

The Catholic Record.

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

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHBURYS,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY,
Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, Messrs. LEWIS, KING, JOHN NISH, and P. J. NEVEZ, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Rates of Advertising—Two cents per line each insertion, agate measurement.
Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterboro, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor, and must reach London not later than Tuesday morning.
Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, August 18, 1894

THE CHURCH UNION MOVEMENT.

Bishop Grafton, of the United States Protestant Episcopal Church, has recently been making known his views in regard to the "historic Episcopate" and of the manner by which other denominations may become united with the Episcopal Church.

In view of the Lambeth manifesto, in issuing which all the Bishops of the Anglican and American Episcopalian Churches agreed, it is not to be expected that any individual Bishop will affirm anything else than that the Episcopate alone can confer valid orders; and this is what has angered Presbyterians, Methodists, Baptists, and Congregationalists alike against Anglicanism and Episcopalianism generally. These denominations positively refuse to take any step which may lead to the inference that they have hitherto assumed ministerial orders without authority; but Bishop Grafton endeavors to mollify them in the following style:

"Let me re-state the truth to which, in the interest of unity, I desire to bear witness. Within the Body of Christ, where the Apostolically descended and Episcopally ordained orders have been transmitted, there are to be found fuller sacramental endowments than among our separated brethren. We are willing to allow their ministers to be what their convictions and their seals of God's approval testify them to be, viz., evangelists, teachers, preachers of the Word. But, realizing as we do the great illuminations and resources and potentialities of grace given under the fuller administrations of the priesthood of Christ's Body, which we by God's mercy possess, we desire them, so much more worthy as many of them are than ourselves, to be partakers of these spiritual gifts. Whenever our brethren are enabled, by the enlightenment of God's spirit, to discern our priesthood, as now we acknowledge their ministry, the barriers to reunion will gradually melt away."

The Bishop's intentions toward the Presbyterians and others in a similar position are as amiable as they could well be; but he does not abate one jot of the demands already made by the Episcopal body, that, as a first condition of union, the ministers of those denominations must acknowledge that they have hitherto made fraudulent claims of presbyterial authority; and these sects see all this perfectly well. They call this plan of union "absorption and not union." They must acknowledge that the Episcopalian alone have valid and apostolical orders, otherwise they must remain unchurched. They prefer the latter alternative, and, despite the meetings of various sects which took place in Switzerland and elsewhere with the object of bringing about a union, this consummation is as far off as ever.

The Bishop hopes that his separated brethren will become partakers of the spiritual gifts possessed by the Anglican clergy; but the separated brethren deny that the latter have any such spiritual gifts as they claim. In fact, the Presbyterians are quite aware that the Anglican claim to "apostolically descended" orders is just as fallacious as such a claim would be if made by themselves.

The Presbyterian position in regard to orders is thus defined in the authorized "Form of Church Government":

"No man ought to take upon him the office of a minister of the Word without a lawful calling."
"Ordination is always to be continued in the Church."
"Every minister of the Word is to be ordained by imposition of hands, and prayer, with fasting, by these preaching presbyters to whom it doth belong."

But it is notorious that at the very time when these doctrinal decrees were issued, there were hundreds of Cameronians, Independents, etc., who had no such ordination as is here prescribed, and, indeed, no ordination whatsoever, but who were nevertheless adopted into the Kirk as full fledged ministers, and so a saving proviso is introduced to cover their case as follows:

"In extraordinary cases, something extraordinary may be done, until a

settled order may be had, yet keeping as near as possible to the rule." "There is at this time (as we humbly conceive) an extraordinary occasion for a way of ordination for the present supply of ministers."

This is an admission that the present supply had no apostolicity of ordination; and it does not require much penetration to see that these clauses were introduced, and the doctrine contained in them manufactured, especially to meet the existing condition of things.

It is clear, however, that the Church of England, and the American Church which springs from it, are not prepared to give up the semblance of orders which they have retained from the days of Elizabeth, unsatisfactory and more than doubtful though they be.

The much talked of "historic Episcopate" does not date further back than the assumed consecration of Matthew Parker, which was more than fifteen centuries too late to be Apostolic. The Presbyterians and Methodists know that they lose very little by rejecting the means proffered for becoming Apostolic, and so there is little likelihood that the proposed union will take place on such terms.

If it were left to the Low Church section of the Anglicans to come to a decision there would be little difficulty in arriving at it, for the Low Church party are disposed to waive all claims to Apostolic orders. They even deny its necessity; but to this extent it is clear that High Churchism controls the bench of Bishops, at all events; and they have the standards of the Church decidedly on their side on this question, for we find in the preface to the form of ordination:

"No man shall be accounted or taken to be a lawful Bishop, Priest, or Deacon in the United Church of England and Ireland, or suffered to execute any of the said functions, except he be called, tried, examined, and admitted thereunto, according to the form hereafter following, or hath had formerly Episcopal consecration or ordination."

This is the rock on which all the negotiations for a corporate union of sects have hitherto split; and there appears to be no prospect that it will be easily removed or got rid of.

REV. GENERAL MORGAN AND THE INDIAN SCHOOLS.

We had occasion last week to make some comments on a document issued in the form of an interview with ex-Indian-Superintendent General Morgan, in which the ex-preacher and soldier defended his administration of Indian affairs by making a most malignant attack upon the whole body of the Catholic clergy of the United States, and especially the Jesuit Fathers, for having conducted a system of Catholic schools for the education of the Catholic Indian children of the West. The document was published with great avidity by the Toronto Mail, which is always glad to furnish literature of this kind to its readers.

In this manifesto the ex-commissioner states that he suppressed Catholic schools in the West because they were immoral; but there now comes to light a pretty transaction which occurred in connection with one of the ex-general's favored schools, showing where the real immoralities existed; and it is scarcely necessary to say again what we mentioned in our former article, that they were not in the Catholic schools, but in those which were specially and liberally patronized by the ex-commissioner.

With great candor the ex-commissioner states that he removed Catholic teachers and put Protestants in their place, so that the Indians might have a moral training. But regarding one of these favored schools the following facts have been elicited on examination by the United States Indian Department.

Charges were made recently by Gen. Frank C. Armstrong, Assistant Commissioner of Indian Affairs, against the Rev. M. H. Savage, a former superintendent, who afterwards became teacher and clerk over the Perris Indian school. This Mr. Savage continued his functions during the whole of Rev. General Morgan's administration, and since General Morgan's resignation until about two years ago, in fact until his peculations were discovered.

The charge brought against the Rev. Mr. Savage was for gross fraud and rascality; and it has been fully substantiated.

General Armstrong says in his report:

"Sufficient facts have been shown to send Savage to State prison. This should be done if he can be caught. I think he has escaped to Mexico, and he should be followed up and an example made of him, if he can be extradited. From the first transaction, three or four years ago, to

the day he left, Savage was in some way defrauding the Government. He stole at least one-third of all the money reported by him as disbursed for the school."

The New York World of the 5th inst. states that the investigation into Savage's frauds was begun some time ago, but was not made public until Saturday, the 4th inst. The impudence of General Morgan in charging the Catholic schools with immorality is all the more glaring, as he must have known of Savage's frauds at the moment that he was making these accusations, and when he was addressing A. P. A. audiences in New Jersey on the theme of Catholic mismanagement of Indian schools.

General Armstrong states that it would be advisable for the Government to order that no superintendent should employ as a clerk any member of his own family. From this it may be supposed that Savage was a relative of General Preacher Morgan, and it may turn out that Mr. Morgan was cognizant of the frauds. At least he should have known of them if he had done his duty properly.

General Armstrong adds that he is convinced that there is more rascality in the Indian bonded schools than in any other branch of the Indian service, and that very few bonded schools are free from fraud and corruption. Special Agent Shelby fully confirms General Armstrong's statements.

The Catholic schools were fully vindicated, before the senatorial investigating committee, from all the charges brought against them by General Morgan; and it is a just retribution that simultaneously with their promulgation to the public the facts of the case should become known, as has happened. They will throw a thick atmosphere of doubt around all the Rev. Mr. Morgan's statements; though, to those who know anything of this gentleman's previous career, his statements would be already unworthy of credit even without these revelations. Meanwhile the delinquent preacher Savage has left the country. He absconded on June 13, and put himself beyond Uncle Sam's jurisdiction.

THE QUEBEC RIOTING.

We can have no sympathy with rioting or mob law under any circumstances, and our disgust is increased when the like is carried on under the pretext or semblance of zeal for religion. Hence we regret very much that in the city of Quebec there should have been a disgraceful riotous demonstration under any such a pretence as this.

A French Baptist mission has been established in the most Catholic part of the city, and a mob, consisting of somewhere about two hundred persons, gathered around the place where the meeting of the mission was held, and attacked it with stones, breaking the windows, and keeping up the fusillade until a police force came to the rescue and cleared away the crowd. The mob then proceeded to the building occupied by the French Anglican mission, and broke the windows there also. The Salvation Army barracks was likewise attacked, and the property of the Army sustained considerable damage.

It was not prudent, indeed, for the promoters of these missions, the open object of which is to proselytize the French Canadian population, to place them in the midst of so thoroughly Catholic a quarter of the city as St. Roch's, and it is not altogether surprising that the population should be goaded to anger by the persistence of the missionaries in their work; and if the missions were openly aggressive and calumnious in the usual style of such establishments, it is not very surprising that in a moment of irritation there should be a counter demonstration; but we have not learned that such was the case in the present instance; but even if it were, the attack of the mob was illegal and intolerable. If the missionaries broke the law, or were abusive, those who objected to their proceedings could have applied to the law for redress. They were not justified in having recourse to acts of violence.

On the other hand, though the press have been on the whole fair in giving an account of the occurrences, it is a pity that some of those newspapers, which are accustomed to misrepresent the conduct of Lower-Canadian Catholics on all occasions, have taken advantage of what has occurred to vent their spleen on the French-Canadians generally, and to represent them as an intolerant people.

This is not just. The general tolerance of the French-Canadians has

been so marked that Protestant gentlemen of all denominations, and political parties, have testified to it, and notably the Hon. Mr. Joly, on the occasion of his visit to Ontario twelve months ago. There is, therefore, reason for the suspicion that the missionaries, by some imprudences, have given occasion to the residents to be out of humor with them. We have no doubt that light will be thrown on the subject when the judicial investigation will take place, which will be sure to follow when some of the guilty parties shall have become known.

The Montreal Witness takes occasion to draw from the occurrence the inference that

"The ecclesiastics of the North-West have based their plea for special privileges upon the alleged tolerance of the French Roman Catholics in this province. (Quebec.) There is no foundation for the general belief which has gained ground outside of the province that the Quebec Catholics are especially tolerant. They are not more tolerant than the Protestants are, not in fact so much so as most Protestants are."

That the inference drawn by the Witness is unjust is plain from the single fact that the extent of the riot has been very much exaggerated, and the exaggerations have been greater in the columns of the Witness than in most other journals. The crowd itself which did the rioting was represented in the Witness as numbering about 5,000, whereas the correspondent of the united press states that there were about 200 all told. Multiplying the actual number by 25 is in itself no small exaggeration; but there is a further exaggeration in making it appear that almost the whole population were concerned; whereas truthful witnesses state that it was simply a riot of wild boys with the intention of creating what mischief they could. Deputy Chief of Police Watson told the united press reporter that there was "not a single man in the mob," and that "three good men would have put the whole crowd to flight."

It is satisfactory to find that the universal sentiment among all classes of French-Canadians and Catholics in Quebec is to condemn the rioters, and this fact is attested by the united press report. It is also said that in all the Catholic churches of the city a condemnation of the rioters has been read. The strictures of the Witness are therefore extremely unjust.

The French-Canadian Catholics are not intolerant; but undoubtedly the intolerance which has been exhibited of late by such organizations as the A. P. A. has had some effect upon them, in the way of irritating them and making them more than usually hostile to any movement which has for its object an attack upon their religion.

It is unfortunate that such a riot should have occurred, especially at the present time, when every effort is being made by a certain faction in Ontario to stir up discord on account of racial and religious differences. The event will be made an occasion for still greater discord; but the established character for tolerance which the French-Canadians have gained cannot be destroyed by the facts that a few boys in their fondness for mischief have perpetrated an outrage.

There has never been in the Province of Quebec an anti-Protestant party, and would certainly have been the case if there had been material for it to build from; whereas three general elections have been fought out in Ontario on a no-Popery cry, within the last nine years, simply because there are fanatics enough in our province to give a hope, forlorn though it be, that they were strong enough to gain a victory; and it required all the energy of a lusty fight to put them *hors du combat*.

The Protestant school system of Quebec was established by Catholic votes without a murmur being heard from any part of the Province; whereas it is to this day a matter of complaint with the fanatics that the Catholic school system was imposed upon the people of Ontario, in spite of the majority of the representatives of the Province, who were overpowered by the votes of French-Canadians, who, in their desire for equal justice, would not allow their Ontario co-religionists to be left in a worse position than they had placed Protestants of Quebec. The fact is the union of the two Canadas was made with the hope that the English Protestant vote would be able to ride rough-shod over the French-Canadians; but the Ontonians were hoist with their own petard.

We might add other evidences of the tolerance of French-Canadians; but these will suffice. We should hear

no more about their intolerance, when we find that, in spite of all promises to the contrary, two western Governments broke faith with the Catholics, by destroying the Catholic school system as soon as Protestants became strong enough to show their intolerant spirit.

We have no desire to bandy reproaches; but we cannot permit falsehoods about Catholic intolerance to pass unchallenged.

TENANT RIGHT.

The rights of the Irish tenantry to the soil they hold have always been the foundation of the claim of the Irish people to redress against British legislation, the tendency of which has constantly been to sacrifice the people of the country for the sake of absentee landlords, including the linen-drappers and merchants of London. If under the Act of Union of Ireland with the united kingdoms of England and Scotland, these rights had been recognized, and due legislation had been passed to better the condition of the tenantry, it is probable the demand for Home Rule for Ireland would never have been made; or, at least, it would never have developed itself to the degree that it should be now the fixed demand of Ireland as the only means whereby the abject condition of the people can be changed to one of prosperity.

The purpose of the Evicted Tenants' Bill, introduced into Parliament by Lord Roseberry's Government, is to ameliorate the present condition of the tenantry by a legislative recognition of tenant right; and it is a measure to which, as might have been expected, the Irish landlords are bitterly opposed; and the House of Lords, which represents essentially the landlord class, is very loath to pass it. It is, indeed, currently stated that, under the advice and direction of Lord Salisbury, the Lords have made up their minds to reject it absolutely.

The bill has now passed its third reading in the House of Commons, notwithstanding that it was opposed by the Unionists at every stage. The Government's majority on the third reading was 32, the vote being 199 to 167. The Lords appear, however, to be in a quandary in regard to it. They evidently dread another collision with the Commons such as that which they had on the question of Home Rule and the Parish Council's Bill; and last week a special meeting of the Unionist leaders was held, under the chairmanship of the Duke of Devonshire, to consider what attitude the party of Lord Salisbury should assume regarding it.

Mr. T. W. Russell, the Unionist member for South Tyrone, had, during the week, an article in the *Pall Mall Gazette* in which he recommended that a compromise be accepted whereby the reinstatement of the tenants should be voluntary, instead of compulsory, as the bill proposes to make it. He considers that in this shape it might be accepted by both Lords and Commons; but the meeting did not arrive at any definite conclusion.

The Tory landlords are bitterly opposed to reinstatement in any form, and insisted upon uncompromising opposition to the bill, as they declared that no amending of it would overcome their objections to it.

The bill was read for the first time in the House of Lords just after midnight on the morning of the 7th inst., so that it will soon have to be decided by the Tory majority there whether or not they will risk another collision with the popular Chamber. Such a collision would give new life to the agitation against the Lords as obstructionists against useful legislation. Of such an agitation they are in dread, but it may be supposed that they will avert it for a while longer by making some minor modifications to the bill which will not render it wholly unacceptable to the House of Commons and to the Irish people; but if they make it unacceptable to the Irish, it cannot be accepted by the Commons.

The Lords feel perfectly that they stand in a more precarious position in regard to the present Bill than they did in reference to Home Rule. The Evicted Tenants Bill is a property measure, and not a concession of Home Rule; and though the Ulster Orangemen are so bitterly opposed to Home Rule that they assert they will not obey the laws of an Irish Parliament, should one be established, they are as much interested in the question of tenant right as are the people of the other three Provinces. Tenant right exists in Ulster, and the people of Ulster prize it as a most precious privilege,

so that the Lords need not expect their support if they attempt to kill the Evicted Tenants' Bill. The measure, indeed, can scarcely be said to be peculiarly even an Irish one. In Scotland popular sympathy is extended to the Crofters, who have suffered under landlord absolutism, and the tenant farmers of England, even when opposed to Home Rule, as an attempt to make Ireland independent of England, will naturally understand that the present Bill is in the direction of establishing the rights of the people, and that, therefore, they are almost as much interested in having it pass as are the Irish themselves.

If the Lords refuse this measure of needed reform they will have good reason to dread that the war-cry of the Liberals at the next election will be to mend or end their House. In fact, already Sir William Harcourt announced this as the issue to be placed before the electorate; and it will have increased force if their lordships are stubborn on the present occasion.

The Toronto Mail, which always takes the part of the landlords in the discussion of Irish questions, has the following in its issue of Thursday, the 9th inst., in reference to the Evicted Tenants' Bill:

"There is no reason why the Irish should be coddled. Nothing like the Evicted Tenants' Bill would be tolerated if the attempt were made to apply its provisions to English landlords or tenants, or, for that matter, to Toronto landlords or tenants. People may, therefore, be excused if they enquire why special and artificial ethics should be made for Ireland, and if they wonder, for instance, why Mr. Edward Blake would support, for Ireland, a method of administration which, it may be supposed, he would condemn for Ontario."

The Mail knows well, or ought to know, that the case of Ireland is very different from that of either England or Canada. The case of Ireland resembles that of the Saxons of England when the country was seized by the Norman conquerors, with this difference, that the Normans dwelt on the lands they seized, and spent among their serfs the wealth of which they had despoiled them, while the absentee landlords of Ireland, after grinding out from their tenantry the last penny of their earnings, spent all in England, leaving their serfs to starve, without even the right to be paid for their improvements on their lands, but always subject to danger of eviction when for ever so short a time they were in arrears for rent. Such a condition of things would not be tolerated for a single week by the people of either England or Canada. Time, the universal leveller, has remedied the state of things which existed in England after the Norman conquest. The races became amalgamated, and there is now neither Saxon nor Norman; but in Ireland, the lapse of time, until very recently, only made matters worse by impoverishing the country more and more. It is no wonder that the people of Ireland have periodically had famine staring them in the face. There is no great difficulty about telling the ethics which should be applied to remedy Ireland's condition. It is the ethics according to which the ox that treads the corn is not to be muzzled, by which the toiler is first entitled to his livelihood out of his own labor, even if the landlords had come into possession of their Irish estates by most just means—which is far from being the case. The Hon. Edward Blake, to whom the Mail appeals to apply universal ethics to the case of Ireland, has before now told us to what extent Ireland has been "coddled." He was well able to do this, for he witnessed an Irish eviction scene at Bodyke.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

IMMORALITY IN BANNSHIRE, says the *Scottish Leader*, is one of the subjects dealt with in the report to the Assembly by the commission of the religious condition of the people. The report says that for the purpose of illustrating the extent of illegitimacy, Dr. Cramond at a meeting of the commission produced a scale in inches showing the comparative state of illegitimacy of the three kingdoms. Ireland was represented by a line one and three eight inches large, England by one five inches long and Banffshire by one 16 inches long.

SOME are pleased to make merry over the failure of Debs' agitation, but we fail to see the reason. Thousands of men do not relinquish work at the mere command of an individual if they do not believe in the legitimacy of that command. We do not presume to defend the action of the strikers, but we do say that their