

ROME AND FATHER M'GLYNN

THE QUESTION OF RESTORING THE DEPOSED PRIEST.

HIS FOLLOWERS PLEASED BY A REPORT THAT A SETTLEMENT HAD BEEN REACHED AND TROUBLED BY A DENIAL—DR. M'GLYNN DECLINES TO TALK ON THE SUBJECT.

An interview with Archbishop Corrigan, in which he is made to say that Dr. McGlynn was coming back to the Church, and that Archbishop Satolli had arranged a settlement satisfactory to both the Anti-Poverty people and to the Archdiocese of New-York, appeared yesterday in a morning paper which is credited with being the Archbishop's official organ.

In the same issue was a dispatch from Washington containing an interview with Mgr. Satolli and Bishop John W. Keane, rector of the Catholic University, in which the statement contained in the Corrigan interview as to the settlement of Dr. McGlynn's case was absolutely denied.

At the Archbishop's residence yesterday the head of the Roman Catholic Church in New-York was not visible, but he sent out the following written statement to the press:

"The Archbishop repudiates the interview in this morning's *Sun*, and declares that he said nothing whatever about Dr. McGlynn, further than he expressed the hope that he would be reconciled to the Church."

The following had been erased before the statement was given out: "The various speculations about the future are due entirely to some one's lively imagination."

No further information was granted, and the Catholic clergy in this city were dumb to interviewers.

The followers of Dr. McGlynn were very much delighted at the apparently official statement, coming from the source to which it was accredited. Dr. Carey, one of the McGlynn leaders and the Treasurer of the Anti-Poverty Society, said that, although Dr. McGlynn had not made any statement himself as to the possibility of his restoration and the resumption of his sacerdotal functions, yet from various remarks made lately by the doctor's most intimate friends the Anti-Poverty people had been expecting the settlement of his case daily for some time.

The visit of Archbishop Satolli and the confirmation of his extraordinary powers as the head of the ecclesiastical court for the settlement of differences between priests and Bishops and other Church questions seem to point to his taking up Dr. McGlynn's case, which has caused the most important dissension between prelate and pastor in this country during the last twenty-five years.

Mgr. Satolli is accompanied by Mgr. O'Connell, rector of the American College in Rome, who on his last visit to this country, in 1889, made an exhaustive study of the McGlynn question. He was led to believe by the Church authorities in this city that the issue was merely a local dispute, and that Dr. McGlynn's followers were simply a handful of dissatisfied parishioners, who had cast their religious lot with their deposed pastor.

A tour of the West and the Middle States, however, soon disabused Mgr. O'Connell's mind of this impression, as he found everywhere thousands of McGlynn sympathizers, and he was satisfied that the question involved in Dr. McGlynn's removal was a very serious one for American Catholicism.

It is well known that Dr. McGlynn's adoption of Henry George's land theories was simply an excuse for his removal. His bitter opposition to parochial schools was the real issue in the case. Archbishop Corrigan, as is well known, is an ardent supporter of the parochial school system, and he has condemned in unmeasured terms Catholic parents who send their children to the public schools.

It was some time before Archbishop Corrigan would admit that he had been beaten in the battle between himself and Archbishop Ireland on the Faribault school question. The toleration of that experiment allowed by the Pope was considered a mere quibble, but the return of Archbishop Ireland from Rome and the subsequent visit of Archbishop Satolli and Mgr. O'Connell to this country gave the matter a new phase.

At first Archbishop Corrigan denied that Archbishop Satolli had any special powers from Rome. He stated in several interviews that his presence at the conference recently held in this city was simply that of a spectator. It was said at the Archbishop's residence during that time that Mgr. Satolli had only presented a letter from the Propaganda, which simply amounted to a credential.

The decision at that conference brought about by Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop Ireland, evidently with the aid of Archbishop Satolli, that Catholic parents could send their children to the public schools, has also been treated by Archbishop Corrigan's party in the Church as a measure of no particular importance and simply a formality.

Friends of the Archbishop said that this ruling had always been tolerated, but not approved, and that the measure did not carry with it any sign of the triumph of Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Gibbons in their views on the school question.

This toleration was precisely, as has been stated, the cause of Dr. McGlynn's removal from the rectorship of St. Stephen's Church. His insubordination to Archbishop Corrigan and his land theories are now the only reasons left for his suspension.

As for the peculiar doctrines advocated by Dr. McGlynn on economic questions, which have been frowned upon by the Jesuits in their treatises on moral philosophy, but which have never been actually condemned by the Pope, there is no reason now why they should not be finally removed out of the controversy as disturbing factors.

Archbishop Corrigan, however, is a little wary just at present of clashing with statements made by Archbishop Satolli, and the latter's denial may have something to do with the modification of the views expressed in his official organ. The Archbishop of New-York, who is the person most deeply affected by any revocation of the suspension of Dr. McGlynn, would wish to be the first to announce any arrangement that might be made by the withdrawal of his mandate so far supported by Rome.

In case Dr. McGlynn is reinstated, he will, after the customary formality of a retreat in a monastery, take a charge not under the Archbishop of New-York.

Dr. McGlynn was asked yesterday if any steps had been taken toward restoring his former relations with the Church, and if he had receded from the position taken by him in his letter to Archbishop Corrigan. He declined positively to make any statement.

It was in 1886 that Dr. McGlynn was called to account by Archbishop Corrigan for his connection with the Henry George movement. At least nineteen years before that year he was in conflict with the dignitaries of the Church in this city. Under the aged Cardinal McCloskey Dr. McGlynn frequently displayed evidences of what was termed a rebellious spirit. His course was carefully watched by Archbishop Corrigan and various priests. His independent and at times defiant manners met with their disapproval and censure.

At a time when it was optional with Dr. McGlynn to build a parochial school or not, he refused to build one. Even when the Plenary Council at Baltimore declared that it was a duty incumbent on priests to build parochial schools wherever it was possible, Dr. McGlynn stubbornly and alone opposed the injunction. This, in the eyes of Archbishop Corrigan and many priests, was regarded as insubordination, and it was predicted that unless he displayed a more obedient spirit his downfall would follow.

The doctor's boldness in giving expression to his views aroused the indignation of the priests in the diocese and they petitioned Rome to instruct him as to the opinion of the Church on the school question or to caution him to remain silent. They declared that he was causing scandal by proclaiming his hostility to parochial schools and said he was aiding in preventing the appropriation of public moneys for the support of schools.

At that time Archbishop McCloskey was in Rome, and he was empowered to deal with Dr. McGlynn. The gentle old Archbishop was disinclined to resort to drastic measures and seemed to think that time and kind words would subdue the doctor.

Two or three years after the complaints against Dr. McGlynn had been forwarded to Rome, Archbishop McCloskey presided at a conference of clergymen held in this city. The school question came up for discussion, and Dr. McGlynn was asked to express his views. Vigorously and defiantly he opposed the parochial school idea. He declared that while he knew that priests were but the breath of the nostrils of Bishops, if ordered to build a school he would do so reluctantly and with bad grace. He would prefer to go to China and preach the Gospel without any of the corollaries tacked on by the Bishops.

No official notice was taken of these words of insubordination, yet they were regarded by the majority of his hearers as an insult to the kind-hearted and aged Archbishop.

In 1882, Dr. McGlynn indorsed Henry George's views on the land question, and he was warned by Cardinal McCloskey that he was not in accord with the Church, and that a repetition of his offense would be followed by punishment. It is said the doctor became alarmed, and made a written promise to the Cardinal and Propaganda to comply with the instructions he had

received. But 1886 found the doctor standing on the same platform with Henry George in Chickering Hall and indorsing the latter's utterances. Again the doctor was admonished, and ordered before election day to quit making speeches. He complied with this order, yet visited polling places and interested himself in the election. He also became a member of the Executive Committee of the National Labor Organization.

Dr. McGlynn was suspended, after which he wrote a letter ridiculing the principles laid down in a pastoral letter regarding the means of alleviating human misery. He apologized for this letter subsequently. Archbishop Corrigan, younger and more of a disciplinarian than his aged predecessor, believed that Dr. McGlynn's course was inimical to the best interests of the Church; that he had set himself up against the authority of the Church, and, unless summary measures were resorted to, insubordination would be encouraged.

Dr. McGlynn was summoned to Rome to meet the charge of being in conflict with the Church. He did not obey the summons, and made the excuse that he was too ill to go to Rome. He was finally excommunicated for failure to obey the mandates of the Church, and discipline was again firmly established under Archbishop Corrigan.

WASHINGTON, Dec. 7.—In response to a request for a statement in regard to the McGlynn matter, Mgr. Satolli said that, while he was very glad to hear of the predictions, apparently based on such good authority, concerning the probable restoration of Dr. McGlynn to good standing as a Catholic priest, he felt it his duty, to say that, as far as his own action in the matter was concerned, it would be premature to make any statement whatsoever.

Bishop Keane remarked that, if Mgr. Satolli was to act as a judge in the case of Dr. McGlynn, it would be manifestly improper for him to make any statement in regard to it at this time.