

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
AT THE
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.
FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.
THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 1893.

Calendar for the Week.

- Sep. 7—Blessed Adrian III., Pope and Confessor.
8—The Nativity of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
9—St. Sergius I., Pope and Confessor.
10—Sixteenth Sunday after Pentecost. The Feast of the Most Holy name of Mary.
11—St. Nicholas of Tolentino, Confessor.
12—Fifth day within the Octave of the Nativity of the Blessed Virgin.
13—Sixth day within the Octave.

Reply to Archdeacon Farrar.

In answer to the violent attack of the Archdeacon of Westminster Mr. Knox Little comes forward as champion of the Ritualists, and devotes fifteen pages of the *Contemporary Review* of August to this purpose. The reply is divided into two parts, of which the first consists in remonstrances with Dr. Farrar as to his method of controversy; for he assumes a "tone of infallibility which is startling," and a violence of language which is as unexpected as it is unbecoming. Again the Churchman runs with the hare and hunts with the hounds. In striving to beat the Protestant drum, writing about the dangers of sacerdotalism, the Mass, the undoing of "the work of the reformation," he is appealing to popular prejudices, while he also poses as a martyr for the unpopular opinion of low churchism.

It was natural that the adversary should remonstrate. That a prominent clergyman should write of fellow-members of a Church as the Archdeacon wrote should not only call for remonstrance, but if there was a shred of authority in the Church it would call for action. Simply because there is no authority in the Church of England, either to define the faith or to enforce discipline, we have in one of the great reviews the pitiful spectacle of one minister calling a whole school of ministers bad names, and one of the latter on his knees, saying, "Now, brother, don't do that. That is rude, not becoming an English gentleman. You should have more generous consideration, a larger allowance" for our diversities of view and Christian love."

It is also natural that this reply of the Ritualists should be unsatisfactory, illogical and evasive. The very position of Ritualism is unsatisfactory to every honest man who thinks seriously upon the subject; it claims the necessity of an historical priesthood, yet closes its eyes to the only quarter from which that undying stream springs and flows. It insists upon religious sacramental practices, *e. g.* confession, yet when pressed, yields upon the point. It all comes of there being no authority in faith or practice amongst them. But now for some unsatisfactory points in Mr. Knox Little's reply:

"The Archdeacon writes as follows: 'In the Apostolic age—the Eucharist follows

the Love Feast, yet there are clergymen who now teach that to receive the Eucharist unfasting is a deadly sin.' If there are clergymen who teach this (although I myself do not know of any such) one may well believe with the Archdeacon that they use very extreme language."

Now what is to be thought of the man who, while teaching the Real Presence, will not count as a deadly sin wilful irreverence towards it? He acknowledges that some clergymen teach that fasting before communion does not matter. This for the laity is the unsatisfactory part. One extremist says: You must fast under pain of deadly sin. The other extreme puts the case. It is desirable that you do not fast. Mr. Knox Little evidently requires fasting before communion, but seems to think a violation of it to be what we call a venial sin. Where are the poor lay people who are conscientious and who wish to be reverent? Are they in the same class with those who take a hot breakfast before receiving holy communion? What a mockery! It is no wonder that the Farrars cry to them to take off the mask. We are not, however, done with this point. Fasting communion being a long established custom of the whole Catholic Church, which is the pillar and ground of truth, and his own Church distinctly repudiating "the notion of striking at established doctrine, or laudable practice of the Church of England, or indeed of the whole Catholic Church," fasting with prayer being a devout custom—for all these reasons the Ritualists require fasting communion. Here is confusion. The fast before communion is one thing—the fasting with prayer referred to is entirely different. The former is reverence towards our Blessed Lord, and is an exercise of the virtue of religion; the latter is an act of the virtue of mortification. It is most illogical to reason from the fasting which the angel Raphael praised in Tobias to the fast which the Church commands as a bodily preparation for holy communion. No one should quote Scripture as fast as that.

Mr. Knox Little claims that there is a real priesthood in the Church of England. Here comes in the evasiveness of his answer. Insist as one may, and should, upon the priesthood of our Blessed Lord, it is a long conclusion to draw therefrom the reality of the priesthood in the Church of England. Nor is the case covered by arguing that Sacerdos—*i. e.* sacrificing priest—was used in the Latin service books at the time of its establishment, and was retained in English as "priest," and therefore they wished to maintain the sacrificial and essential function of the priesthood. Even if we grant that all through the history of the Church of England from Henry the Eighth she insists upon her ministers being styled priests and exercising the priestly offices of sacrifice and absolution, we have not reached the essential point in question—the validity of their orders. Not only does the weakness of the Anglicans consist in the fact that their ministers are divided as to what the Book of Common Prayer means, but the greatest weakness is to maintain the necessity of the priesthood and at the same time be doubtful about the validity of the Orders. We would be very glad if every minister

in the English Church insisted upon the want of sacerdotalism, because many more would then turn to the only port of safety; but all the insisting in the world will not form a single priest.

The second point, that upon Transubstantiation, is answered by a flat denial. "What our part of the Catholic Church does is this: she refuses to say *how* that mysterious Presence is given, and she declines to accept the teaching of the Roman part of the Catholic Church that 'the how' of the Presence is to be defined by the term, Transubstantiation." Our part must be connected with the whole. Where is the connection? What mockery again! Are these Ritualists children, playing a part? Or do they trifle with the eternal interests of men?

"Confession, according to her (the Church of England) teaching, is a privilege allowed to her children if they choose to use it. She directs her priests to offer to her children the opportunity of making confession to their priest *if they choose*. She encourages confession to the priest in certain cases. It is a matter of liberty not of absolute necessity." There it is again—something wanting. Nothing definite, secure or satisfactory. No authority to teach or command. Mr. Knox Little maintains that it is God who pardons: "Of course every priest agrees with the Archdeacon that 'none but God can say *Abolvo te*,' but those who hold the doctrines taught us by the Bible and Prayer Book believe that God *does* say so to those who confess their sins with penitence by the mouth of the ordained priest." Where is the power to absolve in the name of the Lord, which Mr. Knox Little claims for himself? What is the meaning of the words which the English Church uses in its ordination service—Whose sins you shall forgive, they are forgiven? Thus again does he evade the very essence of the question. Either the priest has the judicial power to pardon the sin himself or his function is merely ministerial. In fact he yields this point to his opponents.

He concludes by saying, "It seems to me that, 'quot homines tot sententia,' that in a great communion like the Anglican Communion there must be, and there ought to be, a very various ritual and large liberty in such a matter." We agree with him that there must be disunion and a variety of opinions in the English Church; for it will always be the case where there is no authority, no legitimate judge. But we deny that it ought to be the case in Christ's Church, otherwise unity would be destroyed and Catholicity would perish from the earth.

Whither Are We Drifting?

It affords us great pleasure to call the attention of the Orange Order, the Equal Rights Association and the P. P. A. to the fact that not only are the Premier of the Government and the Leader of the Opposition in our Dominion Catholic, but there are other colonies belonging to the great Protestant British nation also children of the Church. Sir Ambrose Shea is

Governor of the Bahamas, and presented a very satisfactory report of the islands under his charge, showing that the revenue for 1892 was £50,704, being £8,800 more than the year previous. British Honduras has for Governor Sir Alfred Maloney. In a report lately sent this Governor gives comforting assurance of the future development of Honduras. The establishment of local government has been, and is, still under consideration. These reports were both made to a leading Catholic nobleman, Lord Ripon, Secretary of the Colonies, a convert, too, like Sir John Thompson. All these need investigation. It would be well for the P. P. A. not to bother with Margaret L. and devote their bitter zeal to prevent the advance of Catholics in high places throughout the Empire.

Home Rule at Last.

The night of the 1st September, 1893, is destined to mark for ever an epoch in the history of the British Empire. Seven hundred years of misgovernment and of persistent persecution of a faithful and noble race of people were brought to a close on that memorable evening. From Westminster Hall, and from a full House of British representatives, the solemn declaration went forth that Ireland, henceforth and forever, enjoys the right of every other civilized nation, to make her own laws, and, under God's guidance, to carve out her own destinies. Many a fervent prayer and deep-drawn sigh from purest souls and well nigh broken hearts, went up to Heaven, year after year and day after day, in hopeful, enduring patience, that the God of all justice and mercy would look down on the sufferings of the people who only asked for peace and temporal prosperity, that they might the more freely worship Him, and the more abundantly share in the blessings which His providence lavished on the rich and beautiful sea-girt home of their birth. To-day that prayer of a martyred nation is answered; the voice of the British people is heard in thunder tones over every land and sea proclaiming that the poet's dream is a reality:

*Erin, oh Erin, thus bright thro' the tears
Of a long night of bondage thy spirit appears.*

It is impossible for us, however, in the midst of rejoicing, to shut our eyes to the fact of the probable rejection by the House of Lords of so just, so long wished for, and so universally demanded an act of national reparation and humanity. But the whole people have spoken by their representatives, after having battled for seven years in the prosecution of so holy a cause, and after having struggled unflinchingly and with unflagging endurance and courage through a Parliamentary contest such as never before was witnessed in any legislature. Never in the history of English legislation was opposition so fierce, so unscrupulous and so determined, offered to any bill or to any change in the Constitution. Never we may add as a corollary, was there more righteous justification for party triumph and for national rejoicing and self-congratulation for the Irish people, whether at home, where a future of self-aggrandisement or servitude hung in the