

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

London, Saturday, March 17, 1894.

THE TOLEDO A. P. A. TROUBLE.

It has already been mentioned in our columns that the secret plottings of the A. P. A. of Toledo, Ohio, had been carried so far that complaint had been made to the Government of the United States against the association, the charge being that they were engaged in a conspiracy against the Catholic population of the city to deprive them of their rights as American citizens.

Under the laws by which all citizens are equal, it was believed that sufficient evidence would be brought forward to prove the association guilty of conspiracy, and prominent Protestants, equally with Catholics, showed themselves in earnest in the prosecution, which was directed, however, only against the leaders of the movement.

The enquiry made into this matter has developed some facts as unexpected as they are astounding, and fully bearing out the charge of a most dangerous conspiracy, not merely against the liberties and rights, but even against the lives of Catholics.

It has been discovered that the members of the A. P. A., to the number of three thousand, were ordered last September to arm themselves with Winchester rifles, the most deadly weapons known in modern warfare, at an expense of nearly \$60,000; and the rifles were actually purchased.

The fanaticism of the Apostats was worked to the highest pitch by an absurd story that the Pope had ordered the Catholics of the United States to massacre the Protestants, and this army of three thousand men was organized for the purpose of waging war upon an imaginary foe.

The Toledo Commercial, the most influential paper of the city, says:

"Was there ever a more sublime exhibition of ridiculousness? Was ever wild fanaticism carried to a more dangerous extent? The world is having the laugh on Toledo, but to our own people the remarkable and startling revelations coming to light have a far more serious aspect. They have a fearful significance. Here was this army, organized in secret, armed with the most deadly weapons, ready for war. The evidence shows that there was wild excitement. The fanaticism of the members had been wrought up to a pitch bordering on insanity. We not only have this evidence from witnesses in the case, and from interviews with members of the A. P. A., but the fact that they deemed it necessary to spend vast sums of money for arms and ammunition indicates the truth of all that has been said. The evidence shows, and the facts indicate a delirium of fanaticism that was liable to burst forth at any moment. And had it burst forth, what then? Where would it have ended? What awful consequences may have been involved before its fury could be checked? The check turned pale at the thought of the mine of dynamite over which we have been treading, that needed but a match to touch it off; a chance word spoken here or there, an altercation between a Catholic and an A. P. A. that might lead to a fight."

The pretence on which these preparations were made was the bogus encyclical letter pretended by A. P. A. journals to have been issued by Pope Leo XIII. to the Catholics ordering them to arm themselves for the extermination of the Protestants. This supposed encyclical, which was also published in the P. P. A. journals of Canada, was in reality an invention of the A. P. A., and on this ground a civil war of extermination was threatened.

It has been proved that the Mayor of Toledo, who is the head of the A. P. A. in that city, and chief of the police commissioners, was at the head of this insane movement, which might have deluged Toledo in blood.

The full particulars of this diabolical plot were revealed owing to a suit at law entered by Mr. A. J. Rummel against a Mr. Ostrander, Treasurer of the association, for \$250, the price of ten guns, of which he knew nothing. Mr. Rummel claims that, although these guns were not delivered to Mr. Ostrander, yet they formed part of the contract. Mr. Ostrander desired the other members of the committee to be joined with him

as defendants, but the judge overruled his application, and the other members are found to be inclined to leave the Treasurer in the lurch. The consequence of this is that Mr. Ostrander demands that the case be tried before a jury, as he does not wish to be held personally responsible. This course gives great dissatisfaction to the A. P. Aists, as the details of the intended warlike campaign are likely to become public. There is much ill feeling displayed over the matter between the parties embroiled in it, and it is likely to result in one good thing, the break up of the association in Toledo, the more especially as the presiding officer is said to be arrogant and domineering as well as profane, so that he has become intolerable to many of the members. According to the Toledo Evening News, one gentleman who was recently discussing a matter in a way which did not meet the approval of the autocrat, was ordered to sit down, but he replied angrily:

"I shall speak my sentiments in spite of you. I came into this order to secure free speech—to fight Popes, and not to make new ones. I am not in it for politics and the spoils of office, and if we are to have supreme bosses—Popes—in this order, I want to know it. If we must endure them I would just as leave live under the Pope of Rome as under you. He knows more than you do."

Similar sentiments to these are widespread in the order, so that it seems very likely that the Toledo branch will be slain by its own Winchester rifles.

CHRISTIAN REUNION AND MINISTRIAL SUCCESSION.

Dr. Perowne, the Anglican Bishop of Worcester, England, read recently at St. John's College a paper on "Reunion," meaning thereby the reunion into one body of the sects which now divide Christendom. He says that "the longing for reunion among the various sections of the Church of Christ is evidenced by the attempts being made by the Presbyterians and Methodists to draw nearer together. The desire was also evidenced by the conference of Bishops at Lambeth in 1888."

He asks: "How is it that the overtures of the Bishops have produced no result?" The answer he gives to his own question is that "non-Conformists require the recognition of their churches as true churches, and of their ministers as truly ordained. Can these points be conceded to them?" In considering the answer to this question he declares that on account of their foreign missions, and the army of martyrs they have furnished, he would not dare say that their churches are not churches at all, that their ministers are not truly ordained, and that their sacraments are invalid.

According to his belief episcopacy has apostolic sanction, but he thinks also that there should be a larger and truer union than any afforded by external organization.

We can appreciate the good nature which dictates the utterance of such views, but good nature is not the sole requisite to theological accuracy, and in this the Right Reverend Doctor fails egregiously. He declares that episcopacy has apostolic sanction, and thus far he reiterates the decision of the Bishops at Lambeth. On what grounds, then, can any human assemblage decide against episcopal ordination as an essential quality in the Christian ministry? Is there any scriptural foundation for the hypothesis that an apostolic requirement for ordination can be dispensed with, and in its place such other qualities as human wit devices be substituted?

Under the Old Law the manner of succession to the priesthood and the duties pertaining to the various families of the Levites were most carefully defined, and it was strictly prohibited that "others by any curiosity" should even touch or see the things that were in the sanctuary before being duly wrapped up as commanded by God. (Num. iv. 15, 20.) Those who schismatically assumed the priestly office, not being appointed thereto by Almighty God, even though they were of the tribe of Levi, were condemned to death (xvi. 30, 33).

Under the New Law we are told also that "neither doth any man take the honor to himself, but he that is called by God as Aaron was. So Christ also did not glorify Himself that He might be made a high priest; but He that said unto him: Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee. As He said also in another place: Thou art a priest forever according to the order of Melchisedech." (Heb. v. 4, 6.) The rite of ordination was therefore practiced by the Apostles, who, by prayer and the imposition of hands, selected

and authorized those who were to fulfil the duties of the deaconship and priesthood. (Acts vi. 6. xiv. 22.) By what authority, then, can Bishop Perowne declare that the fact of usurpation alone on the part of foreign missionaries, or even the shedding of their blood on the part of some of them, should change the whole institution of the Christian ministry, and constitute as "truly ordained ministers" the whole body of those who have unduly taken to themselves this honor?

A more preposterous contention than this cannot be imagined. What St. Paul says of the necessity of charity is true also of the divine institution of the Christian ministry, and as "if I should deliver my body to be burned and have not charity it profiteth me nothing" (1 Cor. xiii. 3); so also the ministry which comes not from the Apostles by lawful succession is no ministry whatsoever, nor can any qualities invented by men take the place of that succession. This is so self-evident that we cannot imagine that apostolic succession would have ever been denied by any body of professing Christians to be an essential of the ministry, if they had not been aware that their ministry did not possess it, and that there was no means of supplying the deficiency, except by a return to the one fold which has undeniably retained that succession.

The Church of England positively declares the need of apostolic succession when in its ordinal it proclaims the necessity of episcopal ordination, and the decision of the Bishops at Lambeth, referred to by Dr. Perowne, shows that to the present day that necessity is asserted, whereas it is plainly set forth that only on the condition of their submitting to it can the non-Conformists be negotiated with for the purpose of union with the Anglican church. For this reason also the Anglicans strenuously maintain that they have preserved that succession through their first Bishops, having received episcopal consecration from some of the Catholic Bishops who preceded them in the days of Queen Elizabeth; though history and theology give no countenance to this claim.

The Presbyterians and Methodists also, conscious as they are that any claim on their part to apostolic succession cannot be maintained, have instituted a form of ordination which they have made requisite for admission to the ministry, thus virtually acknowledging that a succession of some kind is a necessity. In fact there are only a few obscure sects, such as the Quakers, Independents, etc., which do not require a succession of some sort. We must infer, therefore, that Dr. Perowne's readiness to admit the non-Conformists' claim to be part of the true Church, and to have a true Christian ministry, merely arises out of a desire to set up some semblance of unity among Protestant sects, as an offset against the unity of doctrine and government which exists and has always existed in the Catholic Church. We can scarcely attribute the whole of his anxiety to good nature merely, when we consider that he leaves entirely out of the question the Catholic Church, which comprises within its fold the vast majority of Christians, and the Oriental Schismatics, who are nearly half of the remainder.

It is needless to add that such a fictitious unity can never constitute the one fold under one shepherd into which Christ declares all His sheep must be brought. Dr. Perowne's error apparently consists in this, that he imagines that Christ established many churches, and therefore he speaks of Christian and true churches in the plural number, whereas Christ speaks of one only, against which the gates of hell shall not prevail.

THE OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL ELECTION.

For years it has been the delight of the Toronto Mail to represent the proceedings of the Separate School Boards, especially of the large cities of the Province, as being in turmoil and confusion, and since January last it has devoted itself especially to the magnifying of a difficulty which occurred regarding the election of a French Separate school trustee for Rideau ward, Ottawa.

Contested Public school elections are by no means an unusual occurrence, and no one imagines that such an event, when it does occur, is an evidence that education is an evil, or that the school system ought to be entirely overthrown on account of the liveliness with which such contests are occasionally carried on.

With the Separate schools the case is

somewhat different. On most occasions there is scarcely a contest at all, and even when there are two candidates for a trustee's office, the matter is settled in a few minutes, almost always without a poll being demanded. Indeed, we have often wished that somewhat more liveliness would characterize elections, as this would show that the Catholic people take a real interest in them and in the proper management of the schools. It seems, however, that there is a confidence among them that the schools will be well managed at all events, and they do not desire to disturb the harmony which exists generally in the Catholic school sections on educational matters. Perhaps, too, this view of the case is the correct one, for the returns semi-annually made to the Educational Department by the Separate school trustees are not only, as a rule, promptly made, but are also models of neatness and accuracy, showing that the schools are well conducted.

But the Mail has a constituency that delights in reading highly-colored accounts of Catholic school matters, so that they may persuade themselves that disorder and confusion dire prevails in them. It is, therefore, the task which the Mail has laid down for itself to perform, to emblazon before its little world of readers all the petty difficulties which occur in any of the Catholic school sections, and frequently those which do not occur at all.

Last January there was one of these small troubles at the Ottawa Separate school election. Mr. Solomon Leveille was elected trustee by a majority of one over Mr. J. A. Frigon, and the election was protested.

Mr. Leveille for some reason best known to himself resigned his seat; perhaps partly because he was not anxious for the position, and partly because it would be both less troublesome and less expensive to trust to another election than to contest his seat in the Courts. The Mail's House-that-Jack-built story, which has been published over and over again, is that Mr. Leveille "owed his election in January last to the exercise of undue clerical influence, and when legal action was taken to have his election voided, he resigned because the ecclesiastical authorities shrank from the publicity of a court."

At all events, Mr. Leveille had confidence that he would be elected a second time if he presented himself, which he did on the 6th inst., with the result that he received 27 votes, and his opponent, Mr. J. Martel, 20. The total number of votes in the ward, exclusively of those of the two candidates, is 53, so that Mr. Leveille had an absolute majority, and we are informed by the Ottawa Free Press that the election will not be protested this time.

The Mail informs us that the issue at stake between the two candidates was the question of the ballot at Separate school elections. If such is the case, it is rather unfortunate for the Mail's contention that the Separate school supporters are anxiously seeking for the ballot, inasmuch as not only on the present occasion, but at every election where the issue was the same, the agitators for the ballot have been completely buried under the avalanche of votes recorded against them. The Mail explains this by saying that Mr. Martel "had a strong force working against him." We do not doubt this at all. It is usually the case in keenly fought contests that the unsuccessful candidate has "a strong force against him." And we are told that the strong force consisted of "Chairman Lavoie, of the Separate School Board, and Trustees Latour, Prevost and Seguin," who came from their own wards and devoted the whole day to the work of getting in votes for his opponent."

Was all this a very great crime, then? But we remark that there is one element of the strong force which the Mail overlooks in this enumeration—the absolute majority of the electorate of the ward. This element no amount of canvassing could have overcome. The Mail consoles itself, however, by stating that "the supporters of Mr. Martel declare that if Mr. Frigon had been the candidate instead of Mr. Martel, he would have been elected. They say that they had an actual majority of the 55 voters in the ward pledged to vote for Mr. Martel, and that if the voting had been by secret ballot, Mr. Martel would have carried the election."

We are free to believe as much as we please of this gratuitous assertion. We are told, however, that two ladies who voted for Mr. Frigon in January were counted on to vote for Mr. Martel, but that influences were brought to bear which made them vote for his opponent, on account of which

Mr. Martel's supporters are particularly sore.

Of course it is easy to divine what the influences were to which the Mail refers. It means "the undue influence of the clergy" already referred to. The Ottawa Free Press, however, which is an authority quite as truthful as the Mail, asserts that "both Mr. Moffette and Mr. Frigon acknowledge that the clergy had not interfered in the election." While we take note of this fact we must at the same time remark that the clergy feel a deep interest in the welfare of the schools, and they have both a moral and a legal right to use their influence in favor of the best candidates for the trusteeship; and if they had used that right in the Ottawa election it is not to be taken for granted, without further proof, as the Mail has done, that they have used "undue influence."

GLADSTONE'S RESIGNATION.

The retirement of Mr. Gladstone from his position as the leader of the British Government at the age of eighty-four years, after having been in Parliament almost constantly during a period of sixty-two years, during at least forty-two of which he has been recognized as the principal force in British politics, is an event which, of course, creates a great sensation, not only in Great Britain, but throughout the civilized world.

Eighteen years ago Mr. Gladstone gave up the leadership of the Liberal party; and as he was then sixty-six years of age, it might well have been thought that his retirement was for life; but the event proved otherwise, for though he steadily refused for several years to become the nominal leader of the party, he naturally came to the front whenever any important measure was brought forward, until, in 1880, after a general election secured, mainly through his energy, a decisive victory for the Liberals, he was again compelled by the voice of his party and of the nation to resume the command of the Liberal forces in name, as he had it in fact, notwithstanding his desire to leave the brunt of the political battle to younger men.

Mr. Gladstone is known to the present generation only as the great leader of Liberalism, and this position he has filled, not merely as a politician, but as a statesman.

It sounds like a piece of ancient mythology to speak of him as having ever entertained other than Liberal views, yet he himself declared in a speech delivered in 1878, at the organization of the Reform Club which bore the name of Lord Palmerston:

"I must admit that I did not learn at Oxford that which I have since learned, to set a due value upon the imperishable principles of human liberty. The temper, which, I think, too much prevailed in academic circles was that liberty, regarded with jealousy and fear, could not be wholly dispensed with. I think the policy of the Liberal party is trust in the people, only qualified with prudence: that of the Conservative party is jealousy of liberty and of the people. I have learned to set the true value upon human liberty."

Mr. Gladstone was first elected to Parliament for Newark, in 1832, and he took his seat for the first time in 1833, on the Opposition or Tory side of the House, under the leadership of Sir Robert Peel, who was supported by a compact body of followers. During the period while he followed Sir Robert Peel's lead he voted against many of the measures which he was destined to carry out afterwards to a successful issue. Thus he then opposed the motion asserting the right of Parliament to apply to the use of the State the property of the Anglican Church in Ireland, and other Reform measures.

He took office as Vice-President of the Board of Trade and Master of the Mint in 1841, and was sworn in as a member of the Privy Council, under the ministry of Sir Robert Peel. In 1852 he incurred the rooted displeasure of the Tory party by his opposition to Mr. Disraeli's budget; and in 1853 he became Chancellor of the Exchequer in the Coalition Government of Lord Aberdeen, but not until 1859 did he definitely become a member of the Whig or Liberal party.

In 1865 he became leader of the Liberals in the House of Commons in the Ministry of Lord John Russell, on the death of Lord Palmerston; and between November 1868 and February 1874, many great measures of Reform were passed, Mr. Gladstone being then Prime Minister. It was during this period that the Irish Church was disestablished, the tenure of land in Ireland was made more equitable, religious tests in the universities were abolished, the franchise was extended,

and voting by ballot established. At the end of this period Mr. Disraeli was called to the office of Prime Minister, and soon after Mr. Gladstone resigned the leadership of his party, which, as already stated, he resumed in 1880.

In 1881 fixity of tenure was granted to the tenantry of Ireland, and their rights to the soil recognized. Thus began a new era for the people of Ireland, but not until 1886 was their right to Home Rule adopted as a plank in the Ministerial policy. Mr. Gladstone's Home Rule Bill presented to Parliament in that year was defeated by the defection of the Liberal-Unionists under Lord Hartington, and the general election which followed resulted in the return of Lord Salisbury to power with a majority of one hundred and twenty. During the six years of Lord Salisbury's regime his majority gradually declined chiefly by the loss of seats at the by-elections, until in 1892 through the general election which could not be put off any longer, Mr. Gladstone was again returned to power with a majority of 40, in spite of the combined efforts of Conservatives and the seceding Liberal-Unionists.

The principal issue before the electorate between 1886 and 1892 was the question of Home Rule for Ireland, and the new Parliament at once took into consideration the preparation of a Home Rule Bill which would prove satisfactory to the Irish people. The Bill was passed by the normal Government majority, and it is still fresh in the memory of our readers how it was defeated by the House of Lords by the unprecedented majority of 412.

The disposition of the Lords to thwart the will of the people seems to have been sharpened by their success in delaying the day when justice should be accorded to Ireland; but though it is well known that their principal work during the present century has been to delay all important measures of Reform demanded by the nation, they have hitherto been compelled to yield in the end. This they have done always with a bad grace, and their present purpose seems to be to recover that influence in swaying the destinies of the Empire which they have lost through their own obstinacy.

The opposition of the Lords to the Employers' Liability, and the Parish Councils Bills, has broken down the patience of the popular House and of the people, and instead of strengthening their position, the Lords have succeeded only in raising an issue which can have but one result, that of making their power of interference with the popular will, less than it has ever yet been. It was Mr. Gladstone's duty to warn them of the consequences of their temerity before retiring from his leadership of the Commons, and he has nobly fulfilled that duty. It was his last shot before announcing his resignation, to tell the Lords that they cannot be permitted to place themselves as an obstacle to much-needed reforms; and that as they seem resolved to do this, steps must be taken definitely to restrict their power to do harm hereafter.

The progress made in bringing home to the minds of the people of Great Britain the necessity of Home Rule is due in the first instance to the patriotism of such men as Isaac Butt and Chas. Stewart Parnell, and to the support given them by the people of Ireland, for without all this it is probable that even Mr. Gladstone with all his admitted honor and honesty of intention would never have given the case of Ireland that attention which it needed in order that a remedy might be applied which would undo the evils of three centuries of misgovernment. But it is due to Mr. Gladstone that when the matter was properly brought before him and that he was convinced of the necessity of granting to Ireland the justice she demanded, he so brought the matter before the people of the three kingdoms that within the term of eight years a majority of Parliament was returned pledged to repair the injustices of the past. It was not Mr. Gladstone's fault that the Home Rule Bill failed; and his last assurance to the people of Ireland is to the effect that his followers will yet carry out the pledge which he so solemnly gave them.

We may well ask what will be the consequences to Ireland arising out of Mr. Gladstone's resignation? Lord Rosebery, who succeeds to the Premiership, being a Peer, it might be supposed that his anxiety to grant Home Rule falls short of that of Mr. Gladstone; but, on the other hand, the unanimity with which Ireland demands it cannot be despised, and as even to the last moment the Liberal leaders have continued to declare that they will carry out Mr. Gladstone's policy, there is good reason to hope that they will fulfil their pledges. If, however, they show an unwillingness to do so, firmness on the side of the Irish party will nevertheless succeed in the end. Home Rule will certainly be granted by one party or the other, though it is most likely that the Liberal party, which has been educated to know the kind of Home Rule which will be satisfactory, will be the one which will concede it.

The present would be a most auspicious moment for the hostile sections of the Irish party to forget their differences and unite patriotically to obtain the end for which both are laboring. A continuation of their present hostile attitude toward each other will mean an indefinite delay in securing their common object.

Charity is the choicest as well as the most eminent emanation from the Adorable Host.—Faber.