

The Catholic Record. Published Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHEGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels." THOMAS COFFEY, Publisher and Proprietor, THOMAS COFFEY, MESSRS. LAKE, KING, JOHN NICH, C. J. NEVIN and W. A. NEVIN, are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transact all other business for the CATHOLIC RECORD.

London, Saturday, Feb. 15, 1896.

LENTEN REGULATIONS FOR 1896.

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.

4th. 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.

A PROSPECTIVE ANGLICAN CELEBRATION.

It is frequently the most unexpected event which happens, and after the anti-Ritualistic crusade inaugurated by Dean Farrar within the last two years, it could scarcely have been expected that he would, in the short time which has since elapsed, have developed in himself a most Ritualistic tendency; yet this appears to have been the case since he has gone to Canterbury. It is announced that he is not satisfied with the capabilities of the cathedral for great religious services, and that he intends to make it available for such.

The acoustic difficulties in the way of meeting the dean's purpose are great, but they are to be overcome by hanging large banners between the arches, representing the arms of the English sees. How this decoration will accord with the pronounced anti-symbolical and anti-decorative views of the Evangelical party in the Church, of which the dean has been regarded as the leader militant, it is difficult to see, but we presume it will be said in defence of the banners that there is no breach of the second commandment in hanging them about the church, for the reason that the lions and griffins and other animals, real and imaginary, thereon emblazoned are not the "likeness of anything that is in heaven above or that is in the earth beneath or that is in the water under the earth."

The immediate purpose of the contemplated preparations is to hold a grand celebration in the cathedral next year in commemoration of the thirteen hundredth anniversary of the baptism of King Ethelbert of Kent, baptized with 10,000 of his subjects in A. D. 597. There will be a gathering of Anglican and Protestant Episcopal Bishops at the same time, and the probability is that a Pan-Anglican Council will be held somewhat similar to the two which have been already held in former years.

These councils differ essentially from the general councils of the Catholic Church which pronounce definitely on

matters of faith and morals. It is acknowledged that the Pan-Anglican council cannot issue any binding decrees, and therefore no attempt has ever been made to issue such. The Pan-Anglican councils are nothing more than social gatherings at which the Bishops interchange views and cultivate friendly intercourse with each other. It requires a great stretch of the imagination to regard them as ecclesiastical councils at all. They have not even the legislative authority of a Catholic provincial ecclesiastical council, nor of an Anglican diocesan synod; and they certainly cannot address even their own adherents in the words of the first Christian Ecumenical Council held at Jerusalem by the apostles and ancients:

"It hath seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us to lay no further burden upon you than these necessary things." (Acts xv.)

The baptism of King Ethelbert was certainly a great event in the history of the people of England. In the year 597, St. Augustine, with his monks, the whole number being forty, landed on the Isle of Thanet, and intelligence of their arrival was brought to Ethelbert, then reigning over Kent and the whole country south of the Humber.

Though the Saxons, the masters of the country, were Pagans, Ethelbert was somewhat aware of the nature of Christianity, for his queen, Bertha, was a Christian, and so must have been the majority of his British slaves, as there had been a flourishing Church in Britain before the Saxon conquest, from the time of King Lucius toward the end of the second century.

Ethelbert received the missionaries well, and they were established in a church which had belonged to the Britons, and soon had many converts, though Ethelbert did not himself embrace Christianity until Pentecost 597. His example was soon followed by many of his subjects, and the way was soon opened for the conversion of the whole country; but it is not easy to understand why the Anglican Church should make a special celebration of Ethelbert's conversion, as it is certain that St. Augustine was commissioned by a Pope, Gregory the Great, and he brought to the Saxons the universal faith of Christendom, which was certainly not the faith of the modern Church of England.

St. Augustine received his jurisdiction from the Pope, but the modern Church declares by an oath exacted from every clergyman that "no foreign Prince, prelate or potentate hath or ought to have any jurisdiction in this realm."

We can see in the proposed celebration of King Ethelbert's baptism an intention to make the public believe that the faith brought in by St. Augustine was identical with that now established by Act of Parliament, but this is to give up the pretence which is so frequently made by Anglican divines and polemicists that the ancient British Church was the independent Church of England, which resisted St. Augustine's effort to make the Church Papal.

The truth, attested by all the early records, is that the ancient British Church, equally with that established among the Saxons by St. Augustine, was established by missionaries from Rome, and derived their ecclesiastical jurisdiction from the Pope. The resistance of the British Bishops to St. Augustine did not arise from a difference of faith, but from the antipathy existing between the two nations, the vanquished and the victors, and time soon healed the temporary dissension. But the history of St. Augustine's mission, which is more within the period of exact history, is detailed more fully, and every circumstance is such as to prove that the faith he planted was that of the Catholic Church in communion with and subjection to the See of Rome.

PENITENTIARY ADMINISTRATION TOO EXCLUSIVELY PROTESTANT.

Sometime ago, when Sir Charles Hibbert Tupper was Minister of Justice, the *Arnprior Chronicle* published the following remarks in reference to the government of penitentiaries by the Department of Justice:

"Since the popular and learned Sir Chas. H. Tupper has assumed the Cabinet portfolio of the Justice Department the reputation of that important branch of the public service has not been allowed to suffer in the estimation of the public. The fairness and impartiality so characteristic heretofore is still maintained by the present incumbent. The late parliamentary amendments and additions to our criminal code have all been made in the direct interest and protection of the whole Dominion. The liberality of Sir Chas. Tupper is unquestioned; his fair and liberal treatment of the Manitoba school question marks him forever a real champion of civil and religious liberty. Not unlike many another statesman, owing to the multitudinous duties of his office and the many calls on him as an orator, he is apt to overlook some-

times certain matters. What we refer to here is our penitentiary board of official directors as constituted by the late Sir John A. Macdonald. He established a board of three directors, by whom all important questions affecting the general welfare of the penitentiaries of the Dominion should be finally settled. This board constituted the Minister and Deputy Minister of Justice and the Inspector of Penitentiaries. Since the formation of the directorate it was always a rule that one Catholic should be on the board to represent the Catholic portion of the officials as well as the prisoners. This to all just and fair-minded citizens must appear right and proper, but since the superannuation of Mr. J. G. Moylan, the late inspector, all three are Protestant, and a most valuable and impartial officer. The present board being all of one persuasion is a circumstance which it is perfectly safe to say the present Minister has not thought of. Had his attention been drawn to it the remedy undoubtedly would have been applied. Another official would have been nominated to the board, thus affording the Catholics their share of representation. It is not an absolute necessity the third member of the board should be the inspector; any responsible official of the penitentiary system is a circumstance constantly occurring affecting the officers or inmates of the different institutions—for instance, an investigation regarding the conduct of officers, the liberation or severe chastisement of convicts, the party in question, may be a Catholic, would naturally look to his member of the board for protection or justice. The Minister of Justice some two or three weeks since, in a speech delivered by him, informed his hearers that the Protestants and Catholics in the penitentiaries were about even, with a slight majority of some ten or twelve of the former. Again, all the wardens in the Dominion are Protestant, with the single exception of the warden of St. Vincent de Paul, who is a brother of the present Minister of Public Works. Doubtless when this is properly represented the Minister, with his usual liberality, will take such means as will restore the former order of things as originally laid down by his illustrious predecessor and continue to enjoy the confidence of the Catholic population of Canada."

We agree with our contemporary in the opinion he has expressed on this very important matter. He is in error, we believe, in stating that "a board of official directors" exists. That board, as constituted by Sir John Macdonald, was abolished by Mr. Mackenzie's Government, in its early days, and an inspector was appointed to perform its duties. That officer, Mr. J. G. Moylan, had been one of the three directors. He represented Ontario and the English-speaking Catholics, officers and prisoners, as Mr. King did the Maritime Provinces and the Protestant element, while the French-Canadian members of the Quebec penitentiary staff and the convicts were attended to by Mr. Prieur. At a matter of fact, the board took cognizance of and acted upon everything that required its consideration, regardless of nationality or creed. Withal, it was deemed advisable that the Protestant officers and convicts and the English and French speaking officers and convicts should have access to the Director or who, in a special manner, represented their respective interests. This procedure gave great satisfaction, because of the confidence which the inmates of the penitentiaries, officials and prisoners, as well as the general public, felt that fair play and justice would characterize the conduct of the board, and that unfairness or injustice would not be tolerated. Although, as far as we have been able to learn, the administration of the penitentiaries was greatly improved and most efficiently conducted under the direction of the late inspector, yet, it is our opinion that a grave mistake was committed in doing away with the board of directors. The responsibility and duties connected with the proper government of our penitentiaries, involving as it does such varied and conflicting elements and interests, are too great and manifold for one man to discharge in a thorough and competent manner. The best prison systems in the world, on the continent of Europe, in Great Britain and Ireland, and in the United States, are carried out by boards of directors and inspectors, superintendents, commissioners, etc. We therefore strongly advise that the administration of the penitentiaries be again placed in the hands of a board, no matter what its designation, provided only that the members be selected by reason of their experience and fitness. This would protect the Government, and especially the Department of Justice, against the charges of tyranny and injustice which, of late, have been current respecting the treatment of Catholic employes in certain penitentiaries.

The necessity for some change in the personnel of the penitentiary regime will be apparent when we inform the reader that every one who is concerned in it is Protestant, viz., the minister of justice, his deputy, the inspector, the accountant and the secretary of the penitentiary branch. This is a marked departure from the course followed by Sir John Macdonald. His rule, approved by his colleagues, was to appoint an Irish Catholic to fill a position held by his co-religionist and countryman, and to give assurance to that body that, in no respect, were they ostracised in the public service. Moreover, the wardens of four out of the five penitentiaries are Protestants. The same is to be said of the account-

ant in view of the widespread dissatisfaction on this subject, we are surprised that none of our representatives in Parliament has called attention to this manifest, but, mahap, unintentional unfairness. It is not a matter which should be viewed from a political standpoint. The promptings of common justice should convince any Government that this state of things calls for a remedy. To say the least, it augurs indifference, disregard and, we may add, contempt for the feelings and sympathies of the English-speaking Catholics of Canada.

We are convinced that, as in the past, the public in general would not object to the presence of an English-speaking Catholic in the Penitentiary Branch of the Department of Justice, who would be associated with the Inspector, or form one of a board to supervise the management of our penal prisons. Surely the penitentiary service can supply a man capable and experienced enough whom the Government could appoint to the office indicated, and this would furnish the very reasonable representation suggested.

It is an acknowledged principle, carried out in practice by the Dominion Government, that Catholics are entitled to representation in the Cabinet. Is it not reasonable and just that the same principle should be carried out in the branch of the public service to which we have reference. It needs no argument to prove this.

We have dealt with this subject in a purely non-partisan spirit: and we do not aim at making political capital out of it. We ask our contemporaries, Catholic and Protestant, of all shades of political opinion, to join us in urging upon the Government, be it Liberal or Conservative, the wisdom and necessity of remedying, at once, what must reasonably be regarded as a grievance.

"KING CHARLES, MARTYR."

The Catholic Church, being the Church of the world, makes no distinction of nationality in the recognition of the virtues of the saints, and so the calendar contains the names of saints of every nation, England, Ireland, Scotland, France, Germany, America, Japan, etc.; and though the people of various nationalities have their special devotion for certain saints, no Catholic has any difficulty in honoring duly the virtues of saints who are the special objects of devotion in other countries than their own. Thus Germans and French Catholics do not hesitate a moment in this country to join with devotion in the celebration of St. Patrick's day by Irishmen, and elsewhere the feasts of St. Louis, St. John the Baptist, St. Aloysius, and others which are specially honored by other nations, are devoutly observed by Irishmen or American Catholics who may be present when the festivities are religiously celebrated.

But the recent celebration of the feast of King Charles I, Martyr, in the Church of St. Mary the Virgin, New York city, has excited the ire of the New England descendants of the Pilgrim Fathers. This church, in which the celebration took place on the 30th ult., the feast of King Charles, according to the Anglican Book of Common Prayer, is of decidedly Ritualistic character, and the service consisted of a High Mass, with a eulogistic sermon on King Charles the Martyr, the reading of some of the King's meditations, and the other usual accessories of a religious celebration.

The descendants of the old Puritans explain the cause of their indignation to be that King Charles was a bitter enemy to Puritanism, towards crushing which he spared no pains, having endeavored by persecution to force the Church of England liturgy on the three kingdoms.

It was on account of this persecution of the Puritans that the Pilgrim Fathers were obliged to seek an asylum in the new world, where they would be free to practice their religion according to their conscientious convictions, and they regarded the king as a man of blood, and even went so far as to declare that he was the anti-Christ foretold in Scripture. It is no wonder, therefore, that they should regard with indignation an effort made in America to hold him up as a model Christian monarch and saint; but they also take the ground that it is disloyalty to the United States to celebrate the festival of a British king, the tyranny of whom, imitated and reproduced by his successors, was the cause why the American colonies threw off their allegiance to Great Britain and declared their independence. Charles I. was undoubtedly a mon-

arch truly religious as he viewed religious duty. He was honest in his endeavor to make the Church of England the sole Church of the British Isles, and his treatment by Oliver Cromwell was so atrocious as to deserve the strong denunciatory language of the Prayer Book, which describes Cromwell, and all those who had a hand in the king's execution, as "cruel and bloody men . . . sons of Belial, who imbrued their hands in the blood of Thine (God's) anointed". Yet we think it is certain that though the king had many social and natural good qualities, he had not those supernatural virtues which characterize the saints of God, and render them worthy of being proposed in the Church as the examples whom Christians ought to imitate. The faults of Charles are so evident to every intelligent reader of history as to make our view of the case a matter of self-evidence. His abandonment of Lord Strafford to the fury of those enemies who thirsted for his blood may have been an act of expediency for his own safety, but it was certainly not the act of a saint or hero of Christianity who would think more of what is right and just than of his personal safety, even though he had the advice of the Bishops of the English Church to yield to the demands of the puritanical party in Parliament on this point. This weakness of the king must remain as a most serious blot upon his memory, and as we have no evidence that he seriously repented of it to any greater degree than because he thereby lost a staunch friend, the fact ought to be an insuperable barrier against the insertion of his name in the calendar of saints.

Again, Charles was undoubtedly a persecutor, and the cruelties he authorized against the Covenanters of Scotland should also be a bar against paying him a religious homage.

Viewed in the light of the political sentiments of the present day, he was also politically a tyrant. We may be disposed somewhat to pardon his extreme views on the divine rights of kings, because the more modern view that kings should rule for the good of the people was not so well understood in his day; but in one who is held up to us as a martyr and a saint, we should expect less of the proud spirit of the arbitrary autocrat than was displayed by King Charles. In any event he was not a martyr in a Christian sense. He did not die for his religion, but for his extreme political views on the rights of kings.

We can readily conceive that the democratic New Englanders of to day should be indignant that the celebration of the king's festival should be transferred to American soil, yet the curious controversy which has arisen out of the matter is conclusive proof of the irreconcilable differences which exist between the various denominations, and that they are all equally and essentially local institutions, as the late Lord Macaulay describes them to be in his well-known review of Ranke's History of the Popes King Charles would never have been put into the calendar as a saint, except by a Church which was in every respect the creature of the State, and this fact is enough to make it very inappropriate to introduce the celebration of his festival into an American Church. The Ritualists, however, take the ground that Charles is the only martyr who has been officially proclaimed to be such by any Protestant Church, all the other saints named in the calendar having been accepted from Catholicism. This may not be a very strong argument in favor of that monarch's claim to religious veneration, as it is acknowledged that no Protestant Church can claim the attribute of infallibility; but it certainly leaves Protestantism in a very curious position if it is so poor in saints that the only one whom a Protestant Church has ever presumed to canonize is to be repudiated as unworthy to be reckoned in the ranks of the "noble army of martyrs."

MR. O'ROURKE ON THE SCHOOL QUESTION.

We publish in another column an able letter from Mr. T. A. O'Rourke, of Trenton, on the Manitoba school question. The letter was sent to the *Toronto Globe*, but up to the moment of our going to press it has not appeared in the *Globe's* columns. The letter is an able one, and it sets forth in a strictly logical manner a view of the school question which, though several times briefly put forward in our columns, has not hitherto been so strikingly insisted on as in Mr. O'Rourke's communication. The point on which Mr. O'Rourke specially insists is that there is a radi-

cal difference between Catholics and Protestants on the subject of education, a difference which cannot be settled by forcing upon either creed the view of education which is quite satisfactory to the other. As a consequence, he argues that the school system with which the members of one creed are quite satisfied should not be forced upon those of another belief.

It is in the nature of education that the religious views of the teacher are almost necessarily impressed upon the pupils, and this fact is thoroughly understood by Protestants as well as Catholics. Most Protestants, however, are able to agree so far on the matter of religion that it is of little concern to them that the teacher be a member of one or another Protestant sect. Protestantism, as it is generally believed in, consists of little more than the belief in one or two salient Christian doctrines, together with a hatred or contempt for the Catholic Church. Hence Protestants with very little scruple attend churches not of their own denomination, and their ministers are frequently invited to interchange pulpits, but the Catholic faith is of a less versatile character; hence Catholics cannot conscientiously submit to have their children educated where their faith may be endangered. This is one of the many reasons why Catholics wish for Catholic Separate schools in which to educate their children, and Mr. O'Rourke shows that on the principle of "Equal Rights" to all, Catholics should enjoy the same liberty to have schools to their liking as Protestants have.

A NOBLE UTTERANCE.

The *Toronto Globe* of the 7th makes the following reference to a sermon recently delivered by the distinguished Archbishop of Toronto:

"A new Catholic church, St. Cecilia's, was opened in Toronto Junction on Sunday. A notable feature of the occasion was good feeling exhibited between the Catholics and Protestants of the place. Rev. Father Bergin thanked the Protestants for their good wishes and substantial aid, and expressed the hope that kindly relations might always exist. The presence of the Mayor and Council of the Junction was referred to by Archbishop Walsh in these terms:

"I am glad to see that the Mayor and members of the Town Council are here with us today. They have given the highest testimony they could give of respect and good-will for their Catholic neighbors. They have given an example which is in the highest degree creditable to the spirit of tolerance and broad minded liberality of the Protestant people of this town. The presence of the Council here is an object lesson that is much needed in many parts of this country, a worthy lesson, one that will do good as a sincere manifestation of liberality and kind neighborly attention to their Catholic friends. I have been preaching this gospel to my people for many years. What this country wants is peace. Do not allow political adventurers who want to rise to power to play upon feelings of passion and animosity; do not allow factionist agitators or religious agitators to disturb your peace by saying that others shall not be free to worship at the altar of their choice. This country wants peace and good feeling between neighbors. We want this good feeling in our social life, in our financial life, in all our relations one with another as citizens of a common country. Let us strive for it as men, as Christian men, as neighbors; let us strive to build up a great country; let us strive to make this country of ours what it ought to be and what it shall be—the home of millions of prosperous, free and happy citizens. This is what should be done by Protestants and Catholics, and this is what the Protestant people of this town have done—as Christian men they have shown an example of tolerance and liberality."

"The speech of the Archbishop at the opening of St. Michael's Hospital was equally noteworthy for its good sense, magnanimity and eloquence. The Archbishop is sustaining his reputation for wisdom and moderation, and is doing noble work in fostering good relations between Protestants and Catholics in this community."

What the *Globe* states is but the simple truth. The talented and large-minded occupant of the archiepiscopal See of Toronto has a reputation for sterling worth which extends, indeed, far beyond the limits of the Dominion. His aim is but the carrying out of the precepts of his Master—the planting of the seeds of charity, good-will and all manner of Christian kindness in the hearts of the people. Long may he be spared to continue the blessed work!

A DESERVED REBUKE.

The following extract, from "Kit's" Department, in the *Mail and Empire*, we have much pleasure in reproducing in the *Catholic Record*. "A Candid Friend" is evidently one of that class of Englishmen—too often the ruling class—which imagines that it is no harm to treat Irishmen with injustice and contempt, and stares in consterna-