

THE CATHOLIC RECORD

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond

Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
EDITOR—REV. GEO. R. NORTHGRAVES,
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor.
Messrs. DONAT CROWE, LUKE KING and
JOHN NICH are fully authorized to receive
subscriptions and transact all other business
for the CATHOLIC RECORD.Agent for Ottawa—P. J. Coffey, Esq.
Agent for Alexandria, Glenora and
London—Mr. Donald A. McDonald.
Rates of Advertising—Ten cents per line
each insertion.Approved by the Bishop of London, and
recommended by the Archbishop of St.
Boniface, the Bishops of Ottawa, Hamilton,
Kingston, and Peterboro, and leading Catho-
lic Clergymen throughout the Dominion.
All correspondence on business should be
addressed to the Proprietor.Persons writing for a change of address
should invariably send us the name of their
former post office.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., July 14th, 1888.

A PSEUDO-BISHOP.

Bishop Coxe, of Western New York, has once more been pushing himself into notoriety by an act which for its absurdity and assumption is scarcely equalled, and certainly not surpassed, by anything which that erratic genius has ever done. Being now in Paris, he has written a letter to the Archbishop of Paris, M. de Soubise, in which he says: "Certain of the faithful priests and laity of your archdiocese have complained of their destitution as deprived of your paternal care, and have appealed to the entire episcopate of the Anglo-American Church to give temporary succor in their grave necessities." He then explains that these persons who have appealed are "Latin Christians of the illustrious Church of Gaul, founded by Saints Pothinus and Irenaeus and professing all the dogmas and obeying all the constitutions of the undivided Church," and that "they adhere to the Gallican maxims, maintain the Gallican liberties and profess the Catholic faith according to the rule of antiquity as expounded by St. Vincent of Lerins." He further states that the supposed Catholics "share the convictions of the saintly and erudite D. Illiger and of millions" who reject the doctrine of the infallibility of the Pope, which was "not accepted by the Latin Episcopate, but was imposed by the voice of a single bishop," viz, the Pope himself.

He then informs the archbishop that he recognizes his archiepiscopal authority in Paris, and the "canonical primacy of the great Apostolic See of the West," but maintains that the clergy and laity, whose interests he has at heart, reject only "those modern pretensions to infallibility and supremacy which were rejected by the entire Gallican Church" in 1682. He says that if the spiritual wants of these faithful Catholics are not to be supplied by the Archbishop of Paris, it will become his duty to afford them provisional care.

"The flock to which I should minister in such case belongs to you, and only invokes temporary and provisional succor at my hands. It is not, therefore, to stimulate schism, but the reverse, that I have resolved to administer confirmation and to celebrate the offices of the Church among these Gallicans, unless Your Grace shall charitably inform me that you have by no means disowned them and have not failed to approve their fidelity to the traditions of the Church of France."

In conclusion, he expresses admiration of the doctrines of the Church in France, but declares his "Catholic sympathy" with "those who will not suffer ecclesiastical France with their consent to be reduced to a mere satrapy which Bossuet has called a foreign domination" and his veneration for those who "were resolved that the illustrious Gallican Church should not become extinct, and that her free maxims and splendid traditions should never be forgotten."

The last paragraph prays His Grace to accept "the assurance of his profound respect in Christ and in the Church." "in Christ et in Ecclesia."

Of course it is evident to every reader that the "faithful Catholics" whom Bishop Coxe professes to take under his spiritual care, are those who have refused to accept the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility as defined in the Vatican Council in 1870. He maintains that these have preserved the traditions of the Gallican Church, as distinct from those of the Catholic Church in communion with the Apostolic See of Rome, and thus virtually maintains that according to the Constitution of the Church as established by Christ, every nation is authorized to hold its Church independently of any central supreme authority. The Pope's Primacy in the western Church he acknowledges, but declares that his supremacy over the whole Church is an unwarranted assumption which has no foundation in the testimony of the ancient Fathers of the Church. That is to say, that though a certain amount of honor was conferred by some act of the Church upon the Supreme Pontiff as Primate and Patriarch of the West only, there is no evidence that the Pope had any real authority over the whole Church, and that even in the West he had no right to decide controversies of Faith. Every National Church is, according to this theory, its independence in itself, the Church of England, in England, may recognize the

king as supreme, the Church in the United States may appoint its own head, and the Church in France is also an independent body, whose authority, in France, Bishop Coxe is ready to recognize and acknowledge. And with great assurance he claims that in their view he is sustained by antiquity, that is to say, by the usage of the Church of Christ in ancient days. He even professes that his interference, on his own authority, in the diocese of Paris, is justified by primitive canons of the Church, on the pretense that the Archbishop of Paris is neglecting his duty, by not recognizing as faithful Catholics the handful of "old Catholics," as they call themselves, who will not accept the decrees of the Vatican Council.

It is almost unnecessary to say that there are no such canons as Bishop Coxe pretends, and though he refers to such so confidently, he is guilty of presumption and sacrilege by pretending to administer to the spiritual wants of those who would be beyond his jurisdiction, if even he were actually a bishop, which he is not.

The theory of modern Anglicans, which is here maintained by Bishop Coxe, that every nation possesses a thoroughly independent Church, has not the least foundation, either in Holy Scripture or in the primitive canons of the Church to which he appeals with so much confidence. The Church, as established by Christ, is one. It teaches everywhere the same doctrine, administers everywhere the same sacraments, and is subject everywhere to the same supreme authority which resides in St. Peter's successor. When Christ commissioned His apostles to "teach all nations" He ordained that they must "observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you." (St. Matt. xxviii, 20.) It is evident that independent National Churches would not, in the very nature of things, preserve the same doctrine, and as a matter of fact they do not do so. The Protestant Church of England certainly does not teach the doctrines which are taught by the Church of France: not even the "old Catholics" have the same doctrines with the Anglican Church and the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States. The "old Catholics" profess to accept all the doctrines of the Catholic Church, except the infallibility of the pope. They offer up the mass, which is declared in the Anglican Book of Common Prayer to be "a blasphemous fable." They accept the doctrines of purgatory, and the efficacy of prayer for the dead, and acknowledge those sacraments which the Anglican articles of religion declare to have originated from "a corrupt following of the apostles." Even the Protestant Episcopal Church of the United States does not accept the doctrinal teachings of the English Church, having revised the Prayer Book, and rejected some important doctrines which are found in the Anglican formularies of faith. Is it to be supposed, then, that Christ, who insisted so strongly upon the preservation of one faith even as He revealed it, should authorize a system of independent churches which results, from its very nature, in diversity of doctrine?

St. Paul exhorted Timothy: "Hold the form of sound words which thou hast heard of me in faith, and in the love which is in Christ Jesus. Keep the good things committed to thy trust by the Holy Ghost who dwelleth in us." 2 Tim. i, 13. "And the things which thou hast heard of me before many witnesses, the same commend to faithful men who shall be fit to teach others also." 2 Tim. ii, 2. "Continue thou in those things which thou hast learned and which have been committed to thee, knowing of whom thou hast learned them." iii, 14. He exhorts Titus: "embrace that faithful word which is according to doctrine, that he may be able to exhort in sound doctrine, and to convince the gainsayers." Titus i, 9.

This is fatal to Dr. Coxe's theory of independent Churches, teaching different doctrines in different countries. In vain does he appeal to the authority of St. Vincent of Lerins to bear him out in this. No one, more strongly than St. Vincent of Lerins, insists upon complete unity in faith and upon the authority of the Pope as the supreme judge in matters of faith. Bishop Coxe is unfortunate in quoting St. Vincent as bearing out his views. In his work entitled "Commentarium," written about A. D. 434, St. Vincent describes how the truth of Catholic faith is to be discerned from the falseness of heretical pravity. This he says is to be done, "First, by the authority of the divine law, secondly by the tradition of the Catholic Church. Here some one perhaps may ask 'seeing that the canon of Scriptures is perfect and self-sufficient, and more than sufficient for all things, what need is there that the authority of the Church's interpretation be joined unto it?' The reason is because all men do not take the sacred Scripture, on account of its very profoundness, in one and the same sense. . . . For Novatian expounds in one way, in another Pothinus, in another Sabellius, in another Donatus,

etc. And for this cause very necessary it is that the line of interpretation be directed according to the rule of the ecclesiastical and Catholic sense. In the Catholic Church itself, very great care is to be taken that we hold that which hath been believed everywhere, always and by all. . . . What then shall a Catholic Christian do if some small part of the Church cut itself from the communion of the Universal faith? . . . He shall consult and interrogate the collated sentiments of the ancients, of those who though living at different times and places, yet remaining in the communion and faith of the One Catholic Church, were trustworthy teachers. . . and whatsoever all have unswervingly held, wrote, or taught, that let him understand it to be also believed by him without any doubt."

There is nothing here of that divided jurisdiction of nationalities which is held by Dr. Coxe.

Again the same doctor says: "Adv. Hæreses: "Whoever instituted heresies, save he who first divided himself from the consent of the universality and antiquity of the Catholic Church?" Pelagius, Arius and others are cited as examples, and the words of the illustrious father are equally applicable to Bishop Coxe and Anglican divines.

In the same work he relates that Agrippinus, Bishop of Carthage, against the rule of the Church, held that Baptism ought to be repeated: then Pope Stephen of blessed memory, prelate of the Apostolic See, resisted with the rest of his colleagues, indeed, but still beyond the rest, thinking it, I suppose, becoming that he should excel all the rest in devotion for the faith, as he surpassed them in authority of place. In fine, in an epistle which was sent to Africa, he gave a decree in these words: "Nothing is to be innovated, but that only taught which has been handed down."

Elsewhere he states in the same book that letters were read at the Council of Ephesus from "St. Felix, Martyr, and St. Julius, Bishops of Rome, and that not only the head of the world, but others also gave testimony to that judgment." St. Cyprian is then quoted by St. Vincent in confirmation.

It appears, then, that St. Vincent of Lerins is far from being of the sentiment that Bishop Coxe, or any one else, cut off from the communion of the one Church over which the Bishop of Rome presides as "head of the world," has any authority to propagate a gospel which is not in accord "with the faith of the One Catholic Church."

We do not deny that the declaration of the Gallican clergy in 1682 was irreconcilable with the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility. This doctrine was not at the time defined by the Church with that clearness with which it has been laid down by the Vatican Council, though it was undoubtedly the general doctrine of the Church in every age. But the declarations of the Church in France have not the authority of the Universal Church, and the voice of the Universal Church as pronounced by the Vatican Council has been heard with no uncertain sound. The Church in France has accepted the teaching of the Vatican Council unreservedly, and it can not now be said that there is a Gallican Church teaching differently from the great body of the Church Catholic. While the doctrine of the Pope's infallibility was not strictly defined, there was an excuse for a section of the Church to question it, but even though the Gallican Church questioned this infallibility, it never denied the Pope's real supremacy. Bishop Coxe endeavors to make it appear that this supremacy over the whole Church was not recognized previously to the schism of the Greeks. A few quotations will show the utter fallacy of this position. St. Cyprian, in the third century, writing to Pope Cornelius, says of certain heretics who had gone to Rome to lay their case before Cornelius: "They dare to sail and to bear letters from schismatics and profane persons to the chair of Peter, and to the principal Church whence the unity of the priesthood took its rise."

St. Optatus of Milevis, writing against the Donatists, said: "Thou canst not deny but thou knowest that in the city of Rome an episcopal chair was conferred on Peter first, wherein Peter, the head of all the Apostles, might sit, that in one chair unity might be preserved by all, and that whatsoever should set up another chair might be a schismatic and a sinner. To Peter succeeded Linus, to Linus, Clement, etc." He proceeds to give a list of Peter's successors down to Siricius, who was Supreme Pontiff in his day.

St. Basil, a Greek father, writing to Pope Liberius, says that Eustathius, Bishop of Lebarthe, being deprived of his bishopric "devised as a way of being restored a journey to you. . . and he brought back a letter which, when he had shown to the synod of Thyana, he recovered his see." (Letter 263.) Thus it is seen that the Pope's authority was as fully recognized in the East as in the West.

We may conclude with the following words of St. Jerome in Epistle 16:

"The Church here is rent in three parts, each of which is eager to drag me to itself. Meanwhile I proclaim aloud, if any one is united to the chair of Peter he is mine. Wherefore I beseech Your Holiness. . . by your letter make known to me with whom I ought to hold communion in Syria."

By this test, then, the Catholics of France can tell whether they should hold communion with the Archbishop of Paris, or with Bishop Coxe, and the rebellious subjects whom he has taken under his special protection.

We have hitherto argued the case, even in the hypothesis that Bishop Coxe were really a Christian Bishop. But as it is well known that the orders of his Church have never been acknowledged by the Catholic Church, he is in the position of those who have "taken this honor to themselves, not being called by God as Aaron was."

THE LATE EMPEROR'S LIBER-ALITY.

Several instances of the determination of the late Emperor Frederic III. to treat Catholics with respect for their religious convictions occurred during his short reign. The week before his death it was arranged by students of the University to exhibit a theatrical play entitled *Luther Festspiel*, in which occurred several passages calculated to excite odium against the Catholic religion. Luther was to be represented as giving vent to his virtuous indignation against the sale of indulgences, and the licenses to commit sin which were supposed to have been issued by Tetzel, and a scene was also introduced in which the Pope's Legate was insulted by the mob while holding out the cross to the people. The *National Zeitung* states that the play was altogether the most aggressive of the Luther plays which had hitherto been put upon the stage. It was to have exhibited the leading scenes of Luther's life, and of course to have done so in such a way as to put a wrong construction on Catholic doctrine. However, when the time for the performance arrived, the performers were obliged to announce that the authorities would not permit the play to go on. One of the Berlin newspapers, the *Krauszeitung*, states that the Emperor himself had prohibited it, as there are subjects enough for theatrical performances without heaping insult on one-third of the population of the empire.

Another instance is to be found in his acceptance of the position of patron to the *Gustav-Adolf Verein*. The object of this Association is to supply funds for erection of Protestant churches in districts which, being mainly Catholic, are unable to build Protestant churches for themselves. Of late years, however, this Society became very aggressive in attacking Catholics, and the Emperor William, being its patron, never attempted to check them in this. Emperor Frederic, however, in accepting the position as patron, told them plainly that he consents on the understanding that the Society confine itself to its proper sphere, "which is," he said, "to scatter Christian thought and Christian love, by works of charity, and benevolence, and to prevent religious spirit and feeling from being sapped by indifference."

The late Emperor was undoubtedly a thorough Protestant, yet he did not consider it part of his duty to be unjust to Catholics.

THE BOSTON HIGH SCHOOL OUT-RAGE ENDED.

Our readers will remember that one of the teachers of Boston High School, Mr. Charles B. Travis, outraged the Catholic community of that city by teaching that indulgences in the Catholic Church mean licenses to commit sin, which are given by the Pope or the clergy on payment of a certain price. It was nothing to Mr. Travis that the Catholic catechism gives quite a different explanation of the nature of an indulgence, and that every Catholic child could tell him that no authority can give a licence to commit sin. He persisted that his teaching was correct, and sustained his position by citing Swinton's "Outlines of the World's History," which was one of the books authorized to be used in the school.

On complaint of the Rev. Father Theodore Metcalf, the matter was brought before the School Committee on text-books, which consists of three Protestants and two Catholics, and Father Metcalf's charge of objectionable offensiveness was fully sustained. The Committee arrived at the following decision, which was signed by four members of the text-book Committee, and was approved by the School Board.

"We are all of the opinion that such definitions and illustrations in any of our public schools are to be deplored by all those who have at heart the best interests of our public schools. Our schools are established for the education of all our children. Any language, therefore, by our school teachers justly offensive to any class of our citizens, whether rich or poor, Catholic, Protestant or Jew, white or colored, cannot be too severely censured. Boston is too enlightened and too just to tolerate in our schools

what every well educated man—nay every tolerably well instructed person in the community—knows to be but a vile slander against Catholics. We condemn in the most unqualified manner both Mr. Travis' definition of an indulgence and his explanations in illustration thereof. We are also convinced that immunity from instruction so objectionable in the future will be sufficiently guaranteed by this declaration, by the removal of the text-book which we believe tended to mislead the teacher, and by the transfer of Mr. Travis to some field of duty in the English High School, other than the one heretofore occupied by him as teacher of history.

Swinton's "Outlines of History" have therefore been properly thrown out of the school. The members of the committee in their examination of the book found it inaccurate, not only on Catholic subjects, but in many other matters. One of the five members of the committee does not appear to have signed the above report, the Rev. Dr. Duryea, Presbyterian Minister; nevertheless he also was in favor of it, and the report is declared to be the unanimous conviction of the committee. The law requires either for the adoption of a text book, or its rejection, not merely majority vote, but a two thirds vote of the whole school Board. This vote was obtained, though there were present only nine Protestants and eleven Catholic members of the board. The report of the text book committee was agreed to by the necessary majority, notwithstanding the absence of several members, which under the operation of the law was equivalent to their voting in the negative.

It was an intolerable outrage that in schools supported by the taxes of the whole community, such an insult to Catholics should have been committed. However the school committee have made in this case all the atonement which it was in their power to offer.

MR. HENRY A. GRAY.

We notice with great pleasure the appointment of Mr. Henry A. Gray, C. E., to the position of Engineer in charge of the Maritime Provinces. This is one of the most important offices in the Engineering Department of the Dominion. Mr. Gray has been for a number of years attached to the Public Works department as Inspector of Harbors and in similar offices of the Engineering Department. He is known to be at the head of his profession, and he is as much admired for his affability and friendliness as for his ability in the discharge of his duties. For several years Mr. Gray made his headquarters at Stratford, and afterwards removed to Ottawa, and in both places made many staunch friends, who will greatly regret his removal from Ontario, but will nevertheless be rejoiced to hear of his promotion. The Government of the Dominion deserve credit for their proper appreciation of an official who has done his work so faithfully and well as Mr. Henry Gray. We wish him and Mrs. Gray every prosperity in their new place of residence.

A COERCION COURT BAFFLED.

Five prisoners who were sent to jail five times for refusing to give evidence against their friends under the Coercion Act at Dungloe in Donegal, have at last been released, the magistrate being completely baffled. For the fifth time they were asked to allow themselves to be sworn, but they steadfastly refused. They were then released, being told, however, that they may be called on again. The clergy of Raphoe Diocese assembled at conference, passed strong resolutions of approbation of their fortitude and propose to raise a fund for their indemnification, the treasurer being the Right Rev. Dr. Donnelly, Bishop of Raphoe. The cause of the sufferers is the cause of the country, and this movement on the part of the clergy manifests their patriotism and sympathy for the suffering poor people. The consequence of their long imprisonment must be much privation and want in their families, and it is but right that they should be relieved. They cannot be indemnified for their loss of health through imprisonment, but the suffering endured by their families on account of it may be greatly mitigated.

The following is the resolution unanimously adopted by the priests:

"That we warmly sympathize with our brother priests and with Mr. Blane, M. P., now incarcerated in Derry jail for their courageous and self-sacrificing endeavors to defend poor tenants against the impossible demands of cruel landlords. That we admire the heroism of the lay prisoners who chose to suffer in health and business rather than incur the name of acting as spies and informers on their good neighbors at the bidding of the creatures of an odious despotism. That we earnestly protest against the manner in which some of the most peaceable districts in Donegal have been thrown into confusion by the utterly unneeded introduction of a secret court of inquiry. That we deem it our duty to organize a fund to indemnify all who suffer under the mean persecution of the Crimes Act in Derry jail, and we appeal to friends and sympathizers to assist us in this necessary undertaking."

Dungloe is one of the most peaceable and quiet neighborhoods in Ireland. Nevertheless, Mr. Balfour with his usual

policy of manufacturing crime where there was none must belie all the promises which were made when the Coercion Act passed Parliament, that the powers of Government would be used only for the suppression of crime, and the Star-Chamber Court of inquiry must be introduced there to discover whether there are any members of the National League there. The most respectable residents of the place are dragged before the Court to give evidence to criminate themselves and their neighbors, and their refusal to comply with the demand is made to constitute crime in a crimeless district. The Government might as well assume that all the decent people of the locality belong to the condemned League. If they had done this they would not have been far astray, and they would have saved themselves the humiliation of being beaten at their own game, as they have been, owing to the courage and firmness of the men, women and children of Donegal.

The Right Reverend Bishop O'Donnell is equally outspoken with the priests of his diocese in condemning these iniquitous proceedings. He has addressed to the *Freeman's Journal* a spirited letter in which he solemnly protests against the action of the Government. He says:

"It is impossible to heal the wounds already inflicted on public tranquility by this itinerant tribunal, but it may not be too late to arrest the danger of still worse results. Its daily work is a standing menace to peace and an incitement to violence."

THE PERSECUTION OF MR JOHN DILLON.

The treatment of Mr. John Dillon by the Coercion Government is of a piece with all their conduct towards Ireland since they came into power—or rather into office—for power is scarcely the word to be used in regard to a Government which is every day openly defied by the public of high and low estate, by the noblest in the country, equally with the little newsboys who sell *United Ireland*, the *Freeman's Journal* the *Cork Examiner* and similar journals without the fear of Mr. Balfour's prisons deterring them in the least. A government cannot be said to be in power which depends upon so heterogeneous an alliance, and which on an important question like the Local Government Bill is subject to ignominious defeat, and is obliged to beat a retreat, while putting forth the flimsy pretext that they were not beaten on a test question.

Mr. Dillon is again in one of Secretary Balfour's jails. The charge against him was conspiracy; yet so confident was the crown prosecutor of the decision of the magistrate, that he did not consider it at all needful to prove that there was any conspiracy. Mr. Dillon's own speech was the only evidence of conspiracy brought against him, as if a man could conspire with himself. And the confidence of the crown prosecutor was not misplaced. As a matter of course, Mr. Dillon was convicted, though there was not a particle of evidence adduced that there was a combination or conspiracy of any kind in the case. This is one of the travesties of justice for which the Irish law courts have become remarkable. It is certain that the Irish would not endure passively these mockeries and cruelties without open rebellion were they not firm in the conviction that every act of injustice perpetrated will hasten the day of their deliverance; and the elections of Southampton and Ayr, especially of Ayr, prove that their conviction is well grounded.

As was to be expected, the greatest sympathy was manifested for Mr. Dillon when he left Dublin to prosecute his appeal at Dundalk before County Court Judge Kisbey, and along his route. From Dublin he was accompanied by Messrs. Wm. O'Brien, M. P., Shaw Lefevre, M. P., Schwan, M. P., T. Harrington, M. P., Roantree, M. P., J. B. Ellis, M. P., Professor Stuart, M. P., also by Mr. Wilfrid Blunt and Lady Ann Blunt and many others. At Dundalk the dragoons and police were drawn up in force at the station to prevent any demonstration; nevertheless flags and green boughs were displayed from the houses of the town, with inscriptions such as "Long live John Dillon," "the Plan for ever," etc.

Mr. Dillon did not think it worth while to make any defence, or even to employ counsel. He knew that his imprisonment was a foregone conclusion, but he pointed out that the Crown had made no attempt to prove conspiracy. He remarked that when the Crown denies the accused the right of trial by jury, it should have the decency, at least, of taking the pains to offer some proof of the charge, which had not been done in this instance. But all this was of no avail. The sentence of six months' imprisonment was confirmed, and he was confined, accordingly, in Dundalk jail.

It is well known now that Mr. Dillon is one of the Nationalist leaders whom Mr. Balfour aimed at killing by imprisonment, so as to choke off the National agitation. The aspirations of the country