

The Catholic Record

Published Weekly at 494 and 400 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Price of Subscription—\$1.00 per annum.

EDITOR: REV. GEORGE E. NORTHGRAVE

Editor of "The Catholic Record," 494 and 400 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.

Agents for Newfoundland, Mr. James Power of St. John's.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, Hamilton, Peterborough, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication, as well as that having reference to business, should be directed to the proprietor and must reach London not later than Monday morning.

Subscribers when changing their address should notify this office as soon as possible in order to insure the regular delivery of their paper.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning.

Obituary and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to insure insertion.

When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent us.

LETTERS OF RECOMMENDATION. Apostolic Delegation, Ottawa, June 18th, 1906.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

My Dear Sir—Since coming to Canada I have been a reader of your paper. I have noted with satisfaction that it is directed with intelligence and ability, and above all that it is imbued with a strong Catholic spirit.

It strenuously defends Catholic principles and rights, and stands firmly by the teachings and authority of the Church, at the same time promoting the best interests of the country.

Following these lines it has done a great deal of good for the welfare of religion and country, and it will do more and more as its wholesome influence reaches more Catholic homes.

I therefore, earnestly recommend it to Catholic families.

With my blessing on your work, and best wishes for its continued success.

Yours very sincerely in Christ, DONATUS, Archbishop of Ephesus, Apostolic Delegate.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA, Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1906.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD, London, Ont.

Dear Sir: For some time past I have read your estimable paper, THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congratulate you upon the manner in which it is published.

Its matter and form are both good; and a Catholic spirit pervades the whole. I am glad to see that you are so successful in your efforts to reach the faithful.

Believe me and wishing you success, Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, J. PALCOVIC, Arch. Deleg.

LONDON, SATURDAY, NOV. 10, 1906.

THE OTTAWA SEPARATE SCHOOL TROUBLE.

A few years ago a difficulty arose in the city of Ottawa as to the qualification of the Christian Brothers to teach in the Separate schools of that city, and the matter reached the courts and was carried in a friendly way to the Privy Council.

Last week a decision was given which is directly contrary to the meaning placed upon the school law by the Government and the Education Department and by all concerned in the interests of Separate schools for the last forty years.

It was taken for granted that the law said and meant that the members of certain teaching religious communities, who were qualified in the Province of Quebec before 1857, were also to be considered qualified in the Province of Ontario without receiving certificates of qualification to teach in the Public schools of this province.

But now we are told it is all wrong. Hence if some of the religious teachers find themselves—as a result of this recent decision—without the technical qualifications, it is not their fault. They acted in good faith and in obedience to the rules and regulations and laws of the Education Department.

The schools taught by the religious teachers were inspected in the same way as other schools, Separate and Public, and no Minister of Education ever raised any question as to the qualifications of these members of the religious communities. In secular subjects the same examinations were passed as in the other schools of the province, and no doubt every inspector and every Minister of Education knew that the pupils of the religious teachers easily held their own with the pupils of the other schools. After all the main point is that teachers should be qualified to do good work and be willing to do it. And whether they become qualified in Model or Normal schools, or be trained by experts among the religious teachers themselves, is merely a matter of detail.

Since Catholics will always and everywhere insist on Catholic Education and will demand as a matter of justice and right their own taxes and fair share of public money spent for education, and since they do not interfere with other parents in the education of their children—there should be no difficulty in adjusting matters to meet the new interpretation of the Separate School Law. Several of the religious teachers have at present the legal certificates required and no doubt the Minister of Education and all concerned will deal with the question in a reasonable and fair way.

At the present time there is much trouble in England and other countries about education and rights of minorities. Let Canada continue to show them how to solve the problem.

As a matter of fact there is perhaps

no place in the world to-day that treats a minority with the same justice and generosity, especially in this matter of education, as the grand old Province of Quebec. Let Ontario be at least a good second in the treatment of the minority and both Provinces will show the world the easiest and best solution of the important question of education.

LETTER FROM REV. MR. CLARK.

London, Nov. 3rd, 1906.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD: Dear Sir—Some kind friend has sent me a marked copy of your paper this week in which the leading editorial is based upon a report of an address I gave a week or so ago in the lecture room of my own church. I feel it is necessary I should pay attention to it, and there are two or three things I would like to say, and which you I am sure will publish.

I do not hold myself responsible for reports which are given in the daily press, and which are simply a record of the impression made upon the reporter, who is sometimes qualified, and sometimes only learning to report. The language of the paragraph is not mine. It was an extempore address and the thought in my mind was simply this, that there are in Canada the English-speaking Canadians and the French-speaking Canadians. In a number of rather important respects the ideals and ideas of these sections vary, and the question of assimilating them as one Canadian people is an important one and presents difficulties which are present to the mind of every thoughtful citizen, and which sometimes present themselves in intensified form. In the United States there is the white population and the black, and the problem of justice to both sections and assimilation from the national standpoint is a very great one. The analogy is evident, I think, and to this I referred. That there was anything either in my mind or words to cast a slur on my fellow-citizens of French origin, I directly and positively deny.

In another quotation made from the press report of my address I am credited with saying that with "every man on Fifth Avenue there was some scandal connected." I made no such statement, but said that with almost every mansion pointed out by the cabman who was acting as showman there was some scandal or tragedy connected. If the Fifth Avenue millionaires should happen to see the London newspaper, they too would have cause or think they had for complaint.

You speak of "my past" in complimentary terms. Present or past, I am willing to be judged by my constant attitude to all my fellowmen, of whatever racial extraction, or religion, and that attitude is in my thinking, and I strive to make also in my speech and action, one of justice and kindness.

If I might venture a word to the editor personally, I would say it is possible to be too sensitive, and that even the paragraph as quoted is in my judgment hardly sufficient ground for an offensive editorial under the caption "An Offensive Mistake." Although, if any of my hearers imagined that my language was meant to slander the French Canadian, I am glad of the opportunity of setting myself right, and declaring emphatically I hold for the decent man everywhere, whether he be black or white, whatever he speaks English or French, the very same respect and good will.

Very truly yours, W. J. CLARK.

We give place with pleasure to the letter of Rev. Mr. Clark, and are gratified to know that he did not make use of the language attributed to him by the reporter. It would be strange, indeed, were such the case, because we have always been pleased to note on his part a broad-mindedness and a fairness which we should be glad to see copied by certain other clergymen of the Protestant sects. We must disagree with the reverend gentleman, however, as to our being too sensitive.

He must surely know that the Catholic hierarchy, the Catholic priests, the Catholic Church and the Catholic people are oftentimes looked at askance by their Protestant neighbors because of the un-Christian-like and foundationless statements made so frequently regarding their faith by some clergymen who seek by that means to gain the applause of the unthinking and the ignorant.

We hope the time will come, and come soon, when Canadians of every race and creed and color will set their faces against any and every attempt to foster discord amongst us. It has been too much in evidence the past few years.

ANTI-PROFANITY LAWS IN ST. LOUIS.

Since the beginning of 1906 the police of St. Louis, Missouri, have been waging a war against public profanity, gambling, bribing and unlawful saloons, with great success. The Chief of Police made the announcement early in the year that profanity in public places is a violation of the municipal laws which were passed in the interests of public decency, and that all good citizens should use every effort to minimize the abominable practice. The citizens almost if not quite universally approved of the strict enforcement of the law, and the police being under instruction to arrest violators of the law performed their duty faithfully, and within the time which has elapsed since it was so strictly enforced this public scandal has been almost if not totally eradicated in the city. It was found that the prac-

tice was indulged in, not only by persons in the lower ranks of life, but that even educated persons, fathers of families, and many who were generally regarded as upright citizens, were addicted to the bad habit of using profane words, and of blaspheming the Holy Name of Jesus, but now such oaths are scarcely to be heard in public at all. This is certainly a very great improvement, even though in those parts of the city where the police are not so watchful this vicious use of the Holy Name of God is still to be heard to some extent, but even in such localities the practice is dying out, and the improvement is remarkable. Indecent language, which was also frequently heard before the police became so particular on this point, is now but seldom heard. From the good effect of the law in the exposition city, we may safely draw the inference that legislation will work wonders in putting down evils of this kind when it is sustained by the approval of the people; a point which has been a good deal discussed in connection with prohibitory and local option liquor laws.

HISTORIC ACCURACY—EDITORS WHO ARE COARSE.

To the Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Sir—In the course of your article you say: "Editors who are coarse." You suggest that I should be more careful in my choice of words. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order. I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

I am not a member of the Queen's Crown, and I do not believe in the Queen's Crown. I am not a member of the United Loyal Orange Association, and I do not believe in the United Loyal Orange Association. I am not a member of the Orange Order, and I do not believe in the Orange Order.

writer refers to a letter which he had received from one of the readers of the paper, protesting against his insulting reference to the Home Rulers. Here is a part of his reply:

"I have nothing but sympathy for the Irish people in being as much maligned by their self appointed political (?) leaders as they are usually libelled by the caricatures on the stage; these stage representatives have been freely posing Irish patriots were served in the same way and silenced it would indeed be a great day for Ireland."

It is lamentable to see the management of one of our daily papers permitting one of its editors to thus cast odium on such men as Edward Blake, T. P. O'Connor, Devlin, Redmond and all the other members of the Imperial House who are known as Nationalists, and who enjoy as large a share of public esteem as any of the English members who sit in Westminster.

We will be much mistaken in our Irish fellow countrymen if they do not resent in a fitting manner this insult cast upon them by a writer whose work in Canada is not for Canada's good and who should have remained in the old country in the ranks of those who were led by John Keenan and Ballykilbeg Johnson.

THE CHURCH AND ANGLICANISM.

It is time that the utterances which we hear and read so frequently of late years, concerning the predominant position of the Church of England in all great works, should come to an end, whether they be the pronouncements of prelate, cleric or layman.

In the report of Bishop Williams' sermon of Sunday, October 28, delivered in St. Paul's (Anglican) Cathedral, in this city, and published in the Free Press of 29th October, we are told that "in the eighteenth century the greatest Church revival the world has ever known took place, and the English Church was ever foremost in the good work. These facts seem to point to some special mission for the English Church. God has a mission for the English Church. What is the mission? We can discover the mission clearly by looking back through the history of the English Church, and seeing what she has accomplished in the past, and what is more, we can see what she can still do."

And what is that great Church revival of the eighteenth century which proves that "God has a mission for the English Church?"

We confess we are somewhat perplexed to solve this enigma. There were three convocations of considerable magnitude in which the Church of England was an important factor during that century: one was the teaching of Bishop Hoadly, the second, the Gordon riots, and the third was the birth of Methodism.

We cannot suppose that an educated gentleman considers it to have been a great revival of religion that eighty or a hundred thousand men should have ravaged London with fire and sword for several days in the effort to kill Catholics and destroy their property.

Neither do we suppose that a Bishop of the Anglican Church would speak of John Wesley and his work as a great revival shining forth brilliantly like the star which guided the three wise men of the East to Bethlehem, or that star of which Balaam spoke in prophesying the coming of Christ; for John Wesley's work was relentlessly persecuted by the Church of England.

There remains to be considered only the work of Bishop Hoadly. In the early part of the eighteenth century, namely, in 1717, and subsequent years, there was indeed a lively time in England, both in Parliament and throughout the country, in regard to certain doctrines maintained by Bishop Hoadly, its Sacraments and the futility of the belief in the 39 articles of the Church of England which should be demanded of its adherents, and especially of her clergy.

The 27th article of the Church of England asserts that men are grafted into the Church of Christ by baptism. The 23rd article teaches that the Church may rightly cut off certain persons from the unity of the Church, and excommunicate them "until they be openly reconciled by penance and received into the Church by a Judge that hath authority thereunto." The 20th article declares that "the Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies, and authority in controversies of faith."

All this was pointedly denied by Bishop Hoadly, who, in his sermon of 31st March, 1717, which created the turmoil of which we have spoken, declared that the Church of Christ is "the number of persons, whether great or small, who are sincerely and willingly subjects to Christ alone as to a lawgiver and judge in matters relating to the favor of God and eternal salvation."

This definition of the Church of

Christ certainly does not require what the 19th article of religion positively lays down as absolutely essential to the Church of Christ: namely, that in it the pure Word of God be preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered according to Christ's ordinance in all those things that of necessity are requisite to the same.

It could scarcely be believed that a Bishop of the Church of England in Canada, loyal to his Church as he should be supposed to be, should magnify the work of Bishop Hoadly, which tended to the destruction of authority in the Church of England, and in fact of Christianity. Bishop Hoadly's teaching would lead to the belief that there is no visible Church of Christ, but all that is necessary to constitute this Church is a general disposition to be subject to Christ, such as every fanatic, from Johanna Southcote to Mrs. Mary Baker Eddy and John Alexander Dowie, have professed.

Hoadly declared in express terms that "a man's title to God's favor does not depend upon his actual belief or continuing in any particular method (of religion) but in his real sincerity in the conduct of his conscience."

Dr. Hoadly, learned man though undoubtedly he was, was condemned by his writings by the convocation of the Church, as subversive of all government and discipline in the Church of Christ, but the government of the day dissolved the convocation to prevent final action against their favorite Bishop, and Bishop Hoadly himself declared that he favored this action "as proceeding from a sincere regard to the constitution in Church and State."

But we need not follow up so closely the absurdities of the latitudinarian and Low Church systems to which Bishop Williams has evidently attached himself. Suffice it to say that the Church of England does maintain in her forms of ordination that the orders of the ministry, deacons, priests and Bishops, have come down from the Apostles, and from Almighty God, and that episcopacy is of divine institution, and therefore necessary to the existence of the Church. It will therefore be a matter of surprise to many members of the Church of England that one of her Bishops to-day is quite ready to admit the Church of England Presbyterians or Priests have not a whit more power in the ministry than Presbyterian ministers, on whom the grace of ordination was never conferred by the sacrament of Holy Order, administered by the imposition of hands of an apostolic successor.

It is ludicrous for a claimant to Episcopacy to describe as the greatest Church revival the world has ever known the complete subversion of the ecclesiastical authority from the position it once held in the Church of God, and the substitution of the civil power therefore, against which all varieties of Church have protested to the shedding of their blood in the cause of religion, whether Calvinistic, Lutheran or Zwinglian, or High, or Low, New or Old, Dry or Wet.

The Lord Bishop tells us "The Church of England combines all that is true and essential in both the Protestant and Catholic religions."

Are we sure that it combines all? It is very strange, if it combines all truth, its clergy everywhere teach the most contradictory doctrines, all derived from the Book of Common Prayer and Scripture—at least so they say. With such results, is it not more consistent to say that it teaches nothing positively, but leaves every one to understand it as he will? Let us have a few examples.

It is but a few years since Hon. S. H. Blake, the principal pillar of Wycliffe College, Toronto, said:

"Forty years ago there was a perceptible cleavage between the parties in the Church in this country. It was between evangelical teaching on one side, and ritualistic on the other."

Books were circulated by an Anglican pastor of Toronto which Mr. Blake declared to be "vile and indecent." These books taught "confession to a priest, the Romish Mass, prayers for the dead, and all that from which, at the glorious period of the Reformation, we parted." The Archbishop of Canterbury had said of the same man who wrote this book:

"This is not a foe inside the Church, but a foe outside the Church, whereby they want to sap its foundations and to cast out all that was won at the Reformation."

It is needless to quote more. It is known by all that the fight which began, not merely forty years ago, but so early as Bishop Hoadly's time, say in 1717, is still going on, though the convocation which was suppressed in that year was silenced by a most extraordinary diplomatic coup; and a bitter fight it is, so bitter that it rages alike in England, the United States, Canada, Australia, and wherever the Church of England and its daughter churches exist.

And here we must note a character-

istic statement of Mr. Blake. He endeavored to make it appear that there is immorality in the Catholic doctrine he refers to, whereas the whole doctrine is between two parties in his own Church, and these parties so evenly divided that it is not known yet which of them is really the Church of England.

We might introduce similar incidents beyond number; but we will give only an extract from a speech delivered in May, 1899, by Mr. Charles McArthur, M. P., for Liverpool, (Exchange Division) in moving a bill which the Low Church Party desired to have passed. The mover's language shows the intensity of the present quarrel. He said:

"A section of the clergy of the Church of England are in open revolt, not only against the law of the land, but against the law of the Church, but against the law of the land. The lawlessness which threatened to rend the Church asunder is called by different names, as tractarian, ritualism, sacerdotal ritualism, etc., but which, under all names, is one and the same thing, its object being to undo the work of the Reformation. One reason why the Protestant party had lost confidence in the Bishops was because they had not only failed to put down ritualistic practices, but had exercised their patronage in favor of the ritualistic clergy, etc."

We see, therefore a Church, with its Bishops and principal teachers, hopelessly divided and ready at any moment to fly at each others' throats, and this language was endorsed with loud cheers from the House of Commons, though the bill was defeated by a vote of 310 to 156.

But, though this measure was defeated, the government which opposed it as too drastic moved a substitute resolution, which was carried, to the effect that if the Archbishops and Bishops fail to secure the obedience of the clergy which is demanded in terms so strong, legislation must be introduced to maintain the existing laws of the Church and the realm."

This resolution was passed unanimously, which proves that Bishop Williams is sadly mistaken in his assertion that the Church of England "combines all that is true and essential" in Christianity.

We cannot understand why clergymen of the Church of England are so anxious to have it believed by the public that the modern Church of England "as by law established" is identical with the Church of England of ancient times. Bishop Williams practically asserts the same thing, saying:

"We should remember that there was an English Church before there was an English nation, and in fact the Church led the way for the nation. The Church of England had always led the van of English liberty and progress. We would not have had to-day any English literature, any English art, or any English liberty had it not been for the Church of England. If the Church has accomplished these things in the old land, she can also accomplish them in this country."

... and we will need her aid in establishing a national character such as has made England what she is to-day."

We cannot but admit that the Church of England led the van in the progress of the nation from its original barbarous state down to the days of civilization.

In the beginning of the historic period the religion of England was Druidical. The ancient Britons worked to some extent the mines of copper and tin in the south-west, and Christianity, which was then the Catholic Church in union with the Pope, did much to improve the condition of the people by introducing and maintaining schools, improving agriculture and house-building, and cultivating a taste for the arts of civilized life.

From Gildas, Venerable Bede, and AEsch, for the most part, the early history of the Catholic Church in England is known. There were Christians in England who came thither with the Roman armies, but the sure authentic history of the Church begins about the year 183, when King Lucius sent messengers to Pope Eleutherus beseeching him to send missionaries to teach the Christian faith. The king's wife was a Christian and it was through her influence in the main that Lucius took this step.

In the year 314 a great Council was held at Arles in France, and among those who signed the decrees, and a letter to the Pope couched in most respectful language, and ending with a request that "As your jurisdiction is the most extended, it remains for you to use your authority in promulgating these decrees in all the Churches," there were three British Bishops.

It was there decreed that "Easter should be celebrated throughout the world on the same day, and that according to custom the Pope (Sylvester) should indicate the date to all by circular-letters."

The ancient British Church, therefore, was part of the universal Church, acknowledging the Pope for its head, and not a mere national Church receiving its doctrines and its discipline from either a king or a lay Parliament.

The name Church of England would not be given to it until the country itself was called England, which was