

ARCHBISHOP TACHE'S REPLY.

A PLAIN AND STRAIGHTFORWARD STATEMENT.

All Mr. Tarte's Points of Attack Completely Covered—The Pledge of the Government and of Hon. Mr. Chapleau Explained—The Alleged Pastoral Letter—A Crushing Answer to the Political Firebrand.

Mr. J. Israel Tarte, M.P.:

SIR,—The journal *L'Electeur* in its issues of the 5th and 6th instant, contains two letters that you address to me, because "there is between us a misunderstanding with regard to the interpretation of certain incidents which preceded the elections of 1891." Being anxious myself to explain the misunderstanding, I will answer your letters, but this answer, will be the last step, on my part, on this subject.

You say: "I think I have some reason to be surprised that Your Lordship thought proper to delay so long the declarations just published, some of them but a few days before the convention of the 20th June, and the last in a letter to my address and dated the 28th of the same month."

After explaining very clearly the cause of the delay in the correspondence, His Grace continues.

As for my letter addressed to you, if it appeared about four months after you had spoken in the House of Commons, that is due to the fact that I had, at first, no intention of writing, and would have kept silent if your provocations and challenges had not been so often reiterated. On the 21st of June last you repeated what you had so often stated before, and you added: "I challenge Archbishop Tache to deny." You evidently then believed that it was still time for me to accept your challenge. I have done so, and wrote immediately. I merely answered what you had said against me, quoting your own words, denying only what was inexact in your statements, and adding "that I would not question your good faith, and I would prefer to think that you acted from conviction."

In your two last letters you express doubts on certain points that you previously affirmed in a most positive manner; you ask even for more information. I will try to satisfy you. "I will endeavor (as you say of yourself) to express myself with all the clearness that I can find in my determination to say the truth without reticence and without afterthought."

Having pointed out how Mr. Tarte made public use of a letter marked private the Archbishop says:—

I wrote this: Sir: "Sir John Thompson pledged himself officially and publicly." Everyone knows that: the report of Sir John Thompson, dated 21st March, 1892, is an official document; it came under my knowledge, but after it had been given to the public; my correspondent knew of that document as well as myself, and I was certain that he would fully understand the significance of my words. The same sentence of my letter contained, moreover, the following words: "Others did it privately but solemnly." My nephew was also in a position to understand this, and, surely, he never thought more than I did, that such words meant that I had received assurances in the name of the Government.

THE PRIVATE PLEDGES.

In that connection you tell me: "Give to the country the names of all those who pledged themselves to you privately but solemnly."

Did it not, sir, occur to your mind that such a demand is rather extraordinary on your part? Do you really believe that I am in any way bound to give to the public the names of the members of Parliament, of the senators, of the journalists and other friends who visited me in Montreal during two months, and who pledged themselves to help the minority of Manitoba in their difficulties about their schools? As there is no reason to place all these names before the public, I decline to gratify your curiosity. The matter is so much the less necessary that the full list would not satisfy you, because it would contain but one single member of the Federal Cabinet, whose name you already know; it is that of the Hon. Mr. Chapleau.

Precisely, here we are. Yes, here we are and what do you wish to know? Mr.

Chapleau was a member of the Federal Government! Undoubtedly he was, but under what law is a member of the Federal Government forbidden to speak to me or under which am I forbidden to answer him? But, Mr. Chapleau was secretary of state in Sir John Macdonald's government. Yes, he was, and I knew it. Then he negotiated in the name of Sir John Macdonald, that is to say, in the name of his government. Not at all, Sir, and here lies the error, under which you speak. Mr. Chapleau positively declared to me that he was not talking in the name nor with the authority of the Premier; that he was merely visiting me in his own personal name, that his words were not binding on anyone but himself. His visit was not official, but private, as well as that of the friend who accompanied him.

Regarding the Pastoral letter His Grace replies to Mr. Tarte:—

It is evident that you have no idea of what you are forcing upon me in so speaking. Well, sir, I must tell you that the pastoral letter alluded to, and of which so much has been said, never existed, at least to my knowledge. I, for one, though you have insinuated that I was its author, never saw that letter. I never heard of it from any of the bishops or from anyone authorized to speak in their name.

Please notice that I wish to be understood. This supposed pastoral letter and my supposed negotiations with the Government are the two sources from which flow all the errors, which have caused the misunderstanding I endeavor to explain. I have already denied in the most formal and explicit manner the existence of negotiations between the Government and myself, I now deny in a manner as formal and explicit the existence or essay of a pastoral letter, which their lordships the bishops were to sign before the elections. I know nothing of such a document as far, at least, as the bishops are concerned.

As yourself, as many others, I have heard of that imaginary letter; people spoke and wrote to me about it. Some thought it would be a good thing if it were published; others, on the contrary, considered its publication as dangerous. It was spoken of in Montreal, Quebec, Ottawa and elsewhere, but you know, sir, that a false affirmation does not become true by its repetition, even in the midst of electoral excitement. I am not astonished that you have believed in the existence of the alleged document, but for my part I have yet to learn that the idea of such a letter ever entered the mind of any Canadian bishop, without excepting your humble servant. You see thereby that it is very easy for me to answer your question:—"How is it that the pastoral letter in question was not read nor signed?" It was not read because it did not exist and it was not signed for the same reason. Such pastoral was never written. Naturally, you would object to my saying and state that a letter was written, that it was seen, that it was read, as the Rev. Father Gendreau mentions the fact in his communication to Le Canada on the 24th May, 1893. Yes, sir, the affirmation of the Rev. Father leaves no room for a doubt of the fact that someone has written a letter stating that it was to be signed by the bishops. I confess that I was greatly astonished on learning in 1893 that things had gone so far in 1891, and that without the knowledge or consent of the alleged authors of such a production. I may repeat, sir, that I am entirely ignorant, if the Canadian bishops ever thought of the letter attributed to them and to be published before the elections of 1891.

The only collective letter of the bishops in 1891 is the one which was published after the elections, and which, consequently, cannot have been written or published to influence the electors. The confusion of things went so far that I have heard people affirming that the supposed pastoral letter was identical with the petition addressed by the Canadian episcopacy to the Governor-General in Council.

YOUR PROVOCATIONS.

Towards the end of your letter of the 5th July you say:—"I did not provoke, nor did I calumniate you. . . . I have merely accused the ministers who deceived you. . . . I regret that you consider as directed against yourself the blows that I give to men who care nothing in this affair of the schools but to avoid the responsibility which falls upon them and make a shield of your episcopal robe."

I have no mission, nor desire to argue

with you nor anybody else in defence of the ministers, that is their affair; but allow me to add that I naturally consider my own defence as my own affair. Your memory serves you badly when you say that the "blows" I speak of were intended for others. Here are some instances of the way you have avoided hitting at me, and I leave you to be judge. On the floor of the House you have said: "Monsieur Tache has come forward in the question of the schools of Manitoba. . . . it is not the best thing he has done for his own reputation. . . . if the deceptions we have experienced are brought against his episcopal prestige, he will suffer considerably in history. Monsieur Tache, as the other bishops are not sufficiently equipped." Then, in *L'Electeur*, of the 18th May last, you wrote: "The old Archbishop, sick, tired, harassed, easily became the prey and the victim of the Cabinet, in whose name Mr. Chapleau applied to him. His excessive confidence has compromised the cause, which could then have been safeguarded."

It is evident that such "blows" are not absolutely fatal, but it is still more evident that they were directed against me, and I am surprised that you denied it after having promised to be sincere.

In regard to the Amnesty question Mgr. Tache says:—

Should anyone desire to know the part I have taken, in these painful circumstances, they may find it in three documents, which I take the liberty to indicate: The first is a pamphlet I published in the beginning of 1874 and which is entitled, "The Amnesty;" the second is the report of the Select committee, appointed by the House of Commons in Ottawa, during the session of 1874, to enquire into the causes of the Red River troubles; the third document is another pamphlet which I published in 1875, and which bears the title of "The Amnesty Again." (On being asked, I will send the two pamphlets.)

THE CONSTITUTION AND THE SCHOOLS.

You speak of the policy I have pursued with regard to the question of the schools, but as you do not define it with full clearness and truth, you will pardon me if I give my own version. I am convinced that the Catholics of Manitoba have an unquestionable right to their schools; that such right is not based on mere promise, but on the very constitution of the country. I consider that in urging that such right be respected, we do not apply for any favor, but merely and simply for an act of justice. I am, moreover, persuaded that those in power are in duty bound to protect us. It is on account of such convictions that I have signed all the petitions or official demands, addressed to the Governor-General-in-council. Our first petitions were drawn when Sir John Macdonald was premier of Canada; they would have been the same in tone and form if the Hon. Mr. Laurier had been in power. Other petitions on the subject were formulated under the successor of Sir John Macdonald, the very same thing would have been done and in the same manner if Mr. Dalton McCarthy had been at the head of the administration. We appeal to the executive as a body, because I believe that each of its members is bound by his oath of office to render us justice, the members of the Privy Council are obliged to safeguard the Constitution and to protect the minorities.

What could I expect from the promise of any member, if the body itself does not care for its obligations? My policy in that matter has not been therefore to seek for secret promises that you wrongly believe I have received and accepted. I am so entirely persuaded of the right of Catholics in this matter that I have said in the letter of mine which you published, and I now repeat:—"The constitution is violated; if no remedy is provided the federal power will have to its account a new iniquity and a new shame." I will add, moreover, that the same iniquity and shame will be shared by all those who, under one pretext or another, will render more difficult the granting of the justice we claim.

Such, sir, is the policy I have pursued, and I repeat once more: "I have made no concession and have accepted no compromise. I have not given assent to any delay or to any special mode of action. I have asked for justice and that is all. If you would take the trouble to read again all the petitions, to which I have attached my name, you would have a complete knowledge of my relations with the federal Government, on the question of the schools of Manitoba.

After an appeal on behalf of the schools the letter closed thus:

May the above explanations dissipate the misunderstanding which existed, and help you to fulfil the public and solemn promise you made to your electors, to work for the Catholic schools of Manitoba.

Your obedient servant,

† ALEX.,

Arch. of St. Boniface, O.M.I. St. Boniface, July 13, 1893.

INDIA AND CEYLON.

Native Clergy.

His Grace the Archbishop of Madras lately conferred the Holy Order of the Priesthood on the Rev. Camburo Chin-napah Reddy, Deacon from the Nellore Ecclesiastical Seminary. Several priests in and about Madras and some from the interior were present at the solemn ceremony of the imposition of hands. Mr. Chin-napah Reddy is a nephew of the Rev. Father Balana Nader, who is himself the first *Teluga* native priest ordained in this archdiocese.—*Illustrated Catholic Missions.*

CENTRAL AMERICA.

The Great Day at Belize.

April 16th, 1893, is a day the like of which has never been seen by the Catholics of British Honduras, and in all likelihood never will be seen there again. We have already narrated the generous and courageous efforts made by the zealous efforts of this plucky little colony to secure a bishop for themselves, and the success of their efforts. The Holy See having elevated the colony from a Prefecture to a Vicariate Apostolic, the next step was the consecration as bishop of the Prefect of Right Rev. Salvatore de Pietro, S.J. Three prelates from the United States, viz., Bishop Becker, of Savannah; Bishop Ileslin, of Natchez, and Bishop O'Sullivan, of Mobile, after a three days voyage, reached Belize from New Orleans on April 9. The consecrating bishop was the Bishop of Savannah, and the sermon was preached by the Bishop of Mobile. Space does not permit us to detail the many festivities, religious as well as civil, which accompanied the joyous event, and of which a full account is given in a festive number of the Belize Angelus. The new Bishop of Euels, Vicar Apostolic of British Honduras, is a native of Palermo, where he was born in 1830, and went out to Belize in 1869.—*Ad multos Annos.—Illustrated Catholic Missions.*

The Pope's Choir at Chicago.

A dispatch from Rome says that the Pope has given his consent to the proposal that Maestro Mustafa, director of the Sistine Chapel, and members of the choir should visit Chicago and sing there during the progress of the exposition. This will be the first time that the choir as a choir will have sung outside the Holy City.

At the time of the Papal splendors of the Renaissance the schools of music to which the Palestrinas gave their name created a class of simple but majestic religious music, the traditions of which have been preserved intact by the choir of the Sistine Chapel. While this famous choir no longer, according to some detractors, is up to the standard that Pius IX. insisted upon its possessing, still, as one of the many wonders of the Eternal City, it is proper to hear, in the Sistine Chapel or in the Pope's private oratory, this wonderful quartet of four male voices, which range from most masculine basso to the most feminine of soprano.

As for the musical traditions preserved by the Sistine choir, it is in these that are to be found, mediæval though they are, the origin of all our modern music, not only of the compositions of Verdi and the great Italian composers of our day, but also of Gounod, who more than once has acknowledged his indebtedness to Palestrina, whom he always holds up as the great fountain head of religious composition, and of French masters of today, of the English and German oratorio, and symphony composers, even of Wagner, and the so-called music of the future.

THE RACE TO THE SWIFT: "Did you run for office the other day?" asked Spriggins of a defeated candidate. "No," said the candidate sadly; "I walked. The other fellow ran."