

Northwest Review.

"AD MAJOREM DEI GLORIAM."

THE ONLY CATHOLIC PAPER PUBLISHED IN ENGLISH IN NORTH-WESTERN CANADA.

VOL. XI, No. 42.

WINNIPEG, MANITOBA, WEDNESDAY, APRIL 22, 1896.

\$ 2.00 per Year.
Single Copies 5 cents.

A COMPLAINT.

Mr. N. Bawlf addressed the following letter to the Public School Board:

To the Chairman and Members of the Board of Public Schools Trustees, Winnipeg.

GENTLEMEN,—I beg most respectfully to bring the following to the attention of your board:—

Mr. Mulvey, your secretary, became a candidate for election to the provincial legislature last December, and was absent from his office in that campaign for several weeks. Apart from all other objections, I protest that Mr. Mulvey had no right to absent himself from his duties for that period of time. If it be said that he was entitled to a holiday, the manifest answer is that it did not happen during the holiday season—it was in a part of the year when the duties of his office very particularly demanded his attention.

If it be said that during his absence his duties were satisfactorily performed by someone else, and that the public did not therefore suffer, the answer at once suggests itself that this fact—if it be a fact—only proves that Mr. Mulvey's services cannot be essential to the due performance of the duties of that office.

But, then, Mr. Mulvey was engaged for the purpose of performing those duties: for that he is paid. The public who pay the salary are entitled to his services being honestly given according to his employment, and the public are wronged if by his absence someone else has to be engaged to do the work. If Mr. Mulvey himself is competent to perform the duties, he ought to be at his place for the purpose—if incompetent, he ought to be discharged.

But Mr. Mulvey has also been sitting in the house during the entire session, extending over a period of, I think, nearly six weeks. The sittings of the house, including committee work, take the greater part of the day, and frequently continue to a late hour in the night. I happen to know that Mr. Mulvey took a somewhat active part in committee work. He must, therefore, have necessarily been absent during a very great part of the session from his daily duties. His attention being necessarily absorbed by his legislative duties and the matters that are usually incident to them, he must in any event, have been wholly unfitted to perform the daily work of his office, even if he gave extra hours to it.

I protest that Mr. Mulvey was again evading the services he agreed to perform for the public, and that he has wrongfully given to other objects the time for which he is being paid by the ratepayers. He cannot properly serve two masters, and I respectfully submit that the time has come when your board should call upon him to say which he will serve. It can scarcely be held to justify your secretary that he is in receipt of an additional \$600 a year and an allowance for mileage as a legislator. But there are other circumstances which make Mr. Mulvey's offences much more grave than merely robbing the public of the time for which he is paid and neglecting the duties which he engaged to perform.

I have the most positive information that Mr. Mulvey in the course of the election campaign referred to, in his public addresses, repeatedly made statements relating to certain public matters, on which the public were divided, that were not only out of place for a man who is a public servant, but that were most obnoxious and offensive to a large portion of the community whose servant he is. I protest that a public servant is bound by the most sacred obligations to serve all sections of the community without discrimination and with equal respect. I protest that he should always guard his public utterances on questions that divide the people, so as to avoid giving offense to any section of the community by which he is paid to serve all alike.

Again, I charge that in addressing the legislature during the session, your secretary was equally offensive in some of his statements, and he was offensive also in the manner of making them. The circumstances are so notorious that I need not refer to them. It is impossible to conceive of your board justifying the secretary in making such statements. The fact that his offensive attitude was

in a measure connected with the very subject of education, as to which it is his special duty to serve all classes impartially, only intensifies the wrong in my humble judgement.

I make no apology for bringing this matter under the notice of your board. As a somewhat heavy taxpayer of this city, I have to contribute my share to pay for Mr. Mulvey's services. My taxes in Winnipeg are over \$2,000 a year, and for public schools alone they exceed \$400, nearly one-fourth of his whole salary. I know I speak for scores of other taxpayers from whom money is collected every year to pay your secretary, while he is allowed to spend his time in offensively parading opinions which are distasteful to them, and that in relation to questions of a delicate character on which public opinion is peculiarly sensitive.

Another matter I desire to mention before closing. It is known to your board that on a Friday evening a short time ago, a number of persons paraded our streets, and marched to the Government buildings in a demonstration that was intended to be, and was, offensive to a large portion of the community. I have been informed that amongst the participants in that ignoble parade was one of the teachers of the city staff. I do not affirm that this is true, and I hope it is not, at the same time the statement has been so positively made that I think it is right to bring it to your notice in order that your board may have an opportunity of investigating the facts. I am

Your obedient servant,
N. BAWLF.

If Not Why Not.

To the Editor of the Northwest.

SIR,—In reading your account of the meeting of school trustees held on Tuesday evening, I notice that no mention was made of the reading of Mr. N. Bawlf's letter addressed to the board. On enquiry I learn that it was not read at all by the secretary, among the other communications; and I am anxious to know why. No society or board would ever dream of filing an important communication, without first letting those present know its contents. Apart from the courtesy that is due to a courteous correspondent, surely no corporation elected by the ratepayers has any right to utterly disregard a communication made by an elector. Please let me know how the matter stands.

A PROTESTANT RATEPAYER.
Winnipeg, April 16.

Kick a Catholic.

To the Editor of the Northwest.

SIR,—It would seem to be rapidly coming to this pass in Winnipeg that a Catholic has no rights to be respected and no claim to courteous treatment; while, on the contrary, a premium is ready for those who go out of their way to do his feelings and sentiments violence. A case in point is the treatment received by Mr. Nicholas Bawlf's letter to the city school board. In that letter Mr. Bawlf complained that the secretary-treasurer of that board should be permitted to use his time, liberally paid for by Catholic and Protestant alike, in securing election to, and sitting in the legislature, and in doing both making himself particularly conspicuous by deportment most offensive to Roman Catholics. Mr. Bawlf also complained that another employee of the school board had (so he understood) recently been prominent in a public demonstration hurtful to Catholic feeling and sentiment. He called the attention of the school board to these matters, and, in respectful terms, asked their attention thereto. And what did the board do about it? Without a dissentient voice, a motion to file the letter was passed! Could more contemptuous treatment be accorded Mr. Bawlf himself, or his letter? Do the school board and every member of that body intend that that shall be the end of the matter? We shall see. Then as to the public press what have we from it? The Tribune suppresses the important letter entirely in its report of the proceedings of the school board; and the Free Press, in editorial comment thereupon, would not have it of much importance or very

objectionable that Major Mulvey should hold the dual position of secretary-treasurer of the school board and member of the legislature, though, with its characteristic independence (?), it finds it necessary to so far harmonize with abstract decency, and to mildly, very gently, rebuke the Major for having left himself open to attack. But not a word from the Free Press as to the treatment accorded Mr. Bawlf's letter by the school board, or of that body's apparent entire acquiescence in their secretary-treasurer's conduct. The secretary-treasurer is not responsible to the public for his shortcomings, but he is to the school board and the school board in turn to the public. I don't pretend to set the limits of Protestant toleration of insult to Catholic feelings at the present time, but of one thing I am quite sure and that is that, inasmuch as the average ratepayer recognizes that he is robbed in being compelled to assist in paying Major Mulvey a salary of \$1,500 a year for filling the office of secretary-treasurer of the school board and an assistant \$420, while he is allowed to sit in the legislature drawing therefor \$600 more, the said average ratepayer, the Free Press to the contrary notwithstanding, is decidedly averse to his holding the dual position. It is possible that many of our broad-minded people can look with perfect complacency upon the school board's insolent treatment of Catholic Mr. Bawlf, but I venture to assert that there are few indeed amongst the taxpayers not sufficiently virtuous to be indignant at the robbery referred to, especially seeing that they are the victims.

April 16.

ARGUS.

THE C. M. B. A.

Winnipeg Branches Issue a Circular on the School Question.

A copy of the following circular has been sent by the two Winnipeg branches of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association to every branch in Canada:

WINNIPEG, MAN., April 2, 1896.

TO THE PRESIDENT, OFFICERS AND MEMBERS OF BRANCH NO.

DEAR BROTHERS:—

Thoroughly believing as we do in the fraternal spirit which pervades all ranks of our noble Association, we have decided to approach our fellow members throughout the Dominion to lay before them a plain statement of the grievous persecution which we, in common with all Catholics resident in Manitoba, have been undergoing for six long years and the hopes we at present have of relief, feeling sure that we shall thereby enlist in our behalf the sympathy and support of our brothers in bringing our period of trouble to a speedy and effectual termination.

Eight years ago the future of political parties in Manitoba was hanging in the balance. A single election would decide the fate of the Ministry and decide which party should rule the destinies of the Province, and it was an election in which the Catholic vote was an important factor. Throughout the campaign the leaders of what is known here as the Greenway party lost no opportunity of pledging their honor to the electors, that if returned to power they would protect and guard all the rights then enjoyed by the Catholics in this Province, especially those affecting our Separate Schools, and thinking them to be men of honor the Catholic voters supported their candidate with the result that he was elected and Mr. Greenway became Premier. Within two years, however, for certain political reasons best known to themselves, the New Government suddenly raised the Race and Creed cry and in a most brutal manner and with every insult they could level against us and our Religion, passed an act abolishing our Separate School System, confiscating our school properties, handing them over to the Protestant School Boards, and compelling us to pay taxes to support the Protestant schools, which they made the public schools of the country. Our protests were of no avail, our petitions were unheeded, but our appeal to the Courts met with more success, for we ultimately obtained a decision from the Privy Council, the highest

court in the Empire, to the effect that we have a grievance and that the Dominion Government has a right to grant us relief, should the Local Government refuse to do so. The Local Government, knowing that their best chance of remaining in power lay in keeping up the anti-Catholic agitation, have time and again refused to give us relief, and the Dominion Government bravely taking their political lives in their hands have nobly faced their responsibilities and introduced, as you know, a Remedial Bill based on the lines of the Privy Council's decision and satisfactory to the Catholics of Manitoba. We certainly expected that this measure, satisfactory to us who are most concerned, and approved by our Archbishop, and our legal advisers, would have received the support of at least every Catholic member of the House regardless of party affiliations, but much to our surprise and regret it was the Hon. Wilfrid Laurier himself who tried to effectually kill it by moving the six months' hoist. 'It is proper here to point out that in 1894 all the Archbishops and Bishops of the Dominion presented a petition to the Governor-General-in-Council asking the Government to give just exactly the relief which the Remedial Bill contemplates. Mr. Laurier, therefore, has not only placed himself in opposition to our dearest interests, but also in direct conflict with the wishes of the entire Catholic Hierarchy of Canada, which was surely an action one might have looked for from a narrow-minded Protestant bigot, rather than from an enlightened Catholic statesman.

In this connection we have to say that it has been with great pain, not unmingled with indignation, that we have read in "The Canadian Freeman" of the 25th March a report of a speech delivered by our Grand President, Bro. O. K. Fraser, in support of a motion endorsing Mr. Laurier in which he said:—"He never had to regret or excuse the public course of Hon. Wilfrid Laurier..... He admired Mr. Laurier for his Canadianism and his success in raising superior to any attempt to play upon Race or Creed. He instanced Mr. Laurier's attitude on the School Question." We suppose that in the words "the attempt to play upon Race or Creed" Mr. Fraser referred to the constitutional agitation by which we have sought to bring our case before the people of Canada, and also to the petitions and deliverances of the Hierarchy, and it is, to say the least, humiliating to see our Grand President so far forget himself and what is due to the position he occupies. As Grand President of our noble Association, Mr. Fraser's speech will have a weight and importance it would not have had he not occupy this exalted office, and we deeply regret that he was so injudicious and thought so little of his fraternal duties to assist his brothers in Manitoba in their distress, as to rush into the political arena to defend a politician who has taken a course which to all appearances would prevent us from getting the relief we so much need. We feel that if Mr. Fraser had not the courage as a Catholic to condemn the un-Catholic stand of Mr. Laurier, he should out of sympathy for his co-religionists and fellow C. M. B. A. men in this province have observed a discreet silence, and not by any act of his for mere political reasons do anything to hamper the Dominion Government in their noble task of passing the Remedial Legislation. We desire therefore to put on record our most solemn protest against the utterances of the Grand President and his action in publicly placing himself in opposition to the Bishops of Canada, the well-known tradition of our Mother the Church, and the interests of his Brothers in Manitoba.

Allow us in conclusion to say that in thus addressing you we are actuated by no political motive. We are most of us from the older portion of the Dominion, some from Ontario, others from Quebec and the Maritime Provinces, and not a few of us have in days gone by been engaged in fighting for the Catholic cause in our old homes. Many of us have been life-long members of the party which Mr. Laurier now leads, and to such of us his action has been a cause of bitter disappointment. This is a question into which party politics cannot be allowed to enter. As Catholics our most vital interests are at stake: our future is bound up in and depends upon the fate of

the Remedial Bill; our hope for ourselves and our dear religion in this country is that the Bill may become the law of the land. We feel we need all the support and assistance we can get, and we have great confidence that in this most critical period, our good Brothers will rally to our support and by using all the influence they possess, do what they can to secure the passage of the Remedial Bill and thus help us to recover the inestimable rights of which we have been so unjustly deprived.

We have the honor to remain,
Yours fraternally,
On behalf of St. Mary's Branch No. 52.
L. O. GENEST, President,
H. A. RUSSELL, Secretary.

On behalf of the Immaculate Conception Branch No. 163.
A. PICARD, President,
P. O'BRIEN, Secretary.

In connection with the above the following letter from the spiritual adviser of Branch No. 52 was read at the meeting held on Wednesday last:
ST. MARY'S PRESBYTERY,
WINNIPEG, April 15th, 1896.

H. A. RUSSELL, Esq.,
SECRETARY BRANCH NO. 52, C. M. B. A.

DEAR SIR,—As Spiritual Adviser of your branch, I have to thank you for the stand taken by the C. M. B. A. Branches here on the School Question. I notice by the local press that Mr. Fraser, Grand President, calls your action "political" and says politics must be kept out of the C. M. B. A. affairs. Mr. Fraser, however, did not seem to realize that his conduct in endorsing Mr. Laurier's stand on the School Question, was not only political, but un-Catholic. Had it been a mere political action, no body could find fault with him for using the right enjoyed by every citizen throughout the whole Dominion; but when there was a question of religious liberty at stake, Mr. Fraser before taking the stand he did should first have abdicated the noble title which he holds of Grand President of the C. M. B. A.

To Catholics the Manitoba School Question is not a political, but a Catholic question, involving the liberty of conscience of every member of the Church. You, as good and devoted Catholics of Manitoba, who have been called upon, by conscientious convictions, to make so many sacrifices in the interests of Catholic education, deserved the highest praise for your fearless defence of a truly Catholic principle, and I cannot too highly praise you for it. I remain, gentlemen
Your devoted Pastor,
D. GUILLET, O. M. I.

OFFERINGS FOR THE CATHOLIC SCHOOLS OF MANITOBA.

Drawing of Prizes—List of the Winners.

On Wednesday March 25th, the drawing of prizes to be given those who had made offerings for the support of the Catholic Schools of Manitoba, took place in the sacristy of St. Mary's Church in the presence of a large number of citizens. The following is the list of winners:
Pony—L. H. Larche, Sherbrooke, P. Q.
Gold watch—Valerie Morin, 32 Elice St., Valleyfield, P. Q.
Gold watch—Alice Copping, 44 avenue, College of Ottawa, Ottawa.
Silver watch—Jules Beauchamp, 29 Agnes street, St. Henry of Montreal, P. Q.
Picture of Mgr. Langevin—C. F. Poulin (no address).
Silver watch—Edward Gifford, 74 Montcalm, Montreal, P. Q.
Silver watch—Arthur Tetrault, St Joachim de Shefford, P. Q.
Silver-headed cane—Dame N. P. Lapierre, Ste. Jules de Vercheres, P. Q.
Crucifix—Louise Limoges, 34 Desaberry, Montreal, P. Q.
Silver watch—Patrick Ryan, 155 Lower Water street, Halifax, N. S.
Silver mounted beads—Mrs. Molloy, 20 Florence street, Toronto, Ont.
We take advantage of this occasion to offer our sincere thanks to all who have assisted us, either by their contributions or labor, in this charitable work; and we hope and pray that God may reward them a hundred-fold for their noble efforts in the cause of justice and religion.
D. GUILLET, O. M. I.,
St. Mary's Church, Winnipeg.

Senate Reading Rm Jan 7