

**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 6.

**CURRENT COMMENT.**

**Ewart Vs. Wade.** A rather amusing strife of words and clash of statements is going on in the Tribune. On the 27th ult.

appeared an interesting letter from Mr. John S. Ewart criticizing Mr. Wade's recent attack upon Sir Donald A. Smith's assertion that the Manitoba legislators in 1871 "were looking to what had passed at the convention which preceded the union of Manitoba and Canada. Mr. Wade, on the other hand, traces the act 'not to the people of Red River settlement, but to Archbishop Tache, then recently returned from Rome.'" Mr. Ewart humorously twits Mr. Wade with being a victim of obsession, i. e. with being haunted by a hobgoblin, which makes him "irremediably certain that the priests are not only rogues, but intriguing designers of such consummate accomplishment, that everything short of the flight of the spheres is guided, or at least palpably affected, by their stratagems and machinations."

**An Impossible Yarn.** After characterizing Mr. Wade's account of the way the School Act of 1871 was passed as an "impossible yarn," Mr. Ewart says: "The story is, of course, absurd upon the face of it—a government playing into the hands of the Opposition, and a lieutenant-governor bribing a member to support a bill to which there is practically no opposition—but to completely end the rickety rubbish it has only to be known that the principal facts alleged are not facts at all; and that any one can to-day ascertain that for himself. . . . The Journals of the House show that the government bill was, as a matter of solemn, unalterable fact, introduced before the opposition bill. The former was bill No. 58, and the latter bill No. 60. They were introduced upon the same day within a few minutes of one another, and were both of them on that day read a first time."

**Slight Opposition.** "The Opposition leader, scornfully refusing the bribe to support the bill, swears that he opposed it to the best of his ability. The Journals show otherwise. They show that the second reading of the bill was carried without an amendment being offered, without a division, without a dissentient vote. The principle of the bill establishing separate schools was accepted by everybody. He says that upon the third reading he 'moved to have the bill sent back to the committee for further consideration and amendment, but without success.' That is true, but what were the amendments which he offered in committee? They were mere matters of detail, relating principally to the number of persons who were to form the Board of Education, and to the manner of division and appropriation of the government grant."

**Plenty Of Time.** In answer to Mr. Hay's testimony that no time was allowed to ascertain the nature of the bill, Mr. Ewart points out that Mr. Hay admits he knew the nature of the bill at least two days and probably four days prior to the second reading, and that this was surely enough in the case of a bill so short as not to fill one column of a newspaper. "It would not be possible to occupy more than ten minutes in explaining it, and, as there was no opposition to it, it required no advocacy."

**Clark Not Girard.** "Even such an unimportant detail as the name of the member who introduced the bill has undergone the transmutation that has befallen all the other facts. The gentleman's name was Clark, not Girard. . . . Put the yarn in a kaleidoscope, Mr. Wade; mix it with other alleged facts, give it a good shake, and swear the paternity again on the archbishop!"

**Anti-Climax.** Mr. Ewart concludes with this Parthian shaft: "I had almost forgotten one of the reasons given by Mr. Wade for crediting the statute to the archbishop per the lieutenant-governor. It is this: 'In the same session the act to incorporate the Archbishop of St. Boniface was introduced; also the act to establish St. Boniface College.'" But Mr. Wade forgot to mention that in the same session the Episcopal Bishop of Rupert's Land and St. John's College (Episcopal) were incorporated; and the further momentous facts that at that very identical period charters were granted to the Manitoba Brewing Co. and the Manitoba Brick and Pottery Co.!"

**Verbal Criticism.** It took Mr. Wade three whole days to concoct a reply to this castigation. About half of his answer in the Tribune is devoted to more or less clever banter about certain phrases used, in the course of the past twelve months, by Mr. Ewart. Mr. Wade, usually so independent with respect to legitimate authority, humbly accepts Dr. Taylor's pedantic condemnation of "psychological phenomenon," an expression which, from the point of view of current English, is quite as good as the common phrase so often applied to any extraordinary musician—"a musical phenomenon." Another phrase of Mr. Ewart's, many moons old by the way, which Mr. Wade says no one has had the courage to tackle is "jargogged wrongheadedness," but surely 'wrongheadedness' is an excellent word to express the quality of one who is obstinate in the wrong, and 'jargogged,' though rather archaic, means 'confused, jumbled.' We don't wonder at Mr. Wade affecting not to understand so simple a phrase as "rickety rubbish"; it sets forth so exactly the rotten foundations on which he built his theory of events. Still less are we surprised at his ignorance of the nature of "obsessions," which are too near the field of Catholic theology to come within the scope of his jaundiced vision.

**Side-Issues.** Mr. Wade then dilates upon the tardy introduction of the government bill with a view to proving that it was sprung upon the Legislature as a surprise; but he unaccountably fails to contradict Mr. Ewart's main contention that this bill met with but very slight opposition, a fact which demonstrates the real temper of the House. The previous activity of the Opposition only shows that the minority were noisier than the majority. Moreover, Mr. Wade explicitly admits "Mr. Ewart's argument that the bill which finally became law was introduced a few minutes before Mr. Norquay's bill." Lastly, his silence about the many other facts rectified by Mr. Ewart is significant.

**No More About The Archbishop.**

But the most telling omission in Mr. Wade's reply is the absence of all reference to the late Archbishop Tache's influence upon the passing of the bill. Mr. Ewart has completely silenced him upon that vital point. The only allusion Mr. Wade makes to it is the following: "In conclusion, let me repudiate the statement that I am more apprehensive of interference in politics by the Roman Catholic clergy than their conduct deserves;" in support of which general accusation he trots out Bishop Gravel and Father Lacombe, as if they had had anything to do with the School Act of 1871, or as if their interference were at all comparable to that of certain Presbyterian clergymen boasting of having influenced the first decision of the Imperial Privy Council.

**THE REVIEW AND THE PRESENT POLITICAL SITUATION.**

We have just time before going to press to state that we read with much pleasure in the last issue to hand of the Catholic Register, of Toronto, an editorial note cordially accepting the explanation we felt called upon to make a couple of weeks ago regarding the attitude of this paper in the present political crisis. In order to prevent any further misunderstanding with such an esteemed contemporary as the Register we entered into details to shew how completely free we were from partisan bias, and this is the handsome way in which our Toronto friend refers to what it recognizes as our "straightforward" explanation:—

"The Register referred to the attitude of the REVIEW after fairly considering recent articles upon the political situation in our contemporary. After a similarly fair consideration of the reply to our remarks, we have to say that the tone of that reply is what it ought to be. This is certainly a time when the editors of the Catholic Press of Canada should be above partisan politics. We are glad to see the REVIEW comes out as it does. We hope every paper in Canada with the Catholic name will do likewise."

**MR. MARTIN'S PLATFORM.**

Mr. Joseph Martin, the Liberal candidate for this city, and the very great admirer and friend of the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier, says the election here is to be fought on the school question and Liberals must vote for no candidates who are not pledged to oppose remedial legislation. He says this is a fight between the Church in Quebec and the citizens of Manitoba, and he represents Mr. Laurier as determined not to bow the knee to the hierarchy, but that forgetting his nationality and his religion he will seek only the interests of his party. We believe the time has passed when such an appeal can meet with success. Everyone now knows and realizes that this Manitoba school question is not what Mr. Martin says it is, but that in it the integrity of the constitution is at stake, and the sacred rights of minorities are involved. We know scores, we might almost say hundreds of Liberals in this city and province who are disgusted with the tactics of their leader and party in resisting the passing of the Remedial Bill, and we have great hopes that the sober common sense of the people will prevent them from being further led astray by such dangerous politicians as Mr. Martin and by such an uncertain "statesman" as Mr. Laurier. If Mr. Laurier is the pitiful, weak-kneed partisan that he is represented to be by his trusted adherent, Mr. Martin, and we believe it for we have had our own experience of the "great leader," the Liberal party is in bad hands and it will need more than its alliance with the McCarthys and the like to rescue it from the cold shades of opposition.

**A GREAT CATHOLIC STATESMAN!**

Mr. Laurier's trusted lieutenant in this province, Mr. Joseph Martin, entertains great esteem, we might almost say veneration, for his chief, and he obligingly tells us why in a speech he delivered in

this city on Thursday evening last. Here are his words as reported in the daily press:

"There was no member of Parliament but was completely satisfied with the manner in which Hon. Mr. Laurier conducted the affairs of the Liberal party. . . . Mr. Laurier was a Roman Catholic and a Frenchman; he was selected not because he was such but because he was considered the most competent man. To-day he might be the strongest man in the Province of Quebec if he would bow the knee to the Church authorities; but he declined to do so. With every respect to the Church to which he belonged, Mr. Laurier recognized that he was the head of a great party; that that party sought to place him at the head of the Canadian people; and that he must forget he is a Catholic, that he is a Frenchman, and remember that he is a trustee of the great principles which lie at the foundation of the great party which he represents."

We give this lengthy quotation for the information of those of our Ontario contemporaries who are so ready to condemn the REVIEW for the stand taken by this paper in the present political contest and who are, with an excess of zeal which seems ridiculous under the circumstances, week after week sounding the praises of the self-same Mr. Laurier whom they designate a "great Catholic statesman." "A great Catholic statesman," forsooth! Did any one ever before hear of a great Catholic statesman who would condescend to apologize for his religion, who would be ready to forget his Catholic principles to further the interests of his party; or, indeed, was there ever a great Catholic statesman, who under constitutional government found his duty to his country clash with his duty to his religion? And let it not be said that Mr. Martin misrepresents his leader, for we have, unfortunately, proof in abundance that he is speaking for once only two truly. In considering Mr. Martin's utterances it must be remembered that he is particularly well qualified to inform us as to Mr. Laurier's innermost sentiments. He is, as we have said, the trusted representative here of those interests which Mr. Laurier is said to be so devotedly serving; we have it on the authority of the official organs of the Liberal party that he is one of the pillars of that party and possesses his leader's confidence to a degree which is shared by but few politicians; and we are told by the same authorities that should Mr. Laurier be returned to power Mr. Martin will be given a portfolio in his cabinet. These are reasons enough for attaching great weight to anything Mr. Martin says regarding Mr. Laurier's feelings and opinions, but we have more than that, for the statement made on Thursday evening and quoted above is virtually a repetition of what Mr. Laurier himself told the people of this city when he spoke here during his tour through this country in 1894. Hundreds of Catholics went to that memorable meeting fervent admirers of the Liberal leader, and confident that he would justify the expectations they had formed as to his sympathy for his co-religionists in this country, his thorough appreciation of the grievous nature of their sufferings, and his determination to use his great influence to see they were given speedy justice under the constitution. We confess that we were amongst those who had formed such expectations and who went to that meeting in such a frame of mind, and we were, too, amongst those of our faith who listened with shame and indignation to that portion of this "great Catholic statesman's" remarks which touched on the school question. He said, it is true, comparatively little on this important subject, but he said nothing at all to lead us to hope for anything from him. With a sneer on his lips and with a pose evidently intended to appeal to the crowd and to catch the votes of the mob he laid down his position which amounted to this—that before making up his mind as to the justice of the Catholic claims he must have an enquiry and above all must take the ad-

vice and counsel of his Manitoba friends. And who were the friends to whom he referred? Not the leaders of Catholic thought in this country; not a single statesman or politician in whom Catholics reposed the slightest confidence; not the clergy; certainly not the Catholic people of the country—No! He knew all they had to say on the matter and was, he insinuated, somewhat bored by their repeated petitions, representations, and appeals, and he was determined now to look for information on which to base practical action to those politicians who surrounded him, to the Greenways, the Martins, the Siftons and the like, men who had not only robbed us of our schools, but added on every available occasion insult to injury by libelling us in the worst possible manner; men who in speeches, in pamphlets, in newspaper articles had lied about us and maligned our religion, our clergy, our nuns, our convents, ourselves, and all we hold dear, in a fashion which would do credit to the dirtiest "anti-popery" lecturer or scribbler. It was these men whom Mr. Laurier, in our hearing, called his friends, it was on their advice and the information they would give him that he declared he would act, when called upon to settle the school question, and this is one reason why we have no confidence in him and are ready to believe Mr. Martin knew what he was talking about when he said that Mr. Laurier would forget his religion when the interests of his party were at stake.

We do not believe that the people of Canada have any use for so-called statesmen of Mr. Laurier's stamp. We have confidence in the constitution of the country and feel positive that the people will, sooner or later, see that it is put into force. We cannot believe, therefore, that Mr. Laurier's shuffling and unmanly course on this question will commend itself to the electorate, and as we are positive that his lieutenant in this country Mr. Martin, is fighting his last political fight, and will be buried so deeply that he will never again come to the service, so do we feel that his "great leader" will be taught a lesson which will be a warning to all those who in the political life of the country may be tempted to sacrifice principles to party expediency.

**MISLEADING ISSUES.**

The Winnipeg Tribune is fearful that the school question will not be an issue at the coming general elections. It grows very wroth at the Free Press saying that the school question is a dead issue, and is bound to be settled on the lines of the judgment of the Privy Council, no matter what government comes into power. The Tribune and its friends have so long fattened upon the passions and prejudices of the people of Manitoba, that it dreads nothing more than a cessation of these debasing appeals. The school question would have been settled long ago by the Greenway government if it were not for the hopes entertained by them that it will bring about the defeat of the Dominion government. There seems to be a perfect understanding between Mr. Laurier and the Greenway government. Undoubtedly the Free Press is right when it says that the school question must be settled, but it must be settled on the broad principles of right and justice. It can never be settled on any other lines. After the elections are over and if no further political capital can be made out of a question affecting the rights, liberties and privileges of the long-suffering minority, the question will be settled on constitutional lines. In the meantime the Tribune and its friends will try to call off attention from what should be of deepest interest to the electors of Canada and picture to them the terrible dangers that lurk behind a simple question of constitutional law as interpreted by the highest Court of the Empire.

What would become of the army of unprincipled demagogues if this question were settled and done with? If there was not some cry with which to excite the electors and blind their sense of justice, disreputable candidates would