

The Catholic Record.

Published Weekly at 434 and 436 Richmond Street, London, Ontario.
Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

EDITOR:
REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVE.
Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels."
THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey.

Men: Luke King, John Nigh, P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King are fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.
Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall St. John's.

Letters of Advertising—Ten cents per line each insertion, scale measurement.

Approved and recommended by the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa and St. Boniface, the Bishops of Hamilton, Peterborough, and Oshawa, 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 Tuesday morning. When subscribers change their residence it is important that the old as well as the new address be sent in.

Agents or collectors have no authority to stop your paper unless the amount due is paid.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.

Ottawa, Canada, March 7th, 1903.
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.

The matter and form are both good; and I am sure that the paper will be a blessing to the Catholic community in this country.

Believe me, Sir, to remain,
Yours faithfully,
J. D. PALCOWSKI, Arch. of Ottawa.

Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Tuesday morning.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JAN. 3, 1903.

CENTRAL PRISON CHAPEL.

We have pleasure in publishing in this issue a report of the blessing of the new Chapel in the Central Prison, Toronto. This is another proof of the fairness of the Hon. Mr. Ross and his colleagues toward our people. The complimentary remarks of His Grace the Archbishop of Toronto, who said "He could not omit a word of appreciation and gratitude to the authorities who, whether in connection with the Government or in the management of the prison, had given this beautiful chapel to the Catholic prisoners," were richly deserved.

Hon. Mr. Stratton, Provincial Secretary, who has charge of this particular work, has sustained his well-known reputation of good-will towards Catholics generally.

It must be a source of pleasure to our able representative, Hon. F. R. Laford, Commissioner of Public Works, to be a member of a Government so well disposed to deal fairly with all classes of the community.

DIOCESAN CHANGES.

The people of Dublin, while regretting the death of their late lamented pastor, will give a warm welcome to Rev. Father Noonan, who has done splendid work during his long service both in London and Biddulph.

Father McMenamin, who has been assigned to Biddulph, has already formed two new parishes in the Diocese—Ridgeway and Clinton—and has been very successful in the different places where he has been in charge. The faithful people of Biddulph will, no doubt, appreciate his services and give him all the assistance he requires in the numerous good works connected with the welfare of the parish.

SHOULD BE STOPPED AT ONCE.

Business men who are making selection of calendars which they wish to present to customers should be careful that they are of such a character as to be acceptable to all classes. Some lithographers, whose education, outside of their own particular business, is, unfortunately, very limited, are producing specimens of calendars for 1903 that are not only objectionable, but decidedly insulting to Irishmen and Catholics. These, they think, are popular and sell readily. We strongly advise our readers to show them their mistake. When we see pictures on calendars which belittle the character of a Catholic or an Irishman we should not only not accept them ourselves but do all in our power to prevent our friends from doing so. Furthermore, it would also be well not to deal with merchants who thus so wantonly insult and degrade our religion and fellow-countrymen. We are in receipt of one of the latest of this character—published by a liverman in Nova Scotia—purporting to be a picture of Donnybrook Fair. The publisher may not, of course, have intended an insult. Nevertheless the slur is there; and we trust he and others like him will not repeat the insult. A little judicious action on the part of our people in touching the most vulnerable part of merchants and others who dispose of these calendars—namely, their purse—will soon convince them of their foolishness and so have the desired effect.

Family ties are not severed in heaven; and Jesus in raising His Blessed Mother above the saints and angels, teaches us that filial piety is a virtue of eternity.—Lacordaire.

A TERRIBLE ACCIDENT.

Some forty miles from London, at a place called Wanstead, on Friday night last, a freight collided with a passenger train on the Grand Trunk Railway, as a result of which about 28 persons were killed outright and 40 more or less seriously injured. This awful accident has cast a pall over the whole of Western Ontario, and has made the holiday season an intensely sad one in many a home. Some one has blundered, and the result is terrible to contemplate. We cannot help commending the work done by many noble hearted souls—particularly amongst the medical profession—at the scene of the accident. It was a terrible night, and to add to the horror an severe blizzard prevailed. One can hardly imagine the extent of the misery endured by the victims. No small amount of suffering, too, was undergone by the doctors and their assistants. We must also add a word in regard to the conduct of the railway officials. Everyone connected with the Grand Trunk acted as though he had sustained a personal loss and did all in his power to alleviate the prevailing distress. All honor to them, say we. Those who witnessed their noble work could not help remarking their intense feeling of anguish because of this terrible catastrophe.

THE FEAST OF THE EPIPHANY.

The word Epiphany signifies a manifestation or appearance to. In its application to the festival which occurs on January 6th, it means the appearance of Christ, or His being made manifest to the Gentiles.

Almighty God was in the beginning made manifest to the whole of mankind. He appeared to our first parents before and after their fall from grace; and it was after their fall that a Redeemer was promised by God Who should be the "seed of the woman," and by Whom, in conjunction with said woman, the head of the serpent, the devil, should be crushed. As the seed of the woman is Christ, the Fathers of the Church interpret the woman here meant to be the Blessed Virgin Mary, Mother of God.

God also revealed or manifested Himself to Seth and Enos, and to Noah, and from Noah the knowledge of God was transmitted to his posterity, before and after the great deluge which was sent upon the earth in punishment for the sins of mankind already degenerated by sin and wickedness. Abraham undoubtedly transmitted the knowledge of God to all his children, and it appears to be certain that in the days of Abraham, the true God was adored in Egypt, as well as in Salem, or Jerusalem, inasmuch as the Pharaoh whom Abraham visited in Egypt evidently adored and feared God and respected God's laws. Melchisedech also was King of Salem, and "priest of the Most High God." Isaac, the son of Abraham, also transmitted the knowledge of the true God to his children; but by the time when the children of Jacob had become so numerous in Egypt as to alarm the Egyptian monarch lest they should become masters of the land, it appears that all nations except the Jews, or the children of Jacob, had lost the true faith in one God, and had become plunged for the most part into the grossest idolatries and vices. Yet Job, who lived before the time of Moses, and was descended from Esau, and was one of the most powerful of the Kings of Idumea, adored the true God.

In the time of Jonas, which was probably not long before the building of Rome, or about eight centuries before Christ, the Ninivites had also some knowledge of God, as they were easily brought to do penance for their sins at the preaching of Jonas.

Hence it may be readily understood that when Christ was born there was a tradition existing even among heathen nations, which produced an expectation of the coming of a Redeemer in many Eastern countries, which made it easy to induce their learned and pious men to look for the manifestation of the Saviour by some extraordinary signs, or by a direct revelation from Almighty God when the time should arrive for the appearance of that Saviour on earth.

The prophets of the Old Testament called the expected Messiah "the anointed one," "the expectation of the nations," indicating that the Christ, which word signifies "the anointed one," was expected not by the Jews alone, but also by many among the Gentiles, sunken though they were, for the most part, into the grossest ignorance of the true God.

A number of heathen authors have mentioned this expectation in their writings. Plutarch says:

"There is a doctrine of the highest antiquity, which has passed from the theologians and legislators to the poets and philosophers. Its author is unknown but its rests upon a constant and unshaken conviction. It is conserved, not only in the discourses and traditions of the human race, but also in

the mysteries and sacrifices of Greeks and barbarians, everywhere."

This belief he declares to be that there are two beings or principles in the universe, God the author of all good, and a demon, the author of evil. But "the time will come when Plato (the evil principle) will be conquered, abandoned, and crushed. Then men will become happy, and God, having accomplished His triumph, will again rest in His divinity for a suitable time."

In these words this renowned Greek writer indicates the coming of the Desired of all nations. Zoroaster spoke similarly to the Persians, and Confucius to the Chinese. We shall cite here only the words of the latter who addressed the statesman Phi in the following language:

"I have heard that in a western country there will be a holy man who will put an end to miseries, without exercising any act of civil government. Without speaking, he will inspire spontaneous faith. Without producing a revolution, he will do abundance of meritorious acts. No one will know his name, but I have heard that he will be the true Holy One."

We might quote other similar statements from the sacred books of China, India and Scandinavia, as well as of the Greek and Roman world; but these will suffice to explain how it occurred that when God revealed to the three Eastern wise men or magi that the Christ was born or was on the point of being born, they came to Judea, led by a miraculous star, to find and adore Him.

From St. Matthew's Gospel, chapter second, we learn that these wise men saw in the East the new and miraculous star which announced the birth of the expected Saviour. They were led by it to Jerusalem, the capital city of Judea, and were there informed by the chief priests and scribes that the expected Christ or the Messiah and Saviour should be born in Bethlehem, as it was written by the prophet (Micah v. 2.) "Thou Bethlehem the land of Judah art not the least among the princes of Judah, for out of thee shall come forth the ruler who shall be the shepherd of my people Israel." (St. Matt. ii. 6.)

Herod deceitfully told the wise men to go forward to find the young child for whom they were searching, and to return to give him all information regarding Him, so that he too, might go to adore Him. The three wise men, whom a remarkable tradition asserts to have been Eastern Kings, followed the star which guided them till they found the child Jesus in Bethlehem; and they adored Him, offering gifts of gold, frankincense and myrrh, as God, man and king. Then being warned by a vision from God that Herod was deceiving them and desired not to adore, but to kill the child when he should discover Him, they returned by another way into their own country. Herod desired to kill Jesus, because he feared that Jesus would be a rival claimant to the throne of Judea.

This adoration of the magi was the first manifestation of Christ to the Gentiles, as it had been promised that the salvation which God the Father intended that mankind should enjoy, should be extended to all nations, and not limited to the Jews, as this stiff-necked people imagined, from the prophecies but half understood, would be the case. Hence the Epiphany, the day on which the wise men came to adore Christ, is appointed by the Church to be the special feast of all nations, as it is the day on which Christ our Saviour was made known to the other nations of the world outside of Judea.

THE ARCHBISHOPRIC OF CHICAGO.

It is now stated positively that the important position of Archbishop of Chicago, vacant by the death of His Grace the late Archbishop Feehan, is to be filled by the Right Reverend Bishop Quigley of Buffalo.

The archdiocese of Chicago is in every way second only to that of New York in importance and in the number of Catholics within its limits; but it is asserted that as a commercial centre it is not outstripped even by New York.

Chicago has had in the past an evil reputation, and certainly many events which have taken place there seem to justify the character given to it. The Anarchistic mob which some years ago murdered eight policemen by throwing bombs into the midst of the police at the Haymarket, and the murder of Mayor Harrison, are events which indicate that there has been a condition of lawlessness there which it is fearful to contemplate, and the fact that the saloons do a thriving business both by day and night, and are not closed even on Sundays, shows a sad state of affairs which is unparalleled throughout the United States. This being the case, that city is all the more in need of earnest missionaries who will endeavor to effect a thorough reformation there, and of a vigorous head to direct them in the

steps to be taken to bring about a reformation.

It may be that Chicago is now not so bad as it has been heretofore painted, for Archbishop Feehan's zeal has done much towards improving its moral atmosphere, but we are conscious that there is still much to be done in this direction. It is indeed the case with all large cities that they have much vice within them, but this appears to be especially true of Chicago, which on that account needs a firm and able hand at the helm to steer the Church through the dangers which beset her in such a centre.

We believe that the selection of Bishop Quigley by the Holy Father to rule the Church of God in that city and diocese is a most happy one, as he has the energy and strength of character which are needed in order that the difficulties of his responsible position may be grappled with. He has on several occasions shown an energy and a capacity for dealing with difficult situations which few men possess. His success in counteracting the efforts of certain Socialists to make Buffalo the headquarters of an Anarchistic propaganda, under pretence of advocating a Socialism which will secure the rights of the people, is an example of this. We are confident that he is just the man who is competent to effect all needed reforms in the moral order of which Chicago appears to stand in need.

We hope the efforts of the new Archbishop to guide the Church in that great city of the West will be crowned with the success they will deserve.

THE EDUCATIONAL QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

The Rev. Dr. J. Munro Gibson, President of the Metropolitan (London, Eng.) Free Church Federation, has contributed to the Temple Magazine for December an article entitled "What is the Education Bill?" which is intended as a manifesto announcing the reasons on account of which the Free Churches of England are opposed to the bill. By the "Free Churches" are meant the Protestant Churches which are not established by law in England, and which are usually designated as Nonconformists.

An amendment known as the "Kenyon Slaney" amendment was introduced into Parliament on behalf of the Nonconformist body, the purpose of which was to throw into the hands of the laity of all religions full control over the religious instruction given in the "Voluntary Schools." This amendment was introduced on the plea that as the Voluntary schools were to be supported out of public funds to an extent nearly if not quite as great as the Board schools, there should be no religious instruction given in them except such as would be acceptable to the laity of the locality of all denominations.

Dr. Gibson unreservedly supports this amendment, though he admits that it does not go so far as he would wish in excluding religious teaching. He says:

"While acknowledging that the adoption of the Kenyon-Slaney amendment is satisfactory so far as it goes, in giving to lay representatives a share of responsibility for religious teaching, it gives no guarantee that in schools to which the children of all will be compelled to go, there will not be teaching of such sort as to begot and foster in children whose parents hold the Evangelical faith a suspicion of, and even a contempt for the religion of their parents. On the other hand, of such amendments as have been tentatively proposed as concessions to Nonconformists, some are wholly illusory, and others only aggravate the evils of the bill. We object to this bill all the more because it now appears to be the intention of the Government that the Established Church is to have a special representation on the new Education Committee, thereby enabling that Church to capture the whole educational machinery of the country."

"Further, this Federation once more demands the full right of the people to control the expenditure of public funds, that the resources and influence of the state shall not be used in any way for proselytizing purposes."

The situation in England resembles very much that which existed in Ontario before 1863 when Catholics were contending for the right to establish a satisfactory Catholic Separate school system, and the arguments brought against the English voluntary schools are a duplication of those which were then brought up against the Catholic demand. They are the same old sophisms.

The English Voluntary Schools are those in which the religion of the proprietors of the schools is taught; but the main difference between the Voluntary or religious schools of England and the Separate schools of Ontario is that the English religious schools belong chiefly to the Church of England, whereas, in Ontario, Catholic interests were chiefly at stake. Catholics have also Voluntary schools, but owing to the difference of populations their schools are much fewer than those of the Church of England. The Methodists have also Voluntary schools, but these are less numerous than those belonging to the Catholics.

The situation, therefore, stands thus: By the new Education bill, the chief benefit will accrue to the Church of England: the second to the Catholics, and the third to the Methodists.

Before the educational legislation of 1870, the schools of England were entirely left to private enterprise, and the different religious bodies, especially the three just named, instituted Schools throughout the kingdom. The legislation of 1870 and following years established secular Government schools, which are now designated "Board Schools," which were to be supported from public funds.

The Voluntary schools still continued to exist, and it was soon found that being left unsupported by the Government while the Board Schools were furnished with everything needed, the Church schools were necessarily left in a very hampered condition.

It was then that the agitation began on the part of the supporters of Voluntary Schools to obtain that Government aid should be granted to them. Some small aid was then doled out which was totally inadequate toward meeting the circumstances of the case.

More aid was given afterward, but it was still inadequate; but the present Education Bill is intended to supply the deficiency and to place the Voluntary schools in a position of equality to the Board schools, so far as it is practicable.

This is, in a nutshell, the significance of the discussion now going on in the British Parliament and throughout the country on the Education question.

When it is understood that about 60 per cent. of the English children are even now attending the Voluntary schools, Anglican, Catholic and Methodist, the magnitude of the grievance of these religious bodies will be understood. The schools of 40 per cent. of the children were pampered with Government aid, while the 60 per cent. were left to struggle for a precarious existence, and it is this condition of affairs which the Nonconformists are rabidly endeavoring to perpetuate.

But the English people see through the matter, which is brought so closely home to every family in the land, and the Education Bill has now been passed through both Houses by overwhelming majorities, notwithstanding threats of the Nonconformist clergy that they will refuse payment of taxes when the tax-gatherer goes round. We presume that they will think better of the matter when that time will come. From Ireland, and even from Canada resolutions have been sent by several clerical bodies, chiefly Presbyterian, encouraging the non-Conformists in their course, but we do not for a moment suppose that these resolutions will have any weight in changing the determination of the great mass of people of England.

Even if a minority of the people wished for the teaching of religion in the schools to which they send their children, their wish should be respected. But the proposal of the Nonconformists to practically crush the schools of the great majority of the people is monstrous.

We cannot understand how the Nonconformists, who are Christians at all events, should desire to exclude Christian teaching from all schools, for this is actually the position they have taken—a position which the late Rev. Price Hughes, one of the most prominent among the non-Conformist clergy, greatly deplored.

The plea put forward by the Board school supporters is, as set forth by Rev. J. Munro Gibson, that Nonconformist children may be forced to listen to Anglican teaching.

We presume that in some places where Anglicans greatly predominate, it will be difficult for the non-Conformists to establish Board schools; but this will be an accident which legislators cannot control, and it is not a reason why the great majority of the people should be deprived of the religious education which they desire for their children.

If the non-Conformists, for want of being numerous enough in some localities, cannot support the godless schools, on which their affections seem to be set, they should not deprive, or wish to deprive, the majority from having the religious schools they desire. In such localities they should be satisfied if the law guarantees that their children shall not be harassed with teachings with which they cannot coincide, and the new Educational Bill actually makes this provision for their benefit.

We say this, because it is beyond dispute that their efforts are directed toward depriving the religious bodies of the school buildings which they have erected at great expense, and after making sacrifices in order that they may be placed at the disposal of Boards of management which will be practically of no religion whatsoever; for to this the case will amount where the Boards of Management are of all religions, or of no religion. Opposing forces in physical nature counteract each other, destroying motion in any direction, and

in the School Boards the conflict of opposing opinions would lead to a similar ending so far as regards religious instruction.

It will be noticed from these remarks that the Methodists, a Nonconformist body, are as deeply interested in the passage of the Educational Bill as the Catholics, or very nearly so. It cannot, therefore, be said that all the non-Conformists or Free Churches are opposed to the bill on principle. In practice, however, the Methodists of England are much divided on the question of supporting or opposing the bill. Many are attracted to the support of the non-Conformist view of the case by a spirit of fraternity with the other sections of the non-Conformist body, but we understand that the bulk of the Methodists are in sympathy with the cause of the voluntary schools, owing to the large vested interests of Methodism in the existing Methodist schools.

To the other argument used by Rev. Dr. Gibson, to the effect that the "people have the right to control the expenditure of public funds, and that the resources and influence of the State shall not be used in any way for proselytizing purposes," it may very reasonably be answered that the people who have that right of control are not merely the non-Conformist minority who are opposing the Educational Bill. The majority who support the Bill have surely as valid a claim as the opposing minority; and there is only one fair way to acknowledge the right of the majority, and that is to put the schools of the majority on at least as solid a foundation as those of the minority, which are the Board schools. By the new law, "the resources and influence of the State are not to be used for proselytizing purposes," but are to be employed equitably for the education of all the children, instead of being grabbed by a minority for their own benefit. The whole people of England should feel themselves under an obligation to Cardinal Vaughan and Archbishop Walsh, and indeed to the whole Catholic hierarchy of both England and Ireland, for having used their influence in favor of so equitable a bill.

INFANT BAPTISM.

We have received from the Rev. J. J. Ross of Chatham a short letter purporting to be part of a reply to our comments on his sermon on "the sin of infant baptism." This letter does not enter into the question of our arguments, which proves not only that there is no foundation for Mr. Ross' thesis that infant baptism is a sin, but also furnish solid proofs that the baptism of infants is of Apostolic origin, having been used from the beginning in the Church of Christ.

Rev. Mr. Ross accompanies his letter with two communications addressed to the Chatham Planet, one of which we insert here in full, as it is apparently specially intended as an answer to our article, as we were particularly requested by Rev. Mr. Ross to insert it. It is as follows:

From the Chatham Planet, Dec. 15, 1902.
BAPTISM AND CATHOLIC DOCTRINE AND NON-CONFORMITY IN HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The Catholics and Baptists agree as to the authority for infant baptism, and as to the fact that it is a tradition. This is a tradition according to Catholic teaching. By Rev. James Butler, on page 89, we are informed that according to the Catholic teaching, baptism is a sacrament, of which baptism stands first in order. On page 88 of the same booklet, the seven sacraments, along with the Real Presence, lavoking the Saints, Praying for the Dead, etc., are called divine traditions. But what is a tradition according to the Catholic view? In the "Catholicism Explained," by Sprague and Clarke, two eminent Catholic theologians, published in 1890, the information is given on page 88 as follows: "The truths of divine revelation, which have not been written down in the pages of Holy Scripture, but have been transmitted by word of mouth, are called traditions." It is clear, then, in some sense, according to Catholic teaching, that baptism is a tradition, not in its origin, efficacy or symbolism, but rather in the practice of baptizing infants, for, again, on page 88 of "Catholicism Explained," we read: "The tradition that Sunday is to be kept holy, and that INFANTS ARE TO BE BAPTIZED. (The capital are mine.) As to the authority for infant baptism, then, Baptists and Catholics agree that it is found only in tradition, but as to the divine authority of tradition, Baptists and Catholics part company."

Upon those who assert the scriptural authority of infant baptism, either by sprinkling or immersion, rests the burden of proof, and the settlement of the question with both Baptists and Catholics.

First. Infant baptism is not commanded in the Scriptures. Adults in Christ are commanded to be baptized, but infants in Adam, never. What is not commanded in the Word of God, in relation to the Christian life either in principle, precept or practice is forbidden. To perform what is forbidden is disobedience, and disobedience is a sin.

Second. There is no example of infant baptism given in the Scriptures. Upon those who assert that there is such an example rests the responsibility to produce it. There is no instance of it recorded! Where are the directions for its administration given?

Third. Infant baptism is expressly opposed in the Scriptures. The pre-requisites of the baptism, the scriptural constitution of the Church, and the conditions of participating in the Lord's Supper are all against it. Only intelligent believers must partake of the Lord's Supper. Only intelligent believers may submit to the ordinance of baptism.

Fourth. The passages held to imply infant baptism, when fairly interpreted, contain no allusion to such a practice. As to household baptisms, as recorded in Scripture, being evidence for such a practice, they constitute a strong argument against it.

J. J. Ross.

It will be noticed that throughout this letter the Rev. Mr. Ross assumes as a truth most certain and undeniable that "what is not commanded in the Word of God in relation to the Christian life, either by principle, precept or practice, is forbidden," and is therefore "a sin."

We maintain that this statement is a most dangerous fallacy, the more so

from the fact that it makes the necessary assumption that "the Word of God" necessarily signifies the Bible, the exclusion of the teaching of the Almighty God as found elsewhere.

There is no foundation in Scripture or the teaching of the Church of Christ for the teaching that the Bible is the complete Word of God.

Truly the Bible is the Word of God, but the only evidence of the Word of God is the New Testament, the greatest part of the New Testament is concerned, is the teaching of the Catholic Church to the effect that the Bible is the complete Word of God.

On the part of the Baptists, that infallible authority, the authority of the New Testament assumption without any solid foundation.

The authenticity and truth of the New Testament regarded as a historical narrative may be shown in way in which any history. The witnesses, who are the books respectively are eye or contemporary witnesses. It is clear that they are truthful narrators of fact which they were not mistaken, and the facts are true but from this it follows Christ, Whose miracles were sanctioned to His mission, was a sinner of heaven.

Jesus Christ established a propagandist His teaching. He Apostles with powers of teaching. He Himself possessed from His Father, for He told the Apostles:

"Preach the Kingdom of God, and whosoever will not receive you, go out of that city, and shake the dust of your feet for a testimony against them." (St. Luke ix. 2-5, 11.)

"Amen I say to you it shall be tolerable for the land of Gomorrah in the day of judgment for that city." (St. Matt. xxiii. 32.)

"Peace be to you. As I have sent you, I also send you." (St. John xx. 21.)

"Preach the Gospel to all creatures. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved, but he that believeth not shall be condemned. They going forth preached the Lord working with signs and the word with signs." (Mark xvi. 15, 16.)

"Go and teach all nations, all things whatsoever I have commanded you, and lo! I am with you, and I will consummate the world." (St. Matt. xxviii. 19.)

It will be here noticed that Word as preached, and as written to which these were given: for not a word of the command was then written, nor command the New Testament written. And it was of this constituted that St. Timothy (1 Tim. iii. 15.) "the living (God) the pillar of truth."

It was this Church which Bible to be God's word, and mission rests the acceptance of all Christians.

It would extend this great length were we to treatise on the institution of the Church of Christ, but we will be seen from these passages that the Church was founded more upon the Word of God than the written Word upon the traditional faith recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

The written teachings are certainly not to be regarded as fully on an equality delivered by them orally in context of the gospels, epistles of the New Testament, by the living teaching Church, more written word of God was known of Christ and His kingdom. Hence St. Paul Christian faith which he at Thessalonica:

"Therefore, brethren, hold the traditions which you learned whether by word or epistles." (2 Thess. ii. 15.)

testament version of the Bible with this meaning.

At that time the flock had learned, by epistolary exhortations which are Apostle's first epistle, which was very short, and brief chapters, which regarding how the sacred administered.

According to the theory which makes it a congregation to do a mission which has not been the written Word of God should have together, instead of infusing, as Rev. Ross asserts.

Let us now state our belief in regard to infant baptism. The Holy Scriptures clear statement in ex. "infants are to be baptized," it implies that women" are to be baptized.