

**The Catholic Record.**

Published Weekly at 424 and 426 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHBROOK, Editor.

Author of "Mistakes of Modern Ireland."

THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.

MRS. L. K. KIRK, JOHN NICHOL, and P. J. NEVILL, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and to transact all other business for the Catholic Record.

Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, acute measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Boniface, and the Bishops of London, 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.

Articles must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday, Feb. 10, 1894.

**LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1894.**

(OFFICIAL.)

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. 1894, 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.

M. J. TIERNAN, Sec.

**WHO IS THE SCHISMATIC?**

The Archbishop of Canterbury issued a New Year's pastoral, in which he makes an attack upon the Holy Father and Cardinal Vaughan as insolent as it is ridiculous. He says:

"Never since the days of the Roman schism, when the adherents of the Papacy withdrew themselves from the English Church, has Romanism been so boldly aggressive as at the present time. Its churches and its priests are multiplied in every quarter; its Bishops have arrogated to themselves the titles of English Bishops; its emissaries have claimed for themselves the name of rectors in the parishes into which they have intruded; the name of the Pope of Rome is made to take precedence of the Queen of England; and a writer of some position has brought these claims to a climax by asserting that the present head of the Church of England is an Italian Cardinal. The Church of England can indeed afford to smile at such pretensions which it would be easy to characterize in less considerate language. Happily with all this self-assertion and display there is absolutely no real increase in the numbers of this religious community."

It is a pleasant habit of late with some members of the Anglican clergy to speak of "the Roman schism;" and, notwithstanding its absurdity, the Archbishop of Canterbury has frequently made use of it.

A schism in a Church is defined by Webster as, "appropriately, a division or separation in a Church or denomination of Christians occasioned by diversity of opinions; a breach of unity among people of the same religious faith."

The definition usually given by theologians is more explicit: but this one will suit our purpose. According to it, there are two degrees of schism, one of which generally implies heresy, which is the case when the diversity referred to regards actual doctrines of the Church: the other consists of establishing a new Church authority instead of that which was hitherto recognized by the Church proper.

Now it is a simple matter to tell when Anglicanism made both these departures from unity. Under Henry VIII. the new Church authority was set up, the king being given by Act of Parliament the title "Head of the Church," which had belonged only to the Pope. This was a schism of the second kind, to say the least. In Elizabeth's and Edward VI.'s reign, the doctrines and mode of worship underwent a complete change, so that there were both schism and heresy.

But when did the much talked of "Roman schism" of which the Bishop of Canterbury speaks take place? In vain do we

search the pages of history for any trace of it—and surely the Archbishop and his clergy should have some information about the time when it occurred, and the circumstances under which it took place before thus presuming to speak flippantly on so serious a subject. Such information they cannot have, since it never took place.

The schism of which the Archbishop speaks is evidently one by which the Church of England, once an independent National Church, duly established by Apostolic authority, became subject to the jurisdiction of the Pope, leaving still a remnant at least who protested against such a transference of authority. It would be a work of supererogation to prove at length that this event is purely imaginary. The Church in England, or of England, before the Reformation, from the time of Lucius, was part of the Universal Church, subject to the same supreme authority as the Church elsewhere.

The first missionaries, about A. D. 183, were sent to Britain by Pope Eleutherius, and Bede informs us that their successors claimed their jurisdiction in their respective Sees to be derived from that Holy Pontiff, who instituted the hierarchy of the country. British Bishops assisted at the Councils of Arles, held in 314, and of Sardica in 347, with those of other countries; and these Councils recognized in the clearest terms the authority of the Pope. Thus the Pope's legates presided at the Council of Arles; and the Pope, Sylvester, was "reverently saluted" by the Bishops present as their common father. The Epistle of the Council of Arles to Pope Sylvester expressed regret on account of his absence, and resolved that "by you especially, our sentence should be made known to all men."

The Council of Sardica had also British Bishops present. All united in decreeing that in case of any matter of dispute between Bishops, "the Bishops of another Eparchy should not be called in as judges." But if "any one of the Bishops shall appear to have been condemned in any matter, and thinks that he has not a bad case, but a good one, in order that the decision may be considered anew, if it seem good to your charity, let us honor the memory of blessed Peter, and let letters be written by those who have given judgment, to Julius, Bishop of Rome, that so by the neighboring Bishops of that Province the judgment may be considered anew, and he furnish the judges." (Canon 4.)

We might add much more to the same effect, showing that the Church of England was not an isolated Church like the newly made Church under Henry VIII.

Some Anglican clergy assert, with Collier, Burnet, and others, that the British Bishops whom St. Augustine found in the country were opposed to the authority of the Pope, which was introduced by St. Augustine and his monks. During the wars with the Saxons, which resulted in the driving of the Britons for the most part into the mountains of Wales, communication with the rest of the Christian world was rendered difficult, and the result was that the British Bishops had fallen into an error as to the time for the celebration of Easter. Besides, they hated their Saxon conquerors, and were angered that they should be made the object of missionary endeavor, and they were jealous of the authority conferred upon St. Augustine by the Pope. These causes brought about their dissatisfaction with St. Augustine, but the dispute is no proof that they denied the Papal authority. As a matter of fact they did not do so, except by offering a merely temporary resistance which soon ended. This obstinacy did not and could not constitute the British Church an independent national organization, yet even if such had been the case, this local circumstance would not have amounted to a legitimate precedent on which to found the Anglican theory.

It is not to be forgotten that the Britons had at this period fallen into a sad decay of piety and into moral corruption, that even the clergy had to a great extent lost the sense of religion, and that the zeal for God's glory and the conversion of souls was extinguished in them. Gildas says "it was the custom of the British," even in his own day, "not to have any regard to the faith and religion of the English (Saxons), nor to correspond any more with them than with Pagans." Yet there is ample evidence that the faith preached to the Saxons by St. Augustine was the same as had been preached four hundred years before to the Britons by Fugatus and Damianus,

that the traditions of the British Church connected it with the Roman Pontiffs as closely as the Church was connected with them from the days of St. Augustine to those of Cranmer.

Mr. Collier indeed says in his history that St. Augustine insisted that the British Bishops should "keep Easter and administer baptism according to the Roman usage, and acknowledge the Pope's authority." This is a falsification of history. According to Bede, the chief historian of the whole event, the third article, instead of referring to the acceptance of the Pope's authority, merely asked that the British Bishops should unite with St. Augustine in preaching to the Saxons. The Pope is not even mentioned in any of the three articles, but the proposition made by St. Augustine proves that the British were not of a hostile faith distinct from his own. The answer of the Britons makes this still more evident. They declared that "they had their own Archbishop, and were therefore not subject to St. Augustine, and that they would not trouble themselves to preach to their enemies. That the Saxons had taken their country from them, for which they hated them intensely, and cared not what religion they would they communicate with them any more than with dogs."

Such is the account given of the interview by Bede, and it proves satisfactorily that the difficulty between St. Augustine and the British Bishops did not arise out of a difference of faith but from the obstinacy of the Britons and their hatred of the Saxons. There was, therefore, no "Roman schism" in the event, such as the so-named Archbishop of Canterbury has imagined.

But even admitting all that Collier and some others maintain, the Archbishop's case would not be bettered, for he has over and over again boasted that he is the successor of Augustine and Anselm, so that if Augustine were the founder of a schismatical Church, and an heretical one, he must himself be a schismatic and a heretic like his predecessors.

Concerning the faith of the Episcopal line established by St. Augustine there can be no doubt. We hear it often repeated of late by Anglican clergymen, especially of the High Church school, that there was no recognition of the Pope's authority in the pre-Reformation period of the Church's existence.

We have before now shown the fallacy of this contention, and we shall here cite merely the authority of St. Anselm on the point; especially for the reason that this illustrious Archbishop of Canterbury is so confidently claimed as a predecessor by the present occupant of the See who holds his position, not by ecclesiastical ordination, but by the force of civil authority, that is to say, by Act of Parliament.

On the 24th of May, 1097, Anselm asked permission from King William Rufus to go to Rome for reasons of conscience. It was necessary to obtain this permission before departing, but the king refused it, saying: "No, no! I do not believe he has committed any sin so grievous that he should go to ask the Apostolic absolution. If he only wants to consult the Pope, I believe myself to be more able than he to give him good counsel."

This answer recorded by Eadmer, the Archbishop's secretary and the historian of his life, makes it manifest that neither the king nor the Archbishop ever imagined that any one but the Pope had supreme authority in the Church, though the former was always manifesting a rebellious spirit.

Anselm urged his request several times, so that the king was angered and threatened to seize the revenues of the Archbishop's See, and to refuse to recognize Anselm as Archbishop.

Calling the Bishops together to inform them of his reasons for desiring to go to Rome, Anselm led them to the king's palace and repeated his request, saying to the king:

"How can you say that the customs of the kingdom are opposed to my having recourse to the Blessed Peter, and to the Pope his Vicar, for the salvation of my soul and the good government of the Church which God has entrusted to me? The fidelity I owe to God and the interests of His service demand that I should go to Rome, to the Pope, the Chief of Christianity, to ask counsels which are absolutely necessary for myself and for the government of the Church of England."

This is sufficient to show in what sense the words "Church of England" were used up to the time of Reformation. It was not an independent National Church, but part of the great Catholic Church, spread through the

whole world, and acknowledging the Pope's supreme authority.

The great Roman schism of which His Grace of Canterbury speaks is therefore a myth. From this it follows that the Church of which the Archbishop of Canterbury claims to be Primate was schismatical from its inception to the present time. The authority of the Pope is the same now as it was in the days of Lucius and Fugatus, and St. Augustine and Anselm; and the Primate of England at his appointment, be he Italian, French, or German, is the only one having a Primate's authority. The Primacy of the so-called Archbishop of Canterbury is but a sham.

The Church of England may, as the Archbishop says, "smile at such pretensions;" but they are a reality all the same, and we strongly suspect that the smiling is of the crocodile order, in view of the fact that the clergy of the Anglican Church are themselves being made aware of the teaching of ages in regard to the Pope's authority, and are becoming Catholics by the dozen or by the score. The very morning after the appearance of the Archbishop's letter announcing how pleasantly he could smile at the assumptions of the Pope, the conversion of three rectors to the Catholic Church was announced, making fourteen within a few weeks.

It is to be remarked, however, that Cardinal Vaughan is not an Italian. He is as thoroughly a British subject as is the claimant to the See of Canterbury. However, in matters ecclesiastical, there is no special virtue in being a British subject. The Apostles were not British subjects, yet Christ conferred on them the office of propagating his gospel through the whole world. It appears, then, that a special nationality is not needed to fit any one to be the recipient of ecclesiastical jurisdiction. The necessary qualification is that he derive his authority from the successor of St. Peter.

**POWERFUL FOR EVIL.**The Mail calls the P. P. A. a powerful organization. Perhaps it is, but, so far as spreading the truth is concerned it will be found a great obstacle in the way. Rev. Mr. Madill, the Baptist preacher, who is its Grand High executioner, was a few days ago interviewed by a *Globe* reporter. We give the following choice bit from the report:

"Is there anything in the order to prohibit members from employing Roman Catholics?" I asked a few moments later.

"Now you are referring to that oath that was printed," Mr. Madill replied.

"Well, does the order interfere with its members employing Roman Catholics?"

"That obligation that was printed is wrong."

"How much wrong?"

"Enough to be wrong?"

"How many words?"

"Quite a number."

"Then, with regard to keeping Roman Catholics out of offices, does the order say that no Roman Catholic shall be elected to any public office?"

"The order does not take from any Roman Catholic anything that he has a right to have."

"Is to be elected to office a right or just a privilege?"

Mr. Madill smiled, and repeated his former reply.

"If a Roman Catholic offered himself as a candidate for the Township Council here would there be anything in the principles of the order to prevent its members voting for him?"

"The case is not likely to rise here."

"Speaking for myself, I would support a Protestant?"

"Is there anything in the order to require you to give a Protestant the preference over a Roman Catholic? You would be acting according to the principles of the order by preferring the Protestant?"

"I think so."

"May I understand, then, that the order requires its members to vote for Protestants over Roman Catholics in all elections for offices?"

"The order does not take away any right the Roman Catholic has," was the Grand President's evasive and smiling reply.

"He has a right to offer himself as a candidate, and you don't take away that right? I suppose you think you have a right to vote for whom you please?"

"We support the candidates we prefer."

"And the order requires its members to prefer Protestant candidates?"

"I think so."

"In the same way the order requires its members to prefer Protestants over Roman Catholics in giving employment?"

"It's about the same."

Throughout the interview the duplicity and cunning displayed by Mr. Madill would make a circus fakir green with envy. In a report of the convention published by the *Owen Sound Plaindealer*, an organ of the P. P. A., it is asserted that the order

"Only opposes the political power of Rome, and does not countenance the slightest appearance of persecution of Roman Catholics by advising or supporting the dismissal of employees of that faith, or the refusal of work to them."

This does not fit in very nicely with Mr. Madill's declaration. Somebody is smashing the truth. As Mr. Madill is a preacher we will charitably suppose it must be the other fellow.

But how do some of the brethren of the cloth view the course taken by Mr. Madill? The Rev. Ralph Duff, of Vancouver, B. C., a Congregationalist minister—the denomination to which Mr. Madill belongs—said in a recent address: "The P. P. A. should have

its name changed to D. D. A.—Devil's Destructive Association." According to this, the superior officer of Rev. Mr. Madill must be the evil one.

Another minister of British Columbia—Rev. Mr. McLaren, Presbyterian—said last Sunday that "a man's country should be considered above his creed. They were living in peace with their Roman Catholic brethren, whom they respected as worthy citizens, and he hoped no hot-headed enthusiasts would introduce such a calamity as the P. P. A. into British Columbia." It is pleasant to notice the manly attitude taken by a considerable number of the ministers in regard to this conspiracy. They will have to work hard and perseveringly, however, if they wish to neutralize the devilry planted amongst the people by such clerical anarchists as Mr. Madill.

**A CRUSADE OF MENDACITY.**

The man of pure and simple heart, through life disdains a double part. He never needs the screen of lies. His inward bosom to disguise.

GAY'S FABLES.

The instances have been so numerous wherein the A. P. A. and the P. P. A. have propagated slander as the means of spreading their principles that we may well call the propagation of slanders a peculiar method of these two associations: that is to say, two in name, while being one in origin and in method.

A curious example of this unscrupulousness and addiction to lying was afforded by the Boston organ of the association recently, namely, the *Citizen*. The lie was introduced with the following preface:"The *Citizen* has seen, within a week, in the Boston *Pilot* of May 11th, 1867, the following oath of the Irish Roman Catholic Fenians—and it should be remembered that John Boyle O'Reilly, the editor of the *Pilot*, and tens of thousands of the Romish priests and laymen of the United States who are now attacking the A. P. A. were—and are now—members of the Fenian organization or the organization which succeeded it."Here is the oath as given in the *Pilot*:

"I swear by Almighty God, by all in heaven and earth, by the holy prayer-book of my holy Church, by the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God, by her sorrow and grief at the foot of the cross, by her tears and wailings, by the holy apostles St. Peter and Paul, by the glorious apostle of Ireland—St. Patrick—by the blessed and adorable Host, by the blessed and holy Church in all ages, by our holy national martyrs, to fight upon the Irish soil for the independence of Ireland—to fight until I die, wading to the knee in the red gore of the Sassenach (Protestant) for the glorious cause of nationality; to fight until not a single vestige, track or footprint, is left to tell that the holy soil of Ireland was ever trodden by the Sassenach tyrants and murderers; and moreover, when the Protestant robbers and brutes in Ireland shall be murdered and driven into the sea like the swine our Lord Jesus Christ caused to be drowned, then we shall embark for, and take England, and root out every vestige of the accursed blood of the heretic adulterer, Henry VIII., and possess ourselves of the treasures of the East which have so long kept our island of saints—old Ireland—in the chains of bondage, and driven us from her shores, exiles, into foreign lands. I will wade in the blood of Orangemen and heretics (Protestants) who do not join us and become of ourselves."

"Scotland, too, having given aid and succor to the beast, we shall leave her in her gore. We shall not give up until we have restored our holy faith all over the British Isles."

"To all of this I sincerely and conscientiously swear with my eyes blinded, not knowing who to me administers this oath."

The same hatred which inspired Romanists to take the above oath against "Protestant invaders" in Ireland, would inspire a similar oath against "Protestant invaders" in the United States—for do they not claim that the "Holy Church" discovered and by right owns this land?"

The whole of this story is simply an invention of the A. P. A. journalist, and he must have known that he was a forger inasmuch as he professed to have seen the paper from which he copied the oath.

An alleged Fenian oath was indeed published in the *Pilot* of the date mentioned, but it was not given as being any actual oath of theirs, but as having been brought before the British House of Commons a few nights before by M. P. Whalley, who was so notorious a liar against Catholics that he never received any more attention from the house than to be laughed at for his pains.This fact was noticed in the *Pilot* in introducing the oath with the following words:

"In the House of Commons on Tuesday night, on the discussion of the Oaths and Offices Bill, Mr. Whalley read the Fenian form of oath, as follows:

But the A. P. A. paper was not satisfied with attributing the Whalley

forgery to the *Pilot*, but it even changed its wording to make it worse than Whalley himself made it. "Sassenach," which means Saxon, is turned by the *Citizen* into "Protestant;" and as the pseudo-Fenian oath had words meaning that Scotland had suffered enough from the "Beast," (England, of course,) and was therefore to be left alone as a martyr to English tyranny, the *Citizen* changes all this to mean Scotchmen are also to be made objects of the Fenian spite. Thus for the words,

"Scotland having had her blood shed by the Beast, we shall leave her in her gore."

The *Citizen* substitutes:

"Scotland too, having given aid and succor to the Beast, we shall leave her in her gore."

Another lie, equally malicious, was published by a Cincinnati Baptist organ, which is also playing the part of an organ of the A. P. A. This was to the effect that the Irish Catholics of the United States are in general traitors to the Republic in which they have taken up their residence. This paper, the *Journal and Messenger*, said that the following facts had been lately received from the Pension Department at Washington:

"Whole number of troops who fought in the war, 2,128,200; Natives of the United States, 1,625,207; Germans, 180,817; Irishmen, 144,221; British (other than Irish) 99,040; other foreigners, 48,410."

The desertions were as follows: Natives of the United States, 5 per cent.; Germans, 10 per cent.; Irish Catholics, 72 per cent.; other foreigners, 6 per cent.

Or, to put this in another way, of the 144,000 Irishmen, who enlisted and took the oath of allegiance to this country, 104,000 deserted; and we are informed that most of these desertions occurred after the recognition of the Confederacy by the Pope. It is also a fact that of the 5 per cent. of native Americans rated as deserters, 45 per cent. of the 5 per cent. were Roman Catholics.

Now, as to the proportion of enlistment in the United States army, we find by the census that in 1860 there were in the United States the following number of persons of foreign birth: Germans, 1,301,136; Irish, 1,611,304; British (other than Irish), 834,943."

These pretended statistics carry refutation on their face; for it is self-evident that the Pension Department would never have made the blunder here perpetrated, of confounding Irishmen with Irish Catholics, while speaking of other races according to their nationality alone. At all events from them the *Citizen* drew the conclusion that 14 per cent. of the Germans, 12 per cent. of the British, and only 9 per cent. of the Irish enlisted. It adds a number of other lies, with the conclusion that

"With these and many other facts that can be furnished in great abundance, it is clearly seen that the Irish Catholic citizens of this Republic are not, on the whole, valuable or desirable, but, on the other hand, unreliable, treacherous and dangerous in the extreme."

The calumny, which was extensively copied by A. P. A. journals, was exploded through the enquiries of the *Catholic Telegraph* of the same city, which wrote to the Record and Pension office of the War Department, and received the following reply:

Record and Pension Office, War Department, Washington City, December 16, 1893.

Editor Catholic Telegraph:

Dear Sir: In reply to your communication of the 13th inst. received to-day, in which you enclose a newspaper clipping, returned herewith, containing a statement relative to the nativity and religious persuasion of the soldiers who enlisted in the volunteer army of the United States during the late war, and of those who deserted therefrom, and request to be informed whether or not the statistics given in said clipping are official. I am directed by the Secretary of War to inform you that no compilation has ever been made by this Department upon which any statement concerning this subject can be based.

As a matter of fact, the number of soldiers of any given nativity or religious persuasion in service during the late war is not known, and consequently it is not possible for this or any other Department to make even an approximately correct statement of the percentage of deserters belonging to any particular religious denomination. Furthermore, inasmuch as the War Department is the sole custodian of the records of the volunteer armies, no person outside of said Department has the means of making any reliable estimate concerning the matter in question.

The figures contained in the enclosed newspaper clipping are not based on any report furnished from the official records, and are entitled to no credence whatever.

Very respectfully, F. A. AINSWORTH, Colonel, U. S. Army, Chief, Record and Pension Office.

It must be added that with apparent candor the *Journal and Messenger* made an ample apology in regard to a

portion of its charges.

"We have to be

been deceived three

we published what

report from the Con-

sions relating to de-

army of the Union

war. The paper ca-

in such a way that

plecion and got the

ment. While we do

vaporizing bragado

Catholic papers wit

service rendered by

during the war, we

to be true that 72 p

sertions were Irish

matter of truth, the

good soldier, and, o

about as likely to s

is any other enlist

has not yet appear

has been a hindranc

the republic. We h

Catholic Telegraph

mitted that commu

columns. He who

been deceived by it."

It was honorable fo

Messenger to say th

reluctance to make

evident from the fa

retraction of the o

propagated, among

the Southern Confed

nized by the Pope

assassination of Presi

planned by a conspir

In making such stat

nal and Messenger a

of its class carefull

ground such fact as

President Garfield wa

a Methodist ex-local

Huguenot descent.

The P. P. A. in C

ciously similar metho

sister over the bord

numerous instances

courageous of Mrs.

the absurd stories

daily in its organs.

mention one recent

Mail, in endeavoring

initiated believe th

published in our col

ago is a bogus one.

The present purpos

though the oath has

published through sev

independent of each

Canada and through

States. For our o

tained our copy dire

organizers, so that

mistake about the m

weapon peculiarly P

calumny against Cath

its own defence.