

brazen-facedness on the part of the Canadian to make a special appeal to Irish Catholics to support its favorite candidate in the same article in which it thus appealed to Protestant prejudices, yet the Canadian is equal even to this task. In the same breath, and in the very middle of its attacks on Quebec for being French and Catholic, it tells the Irish Catholics to put no confidence in the French, because "The French Catholic hates the Irish Catholic even worse than he does a Protestant."

The Catholic Record has studiously kept aloof from partisan politics, and it will continue to do so, but from whatever source attacks are made upon the Catholic Church or Catholic interests, it feels bound to repel them, independently of any party affiliations or combinations, and we feel it our duty to reprobate the course which is now being pursued in North Grey, and which is calculated to produce lasting discord and dissension.

The grounds on which the Canadian bases its violent appeals are vile and false. We admit that it would not be any recommendation from our point of view if there were Orangemen in Mr. Laurier's Government. There is nothing in Orangemen to make it desirable that that particular form of Protestantism should be specially represented in the Cabinet, but its intolerance towards a large proportion of the population of the Dominion makes it a very undesirable element in a Government. We may say justly, therefore, that the Protestantism of Canada should be well satisfied that Protestants of all shades of belief are ably and fully represented, and it would be absurd to demand that there should be special representation of a politico-religious society whose only claim to recognition is its mediocrity and intolerance.

It is scarcely necessary for us to say the effort of the *Warton Canadian* to sow dissension between Irish and French Catholics will be fruitless. It gives as a proof of the hatred of the French toward the Irish Catholics, the fact that Mr. Dobell, a French Protestant, was elected in old Quebec over an Irish Catholic. This proves simply that the French-Canadians remained faithful to their political creed. It proves that in the Province of Quebec the considerations of race and religion in politics have not the weight that is given to them in certain constituencies in Ontario, and it is a strong reason for which the course followed by the *Canadian* in reference to North Grey should be condemned by all patriotic Canadians.

It has been asserted in North Grey by Mr. George Taylor M. P., Conservative whip, that he was authorized to tell the electors that the Conservative party has dropped its Remedial policy. After the recent declarations made by Sir Charles and Sir Mackenzie that they will continue to adhere to the policy of justice to the Catholics of Manitoba, Mr. Taylor's declaration should be repudiated, otherwise we may justly entertain the suspicion that Catholic rights are regarded solely as a shuttlecock by means of which the Catholics of the country are to be made merely the instruments for putting one party in and another out of power. We want to know whether or not this is the case, and when we shall have found this out we shall know what action to take.

For the rest we have only to add to present that Messrs. N. Clarke Wallace, Dr. Sproule, Dr. Beattie Nesbitt and others advocated Mr. McLaughlin's election on the ground that he is reliable as an opponent of Catholic schools in Manitoba, and Dr. Nesbitt went so far as to declare Mr. Clarke Wallace to be the future leader whom he and Mr. McLaughlin will follow. We have no authority to decide who shall be the future leader of the Conservatives, but we may say we do not believe that the party will commit themselves to certain destruction by taking up Mr. Wallace as their standard-bearer. If they do so, Mr. Laurier will have an easy task before him.

EDITORIAL NOTES.

The prospects for the reunion of the Irish parties, we regret to say, do not seem very bright. A cable despatch states that neither the Parnellites nor the Healeys will attend the convention. Mr. Redmond makes the extraordinary statement that it was called by the Dillonites, and that consequently he does not feel that he should take any part in it. Mr. Healey appears to have no special reason for non-attendance. We may, however, conclude that he is so wedded to his own opinions that he will not

admit the possibility of any one else possessing more wisdom than himself. If the Dublin convention proves to be a failure the responsibility will rest on Messrs. Redmond and Healey and their followers; and if their constituencies will continue to support them in the course they have seen fit to take Home Rule is a long way off.

The Jesuit Fathers in Montreal are supplying a want long felt by the English-speaking inhabitants of that city in the opening, on the 1st September of this year, of an English preparatory college. The rector, Father Gregory O'Bryan, S. J., will be assisted by an unusually efficient staff of professors. The new college will for the present accommodate only thirty boarders, with, of course, a large number of day scholars. It will be in the building formerly occupied by the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, corner of Bleury and St. Catherine streets.

The *Presbyterian Record* takes a peculiar view of the situation in Quebec. It says that the results of the recent election in that province are both cheering and alarming. It seems deplorable that the French-Canadians—no matter what course they take—cannot create a smile on the face of the editor of the *Presbyterian Record*. If they vote Grit he is not satisfied any more than if they vote Tory. It might be worth while were they to refrain from voting altogether. Perhaps thereby the editor might be comforted. The article he has written on "The Quebec Revolt," as it is called, has been copied extensively into the Conservative press of Ontario, which goes to show that the editors are only too anxious to create a feeling of animosity against the French-Canadians because at the late contest they saw fit to cast their votes with the Liberal party. This is execrable work and should be condemned by all Canadians worthy the name.

In other respects the article of the *Presbyterian Record* is also both nonsensical and spiteful. Surely it were thoughtless on the part of our contemporary to say that during fifty years the Presbyterian mission in Quebec had educated three thousand five hundred French Canadians! This is a miserable showing, a very small return for the money poured into the pockets of the missionaries. Why, in one year Prince Michael of the Flying Roll secured a larger number of followers to his peculiar doctrine in the city of Detroit. We cannot for the life of us see why men of common sense will contribute of their means towards the work undertaken by the Presbyterian missions to French-Canadians! We have abundant evidence that there is very little, if any, sincerity amongst their so-called converts. They are picked up from amongst the waifs of the population, and they remain Presbyterians just so long as they find it to their temporal advantage. How different is it with those who leave the Churches of our separated brethren to enter the Catholic Church! They are invariably persons of position and education, guided in their choice by sincere conviction after a careful study of Catholic doctrine.

The changes wrought by time are sometimes most astonishing, and it would be difficult to conceive a more remarkable change than that which has occurred at Babylon, the city which brought away the people of Israel into a captivity of seven years. It was in Babylon that Daniel was cast into the lions' den and the three Hebrews, the companions of Daniel, known as "the three children," were cast into the fiery furnace for refusing to worship the huge golden image set up by king Nabuchodonosor as a god. Two Jews of Bagdad have recently purchased the whole of the land on which Babylon formerly stood. The Babylonish empire once so powerful perished many centuries ago, and the Jews, once in captivity there mourning their sad fate, have now become possessors of the capital in whose palaces and hanging gardens Nabuchodonosor took such pride. Thus the Jewish race has survived the nations which oppressed it that the prophecies of the Old Testament may be fulfilled, and that the people of Israel may at last be brought to the faith of the Christ whom they once rejected.

SCHWEINFURTH, the Illinois impostor who persuaded many people that he is the Christ, and who established a so-called heaven at Rockford in that State, has been indicted by Winnebago county on three charges of the gravest criminal character. It is said

that he has confessed that his object in establishing his "heaven" was to secure the property of his dupes, and he has for the most part succeeded in this, his dupes numbering now about forty persons. It is considered certain that his establishment will now be broken up. Between this Illinois delusion, the Detroit delusion of Prince Michael and the Flying Rollers, and others of similar character which arise throughout the country from time to time, it is evident that the Protestantism and Non-Protestantism, from whose ranks these communities are recruited, are far from being exempt from superstitions of the most demoralizing character.

The United Presbyterian Church of the United States at its recent General Assembly passed the following resolution, according to the official report of its proceedings:

"The United Presbyterian Church believes in education. She believes in patronizing her own schools, and intends that they shall be in the front rank in the advantages they offer, and above all that they shall not neglect the cultivation of the highest part of man, his spiritual nature."

This is the truly Christian position to be taken in regard to education, and it is what Catholics have all along maintained. It is somewhat surprising, however, to find the Presbyterians now coming into the ranks of those who advocate efficient religious teaching in the schools, as none have opposed more bitterly than the Presbyterian synods and assemblies the teaching of religion in Catholic schools. There was scarcely a synod or assembly in Canada which did not cast its influence against doing justice to the Catholic minority in Manitoba. We are justified in drawing the inference that their opposition is founded on the assumption that Catholics are alone not entitled to the common justice of having their children taught in accordance with the religious convictions of their parents.

ON ANGLICAN ORDERS.

Their Validity Discussed for Three Hundred Years.

The discussion of the validity of Anglican orders has been vehement from time to time during the past three hundred years, and is as yet unsettled, although perhaps more nearly brought to a termination than ever before because of the papal commission just sitting, writes the Rev. Charles J. Powers, C. S. P., in the *Catholic World* for August.

What the Holy See will determine can only be surmised, albeit prophecies are rife enough. But whatever the decision may be, it is evident to all that the conclusion in the matter will have been reached after careful, impartial investigation of the arguments advanced by both the supporters and the opponents of the claim of the validity of Anglican orders.

Nor can the consequences of Rome's judgment, favorable or unfavorable to the Anglicans, as yet be certainly foreseen. For ourselves we cannot agree with even so profound a thinker as Mr. Gladstone in believing that a decision adverse to the Anglican claim will retard the progress of Christian unity. It is our conviction that the mind and heart of Pope Leo will find means to remove the obstacles from the way of those who are sincerely desirous of entering the one fold of which he is the shepherd. For while the dogmas of divine and Catholic faith are unchanged as unchangeable as the truth itself, the discipline of the Church can be adjusted to meet the exigencies arising from particular and peculiar conditions.

We may, therefore, confidently rely upon the Sovereign Pontiff doing all that loving kindness and wisdom will prudently suggest to further one of the great aims of his glorious pontificate, the religious unity of Christendom.

It is our purpose here to sketch in outline the grounds for the position taken in dealing with this subject by the majority of Catholic writers. The arguments may be classed under three general headings, this division being based upon—

1st. The attitude of the Holy See and the Catholic hierarchy, as displayed in the various decisions emanating from Rome, and in the practical application of these in individual cases;

2nd. Upon the facts and uncertainties viewed from a historical standpoint;

3rd. Upon theological difficulties arising from the probability of defect in the intention, and in the matter and form, of the Anglican rite of consecration and ordination.

As soon as Queen Mary ascended the throne a bill was passed by Parliament in November, 1557, for the reunion of the Anglican Church with Rome. Immediately the queen made petition to the Pope for a representative of the Holy See who, possessing legatine powers, would adjust ecclesiastical difficulties in England, and restore the Church to that country to the position it had held among Catholic nations before the schism of Henry VIII. and the heresy of Edward VI.

Reginald Cardinal Pole, illustrious by his birth—he was a prince of the blood—but more by his learning and holiness, was appointed legate. Froude bears testimony that "his character

was irreproachable," and that "in all the virtues of the Catholic Church he walked without spot or stain."

On his advent as plenipotentiary the reconciliation of repentant bishops and priests became a matter of the first importance, and a decision was sought as to the course of procedure to be taken in regard to the clergy who had submitted themselves to the royal mandates during the reign of the late king and that of his father.

Paul IV. instructed his representative in two documents issued, the one toward the middle, the other in the fall of 1555. His Holiness recognized the validity of the orders of those consecrated and ordained according to the approved form of the Church—in *forma ecclesiae*—even in cases where the officiants were schismatics. The bishops and archbishops, however, and those promoted by them to sacred orders, who had not obtained consecration and ordination in *forma ecclesiae* could not be considered as having received orders, and were bound to re-ordination before exercising any function.

Such a decision, coming from the Holy See in the form of a Brief, is in itself of great weight in aiding us to reach a judgment in this controversy. For the policy of the Church has been to admit the validity of sacraments administered and received by schismatics and heretics when the lack of some essential element has not caused them to be void.

Sacra sancte is a maxim of ecclesiastical practice to the strict application of which the whole policy of the Church, concerning the sacraments of those separated from unity, bears witness.

So adverse has Rome been to having the validity of such sacraments unjustly questioned that she has in some cases forbidden their repetition under severe penalty. Irregularly, for instance, is incurred by the baptizer and the baptized who rashly reiterate the sacrament of baptism because it has been given by a heretic; and punishment would not be long with held should mistaken and irreverent zeal go the length of repeating other sacraments in cases where there was no room for doubt of their validity.

The Roman Curia evidently at this time was persuaded that serious doubt existed as to the validity of Anglican orders, and adopted the only course by which defect in those orders could be removed.

Moreover, the force of the argument, drawn from the tenor of these instructions, is all the greater when we recall the character of Cardinal Pole and his intimate knowledge of the situation in all its details. A man of deep piety and wide experience, animated by a sincere love of country and of religion, whatever could have been conceded the Cardinal would surely have granted. His holiness, his sweetness, his very diplomacy are in evidence as to this. But his decision was unfavorable. His action, therefore, in this matter of vital interest to the English clergy and the English people, was based upon a judgment formed after a consideration of all the facts, and was prompted by the dictates of an enlightened and upright conscience.

These instructions to Cardinal Pole are most important utterances of the Holy See on this subject. Confirmation, moreover, has been given to them in the decision rendered in the case of Dr. Gordon, the Protestant bishop of Galloway, who was received into the Catholic Church at the beginning of the last century. The Holy See was asked for an opinion concerning the orders of this Anglican prelate, and Clement XI., in a decree dated April 17, 1704, decided against their validity.

Nor should the severe condemnation of M. Le Courayer, canon of St. Genevieve, be overlooked or undervalued in a sincere effort to arrive at the mind of Rome. This learned French ecclesiastic published a treatise in support of the validity of Anglican orders in which he maintained that the rite, as well as the power of conferring holy orders in the Church of England, was sound.

Oxford applauded, and bestowed upon this new champion the degree of doctor of divinity. The royal favor and bounty were displayed in the gift of a considerable pension. But Cardinal De Noailles, Archbishop of Paris and ordinary of the distinguished author, ordered a retraction—which, however, could not be obtained from the canon. All else failing, Benedict XIII., on the 25th of June, 1728, condemned the work as containing propositions which were "false, scandalous, erroneous, and heretical."

This attitude of the Holy See has been emphasized by the universal custom of treating as simple laymen those clergymen of the Church of England who have embraced the Catholic faith.

To such of these converts as desired to enter and were called to the ecclesiastical state the sacraments of confirmation and order have been invariably administered absolutely, and generally even conditional baptism has been received by them. The manifest conclusion from these premises is that the judgment of the Church as evidenced in her instructions and practice has hitherto been unfavorable to the Anglican claim. We shall now view the question from the historical standpoint.

All who would argue for the validity of Anglican orders are agreed in admitting the necessity of the Apostolic succession. Unless he who ministers holy orders has himself received orders from one who is a successor of the apostles, his acts are without effect as far as conferring sacramental power is concerned.

Dr. Parker is confessedly the source whence the orders of the Church of England have been derived. His con-

secration as a Bishop should be, therefore, a matter beyond dispute. No shadow of doubt should rest upon that fact, for even speculative doubt would begot practical certainty as to the defect of apostolic succession.

But is it certain that Matthew Parker was a Bishop? We need not concern ourselves now as to his fitness for the office. We need not dwell upon his character, nor recall that he was prominent in that group of which Dr. Little-dale writes in his lecture on "Innovations," that "documents hidden from the public eye for centuries in the archives of London, Vienna, and Smaracas are now rapidly being printed, and every fresh find establishes more clearly the utter scoundrelism of the reformers." Nor is it necessary to know the depth of his degradation in being the creature of Cranmer, "the most abject, servile tool that ever twisted or turned to the winds of royal caprice." Neither need we weigh the doubtful honor that Elizabeth—her father's child, a Tudor from head to foot—was his patron and advanced him to the princely See in consideration of his services in the capacity of chaplain to Anne Boleyn, her mother, and to herself.

We can ignore, too, his venality in turning his exalted, sacred office—he the reformer, the purifier of doctrine and of practice!—to his own account in a shameless traffic in holy things. We can even forget that Froude says that "He (Parker) had left behind him enormous wealth, which had been accumulated, as is proved from a statement in the handwriting of his successor, by the same unscrupulous practices which had brought about the first revolt against the Church. He had been corrupt in the distribution of his own patronage, and he had sold his interest with others. Every year he made profits by admitting children to the cure of souls for money. He used a graduating scale, in which the price for inducing an infant into a benefice varied with the age; children under fourteen not being inadmissible if the adequate fees were forthcoming."

All these things, and more, to his discredit would not, indeed, have made him less a Bishop, not curtailed his absolute power of exercising his apostolic order had he obtained consecration. But what proof have we that he ever received that plenitude of the priesthood?—what proof that brings with it moral certainty?

In the directions given for the consecration of Archbishop Parker it was laid down that the order of King Edward's book should be used, and that letters patent should "be directed to any other Archbishop within the king's dominions. If all be vacant, to four Bishops, to be appointed by the queen's letters patent." Lord Burleigh wrote, "There is no Archbishop now four Bishops now to be had." The Catholic Bishops were in prison or in exile.

Had the Catholic hierarchy of England acquiesced in the design of Queen Elizabeth to make her Bishops "something like" the Catholic Bishops of the rest of Christendom, and "yet different," had they assented to her claim of supremacy, Dr. Parker would have had no difficulty in finding a consecrator. But all, save the aged Dr. Kitchen, Bishop of Llandaff, positively refused to take the oath of supremacy, and it is doubtful whether even he took it. The last we hear of him is that he hesitated. He could not make up his mind to sign, although he was willing to obey in so far as to administer the oath to others.

Let his feebleness of mind and body be his excuse. His brethren of the bishop's bench chose prison or exile rather than submission. And the royal hand fell heavily upon them because they preferred to obey God rather than man. "The Marian bishops," writes Bishop Jewel in February, 1562, "are still confined in the Tower, and going on in their old way. They are an obstinate and untamed set of men, but are nevertheless subdued by terror and the sword." The only lawful bishop at liberty was, therefore, Dr. Kitchen, but it is certain that he refused to consecrate Dr. Parker. Richard Creagh, Primate of all Ireland, was a prisoner at the time in the Tower, and an offer of freedom is said to have been made him if he would but act as consecrator; but this prelate also indignantly declined.

The difficulty, however, is supposed to have been removed by William Barlow, Bishop-elect of Chichester. The Lambeth register has an entry showing that Dr. Parker was consecrated on Sunday, December 17, 1559, in the palace chapel by Bishop Barlow, assisted by John Scorey, elect of Hereford, John Hodgkins, Suffragan of Bedford, and Miles Coverdale, of Exeter.

This record, it has been maintained, is a forgery. The register was only unearthed in 1613, fifty years and more after the date of the elevation of Parker to the throne of Canterbury. During the fierce controversy waged over the fact of his consecration in the years immediately following the announcement of it in 1559, when the story of the ceremony at the Nag's Head was flaunted in the face of the adherents of the Reformation, there is a rather suspicious silence as to this register. What more effectual answer than this record could there have been to the pamphlet of John Hollywood, with its detailed account purporting to come from an eye-witness?

Although the kingdom was filled with rumors that the wicker man circumstantially narrated in the pamphlet had taken place; although the statements made therein were accepted by a large portion of the public as true; although the publication of the consecration did not satisfy a large num-

ber who persisted in calling the bishops of the new order of things "parliament bishops"; still the all-important record was not produced until fifty years had passed away. Viewed as a historical event, is Parker's consecration, then so sure that the orders of a whole Church may safely rest upon him?

Even if the Nag's Head consecration be a myth, and the forgery of the Lambeth register an invention of heated controversy, is it yet certain that Archbishop Parker was indeed a bishop of apostolic succession? What does it avail the Anglican claim that Parker trampled under foot canons of general councils and forced his way through broken laws to the seat of St. Augustine? What if the bishop who enthroned him was himself no bishop? And who consecrated Barlow? And what did Barlow care about consecration at best? William Barlow is the link between the old order and the new in the Church of England, and his power to transmit the apostolic succession should be beyond question if the Anglican claim would stand.

Parker's claim to consecration is upheld by the Lambeth register, but no official record whatever gives support to Barlow. Authentic history knows not the day nor the hour of his consecration. Cranmer's record is silent, documentary evidence is absent, credible testimony is wanting. The most material fact in the argument for Anglican orders is doubtful because the consecration of Barlow is not proved. A bishop-elect exercises jurisdiction after he has presented his bulls to the administrator of his See, but he remains what he was previous to his election as far as the power of order is concerned.

It is certain that Barlow was a monk, a priest, a Bishop-elect. That he was consecrated still remains to be proved. Barlow's antecedents make proof imperative in his case. A negative argument drawn from the absence of a record would not have great weight had the "elect of Chichester" been a man of catholic mind. But Barlow was an Erastian in doctrine. "If the king's grace," he said, "being supreme head of the Church of England, did choose, denominate, and elect any layman, being learned, to be a Bishop, that layman would be as good a Bishop as himself or the best in England."

He lived by the breath of his sovereign's nostrils. After the king had "studied better," and changed his mind concerning the Papal supremacy in favor of which he had written in 1521, and, as Mr. Brewer says, had set up, "a headship without a precedent, and at variance with all tradition," he looked about for instruments to aid him in effecting his purpose of separating the English Church from the centre of unity. Barlow became on a sudden a most zealous Protestant, was named first Bishop of St. Asaph, then of St. David's, and later of the richer See of Bath and Wells.

Here his gratitude to his master nearly cost him his head. It occurred to him that the king would be pleased with a series of tracts ridiculing the Mass, Purgatory, and other leading Catholic doctrines. But instead of meriting praise for his devotion to the new religion, he aroused the wrath of the king, who was no lover of heresies except those of his own devising. Barlow saved his life and his See by an abject apology and retraction as fulsome in professions of attachment to the ancient Church as he had been lavish in abuse of her doctrines in his tracts. When Queen Mary ascended the throne he found it convenient to depart into Germany, where he remained until Elizabeth began to reign. Then he returned to England and was made the "elect of Chichester." His irreverent and shifty character was so notorious that even his associates in heresy could place no reliance upon him.

Do we ask too much when we demand proof of the consecration of one so Erastian, so vacillating, so steeped in German Protestantism? Are not Anglicans unfortunate in the link so necessary in the chain? Barlow expressed himself as content with the king's appointment to a See, and there is no evidence he ever sought more than the royal favor or asked or obtained episcopal consecration. Yet this evidence is absolutely necessary to remove doubt.

In the Protestant Churches the wisdom of the Catholic Church in providing for the education of her children is generally recognized these days. There was a time, not so long ago, when the Church was denounced because she insisted that education without religion was not sufficient. Now the thoughtful Protestant clergyman sees that the Catholic Church has been right on this matter. Only the other day at the opening of the Anglican Synod of Ottawa the clergyman who preached the sermon paid a high tribute to the work of the Catholic Church in the education of youth. "If there is one thing more than another," said he, "in which the Church of Rome has shown wisdom it is in the ceaseless care with which she watches over the education of her children. She scouted the idea that the Church should surrender to other hands that which she should hold. Unsatisfactory as things are, we should encourage private schools where the truths of God are taught. The future of the Church depends upon the proper rearing of its children. The provision for boys in this direction is fairly good, but that for girls is deplorable. They have been left to the mercy of the Public schools, and many parents rather than send them there are sending them to convents under the control of the Roman Catholic Church."—N. X. Catholic News.