

The True Witness

AND CATHOLIC CHRONICLE,
PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY
The True Witness Printing & Publishing Co.
(LIMITED)
333 St. James Street, Montreal, Canada
P. O. Box 1138.

MS. and all other communications intended for publication or notice, should be addressed to the Editor, and all business and other communications to the Managing Director, *True Witness P. & P. Co., Ltd.*, P. O. Box 1138.

Discontinuance.—Remember that the publishers must be notified by letter when a subscriber wishes his paper stopped. All arrears must be paid.

Returning your paper will not enable us to discontinue it, as we cannot find your name on our books unless your post office address is given.

The date shows your name on the margin of your paper about you up to what time your subscription is paid.

We recognize the friends of *THE TRUE WITNESS* by the prompt manner in which they pay their subscriptions.

Always give the name of the post office to which your paper sent. Your name cannot be found on our books unless this is done.

When you wish your address changed, write us in time, giving your old address as well as your new one.

If you fail to receive your paper regularly, notify us at once by letter or postal.

WEDNESDAY.....JANUARY 6, 1897

ARCHBISHOP FABRE.

It is with profound regret, in which all our readers will share, that we have to record in this issue of the *True Witness* the death of His Grace the Most Reverend E. Fabre, first Archbishop of Montreal. Although it has been known for some time that he was suffering from an illness that left little prospect of long survival, and that for weeks past His Grace's death has been daily awaited by anxious physicians and attendants, the news of the Archbishop's death will not the less be a shock to the thousands in and beyond the limits of his great diocese and the ecclesiastical province of which it forms part.

For so happily did the face and form and manner of the deceased prelate disguise the approaches of age, and so admirable was his success in hiding his pain from his people's eyes by a characteristic charm of demeanor, that, until his actual danger was announced, few beyond his immediate circle dreamed that his condition was so serious. To the thousands of His Grace's own province and of the rest of Canada who had the privilege of knowing Archbishop Fabre, the fact of his death, even with the warnings that preceded it, will have come as a certain surprise. His Grace was universally loved and revered by the faithful of the Church in which he was an able administrator. He enjoyed the esteem of the non-Catholic community to a degree of which during his illness we had some striking evidences. His Grace's reputation among the Doctors and leaders of the Church was high and far-reaching.

The year of his episcopate called for the exercise of peculiar gifts and it is the essential merit of Archbishop Fabre's administration that he had just the qualities which the situation to which he succeeded on his saintly predecessor's demise especially required. If we were to seek a single term which would present the main character of Archbishop Fabre's service to the Church and to his people, we should not be far wrong, we believe, if we were to fix upon that of Peace-maker. *Beati pacifici*, were Christ's words, and they are not the least of the Beatitudes, *quoniam filii Dei Vocantur*. To heal the wounds inflicted by thoughtless faction, under the guise, perhaps, of zeal, is no trivial task. There are always those who magnify molehills into mountains, and when such zealots create dissensions that might with discretion have been avoided and give needless offence to others as devoted to God's cause as themselves, it is no slight advantage for a diocese or province to be ruled by one who, though firm as a rock, where dogma is concerned, knows the power of the soft answer—the *suaviter in modo*.

There were many delicate questions to be adjusted when the late Archbishop received charge of the diocese twenty years ago. Some of our readers can no doubt recall some of the controversies that preceded Mr. Fabre's accession. Some of them were grave enough; others were grave only through the exaggerations and inconsistencies that were made to aggravate them. But even if the utmost harmony always prevailed, the archdiocese of Montreal is sufficient to engross all the energies of the most vigorous chief pastor.

In the number of the clergy (575 priests alone) it surpasses any other diocese in North America. Had not the late Archbishop put his whole soul into

the task and exerted all the strength of his mind and body, he could not have been equal to such a jurisdiction as fell to his archiepiscopal care. His hopeful nature also did much in overcoming difficulties. The Cathedral question, the Laval University problem, and what may be called the aftermath of the parochial boundaries question, were among the responsibilities of his administration.

The first especially furnished opportunity for the display of the Archbishop's wisdom, patience and diplomatic tact. It was all the more delicate from its relation to our most ancient See, but His Grace felt that Montreal had claims which her importance and population justified. Though wholly internal, the Cathedral question, owing to severe financial distress and other causes, was no less crucial.

In the supervision of the churches of his See, Mr. Fabre insisted on a stately and ornate service, so far as the provision in each case rendered it possible. In his own functions, His Grace was exemplary in his attention to ceremonial detail. Those who have seen His Grace in the great act of worship have not forgotten the solemnity, the majesty, the beauty, that he imparted thereto. For him the feeling that the Lord was in His holy temple was accompanied by a sense of the tremendous debt of homage that mortals incurred in the Divine presence. In the high places of the Church—even in Rome itself—Archbishop Fabre was regarded as an authority on ritual second to none.

During His Grace's rule several new orders, such as the Redemptorists, the Franciscans, the Fathers of the Blessed Sacrament and others were introduced to the diocese and added to its religious activities.

His Grace was a model prelate in the breadth of sympathy with which he acknowledged and encouraged all who gave their hearts and lives to the performance of good will. His memory for faces was remarkable and it was stimulated by his desire to know something by personal experience concerning the persons with whom he was brought in contact. He was most methodical in the discharge of his daily tasks and was thus enabled to dispose of a mass of work which would have driven an un-systematic prelate to despair.

His name was well known in Montreal generations before he was born. There are so few still living who can remember when Mr. E. R. Fabre, the Archbishop's respected father, sat in the seat of civic supremacy. He was mayor in 1849 and 1850. Just then his distinguished son was admitted to the priesthood and began his clerical career as curé of Sorel. In the following year, M. Fabre was sent to Pointe Claire and in 1854 he joined the staff of the Palace. In 1855 he was created a canon. Eighteen years of diligent priestly life, in close relations with Bishop Bourget, ensued. Then in March, 1873, he was consecrated Bishop of Gratianopolis. Three years later, on Bishop Bourget's resignation, His Lordship succeeded him as Bishop of Montreal, and ten years afterwards, on the creation of the new ecclesiastical province, His Grace was advanced to the archiepiscopate.

SENSATIONAL JOURNALISM.

That the timely remarks of the Rev. Father McCallen, S. S., which we recently published in our columns, on the subject of sensational journalism, had a local as well as a general application, shown by a long report which appeared in an evening contemporary a few days ago under the flaring double-column heading of a "Scandalous Revelation." The report describes a sickening immoral orgy in which a number of wealthy New Yorkers indulged in a Fifth Avenue restaurant recently. The details given must have shocked the moral sentiments of every decent reader of that paper. Their publication was nothing short of an outrage on public decency, and certainly calls for the passing of a law, if one does not already exist, making such offences severely punishable. The readers of the paper, however, have it in their power to inflict a punishment themselves. They can decline to allow such newspapers to enter their households.

GREENWAY AT THE CLUB CANADIEN.

Those who organized that quiet little reception to Premier Greenway at the Club Canadien in this city have placed themselves in a humiliating position. Mr. Greenway has shown himself to be the implacable foe of their language and their religion, to which they have hitherto shown themselves to be deeply attached, and for which their forefathers have made sacrifices even of their lives. It is not a question of politics. It is a question of religion, which has nothing to do with politics. The most charitable construction which can be placed upon the conduct of the members of Le Club Canadien is that, carried away by an excess of political enthusiasm, they knew not what they were doing.

REMOVE THE GRIEVANCE!

In his eloquent speech delivered at the banquet given in his honor in this city on the 30th ult., Mr. Laurier has made an elaborate attempt to justify his so-called settlement of the Manitoba school question. He has professed loyalty to the church of his fathers and of his baptism, and has counselled the young men of his party to imitate his example in that respect. But, while his words are those of conciliation, it cannot be truly said that his arguments have successfully shown his policy to be in harmony with them.

At an early stage in his address he, indeed, admitted that his policy was in conflict with the ecclesiastical authorities.

He professes to revere those authorities but he rejects their conclusions on a question with which, if with any, it is their function and right to deal *ex auctoritate*—the question of Catholic education.

He tries to excuse his inconsistency by pretending that the point at issue is a political problem. In the highest sense it certainly is so, for the political includes the social, and in the education of the young the interests of society are profoundly concerned.

If the Catholic Bishops have not a right to be heard as to the training of the young people of their flocks, it would be difficult to believe that they have any claim to authority that Catholics are obliged to respect.

The position, indeed, involves an absurdity. Their primary commission is to teach all nations, and to deny their right of intervention in Catholic education is to question the validity of that commission.

Mr. Laurier indicates the extent of the difference between the views of their lordships and those of the government when he points out that where the latter is satisfied with certain slight concessions, the Bishops lay claim to nothing short of separate schools. This claim they put forward, not only as implying the restoration of a right wrongfully withdrawn and withheld, but as having the sanction of the highest tribunal of the Empire.

Again, he has the questionable taste to mix up the conclusions of their lordships with the views of a political party. He then cites the *Semaine Religieuse* to the effect that the school to which the Catholics of Manitoba are entitled is a Catholic school. They want the control of their schools; they want Catholic school districts, Catholic school books, Catholic teachers and exemption from taxes for schools of which they cannot conscientiously avail themselves. Not only do they deem their demand reasonable, but it is the only demand concurred in which will satisfy them and inspire their minds with a sense of being justly treated. They claim, moreover, that such a system of schools is their right, not morally merely and as Catholics, but legally, according to the decision of the highest tribunal in the Empire.

Mr. Laurier quotes a part of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, in order to give the impression that the concessions obtained from the Manitoba Government comprised all the justice that the judgment deemed the minority entitled to. "All legitimate grounds of complaint would be removed if that system [the system created by the Acts of 1890] were supplemented by provisions which would remove the grievance upon which the appeal is founded, and were modified, so far as might be necessary, to give effect to these provisions." Now, if we turn to another portion of the judgment, we shall find what, in the Judicial Committee's opinion, that grievance consists in. "Contrast the position of the Roman Catholics prior and subsequent to the Acts from which they appealed. Before these passed into law, there existed denominational schools, of which the control and management were in the hands of Roman Catholics, who could select the books to be used and determine the character of the religious teaching. These schools received their proportionate share of the money contributed for school purposes out of the general taxation of the province, and the money raised for those purposes by local assessment was, so far as it fell upon Catholics, applied only towards the support of Catholic Schools. What was the position of the Catholic minority under the Act of 1890?" And the judgment having answered its own question in clear and forcible terms adds this comment: "In view of that comparison it did not seem possible to say that the rights and privileges of the Roman Catholic minority in relation to education which existed prior to 1890 had not been affected."

Now, in the name of common sense as well as justice, what, from the point of view of these contrasted situations, does the judgment mean by suggesting the enactment of "provisions which would remove the grievance on which the appeal was founded?" Had Mr. Laurier quoted the preceding portion of the judgment to which "the words that he reproduced referred, his hearers would have known what he was so anxious to hold back from them and their minds

would have been impervious to his sophistry—sophistry unworthy of a statesman. Let any one, by whatever political views he may choose to be called, only read the judgment and compare it with Mr. Laurier's speech, and he will not hesitate long in deciding whether La Semaine Religieuse or the Premier is right.

A TEMPEST IN A TEAPOT.

The handful of lukewarm and vacillating Catholics in Montreal who are ever ready to seize on any pretext that presents itself for showing their lack of loyalty to their bishops when their Lordships make a pronouncement on public questions affecting the interests of religion, who make up for the paucity of their number by the loudness of their voices, are trying to make the people believe that a terrible tempest, fraught with direful havoc, has been raised by the action of the Bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec in condemning *L'Electeur*.

This is how Mr. Tarte's organ, *Le Cultivateur*, pretends to view it, in an article entitled "A Grave Incident." "It is not necessary for us to say how very much we regret the painful crisis upon which the country is entering. . . . The history of the world furnishes the story of more than one storm as grave as that into which we are about to enter."

La Patrie and *Le Signal* fume and fret and rage over this "storm on which we are entering," and talk portentously of "war to the knife," against the coming onslaught of the elements.

The anti-Catholic fanatics of Ontario, of whom the Toronto Globe has long been the chief mouthpiece, and who eagerly avail themselves of every opportunity to foment religious strife, have not been slow in taking up this "grave incident," and endeavoring to turn it to factious account. They are talking, through the editorial columns of the Globe, of the "crass obstinacy, perversity and tyranny" of the Catholic Hierarchy of Quebec, and of the rising tempest which is going to "complete the destruction of the influence over the people of Quebec."

In a subsequent article the Globe's bitter anti-Catholic spirit breaks out in a new form. It warns the Catholics of Canada against supporting Archbishop Langevin and the Quebec bishops in the "struggle" which is imminent, and tells them that if they extend support and sympathy to these prelates, "whose ideas are at least two centuries old," that the people of "Ontario and the West"—that is, the anti-Catholic fanatics of those regions—will rise in their might and annihilate them in some manner which it does not particularize.

In the name of common sense, what is this terrible tempest with which this little clique of Montreal Catholics of doubtful orthodoxy, and their anti-Catholic allies of the Globe stripe, are to affright us? Whence is it coming? "Old Probs" of the Toronto Meteorologist bureau, has not yet told us anything about it, and he knows more about such things than these alarmists. After carefully scanning the horizon, we confess that we see no sign of it.

Mandements similar to those in which the Bishops of the ecclesiastical province of Quebec have, in the discharge of their duty, warned their flocks against perils to their spiritual welfare, have been issued before, and have effected their object as successfully as has their latest one. These are subjects which concern only loyal Catholics and the religious guides whom they love and revere and obey.

It is useless as well as ridiculous to keep on trying to make a mole hill appear to have the dimensions of a mountain. The "storm" with which it is sought to frighten us is simply a tempest in a teapot.

THE GRAND OLD MAN.

In the chorus of felicitations which has been evoked, wherever the English tongue is spoken, by the celebration by Mr. Gladstone of his eighty-seventh birthday, *THE TRUE WITNESS* heartily joins. Mr. Gladstone's claim to be recognized as the greatest British statesman of the age will be disputed by none expect a few narrow-minded politicians who are incapable of realizing the noble purposes which have motivated the splendid efforts that mark his long and illustrious career. To Irish Catholics, especially, he has endeared himself by many acts of justice and generosity. It was he who appointed a Catholic to the office of Governor-General of India, the highest salaried post in the gift of a British premier. It was he who repealed the law forbidding a Catholic to be either Lord Chancellor or Lord-Lieutenant of Ireland or Lord Chancellor of England. It was he who appointed an Irish Catholic to be Lord Chief Justice of England. And, last but not least, it was he who secured the adoption of a Home Rule bill through the British House of Commons. That he may live to see that bill become an "Act" of Parliament—a measure of justice with

which he himself has stated that it was his desire to crown his lengthy public career—is a prayer and a hope in which we feel sure that all our readers will cordially unite.

THE LATE HON. THOMAS MCGREEVY.

All self-respecting and honorable journals and public men take care to practise scrupulously the time honored maxim, "*De mortuis nil nisi bonum*," when they refer to a public man who has just been called to his account in the next world. In its lengthy notice of the death of the Hon. Thomas McGreevy, the *Daily Witness* of this city violates that charitable principle.

Few, however, will be surprised at this. That Mr. McGreevy was an Irish Catholic was sufficient to excite the venomous instincts of the *Daily Witness*. Had Mr. McGreevy been a Methodist—or, for that matter, had he been anything else but an Irish Catholic—it would have thrown the cloak of Christian silence over the frailties which, either in private or in public life, had shown simply that, like other men, he had had his faults as well as his virtues.

But since Mr. McGreevy was an Irish Catholic the *Daily Witness*, happily isolated in its malignant recrimination, instead of allowing the grave to cover his faults, has pursued him even to his tomb.

This is a sample—a fair sample—of the malevolent spirit in which the *Daily Witness* discusses Irish and Catholic matters generally, sometimes with cynical frankness, as in this instance, and sometimes by suggestion and hint and innuendo, but always on the same consistently bigoted principle.

BEWARE!

A correspondent complains of what he calls "an insidious attempt at proselytism," under the guise of teaching history. He encloses in illustration of the truth of his charge some cards, with pictures on one side of scenes supposed to be historic, and on the other side a short account of the scene depicted. These cards are, it seems, enclosed in packages of tobacco manufactured by a Montreal firm. Whether they are deliberate attempts to shake the faith of the purchasers or merely chosen through lack of judgment, we cannot say. We are inclined to take the latter view. Unless we saw a good many of these cards we could hardly be certain that they were intended to inspire hostility to the Church. They are more sensational than distinctly partisan, but they are not the less surely anti-Catholic.

Our correspondent is justified in using the term "insidious" if the Montreal manufacturer selected them after examination and with a clear knowledge of their contents and tendency. They are in French and the author's name is affixed to those that have been submitted to us. Possibly they were imported from France, and being sold by the gross or hundred gross were taken in trust, lively illustrations of some historic scenes being the main desiderata. By this time, however, one might suppose that some of the Catholic friends of the manufacturer would have let him know the sort of literature he was engaged in distributing. At any rate the matter deserves the attention of the clergy. We will give the address of the firm to any inquirer who is concerned in putting a stop to the diffusion of such pictures.

A REASONABLE LETTER.

In a letter which our readers will find in the present issue, the Rev. Father Marion, of Douglas, Ont., has given an admirable exposition of the school controversy in the stage that it has attained.

He has shown the futility of all attempts to be at the same time Catholic and secularist in the matter of education.

He has exposed the hollowness of pretending to be loyal to the Church while siding with the Church's enemies.

Father Marion condemns those who have forced the school question into the domain of politics, from which it is entirely alien, and points out that they are mistaken if they suppose that by distributing a few timely words of eulogy to the Bishops of the Church in Canada they will be able to effect a compromise that will both satisfy their consciences and pass muster with the spiritual guides to whom they profess allegiance.

The anxiety that some of these vacillating politicians have shown to conciliate the Bishops while retaining the good will of their Lordships' enemies, evinces some vestiges of disposition, perhaps, to repent of their wrongdoing. But there is one way to make such repentance valid, and that is the renunciation of the wrong.

In another column we have ventured to make some comments on Mr. Laurier's great speech. The letter of Father Marion applies as much to the Premier, as to his colleagues. Every word of it is worthy of study. Father Marion pronounces the settlement valueless and so do we. It is indefensible.

OUR ATTITUDE.

The *True Witness* is not a political organ, as a few individuals, for reasons only known to themselves, sometimes insinuate.

It is neither Conservative nor Liberal. It is a champion of Catholic rights, an exponent of Catholic principles.

When these are attacked it speaks out frankly and fearlessly, no matter to which party the aggressors belong.

We condemn the so-called settlement of the Manitoba school question because it infringes Catholic rights and violates Catholic principles, and not because it happens to be the work of men who belong to a certain political party.

We place Catholic principles far above political preferences.

THE APOSTATE.

From time to time during the last few months extraordinary accounts of the Apostate Father Chiniquy and his proceedings in the Old Country find their way into the papers. According to one of these paragraphs, he lectured not long since before the Scottish Reformation Society of Edinburgh, his theme being the doctrine and policy of the Church of Rome. He repeated his familiar slanders about the attitude of the Church to the Bible. "The Church of Rome," said the Apostate, "did all she could to make Protestants believe they respected the Bible, but 'it was a sealed book to her priesthood.'" Now it so happens that in Mr. Chiniquy's own career there is a most striking refutation of this abominable lie.

In the year 1851, nearly half a century ago, or to speak accurately, just 36 years ago this very month, the Rev. Father Chiniquy, who had not yet abandoned the faith of his fathers, had a controversy with a certain Protestant minister named Roussy at St. Marie, a record of which has been preserved (for a committee had been appointed for the purpose of taking notes of the proceedings), and in 1893 an English version of it was printed at the office of this paper.

There could not be a more damning instance of a man being judged and condemned out of his own mouth than this simple report of what took place when Mr. Chiniquy was a priest in fair repute and still loyal to his Mother the Church.

On that occasion the Church's advocate said, in replying to the Church's opponent, that of all the false, absurd and childish tales with which the so-called reformed countries abound, and with which Protestant ministers try to alarm and prejudice the minds of their people against the true church, there is none more lying and more mischievous than the figment that Catholics are the enemies of the Word of God. "Who," he asked, "preserved intact the sacred trust of the Holy Scriptures during the fifteen hundred years preceding the appearance of the lewd apostates, Luther and Calvin, if it was not the Catholic Church?"

He went on to shew that from the invention of printing to the beginning of the so-called Reformation—during that brief interval alone—from seventy-five to eighty editions of the Bible had been translated into the different languages of Europe, forming a total of some 200,000 copies distributed by the Church's authority among the people of Christendom.

"Let Protestants," said the future apostate, "make the tour of Europe and America; let them go into the numerous Catholic bookstores—let them go to Montreal, to Mr. Fabre's or to Mr. Sadlier's, and every where they will find on their shelves thousands of Bibles in all modern languages, printed with the permission of the ecclesiastical authorities."

Not less feeling was Mr. Chiniquy's refutation of Mr. Roussy's other arguments against Catholicity. When at last he asked him to produce a text from the Bible in proof of the inspiration of St. Mark's or St. Luke's Gospel, the Protestant controversialist had to surrender unconditionally and to admit that but for the Church there would be neither the text of Holy Scripture nor any evidence whatever that it was what it was claimed to be—the inspired Word of God Himself.

And this is the same Chiniquy to whom English and Scotch Protestants listen entranced, as he casts slurs and imputations on the Mother from whom he received his earliest nourishment, and to whose communion and priesthood he has proved a traitor.

For more than forty years he has been devoting his wicked energies to the diffusion of lies, to which, in Canada, not even respectable Protestants will listen, and which have hardly had any influence on the mass of his compatriots in this province. A mere handful, mostly exotic, in the harvest of all that fierce and bitter proselytism of the arch-apostate and his helpers!

For what, then, has a man who was once the champion of the Church's doctrines made himself a spectacle to angels and men? Is there any apostate more sad than that of an apostate priest?