

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond street, London, Ontario. Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION. UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA. Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1900.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JUNE 9, 1900.

WARNED AGAINST TRAFFICKERS IN THINGS SACRED.

At St. Peter's cathedral, London, on last Sunday an announcement was made at all the Masses warning the people against peddlers and agents purporting to have authority to sell articles of devotion such as beads, books, papers, sick-call outfits, medals, etc., and which they claim to be in indulgence. This is never the case.

The parishioners were likewise strongly cautioned against subscribing for papers or magazines holding out as inducements a share in the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass or the gaining of stated indulgences. Such practice is altogether out of harmony with the spirit of the Church, and should never, even remotely, be encouraged by the faithful.

THE KENSITES.

Among the vagaries of the Kensites which took place during Holy Week two occurred which are especially worthy of remark. At St. Ebelburg's Church, Bishopsgate, John Kensit went with his wife to the altar-rail to receive Communion on Easter Sunday, and it was offered to him in the thin round form similar to that which is used in the Catholic Church.

Another agitator of the Kensit faction, named Rossy, snatched a crucifix from a clerk who was carrying it in procession which was going to St. Columba's Church on Good Friday. The Church services were impressive and a large number of clergy were taking part in them, when Rossy broke in upon the ranks and broke the crucifix over his knee. He was arrested, and his defence was that he broke the crucifix as a protest against Romanizing practices in the Church services.

EVIL LITERATURE.

The Semaine Religieuse in a recent article makes reference to a judicial decision whereby the proprietors of a review published in Montreal were heavily fined for giving insertion to articles vilifying the Christian religion, and also to a recent judgment of a court in New York condemning a book of Daudet which is subversive of morality. The judges declared that it is their desire to suppress all immoral literature, and the Montreal Court took similar ground in regard to magazines which attack or ridicule Christianity.

What, then, should be done to put an end to this evil and to check the corruption which arises from the circulation of bad literature, whether in the form of bad books or newspapers and magazines which attack the Christian religion or inculcate immorality?

by such suggestiveness as is commonly found in so-called light reading.

Of this class of literature, the Semaine Religieuse says: "Priests, fathers and mothers of families, schoolmasters and schoolmistresses must organize a crusade against bad books, and against books which are light-light. An infamous word created by hell to palliate the word impure. We must stigmatize the holders and the sellers of obscene literature. Without political or denominational discrimination, the clamor of purity and common sense must be raised to a very high key.

There is too much of this kind of literature circulated among the people of this country, and we cannot too strongly warn our readers against it. There are Eugene Sue's and Dumas' novels, and those of the Diches, and even some of Lord Balwer Lytton's, though of Lord Lytton's works we do not thus condemn the whole series, but only such as represent vice as virtues, and make heroes of criminals.

The Semaine Religieuse thus encourages the inauguration of a crusade against such books: "The task is difficult; granted; but so much the better. The intensity of the evil will excite our courage and double our zeal. The beginning by a few will awaken the latent energies of others. The Catholic soul still vibrates in Canada; but with our hand upon our sorrowing heart, and after having carefully probed the sore, we must say that a crisis is impending if the reading of the young people be not watched.

A SELF-APPOINTED POPE.

For some years it was a much mooted question to appoint the Archbishop of Canterbury a kind of general Primate or Pope of all the independent churches which derive their origin from the Church of England and acknowledge it as their Mother Church.

The idea was not favorably received, as both the Colonial and the American Protestant Episcopal Churches would not give up their independence in this way—an independence which the Colonial churches had obtained not very many years previously.

But it now appears that the Canadian Anglican Church is willy-nilly to be supplied with a supreme head or Pope, though not by any action of the Church itself, but by the self-assumption of no less a person than W. M. Lockhart of Alliston, "St. Grand Secretary of the Orange Association of North America." The title of knighthood, however, it must be remarked, is not granted by her Majesty for services to the country, but is conferred by the Orange order to encourage its possessor in denouncing "the Pope of Rome" and the Catholic Church which has propagated the Christian faith for nineteen centuries.

Mr. Lockhart, however, is not Pope by divine appointment, nor by favor of the Church to which he presumes to dictate, but by virtue of his own brazen assumption of the office, as may be seen by the following utterance delivered on Wednesday, the 30th ult., at the meeting of the Grand Orange lodge held in this city. The M. H. and Empire thus reports his pronouncement:

"I have recently been shown a book, said to be a gift of a clergyman to a confirmation class in the Protestant Church of England. This book teaches the confession, penance and absolution as taught by the Church of Rome, and the clergyman who presented such book in the hands of one of the theological colleges in connection with the Church in Canada. I can only hope there has been some mistake, and that the grand old Church which has in the past done so much for Protestantism will not in these later days, in Canada at least, have her usefulness destroyed by those who are not true to her Protestant teachings."

This Grand Secretary of Orangism assumes to himself the right of pronouncing definitely what Anglican divines should teach and what repudiate, basing his pronouncement upon the fact that the "Church of Rome" teaches the same doctrines, and that High Church Anglicanism has borrowed them from Rome. But the same objection might be brought against every Christian doctrine. Was it not from the Catholic Church that Protestantism got its knowledge of God and of the Trinity, the Divinity of Christ, and our Redemption through the Sacrifice He offered on the Cross?

Protestantism in fact has no Christian doctrine which it found out for itself. It has been a purely destructive and not a constructive religion, and if we except perhaps the two special doctrines of certain Protestants which destroy the infinitely holy and just character of God, there would be nothing left in Protestantism if what has been learned from the Catholic Church were taken away from it. There would be no Trinity, no Atonement, as there is even now no

sacrifice; there would be no sacraments and no public liturgy or form of worship of the Almighty worthy of the name, as the liturgy now in use in the Church of England is for the most part borrowed from that of the Catholic Church.

Pseudo-Knight W. M. Lockhart of Alliston, therefore, shows an utter ignorance of Christianity in basing his objection to High Churchism on its assumed nearness to the Catholic religion. Such gross ignorance is surely not becoming in one who sets himself up as a judge in the faith.

But Mr. Lockhart's ignorance does not end here. He praises the Church of England of the past, evidently believing that the doctrines he condemns are something new in that Church, whereas they are all contained in the Book of Common Prayer, and it is not at all unlikely that the book in which he has "recently been shown" the doctrines of "confession, penance, and absolution" is precisely this standard ritual and confession of faith of his own Church, assuming, as we believe to be the case, that he is a member of the Church of England. But if he is not a member, he is meddling in matters which are none of his concern.

The following quotations will show in what parts of the prayer book these teachings are found:

Confession. 1. On the Sunday or Holy Day preceding the celebration of the Communion service, the minister is directed to give warning as follows: "And because it is requisite that no man should come to the Holy Communion but with a full trust in God's mercy, and with a quiet conscience; therefore if there be any of you who by this means cannot quiet his own conscience herein, but require further comfort or counsel, let him come to Me or to some other discreet and learned Minister of God's Word, and open his grief; that by the ministry of God's Holy Word he may receive the benefit of absolution, etc." (The Communion Service.)

Absolution. 3. Beside the above two passages enjoining absolution, we have the form of absolution referred to above, in the very words used by Catholic priests, which will be found in the Book of Common Prayer in the order of Visitation of the Sick.

4. In the ordaining of "Priests" the Bishop must say: "Whose sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose sins thou dost retain, they are retained.

5. Penance, Confession, Absolution, Contrition, and Satisfaction for sin constitute the Catholic sacrament of Penance. We have shown already that Confession and Absolution are prescribed in the Prayer-book, and it will not be denied that contrition or sorrow for sin is implied therein also. We find, however, contrition inculcated positively in the communion service: "whosoever ye shall perceive yourselves to have offended... bemoan your own sinfulness." Satisfaction, which by itself constitutes an act of penance, is also prescribed, especially in the following words: "Being ready to make restitution and satisfaction, according to the uttermost of your powers."

It will probably be news to the aspiring Anglican Pope that these things are found in his Confession of Faith; but if we can contribute to fit him for his newly assumed office, he is welcome to the information we give him here toward this end.

RELIGION IN THE SCHOOLS.

Under the heading "Religion in the schools," the Ottawa Evening Journal reports the following as part of a sermon preached by Rev. Thomas Garrett of St. Luke's Church (Anglican) at that city on Sunday, 27th ult.:

"The example of the Roman Catholics of Canada in fighting for the right to bring up their school children in the fear and knowledge of God, was urged on the attention of the congregation of St. Luke's church by Rev. Thomas Garrett yesterday morning. Mr. Garrett referred to the remanence of Protestant Christians in this respect. There was no reason why the right to Christian education in our schools, he said, should be monopolized by fellow citizens of the Roman Catholic Church and withheld from the Protestant. If the Protestants go on allowing their children to grow up without religious instruction being made as much a part of their education as instruction in worldly matters, the nation must inevitably lapse into the condition of those degenerate countries which have fallen from the understanding of the Master. If the empire is to preserve its blessings, it must jealously safeguard the worship of the Most High, and rear its school children, the future men and women of the English-speaking peoples, in the fear and love of the Almighty, the All-wise, All-present."

A Presbyterian minister, Rev. N. A. McLeod, of the New Edinburgh (Ottawa) Church, on the same day complained of the non-increase of attendance that should be at the Sunday school in connection with his church. In the course of his remarks, in order to show the importance of early training, he quoted Cardinal Newman's famous remark

that if he had the children of the empire to train while they were between the ages of three and ten years he would not care who had them afterwards, adding that, in his opinion, the hope of the Presbyterian Church, from a human standpoint, rested in the children, and the future of Christian activity also largely depends upon them.

Again, in an address delivered before the Royal Society of Canada, of which he is President, and which was in session in Ottawa last week, the Rev. Professor Clarke, Principal of Trinity University, used the following words after stating that the ordinary subjects of education do not produce the ideal: "We must bring it about if it is to be brought about by religion. . . . It will be said this is adequately done in the Separate Schools. Yes, all honor to the Roman Catholics of the Dominion. They have not been contented with mere secular education anywhere. But are they alone to be taught religion.

Aye, there's the rub! Who that remembers the bitter fight of fifty years ago for Separate schools in Upper Canada—now Ontario—or the later one in New Brunswick, can fail to be struck with the change that is gradually coming about amongst non-Catholics? The Church is ever right, and this is invariably proved by time.

RIGORISM IN MORALS.

The Methodist General Conference which sat last week in Chicago considered the question of repealing the rule of discipline which totally forbids card-playing, dancing, theatre-going, and other forms of amusement which since 1872 have been under the ban of that Church. The Committee to which the matter had been referred reported in favor of amending the law as to permit these amusements, while the minority report favored the rule as it stands. The minority report was adopted after the bitterest discussion which took place in the Conference.

The news despatches state that very sharp and angry discussion was indulged in and the Conference was in a state of wild disorder to the time when the vote was taken, the recommendation of the minority being acted upon by a very close vote.

The Philadelphia Press of May 2nd gives a lucid explanation of the state of the question. It says: "The subject is treated in two separate places in the Book of Discipline. The general rules in specifying things from which members are to refrain include the taking of such diversions as cannot be used in the Name of the Lord Jesus."

In another part of the same Book of Discipline a number of acts are particularized as imprudent and un-Christian, and among them are: "Dancing, playing at games of chance, attending theatres, horse races, circuses, dancing parties or patronizing dancing schools, or taking such other amusements as are obviously of misleading or questionable moral tendency. The latter was inserted in 1872, and has caused much dissatisfaction since. Its repeal has been asked for by the New Jersey, New York, New York East, and New England Southern Conferences, but the prospect of success is not bright. The sentiment against any change is strong in the West and is likely to defeat the petition."

The Chicago Tribune asserts that it is not disputed that notwithstanding the prohibition, many members of the Church actually play cards and dance, and yet there is no record of any trial or punishment decreed against those who have transgressed, and it quotes the Christian Advocate as saying virtually that it would be better not to have a law on the subject than to have a law which may be transgressed with impunity.

While it is undoubtedly within the province of the Church of Christ to legislate on such matters, and to restrain its members from them so far as they may be dangerous to morality, or occasions of sin, their absolute prohibition under all circumstances, and under penalty of exclusion from the Church, is a rigorism which is not justified by the laws of God. It was a Methodist minister, the late Rev. Dr. Egerton Ryerson, who invented the phrase "mortal sins made to order," applying the expression to the Catholic Church for insisting on the religious education of children, which is commanded in Holy Scripture, but it is surely a "making of mortal sins to order" to put out of a Christian Church those who engage in innocent amusements which neither Scripture, nor the laws of the Church, which derives its authority from the Apostles, condemn. Is this consistent in a Church which is founded upon a denial of the right of the Catholic Church to lay down a line of conduct for the guidance of its members, and which loudly proclaims the absolute freedom of its members from man-made laws so far as religion is concerned?

The Methodists have constantly abused the Catholic Church for recommending the Evangelical Councils of voluntary poverty, chastity and obedience. But the Catholic Church does not enforce these counsels as if they were laws imposing a strict obligation. She points them out as practices suitable for those who desire to attain perfection, in accordance with the counsel of Christ to the young man who asked of Him the way of salvation. (St. Matt. xix, 21). It is left to the Methodist Conference to "make mortal sins to order."

It is worthy of remark that the Methodist Bishops in the Episcopal address read at the Conference on May 3, while not positively condemning the present regulation, nevertheless recommends that the matter should be left to the individual conscience. The address says: "It would be profitable to place among the special advisers of the Discipline a brief but cogent statement of the evils which attach to many amusements, of the evils inseparable from others, and of the principles by which a Christian should regulate his choice among and his use of them."

THE ANGLICAN CONTINUITY THEORY.

The London Daily Chronicle of May 5 gives a one column review of a new book entitled "A Popular History of the Church of England from the Earliest Times to the present day," by the Right Rev. William Boyd Carpenter, (Anglican) Bishop of Ripon.

This is described by the Chronicle as "an admirable volume" which "ought to have a wide circulation," from which, though we have not seen the volume itself, we infer that it meets well the purpose for which it was written, which was to create among the people of England the notion that the modern Church of England is what most of its divines who write polemically nowadays claim it to be, one and the same Church, substantially at least, with the National Church which existed in England in pre-Reformation times.

The Chronicle, itself a maintainer of the Church of England, declares that the Bishop "has succeeded in describing in approximately just proportion those influences under which the National Church has grown up. . . . The Bishop recognizes that the Church of each age is largely the child of that age, and in this way he is able to maintain a view of continuity throughout the Reformation period, that is practically unassailable, because it is based on the continuity of the English race." The book begins with a chapter on "The Making of the Race;" and this strikes the key-note that is maintained throughout; though, to be sure, in this view of the Church of England it is to be unassailable now, it should include within its fold the vast majority of those who speak the English tongue. It does not do this, and therefore the theory is worthless. However, we may consider the matter under another aspect.

According to this theory, the English people have and have always had the inherent right to construct their own Church in accordance with the views they may entertain at any particular period, and notwithstanding the changes which may be made in course of time in Church doctrine and government, the Church remains the same, and may be called continuous.

If this were correct it should be said that the people of every nation have the same right, for surely it will not be contended that to England or to the majority of Englishmen any special right was conceded by Almighty God to construct a National religion for itself. We would thus have in every nation and in every age different religions both as regards dogma and Church Government, all being in every respect the one true religion which Christ established on earth. The absurdity of this is so evident that it would be an insult to the intelligence of our readers to refute it seriously.

The whole history of Christ as given in the gospels shows that Christ instituted but one Church, under the government of His Apostles. He builds His Church, not Churches, upon a rock, and promises that the gates of hell, that is, the whole power of the devil, shall not prevail against it: using the singular number, and not them in the plural. (St. Matt. xvi, 18). There is but one Church which has authority to decide on all offences against religion, and he who will not hear that Church is to be regarded as a heathen and a publican. (xviii, 17). Elsewhere, in St. John x, 16, Christ declares that those sheep who are not of His fold must be brought to it that

they may be one fold and one shepherd.

In the Acts of the Apostles are found recorded the earliest events in the history of the Church of God, and throughout this Apostolic book we find one Church only to which the Lord adds daily such as shall be saved. (ii, 47). This entire book speaks of the progress of the Church, not Churches, in its earliest stage. In the 15th chapter of the Acts we see the authority of this Church exercised in Council, but the Church as a body altogether distinct from the civil authority, and it alone independently of the civil authority lays down articles of faith which are to be believed, and the rules of life by which disciples are to be guided. It is this Church which St. Paul describes in 1 Tim. iii, 15, to be the Church of the living God, the pillar and ground of truth.

This is enough to show that the modern Anglican theory, as the Bishop of Ripon sets it forth, is totally inconsistent with the theory of the Church as laid down in Holy Scripture by Christ and His Apostles. The Church spread throughout all nations is one and undivided, as there is one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism. (Eph. iv, 5.) Where is there room for the successive ages to construct or reconstruct the Church? In all ages it must adhere to the one "faith once delivered to the saints." (Jude, 3.)

Before the Reformation, the Church of England was simply that part of the Universal Church which was in England. It was governed by the Pope as Supreme Visible Head of the whole Church, assisted by the Bishops of every nation, and there was no thought that the Church of Christ could be anything else than this universal body, thus governed from the centre of unity.

But the Reformation brought forward new conditions. The Church of England was by English law a new creation. It claimed the name Church of England only by virtue of the might of the English Kings or Queens, and of Acts of Parliament. It introduced new doctrines, a new Church Government, a new form of worship differing essentially from that which had been previously recognized, it had a new head and a new hierarchy altogether distinct from that which had been before recognized as the hierarchy of successors to the Apostles. It refused to submit to the established authority of the universal or Catholic Church, and it could not in any sense be regarded as identical with the Church which had existed since the time of St. Augustine, and among the Britons from a still earlier period, the close of the second century.

This new Church of England was simply a rebellious member which had to be cut off from the universal Church, and so far from being a continuation of the pre-Reformation Church, it had no connection with it, and its name was only got by theft, for previously the Church of England meant a part of the Universal Church. Hence the meaning of the designation has changed. It means now a local Church, distinct from the Universal Church, whereas before it signified a branch of the Church to which all Christian nations belonged, the Catholic Church of Christ.

It is incomprehensible how any man can attempt to maintain the identity of Henry VIII's mock Church with the Church which has come down from the days of the Apostles. This theory so persistently maintained by Anglican divines during the past quarter of a century is nothing more nor less than a deliberate attempt to deceive the public. They know from Holy Scripture that the Church of Christ is a continuous organization which can never cease to teach Christ's doctrine, and which will continue to the end of time, and as they have joined their fortunes with the Anglican Church, they desire to make it appear that Anglicanism is the Church to which Christ's promises were made. But Anglicanism is 1500 years too young to be the one Church which Christ established. His Church has remained intact in spite of all assaults, and it exists to-day in undiminished vigor. It is the Church Catholic, under the rule of St. Peter's successor, who is to day Pope Leo XIII.

Dr. Carpenter asserts in the next place that Pope Gregory gave directions to St. Augustine to make choice of such liturgy or service as he deemed most suitable for the people of England, whether that liturgy were that of the Roman or the Gallican Church. The object of this assertion is to justify the Church of England in adopting a new liturgy and creed. It is certainly a bold assertion, as St. Gregory, even according to Bishop Carpenter's quota-

tion, was recommended to "make choice of what may seem to him most acceptable to Almighty God, should he find anything of the kind either the Roman or the Gallican, or any other Church."

The Bishop surely does not suppose that the Roman, Gallican and other Churches, were so many distinct national independent Churches teaching what they pleased, and having liturgies inculcating different faiths. Anglicanism differs from Presbyterianism, or as even the parishes of Anglicanism differ one from another, though they are side by side.

The Roman and French and other Churches were one in Faith, and equally subject to the head of the Church.

There were slight differences of liturgy, but the faith was the same. As regards variations in liturgy, must be remarked that they were permitted by the head of the Church, some extent so long as the faith was not obscured or changed. It is a matter on which the Church or the people have authority in the Church legislate. There are at the present moment several liturgies in the one Church, though the Roman liturgy predominates.

The liturgy is that form of prayer which is approved by the Church, and as it is not divinely given, the Church has authority to select such forms of public worship as it deems proper, provided the essence of the sacrifice which is instituted by God be not vitiated.

It is a matter of prudence which liturgy may be used in any local Church, but it is the supreme authority of the Church which decides this matter, and accordingly, St. Gregory could lay down rules for St. Augustine to follow.

But it is a different matter with the liturgy of the modern Church of England. That was compiled as a rebellion against the supreme authority of the universal Church, which changed the essential faith which handed down from the Apostles. Gregory's directions to St. Augustine cannot be an excuse for the compilers of the Church of England Prayer Book.

Bishop Carpenter also maintains that the first Anglican Bishop, the Rev. Parker and his colleagues served the continuity of the Church being consecrated to their office by four Bishops, viz., Barlow, Cowley, Scory and Hodgkins.

We have already drawn this to such length that it is desirable to conclude. We shall therefore repeat that there is no solid foundation for this statement. The Chronicle says:

"This way of putting it implies a theory in the Anglican Episcopate which does not warrant. Barlow, Parker's consecrator, had been Bishop of Bath and Wells in the reign of Henry VIII, but he resigned the See on the occasion of Mary's and Bourne, then appointed, was recognized as Bishop by Elizabeth in the communion which she directed him and others to administer, he being deprived of his See. His deprivation, however, was not reinstated. Barlow, who was Bishop of Winchester three days after Parker's consecration; his being Bishop at that date being thus sidged."

In fact Barlow was no Bishop. He was never consecrated to the office, even under the illegal and fraudulent appointment under Edward VI, and besides the whole record of Parker's consecration is known to be fraudulent, having concocted forty or fifty years event.

It was for this reason that Elizabeth's Parliament passed a law washing law in 1565 whereby the law in the consecration of Parker and his colleagues were void. Thus the first Anglican Bishops, by Act of Parliament and not by virtue of Apostolic authority.

It will require stronger proof to have yet been advanced in modern Church of England in connection with the Church of St. Thomas, Becket, Anselm, Augustine, etc.

Our readers will further see that Bishop Carpenter fully admitted that St. Augustine undertook his mission to England under the authority of the Pope, namely, Gregory the Great. This fact accord with the attention that the modern Anglican Church was identical with that established by that Gregory? "The older I grow—and I grow on the brink of eternity—comes back to me the sense of a child at my mother's knee, fuller and deeper its meaning. 'What is the great end of life?' To glorify God and to enjoy ever."—Carlyle.