the school question, and professes to think that the Manitoba Government would settle the question to the satisfaction of Catholics if they were approached in the proper spirit. This only shews that Sir Oliver Mowat like many others in the east does not really appreciate the attitude which the Greenway Government assume whenever the question of restoring our rights under the constitution is brought to their attention. Sir Oliver knows how he himself, as a constitutional statesman, would settle the matter and having many times himself invoked and accepted decisions of the Privy Council cannot believe that any body of men governing a Province of the Dominion would be willing, if the matter was properly presented to them, to wilfully set the constitution at defiance, and refuse to abide by a verdict of the highest tribunal in the Empire. In this however Sir Oliver is wrong. Every method of conciliation possible has been tried with the Greenway Government, and all advances whether coming from the minority or from the Dominion authority have been bluntly and rudely repelled. Bitter experience has shewn us that we can hope for no consideration from the Government of Manitoba as at present constituted—our only relief can come from a Remedial Bill such as that introduced in the House of Commons at Ottawa; and as most of our co-religionists and friends of all denominations in the East know this perfectly well, even if Sir Oliver Mowat does not, we are quite sure that they cannot be blinded or led astray by anything to the contrary which may be said even by the respected Premier of Ontario.

THE TWO LEADERS.

We have not much to say editorially of the great speech delivered in this City on Friday evening last by Sir Charles Tupper, but as we sat in the vast audience and listened to him as he unfolded his plans for the government of the Dominion our mind went back to a former occasion when in the same hall we heard the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier lay a statement of his position before the people of Winnipeg, and we think it may not be amiss if we devote a little space to a comparison of the two gentlemen as they presented themselves to the electors here in their respective addresses. This we may the more appropriately do on account of our entire freedom from partisan bias which enables us to deal with the rival leaders without any of that prejudice which must naturally more or less warp the minds and affect the judgment of those who have in the past been connected with either of the great political parties. Judging then Sir Charles Tupper's oration from a thoroughly unbiased standpoint we have no hesitation in

saying that everyone who listened to him must, whether they agree with his conclusions or not, at least admit that he bore himself and spoke in a manner eminently befitting a great Imperial Statesman. In the course of our experience we have had the privilege of hearing most of the leading statesmen who have taken part in the public life of Great Britain during the past twenty years, and we felt on Friday evening that we had before us an orator and a statesman worthy to rank with the best of them—one who had a thorough grasp of the needs of his country, one who was well qualified to inaugurate and carry to a successful issue those vast public works and that far-seeing policy which he felt best adapted to meet those needs, and, above all, one who, having made up his mind as to what should be done, was willing to lay his intentions clearly and straightforwardly before the electors content to be judged by his past record and by his definite programme for the future. There was in the whole of Sir Charles Tupper's speech not a single note of indecision and no-one who heard him was left in the dark as to where he stands on any of the questions of the day or the policy he intends to pursue should he be supported in the coming election by a majority of the people of Canada. And what we say of the whole of his address we may add was particularly the case when he referred to the school question, and it is on this point that we especially desire to make a comparison. In our last issue we showed how Mr. Laurier spoke of this all-important matter when he was here in 1894—how, with a sneer on his lips and with a pose evidently intended to appeal to the mob, he flippantly brushed aside the claims and petitions of his co-religionists in this country and adroitly steering clear of any definite outline of the policy he would pursue sought only to leave on the minds of his hearers the impression that should he be called upon to deal with the question he would be guided by his very good friends, Messrs. Greenway, Martin, Sifton et al. In another column of this issue we give the exact words of Sir Charles Tupper on this subject and we ask our readers, especially those at a distance, to ponder them well. They must remember that the Premier was addressing an exactly similar audience to that before which Mr. Laurier spoke and with this in mind we feel sure they cannot hesitate as to which of the two leaders they can safely trust to satisfactorily settle our difficulties. On the one hand they have Sir Charles Tupper distinctly and definitely placing before the people the responsibility which devolves on the Government of protecting the minority here and of seeing that the rights of which they have been robbed are restored as far as the constitution will permit, and there was evidently no thought in his mind of choosing one speech for Winnipeg and another quite different for Quebec for had he been speaking in the most intensely Catholic portion of the Dominion he could not be more to the point or clearer than he was in Winnipeg. On the other hand our readers have Mr. Laurier's pitiful and unstatesmanlike exhibition—wherein he proved himself to be a man capable of trimming to suit the company in which he might for the time find himself and ready even to insult his co-religionists if he could thereby win the votes of the ignorant and bigotted sections of the community. The difference between the two leaders as shewn by the manner in which they presented themselves to the people of Winnipeg is so marked that he who runs may read, and there cannot be the slightest doubt as to which of them should receive the support of those who desire to see right and justice in the government of the country exalted, and double-dealing and prevarication brought low.

A DEMAGOGUE.

The Standard Directory defines a demagogue as: "An orator or leader who seeks to influence the people by pandering to their prejudices and passions: unprincipled politicians: leader of a mob." A demagogue, then, is not a patriot. He is not one who loves his

country, or one who seeks to advocate its best interests, religiously, socially, or materially. If he were, he would not appeal to their prejudices or passions. History bears ample testimony to the evils which have accrued to nations and peoples by arousing the prejudices and passions of men. We all know what such appeals beget. They destroy reason, common sense and every feeling of right and justice. They lower rational man to the level of the brute creation, by arousing in him all the baser passions of his nature. They cloud his reason, common sense and justice, by depriving him of the use of these attributes of a Christian civilization which are replaced by prejudices and passions as void of reason as an irrational brute.

In this busy, superficial, unthinking age of ours, with its vast pretensions, and its actual littleness of mental grasp, men allow others to mould their views. It is so much easier to let others think for them, that they readily abandon their individuality and their personal responsibility into the keeping of another. They forget, that in doing this, they are throwing over board the privileges and prerogatives which distinguish man from the irrational animal creation. They would get very angry, indeed, if any one told them that they received their views ready-made from others on any public question of the day; but such is the case.

The fact that the demagogue is abroad and fattening on the prejudices and passions of the people is the very strongest proof of the truth of our statement. If truth, justice, reason and calm common-sense governed the public conscience, the demagogue, whether he spoke from the pulpit, the platform or the press, would find his infamous occupation so fruitless of results that he would have to seek some more honorable and patriotic work than that of exciting, for his own selfish ends, the prejudices and the passions of the people. Where those divine attributes of man hold sway, there is no room for prejudices and passions, and consequently no field for the demagogue.

The occupation of the demagogue is so mean, selfish and debasing that few like to be called by that name. And, strange to say, the men who practise this debasing vice and who thrive most on it are the most touchy on this point. A few years ago the Lieutenant-Governor of the Northwest Territories, in a very able speech, felt called upon to warn the public against the demagogues, and although he made no personal allusions to any one, Mr. Joseph Martin took the remark as a personal affront and made an attack upon the governor from his place in the House of Commons. The theory about a guilty conscience being its own accuser cannot hold good here, for we have it upon the authority of Mr. Thomas Greenway, a political friend and colleague of Mr. Martin, that he is a man utterly without heart or conscience. What, then, could be his objection to the name of demagogue? We suppose it must be the fact that the occupation of the demagogue is considered by all respectable men, even by those who allow themselves to be swayed by him, as low, mean, and debasing. Even the hardened demagogue does not like to be branded in that way. Hence Mr. Martin's displeasure.

Let us examine into Mr. Martin's claim to this very questionable honor. What reason has he to object to the name? To Manitobans his political career is an open book. Both in the Legislature of the Province and in the Dominion House, Mr. Martin has held seats. How did he get there? By the acts of an honorable public man, or by the acts of a demagogue? Let us see. He violated his pledges of honor to the Catholic electors of St. Francois Xavier, by ruthlessly and basely betraying the men who put him in power and doing, in coldest detail, the very thing he had pledged himself not to do. Was that the conduct of a statesman or of a demagogue?

A year ago he wrote a letter to the Ottawa Citizen in which he characterized his own school act as "Rank Tyranny" on the Catholic minority, in that it