

**The Catholic Record.**  
Published Weekly at 44 and 46 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.  
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES,  
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland,"  
THOMAS COFFEY,  
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Messrs. Luke King, John Nich, P. J. Neven and Joseph N. King, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdonsburgh, N. Y., 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. Advertisements are inserted in full before the paper is printed. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

London, Saturday, February 18, 1899

**DIocese of London.**

Lenten Regulations for 1899.

The following are the Lenten regulations for the diocese of London: 1st. All days of Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days. 2nd. By a special indulgent from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays at every meal, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember week and Holy Saturday. 3rd. The use of flesh and fish at the same time is not allowed in Lent.

The following persons are exempted from abstinence, viz.: Children under seven years; and from fasting, persons under twenty-one; and from either or both, those who, on account of ill health, advanced age, hard labor, or some other legitimate cause, cannot observe the law. In case of doubt the pastor should be consulted.

Lard may be used in preparing fasting food during the season of Lent, except on Good Friday, as also on all days of abstinence throughout the year by those who cannot easily procure butter.

Pastors are required to hold in their respective churches, at least twice in the week during Lent, devotions and instructions suited to the holy season, and they should earnestly exhort their people to attend these public devotions. They are hereby authorized to give on these occasions Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament. Besides the public devotions, family prayers, especially the Holy Rosary of the Blessed Virgin, should be recited in every Catholic household of the diocese.

**DEATH OF MR. HUGH RYAN**

Our readers will peruse with much regret the announcement made in another column of the death of Mr. Hugh Ryan, a leading Catholic citizen of Toronto. Mr. Ryan was one of the most whole souled, enterprising and estimable of men. By his personal worth, energy and rectitude he forged his way from a humble sphere in life to an honorable and distinguished position. The Catholic Church and the Catholic charitable institutions of Toronto will sadly miss Hugh Ryan, for his great heart ever went out in practical sympathy whenever and wherever assistance was needed. May a heavenly home be his reward for all his noble actions while on earth.

**REV. MOTHER DIGBY.**

We are pleased to be informed that the visit of Rev. Mother Digby, Superior General of the Ladies of the Sacred Heart, to this country, has been in every respect most gratifying. Her sojourn in Mexico has been very pleasant, all classes paying her that respect and honor to which she is so justly entitled. The distinguished lady is now in New Orleans, and it is expected she will come north about the end of the present month, visiting Philadelphia, Torrildale, Pa., (Eden Hall), Atlantic City, Manhattanville, Providence, Boston and Albany; and will most likely return to Montreal en route for England.

**PRESBYTERIANISM SHRINKING.**

A discussion has been going on in the press for some time in regard to the rapid decline of Presbyterianism in New York and other large cities of the United States. The New York Sun asserts that the time was when Presbyterianism was supported by a great part of the wealth and intellectual ability of the city, but now the case is entirely changed. The city has increased vastly in population, and other churches are branching out to keep pace with this increase, but Presbyterianism is shrinking, and is seriously considering the necessity of consolidating its diminishing congregations. Even Episcopalianism is increasing, by attracting to its fold many who have been Presbyterians, two prominent clergymen, Drs. Shields and Briggs, being among the number of recent converts. Some of the reasons for this remarkable state of affairs are said to be the austerity of the Presbyterian system, the harshness of Calvinistic doctrine,

and the absence of an attractive ritual in Presbyterian worship. It is claimed, on the other hand, that Ritualistic Churches are growing rapidly.

**THE IRISH NATIONALIST LEADERSHIP.**

At a meeting of the Irish Nationalist or Anti-Parnellite members of Parliament which took place on the 7th inst., Mr. John Dillon, chairman of the party, announced his resignation of the leadership, his motive being the expectation that new arrangements for the security of the unity of the Nationalist parties under one leadership. Mr. Dillon's resignation was somewhat unexpected, but the honesty of his motive was approved, and it is hoped, in accordance with the wish of the people of Ireland generally, that the reunion of the factions may now take place. Messrs. Edward Blake, Thomas Sexton and even John Redmond of Waterford have been mentioned among those who are looked upon as likely to be selected for the vacant chairmanship. Sir Thomas Henry Esmonde, the senior whip of the party, will in the meantime preside over the meetings. The London Times announces in vigorous language that Mr. Blake would not be a suitable leader, but the Irish Parliamentary Party is not likely to take advice from that quarter, as it is the conviction that the Thund. rer's advice would be such as would be most likely to be hurtful to the cause of Ireland. In fact Mr. Blake is thought by many to be the most eligible man for the position, and the one who by his integrity and ability would be the most likely to command the respect of Nationalists of all sections.

**A VIEW OF THE REUNION OF CHRISTENDOM.**

The Rev. W. T. Herridge, of Ottawa, one of the most prominent of the Presbyterian ministers of Ontario, in a sermon delivered in St. Andrew's church on Sunday, the 5th inst., expressed the conviction that the time for the reunion of Christendom will yet come, though not in our day. He said "Protestantism is not perfect: Roman Catholicism is not perfect. A growing number in both communions are striving to pierce beneath the crust of dogma and ritual and get at the heart of things. The Church was Catholic at the beginning, and it will surely be Catholic at the end."

The Rev. Mr. Herridge is one of the most liberal-minded Presbyterian clergymen in the Dominion, and no doubt he is thoroughly honest in the expression of his convictions, yet we must point out that the picture he draws of Christians endeavoring to construct a new and true Church by eliminating doctrine and ritual from the multitude of jarring denominations is a ludicrous one. The result of such a process would be to bring Christianity down to a mere Rationalism or Deism, without the saving truths which Christ taught while He was on earth. The Christian religion would thus be brought down to the form of a Pythagorean or Platonic school, or to that of some of the other schools of philosophy which in Pagan times failed either to bring mankind to God, or to establish morality among men, because their systems were merely human fancies, and they had no authority from the Almighty to teach their doctrines to the nations of earth.

It requires no lengthy process of reasoning to show that such a system of Christianity must be a dismal failure as far as pointing out the road to salvation is concerned. It would be a Christianity without a Saviour—without sacraments or sacrifice—without any means whereby God would point out how He desires to be worshipped. It would deprive Christ of all authority to govern His own Church, inasmuch as all matters, whether of faith or Church government, would be left to the fancies and idiosyncracies of individuals. Every individual would really be a Church for himself under such a system. It is strange that Rev. Mr. Herridge should claim that the characteristic of Catholicity could belong to a religion thus constituted.

The rev. gentleman hopes that ritual as well as dogma will be abolished under this new form of Christianity, or at least, left to the will of individuals. It is true that revealed truths coming from God Himself must be deemed as of higher importance than any special ritual which has its origin in human law; but it must be remarked that a certain amount of ritual has been instituted by God Himself, as the ritual essential to the act of sacrifice, and the

matter and form of the sacraments. For the rest, good order requires that the Church instituted by Christ should determine what rites should be observed to excite reverence to God's ordinances, instead of their being left to the fancies of individuals, as would be the result if Mr. Herridge's theories were put into practice. We must therefore place Mr. Herridge's ideal Christianity among the many impracticable vagaries of the human imagination.

The Rev. Mr. Herridge in giving out these utterances undoubtedly shows a good deal of impartiality. He seems to have no particular preference for one Church rather than another, as he considers all to be imperfect, and he does not even regard Presbyterianism as the perfect form of Christianity. He concluded his remarkable sermon with the expression of the conviction that "a simple creed, more in touch with the thought of the age, and with a better perspective of truth, will yet replace that remarkable historic monument known as the Westminster Confession."

The resemblance of these views with those of the London Spectator on the Comprehensiveness of the Church of England, elsewhere commented on in this issue, will be evident to our readers. The fact that the tendency of modern Protestantism is toward the elimination of dogma from religion, shows that if there is to be a union of sects at all, that union will be effected, not by the vigorous assertion of Christian doctrine, but by the denial of all the distinctive dogmas of Christianity. It is a mistake to suppose that Catholics can ever be brought to assent to Christian Union on such terms. A necessary condition of union is submission to the authority of the Church, and an acceptance of Christian doctrine in its entirety.

**A LEAF FROM ORANGE HISTORY.**

Seldom have we met with a specimen of more audacious mendacity than was uttered a few evenings ago by Grand Master the Hon. N. Clarke Wallace in an address delivered at the annual supper of "Wm. Johnson Loyal Orange Lodge No. 127," in Toronto.

The occasion was not one which called for this exhibition of bigotry, but Mr. N. Clarke Wallace can find an opportunity anywhere for the exhibition of his innate hostility to Catholics. He could not restrain himself from expressing his bigotry, even when as a Cabinet Minister he was especially bound to respect the feelings of the whole population of the Dominion, and pay regard to the responsibilities of the Government toward all Canadians. It would be too much to expect that such a man would show any regard to decency when he has on him no official responsibility.

Bigotry was the path by which Mr. Wallace reached his position as Grand Master, and we presume he aims by the same methods to retain that office. The occasion of Mr. Wallace's most recent laudation of Orangism and abuse of the Catholic Church was the presentation of a deer's head made to him by a friend of his in British Columbia. An address was sent to him by the donor which spoke of the affection entertained by the Orangemen of that province for their Grand Master.

Mr. Wallace began his reply by lauding the unflinching loyalty of the Orange Order which had rallied to prevent the disruption of the British Empire when England was wavering toward Home Rule for Ireland, which meant Rome Rule. It had killed the annexation movement in Canada. In the North West rebellion which was fomented by priests, it had loyally fought for its Queen. The Church of Rome had by its machinations sent political parties in the past, and would endeavor to do so in the future. The Orangemen are the watchmen on the tower that can be purchased or coerced, ready to desert the agents of the Church which is ever seeking to take away the liberties of free peoples.

So accustomed are we to hear such bald rubbish as this, especially every year when the anniversary of the battle of the Boyne comes round, that it might seem unnecessary to notice this rhodomontade. But it appears to us proper to contradict these absurd statements and to state briefly the facts of the case, lest some of our readers should suppose from our silence that Mr. Wallace's statements have something of truth in them.

So the loyalty of Orangism is unflinching! And what must be our estimate of the loyalty it displayed in 1836, when it was known that King William IV. must soon leave the throne vacant for a successor? Did not a parliamentary commission investigate a rumored plot to set aside the lawful successor to the crown, Her present Majesty Queen Victoria, and to put the Duke of Cumberland in her place? And was it not discovered that the Orangemen of Eng-

land and Ireland had concocted this plot?

It was in consequence of this that, on motion of Earl Sir John Russell, the resolution was passed by Parliament that Orangism should be suppressed, and it was only because the Earl of Enniskillen promised that the order would be disbanded that more vigorous measures were not taken to suppress so dangerous a body of conspirators.

Again, when in Canada a bill was passed by Parliament, and approved by Lord Elgin, the representative of the Orangemen, did not an Orange mob burn the Parliament buildings? And were not Lord and Lady Elgin openly insulted by mobs of these "unflinching loyalists?"

It was shortly after this occasion that the founder of Canadian Orangism in person headed an Orange procession to the Brockville wharf with piratical emblems and black flags, to insult Lord Elgin, who was to arrive by steamer.

Later, in 1860, the Prince of Wales was publicly insulted by the Orangemen of Brockville, Kingston, Belleville, Toronto and of the county of Victoria, because his advisers and guardians whom the Queen sent to direct his conduct on the occasion of his visit to Canada, would not permit him to give public recognition to Orangism by receiving addresses from the association and permitting its members to take a public part in his reception. An unflinching loyal society would not have forced itself thus offensively upon the representative of the Queen and heir to the throne, especially as there were good reasons why no public recognition of it should be given.

And now a word on the occasions of which Mr. Wallace boasts as showing the loyalty of Orangism. The Orangemen of Ireland were indeed opposed to Home Rule, but it is absurd to say that Home Rule means the disruption of the British Empire. Canada has Home Rule, but this fact has made Canada truly loyal, and the measure which has thus built up the loyalty of Canadians was opposed by the Orangemen of Canada, just as those of Ireland opposed the granting of a similar concession to the people of Ireland. The true reason for the Orange opposition to Home Rule for Ireland is set out by Mr. N. Clarke Wallace, who pretends to be horrified at the thought that Home Rule for Ireland means Rome Rule.

There is no foundation for such a statement, but it reveals the truth that the Orangemen opposed Home Rule because Ireland is a Catholic nation, and they wish Catholics not to enjoy the common rights of British subjects. They wish, besides, for the same reason, to perpetuate the evils under which Ireland has suffered for over three centuries.

Mr. Wallace claims that Orangism killed the annexation movement in Canada. It did nothing of the kind. We have never had in Canada anything like a strong annexation movement, though a few Canadians have favored such, and will undoubtedly continue to do so, as there is always a certain fraction of the people who are restless and desirous of a change of some kind. But we remember well that probably the largest amount of annexation talk we ever had in Canada occurred at the same time when Lord Elgin was insulted by the Orangemen, and that talk came from Orangemen. To this we must add that open rebellion was talked of by the leading Orangemen of Ireland when it was thought for a while that Home Rule might be given to that country.

In regard to the North West rebellion, Mr. Wallace is well aware that he is stating a falsehood when he says it was fomented by the priests. The priests of the North West counseled the people to patience, though they desired that certain rights of the settlers should be assured by the Dominion Government.

Sir John Macdonald admitted frequently that proper steps had not been taken to secure to the settlers their vested titles, and it was for this reason that the rebellion took place; but the Government of the day publicly thanked Mr. Taché, the late Archbishop of St. Boniface, for having assisted ably and efficiently in bringing about a settlement of the rebellion, and in convincing the people that Canada would respect their rights—though we regret to add that the terms of the settlement have not been faithfully observed, as the trouble over the Manitoba School question fully proves. But Orangism as such has no claim to assert that it quelled that rebellion. This was done by the volunteer force of Canada, which is not and ought not to be distinctively Orange. Yet we

willingly admit that the Orange body gloated over that rebellion with peculiar satisfaction because it gave them an opportunity to imbue their hands in the blood of French-Canadian Catholics, whom they hate intensely. Many of the North West settlers were of French-Canadian origin, and for Orangemen this gave a zest to the campaign. It will not contribute to the prosperity and peace of the Dominion to make a religious question of the North West rebellion, as Mr. Wallace has attempted to do with manifest injustice.

**THE "COMPREHENSIVENESS" OF ANGLICANISM.**

The London Spectator in its issue of the 24th December discusses the question of the comprehensiveness or inclusiveness of the Church of England, contending "that the acknowledgment of a spiritual right to live and let live belongs to no other Church in anything like the same degree as it does to the Church of England. It is her birthright, and if maintained will, we firmly believe, make her the most living of Christian Churches—the chief repository in the future of the higher spiritual life."

The article is written in accord with the view frequently expressed by the highest dignitaries of the Church of England, and it bears intrinsic marks of having been written by one of these dignitaries, wishing to make the absence of any definite teaching an evidence of the truth of Anglicanism, or at all events of its suitability to be the religion of the people of England.

The writer of the article in question continues:

"The English speaking race is, we believe, destined ultimately to a far greater place in the world than has ever been imagined for it even by the most daring dreamer. But what will that avail if the race is sunk either in materialization or in superstition, drowned in the security of mere physical progress, or dragged by the epistles of a mechanical devotion? We want to see the Anglican Church keep pace with the greatness of the race, and be the unquestioned chief among the spiritual protectors of that greatness. . . . If the Church of England is to be worthy of what may be her future, and what assuredly is her opportunity, she must remain loyal to the spirit of comprehension."

Stripped of mere verbiage, all this means that the religion of a progressive nation should be of such a character as to embrace within its fold—its comprehensiveness or inclusiveness—all or nearly all manners of belief which may be found within the nation itself.

The article is evidently an Irenicon, a peace offering by which it is hoped to moderate the disturbances which are at the present moment threatening the very existence of that Church, and to mollify the contending factions within the bosom of the Church, which are threatening each other with annihilation. It is an appeal for Peace! Peace! where peace appears to be impossible, inasmuch as the differences between the opposing factions within the Church regard the most vital principles of Christian truth.

Mr. W. H. Mallock wrote recently in the Nineteenth Century an article in which he described graphically the differences which exist between the High, Low, and Broad Churchism of the factions of Anglicanism. In regard to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper he says:

"It might happen on any Sunday, owing to the most ordinary of accidents, that three clergymen might be assisting in the celebration of the same communion, who, if each were to speak his own personal conviction, would severally address the intending communicants thus. One would say: 'There will be charity be present on this altar the actual flesh and blood that suffered and was shed on Calvary. If you do not believe this, you will eat and drink damnation, not discerning the Lord's body.' Another would say: 'If you really allow yourself to believe in this vile materialism with which my brother in Christ has been enticing you, you run the risk of being damned for the awful sin of idolatry; while the third would say: 'If you listen to what you have been told by either of them, you will, in an intellectual sense, be neither more nor less than fools.'"

On the question of priestly orders Mr. Mallock points out that the divergence of belief in the Church of England is equally great with that on the bodily presence of Christ in the Lord's Supper. "One section," he says, "holds that the clergyman is a priest in the Roman sense, endowed with miraculous powers, while two other sections, on differing grounds, utterly repudiate this claim."

We must here remark that Mr. Mallock's statement of the case is not correct. It is not claimed that the priesthood of the Catholic Church possesses miraculous powers. The priesthood has supernatural powers, which are of a different order from the miraculous. The powers of the Catholic priesthood are in the order of grace which is conferred in the administration of the sacraments, by virtue of their institution by Christ for this purpose, as grace for the remission of sins conferred by the sacraments of baptism and penance. Grace is also conferred through the

Holy Communion and the Sacrifice of the Mass; but the powers of the priesthood do not ordinarily include that of working miracles, which are a suspension of the ordinary laws of nature. With this exception of confounding what is supernatural with the miraculous, Mr. Mallock's statement of the differences which rend Anglicanism is accurate and graphic. From this may be judged the nature of the comprehension of Anglicanism in which the London Spectator glories as if it were an indubitable evidence of truth, instead of a crass insensibility to the ravages of unrestrained error.

In fact the Spectator's article says openly that men "should think more of affirmation and less of negation, more of spreading their own light than of extinguishing the lights of other people." This is, surely, an ingenious plea for the toleration of all sorts of doctrine, however inconsistent with each other they may be. But it is more ingenious than truthful, for what it calls the "lights of other people" is really the darkness of rampant error. It is almost needless to say that the toleration of such error within the pale of the Church would make it cease to be "the pillar and the ground of truth" as the Church of the living God must be according to the words addressed by St. Paul to Timothy.

If the Church of God were merely a human institution, a political club for the airing of all sorts of theories, it might be that its objects would be best attained by the comprehension advocated by the Spectator. But this was not the intention of the Divine Founder of Christianity in establishing His Church. The Divine Spirit was given to that Church to teach it all truth necessary to lead man to salvation, by preserving him from the danger of being "carried about with every wind of doctrine, in the wickedness of men, in craftiness by which they lie in wait to deceive." (Eph. iv, 14.) It is the duty of the Church, therefore, to suppress dangerous error, and not to encourage it by compromise.

The Spectator's desire may be to bring Ritualists and Evangelicals into harmony by making each party indifferent as to what may be taught by the other, but neither one nor the other party appears disposed to make peace on such terms, and the war between these two parties will probably continue to rage until one or the other acknowledge itself beaten. What the last result will be we do not pretend to foresee.

The Anglican Church is not the only one whose ministers frequently assert that it is an evidence of truth if a Church receives into its communion persons of a variety of creeds, and even it has been claimed, absurdly enough, that the facility with which this is done is what constitutes the Catholicity of the Church. The real meaning of the Catholicity of the Church is something very different from this. It is found in the commission given by Christ to His Apostles which Christ has revealed and in His promise to remain with His Church all days, even to the consummation of the world. Hence the Catholicity of the Church is three-fold. It is Catholic or Universal as to place, sending its missionaries to all nations; as to doctrine, teaching all that Christ taught; and as to time, never ceasing to exist since first Christ instituted it, building it upon a rock, and promising that the gates of hell shall not prevail against it. This is the Catholicity of the Church as Christ instituted it, and that three-fold characteristic is found only in the Catholic Church in communion with the See of Rome.

**COLLAPSE OF THE POUGHKEEPSIE PLAN.**

The so-called "Poughkeepsie plan" of keeping up Catholic schools, under the Public School system of New York State, has collapsed after an existence of about twenty five years. At that time the city of Poughkeepsie was heavily in debt for the newly constructed water-works system, sewerage and other public improvements, and new school buildings were required which would add enormously to the burdens of the citizens. Thereupon the Rev. P. F. McSweeney, the Catholic pastor of St. Peter's parish, offered two fully equipped school buildings to the Public School Board, for the nominal rent of \$1 per annum. These buildings had been erected by the Catholic congregation, and they were gratefully accepted by the Board, and made Public schools, with the understanding that the Sisters of Charity should be continued as teachers, with authority to give religious instruction outside of school hours. In every other respect the schools

were conducted in conformity with Public school laws, and there never any cause for complaint efficiency on the part of the teachers or that the proficiency of the pupils was not fully up to the standard of regular public schools. In fact Poughkeepsie plan was frequently referred to as affording an example method whereby means might be found to reconcile the demands of Catholic religious instruction in the schools with the Public school system in vogue throughout New York and other States.

From the beginning the Poughkeepsie plan was not acceptable to anti-Catholic element of the Poughkeepsie, and efforts to overthrow it have been constantly made, notwithstanding which it continued to flourish until very recently. Now, however, it has been overturned by the decision of the State Superintendent of Education, on the appeal of Edward H. a Protestant resident of Poughkeepsie who objected against its continuation on the ground that the religious of the four Sisters employed as teachers constituted "religious instruction imparted within school hours therefore forbidden by the law."

This decision of the State Superintendent will oblige the people of Poughkeepsie to erect four new school buildings at a cost of \$60,000.

It must be here said that the Poughkeepsie generally admired and just, and have no sympathy with the efforts which have been made by fanatics to prevent the Poughkeepsie plan from being a success, but the State school law has thrust the authority into the hands of those who are animated by a spirit of hostility to Catholics, and who would see the Catholic children grow without education rather than that they be educated in their religion by teachers who are able to give religious instruction, as well as instruction in grammar and arithmetic and other secular branches.

This total collapse of the Poughkeepsie Plan is similar to that which was known as the Fairbank plan which was tried for some years in several cities of Wisconsin and some Western States. The Fairbank plan was also a failure, owing to the united opposition of those who were hostile to all Catholic education.

It is now clear that the only open to Catholics in these States continue their parochial schools, but any compromise with the school system. It is a heavy burden upon the Catholics of the United States to support Catholic schools without aid from the State, while the tax for the maintenance of these schools, but it is necessary they make the sacrifice that their children may not grow up in ignorance and duties to God and of their religion may be that at some future time American people may rectify justice they are at present in but from present appearances it is not likely to remedy that injustice many years to come.

**THE HON. A. J. BALFOUR'S PLAN FOR A CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY IN IRELAND.**

The announcement has been made by the Hon. A. J. Balfour, Lord of the Treasury, and leader of the Government in the House of Commons, that the Government is ready to establish in Ireland two universities, a quasi-Catholic Dublin, which will be named Patrick's, and a quasi-Protestant Belfast which will be called St. Andrew's University.

This announcement is a matter of great importance, and a letter addressed by Mr. Balfour to constituents in East Manches which it is carefully stated that institutions will not be exclusively Catholic and Protestant, respectively, inasmuch as all scholarships and bursarships in both will be open to all irrespective of creed. There will be no public endowment given to chairs in philosophy, or modern history. These chief subjects which are taught entirely different basis, according to the theological convictions of the professors, and as Mr. Balfour declares that the intention of the Government is not to make these chairs distinctly Catholic or Protestant, these chairs will not be endowed. But an endeavor will be made to make the Dublin university open to Catholics by putting it under Catholic governing body from the beginning, while the Belfast one made attractive to Protestants by placing under a Protestant ruling body. A certain number of clergy ecclesiastical dignitaries will be these ruling bodies, but Mr.