

The Northwest Review

PRINTED AND PUBLISHED EVERY WEDNESDAY IN WINNIPEG, WITH THE APPROVAL OF THE ECCLESIASTICAL AUTHORITY. Northwest Review Office, No. 40 Mary Street. P. KLINKHAMMER, Business-Manager.

THE REVIEW is on sale at the following places: Hart & McPherson's, Bookellers, 364 Main street; and the Ferguson's Co., Bookellers, 408 Main St.

ADVERTISING RATES. Made known on application. Orders to discontinue advertisements must be sent to this office in writing. Advertisements unaccompanied by specific instructions inserted until ordered out. SUBSCRIPTION RATES. All Postage is paid by the Publishers. The NORTHWEST REVIEW \$2 a year, \$1 for six months. Club Rates.—Six copies of the NORTHWEST REVIEW for \$10. In ordering for clubs, the full number of subscriptions, with the cash must be sent at one time. Agents wanted to canvass for the Northwest Review, in every town in the Northwest. Write for terms. A Catholic correspondent wanted in every important town. The NORTHWEST REVIEW is the official organ for Manitoba and the Northwest of the Catholic Mutual Benefit Association. Correspondence conveying facts of interest will be welcomed and published. Address all Communications to THE NORTHWEST REVIEW, Post office Box 508, Winnipeg, Man.

NOTICE. The editor will always gladly receive (1) ARTICLES on Catholic matters, matters of general or local importance, even political if not of a party character. (2) LETTERS on similar subjects, whether conveying or asking information or controversial. (3) NEWS NOTES, especially such as are of a Catholic character, from every district in the Northwest, Ontario, Manitoba, the Territories and British Columbia. (4) NOTICES of the proceedings of every Catholic Society throughout the city or country. Such notices will profit to the benefit of the society themselves by making their work known to the public.

The Northwest Review

WEDNESDAY, MAY 22.

SUNDAY

In view of the present agitation about running the street cars on Sunday, it may be well to state a few facts bearing on the observance of the Lord's Day. Advisedly we Catholics habitually refrain from calling Sunday the Sabbath; for to apply this term to the first day of the week is an historical solecism. The Hebrew Sabbath was the weekly day of rest with which the week ended; the Christian Sunday is the day of divine worship with which the week begins. The Catholic Church, "the pillar and ground of truth," has changed the day of rest and worship. With her credentials as the Living Interpreter of God's Will, she has a perfect right to effect that change. On the contrary those who maintain that no practice should be introduced that is not explicitly confirmed by Holy Scripture, cannot logically defend their present observance of the first day of the week.

INACCURACY. Some of the Protestant clergymen who spoke last Sunday on this question asserted, with their usual carelessness about facts, that the Sabbath was instituted before the Mosaic legislation,—one said "before the fall," another "long before the Jewish nation had appeared". We should be curious to see how they prove this assertion. There is not the slightest trace in Scripture of the observance of the Sabbath among the Hebrews before the time of Moses. True, in Genesis ii, 3, we read that "God blessed the seventh day and hallowed it", but it is nowhere said that He told men in the pre-Mosaic period to do so likewise, and evidently the sacred writers knew nothing of a Sabbath kept by the Patriarchs. All that can be deduced from this text of Genesis is that God then laid the foundation of his future law concerning the Sabbath, not that he then and there promulgated that law.

ONE GREAT CONTRAST between the Hebrew Sabbath and our Sunday, is that the former was primarily a day of rest and only secondarily and by consequence a day of prayer, whereas, on the other hand, the Christian Sunday is primarily a day of prayer and only secondarily and by consequence a day of rest. Although the morning and evening sacrifices were doubled on the Sabbath, this was merely a ceremonial prescription that concerned the priests and Levites, and which the people were not commanded to be present at; no law of Sabbatical worship was imposed on the ordinary Israelite. Gradually, however, attendance on the prophets, and afterwards on the synagogue arose naturally out of the cessation of work. But the central purpose of the Sabbath was rest in memory of the creation and of God's resting after the creation; it was on formal dedication of that day in a negative manner by ceasing to work. Hence the stringency of the Jewish law of rest, which admitted of no exception. Conversely, the central purpose of the Sunday observance is worshipful gladness over the redemption, manifested in the sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving which we call the Mass; and the law of rest grew out of this as a protection to the law of worship. When Christianity became the religion of the Roman Empire, it became necessary to pass some law of rest; otherwise a Christian who kept Sunday night obviously suffer inconvenience from being summoned to court, to military exer-

cise, etc., or even from the competition of his heathen rivals in trade. Hence Constantine, as Eusebius relates in his life of that emperor (IV, 18), required his subjects to rest on the feasts of our Lord—and what we say of Sunday applies to all Catholic feast-days, for Sunday is simply the weekly feast—and on Sundays the Christian soldiers were exempted from work that they might have leisure to pray. But it was always understood that, for an urgent reason, an exception might be made to the law of rest. Thus there never was any difficulty in allowing the people to gather in their harvest on a Sunday, when any delay would expose it to be ruined by a storm, provided permission thus to work were asked of the proper authority.

THE PURITAN SABBATH, which seems to be fashionable among the Protestant ministers of this city, is a perversion and exaggeration of the Jewish Sabbath. The latter does not exclude recreation. In the Bible not a word is said against recreation on the Sabbath. The Pharisees themselves, though they multiplied rules against servile work, though they forbade, for instance, climbing a tree lest a twig should break, never prohibited pleasure as such. Even a chief Pharisee did not scruple to entertain on Sabbath (Luke xiv, 1). Contrast this with the Puritan view of the Sabbath, which makes the avoidance of the most legitimate pleasure the primary object of the Sabbath. The only text that affords the faintest excuse for this view is Is. lviii, 13, according to the Protestant Bible: "If thou turn away thy foot from the Sabbath, from doing thy pleasure on my holy day, and call the Sabbath a delight, and the holy of the Lord honorable, and shalt honor it, not doing thine own ways, nor finding thine own pleasure, nor speaking thine own words; then shalt thou delight thyself in the Lord, etc." But the whole context shows that the word "pleasure" here means "will," as it is translated in the Catholic English version: "from doing thy own will," and thy own will is not found; which has absolutely nothing to do with recreation. Besides, the best modern Hebraists say that the Hebrew word 'shabbat' (translated above by "pleasure" and "will") really means "affairs," "business," as elsewhere in later Hebrew.

OUR LORD DID NOT ADOPT the Sabbath during his earthly life. To do so would have been inconsistent with his position as one "made under the law" and with his own express teaching (Matt. xxiii, 3). But he did expose the inconsistency and hypocrisy of men who loosed an ox or ass on the Sabbath and were shocked when Christ on the same day "loosed a daughter of Abraham whom Satan had bound". He, however, enunciated two great principles. The one was that, perhaps, part of the better Rabbinical teaching: "The Sabbath is made for man, not man for the Sabbath". Man is made to fulfill the law of Love. Not so with regard to the Sabbath, which is simply enforced for man's own good. The other great principle was: "The Son of Man is Lord also of the Sabbath", foreshadowing how His Church would one day transfigure and elevate the Sabbath. Just as the Sabbath law must give away before the natural needs of man, so, and much more, before the requirement of Him who is the head and representative of mankind (Mark ii, 23-28). Accordingly, the precept of observing the Sabbath

WAS COMPLETELY ABROGATED by the Apostles. They still, indeed, allowed its observance; but the law was recognized as a dead letter, though they tolerated it, as they tolerated circumcision, in order to bury the Old Law with becoming honor. In the fifteenth chapter of the Acts of the Apostles we read (v, 28, 29) that, having met in council at Jerusalem, they decided "to lay no further burden upon" the Christians than abstinence from four things there enumerated, among which no mention is made of labor on the Sabbath. St. Paul is more explicit: "Let no man judge you," he writes to the Colossians (ii, 16), "in eating and drinking or in the matter of a feast or a new moon or a Sabbath day; which are a shadow of the things to come, but the body is Christ's." Christians are not to be taken to task on such things, which are shadows of the substance that is now come, the substance or body of Christ's gospel. From this abrogation of the Sabbath to its ultimate condemnation by the Church was an easy step. The old legislation which, in the transitional period of the Church's infancy, was merely a dead letter, gradually became a deadly observance; so that the Synod of Laodicea (between 343 and 381) threatens with excommunication those who Judaize by resting on the Sabbath, but exhorts Christians to rest on Sunday "if they can." And in point of fact, be it said in all charity towards Seventh Day Protestants (Baptists, Adventists, etc.), whoever goes back to the Saturday is, whatever he may call himself, not a Christian but a Jew; he stops at the old Testament and does not understand the New. This is one of the many quagmires into which the shibboleth of "The Bible and nothing but the Bible" plunges its victims. They know the sacred Book by heart, but they know nothing of its spirit; they fasten on isolated, mutilated texts and neglect some of the most obvious teachings of Scripture. Once only does the New Testament refer to a Christian Sabbath. "There is left therefore a Sabbath-keeping—

SABBATISMOS —for the people of God" (Heb. iv, 9). The reference, however, is to the early Sab-

bath, but to that eternal rest of which the Sabbath was a type. The word "Sabbath" in kept in the Greek and the Latin of the Church to denote Saturday, a day which is rather a day of fast than a festival among Christians.

THE DAY WAS CHANGED in commemoration of Christ's resurrection and of the Descent of the Holy Ghost. These fundamental events took place on Sunday; on the one is the whole Christian faith built, by the other was the Church of Christ established. The observance of Sunday does not rest on the natural law, which does indeed require us to give some time to the worship of God, but not a whole day rather than parts of several days, much less any particular day; nor again does this observance rest on any positive divine law, of which there is no trace. Sunday is merely of ecclesiastical institution, dating however from the time of the Apostles, as we may gather from the following texts: In a single passage of the New Testament, Apoc. (Rev.) i, 10, we find a special name for the first day of the week, "the Lord's day" (en te kuriakē hēmera—very different from hē tou kuriou hēmera, "the day of the Lord"). In Acts xx, 7 we are told that St. Paul abode seven days at Troas, and that on the

FIRST DAY OF THE WEEK the disciples came together "to break bread." The same Apostle writes to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xvi, 1): "Every first day of the week let each of you lay up at home and collect whatever profit he has had," words which do not, indeed, directly imply that there was public service on Sunday, but which seem to indicate that Sunday was already a sacred day, on which deeds of love (collections for the poor) were specially suitable. Heb. x, 25 shows this much, that the Christians, when the epistle was written, had regular days of assembly. These Scriptural references clearly suggest that the observance of Sunday had begun in the Apostolic age; but the only witness that makes this observance obligatory is the witness of tradition. The earliest Fathers, such as Barnabas, Ignatius of Antioch, and Justin, speak of Sunday—which they call the "Lord's Day," "The Day of the Lord's Resurrection," and sometimes, but only in addressing the heathen, the "Day of the Sun"—as a day of sacred joy and prayer. This, as we remarked above, is the central idea of the Sunday, a day of cheerful worship. We know of only one passage in any Ante-Nicene Father which alludes to the Sunday rest. Tertullian, after mentioning the ritual usage according to which Christians on Sunday prayed standing, not kneeling, adds that on that day business was set aside, that the soul might be left free for God's service. In later ages the law of rest became more stringent, but never so much so as the Hebrew law. The Church obliges the faithful above all to hear Mass on Sunday and secondarily to rest from servile work, i. e. work done with the hands rather than with the head. But custom permits certain servile work even when not required by necessity or mercy, such as cooking food; and ecclesiastical authority may dispense from the law.

This sketch of the origin of the Sunday observance shows that the universal Christian practice of the Lord's Day is mainly due to the INFLUENCE OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH. As she holds from her founder and Invisible Head, the charter to teach in his name, she has an equal right both to appoint the day that shall be consecrated to the Lord and to indicate how that consecration should be performed, in other words, she alone has a divine right to say how the Sunday should be observed. Since France as a nation revolted against God by the French Revolution and profaned the Lord's Day, the Church in France, and in fact in every other country, has never ceased to protest against the profanation of Sunday by manual labor and unifying recreation. On the other hand, that same infallible Church has no sympathy with the pharisaical observance of a spurious, Judaizing Sabbath, which makes the Sunday a day of dismal gloom instead of a day of grateful joy.

SENATOR BERNIER'S SPEECH. We have just read the Hon. Senator Bernier's speech, delivered in the Senate of Canada in reply to Senator Boulton's remarks on the school question. Like all Mr. Bernier's utterances on this much discussed question, his recent speech is clear, logical and convincing; and when he got through with his reply, we fancy Mr. Boulton must have been convinced that his fallacious statements were brushed aside by a master hand. Dealing with that oft-repeated and favorite argument of the majority in this province that any interference with the school legislation of 1890 would be an invasion of provincial rights, Mr. Bernier tersely replied: "Let us consider the matter for a moment. A verdict has been rendered in this case by the Privy Council. That verdict is that the minority have rights, that the legislation of 1890 has caused them a serious grievance, that we have a right to complain, and that the grievance should be remedied. If we are right, then, hon. gentlemen, the others are wrong. There cannot be an escape from that proposition, and if they are wrong their rights are not invaded by the redress of their wrong. It should not be sought to take advantage of the theory of provincial rights to cover and maintain provincial wrongs."

In the same concise and clear way, the Hon. Senator disposes of all the other fallacies brought forward by his opponent. He shows that the statements made as to the inefficiency of Catholic, as compared to Protestant schools, were as misleading as they were false. He instanced the diplomas won by these schools whenever they came into direct competition with other schools, and showed how the College of St. Boniface held a first place in the higher education of the province. He dealt with another favorite fallacy of our enemies, who ask: "Is Manitoba to be bound by a compact made by 12,000?" Hon. Mr. Bernier said: "I now return to the hon. gentleman's statements with regard to the agreement which was made by the then population of the province, as not being binding upon the present population. As a matter of fact that agreement was made not only with the 12,000 people who were there at the time but with their heirs and successors, as all agreements are made. I would it just like to put a practical question which, it seems to me, is a very pertinent one in this connection. How could the agreement have been made with the 12,000 people only and for their sole benefit and not for the benefit of those who were to come after them? The Roman Catholic population of the province at that time had no need of the protection which was provided, for they were not in the minority. They were actually in a small majority. It was the Protestants who were in the minority—not so small a minority that any other section of the population could encroach upon their rights however. I say, then, that the population of the country as it existed at that time had no need on either side of any such protection and it is therefore evident that the agreement was made for a future time and for those who should go to settle in the province thereafter. It was made with the view of getting rid for all time to come of this vexed question. There is another side to this agreement also. Those who do not share our views in the matter of education knew before settling in the province what the law was and that this agreement was in existence, and they must have made up their minds to accept that condition of things. Further, that agreement has been ratified and has been entered into again and again by the province itself. The province has ratified that agreement each time that it has legislated in the matter of education without changing the principles upon which it was based, and such legislation the legislature of the province has passed almost every year for 20 years. In consequence of that yearly ratification for so long a period, it can be said that the agreement is not alone the act of that 12,000 people referred to, but also the act of the increased population." We regret that press of other matter prevents us from giving a full report of the Hon. Senator Bernier's speech. He meets every objection of our enemies and, with an easy and graceful flow of language and a masterly arrangement of facts and arguments, refutes every one of their statements.

WHAT CHICAGO CATHOLICS THINK OF OUR TIME-SERVERS. The so-called liberal Catholics of Manitoba have got to fish or cut bait. There are a few Catholics in Manitoba, as there are, we regret to say, in every community, of this cringing sycophantic order, who are in favor of anything that their more prominent neighbors are. They lack stamina to maintain self-respect by sustaining their principles, if they ever had any. They thus acquire the sobriquet of liberal Catholics, that is men without any religious principles, who cling to the name of Catholics because they are too cowardly to abandon it—knowing it is their only hope for the future life. But the Pope is tired of seeing such men masquerading under the shadow of the Church which they are lending their evil influence to pull down. They must either sustain the principles of the Church or drop out. They are no loss to the Church if they go, and they will be of little benefit to those they join, unless in the capacity of a McNamara, a Chiniquy or a Slattery. —Western Catholic News. Our Chicago contemporary is substantially in the right, though perhaps a trifle too severe as to the ultimate fate of the few "hickory" Catholics in Manitoba. They will come round all right before they die, if a kind Providence only given them time.

LIMITATIONS OF FREE THOUGHT (The Living Church (Episc.) Chicago. Condensed for Public Opinion.) We hear a good deal at times about the right of freedom of thought in religion. It is made an objection to creeds, the ancient Catholic creeds among the rest, that they restrict free thought. Thought, it is said, ought to be left just as unrestricted in the sphere of religion as in secular science. How far, then, is thought really free in science? Just as far as facts will permit, and no farther. Every time new facts come to light, to that extent thought ceases to be free. In the realm of supernatural or revealed religion the case is strictly parallel. So long as no facts or truth of religion are known, so long as men are left to search and grope after divine things, the field is open, thought is free, and one man's thoughts may be as good as those of another. But as soon as facts are made known, events take place, and principles are declared on authority not to be gained, then to that extent thought ceases to be free.

The upholders of revealed religion claim that such facts, events, and principles have been made known. Here, just as in human science, it is real things, truths and transactions, which come in to limit the range of thought. Thus theology is a science, because, as has been said, it is "the facts we know about God put into a system." The difference between theology and human science is not that the latter deals with facts, while the former is concerned with speculations and guesses. Both alike deal with facts; but in the case of earthly science those facts are ascertained by research and investigation, because they are within the reach of human discovery by human means. In the case of theology the facts are far beyond the power of human discovery and have, therefore, been made known to man through the mercy and condescension of Almighty God.

In religion the great Catholic creeds do but express in systematic form the facts, the events, the truths, which have been revealed. When they have been received as facts, as things known, it is not permissible to those who have so received them to ignore them and substitute for them guesses and speculations, old or new. To do so is self-contradictory, it is unscientific. Revelation was not given to save the intellect the labor of acquiring such knowledge as is within the reach of its capacity, nor to supply it with a new material for mere intellectual enjoyment and speculation, but it conveys a knowledge of such things as no man by any searching could find out for himself, and of those things only such as pertain to the regeneration and uplifting of his spiritual life. Outside this field all is left open as before, and in things unrevealed and unconnected with salvation men may go on with the same unrestricted freedom of thought as ever.

CORRESPONDENCE.

Laureat, N. D., May 10th, 1895. To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW, Sir,—Rev. Father Accorsini preached an eloquent sermon at St. Nicholas' Church here to-day, at High Mass and also at Vespers. The Church was crowded; people from Killarney, Man., and Willow Creek, a distance of 25 and 35 miles, were in attendance. Father Accorsini commands large congregations wherever he preaches. J. S. O'BRIEN.

THE SCHOOL CASE.

To the Editor of the NORTHWEST REVIEW. Sir,—A short time ago I was speaking to Mr. D. McNaught, M. P. P. when he asked me what I thought of the School Case. Well as you ask me I will give you my opinion. As it is at present it is neither one thing or the other, but in most part it is a Protestant School. He said how is that? Because there is the same management as there was previous to the abolition of the Separate Schools. If you banish Religion from the School, you will produce Anarchy, and what does Anarchy mean? It means the destruction of all Government. It means no protection for life or property. It means disorder and barbarism. Mr. McNaught. We want the little ones taught in the same school; there should be no chalk mark between them we; want a homogeneous people. I said: that is what we want, but we cannot get it without Religion. Let the

youngsters be educated together, and play together while they are innocent; but when they grow to be men and women and they have to face the stern realities of life, when each one is trying who will have the most of this world's good, when selfishness takes the place of innocent play, then will they be good neighbors, will they be honest to each other, without the fear of the Justice of God? Take two boys for instance, give one education without religion and the other education with religion, and after they grow up to manhood they are tempted to commit murder. The first says, I can do it without being seen by the law of the land. The second will say the same thing but he will also say to himself, there is a law that will see me that is the law of God, which I cannot evade. So the first is more likely to yield to the temptation than the second. Mr. McNaught.—The Pope wants to domineer over the whole world in Spiritual and Temporal power. I acknowledge the Pope as the Divinely Appointed and visible head of the Church and no further; he is successor of Saint Peter. And as for Temporal power he has but little, he has no army but those men with the gowns and the Bible, who give their lives to the Glory of God and the good of His people. The question is how are we to get out of the school trouble that Mr. McCarthy started. He is making a profitable case off the people, see the money he will get; he is smiling while we are quarrelling; he creates a row, so that he may make money, I am of the same opinion as Mr. James T. Coupe, chairman of the school board, Woodlands, that the school question was gotten up by the lawyers to reap a harvest. Could not all denominations have their schools National, and have the religion they like, provided they are up to the Government standard? Then there would be justice to all. No doubt the legislature will mend the law that is complained of. The Manitobans can settle their own affairs. It is a Christian country, although there may be a difference in a few points. Let not the difference of opinion alter Friendship. Mr. McNaught.—The Jesuits have been driven from all the nations in Europe except England. I said: but what was the result? when they were driven out, anarchy came in, and the Jesuits had to be called back again; they are the men to fight anarchy, not with the steel sword, but with the sword of the spirit which is the Word of God. As for the United Kingdom, she is one of the most Powerful nations in the world, where if a person is accused of a crime he or she will have a fair trial, without any fear of being lynched, where the Jesuits are free and where all people are free, where life and property are protected, this is true freedom. It is freedom that has made her Great Britain. Mr. McNaught. Has not the Legislature of Manitoba the right to make her School Law? I said: certainly she has the right; but she has not the right to make laws that inflict a grievance on a portion of the community. The Privy Council said that there is a grievance. I am of the same opinion as the chairman of the school board at Woodlands, "that the act of 1890 was uncalled for and does not give justice to all sects as did Gladstone's School Board Act. But the lawyers must have a harvest." I asked a neighbour what he thought of the School Case. He replied: "I don't no nothing about it; but there ain't goin' to be saprit schools, every nomination ain't goin' to have schools. We want no priests to teach us." He cannot, read or write and he is a good Protestant, and an industrious farmer. Now here is ignorance and bigotry, standing in the way of justice. How many are there like him? There is nothing for him but 'Remedial Order', but he will be forgiven as he knows no better. Ah! but what about those that do know better and will not give justice to the minority? They must be left to the visible and invisible judges. Let peace be unto this Land and to all that dwell therein. Let the P. P. A. Orangen cast off the works of darkness and put on the armour of light, that they may see how to build a wide platform, so that all the nation could stand on it. Do the right, then you will have peace of mind and a clear conscience; and when you lay down to rest at night, the pillow of peace will kiss your cheek, and you will have a fore-taste of Heaven, and you will awake in the morning refreshed with a smile sitting on your face. Now will you let the minority have their schools?—Let there be Christianity in the school if you would walk in the light. Oh! Dark is the school Without Heavenly light To illumine the mind In the path of right. Let the Manitobans act like jurymen and throw off prejudice and passion, and they will give a just verdict on this dear School Case. It is all in the family. "The falling out of friends is only the renewing of love." There will be no different creeds, while the people are free. It is to be hoped that the Legislature will see the wisdom of removing the cause of the grievance. Yours respectfully, HUDSON BAY.

RELIGION AND MORALITY. The President of Cornell University, Dr. Schurman, writes under the heading "Moral Obligation," the following weighty words: "On its lower as on its higher levels, religion is the indispensable ally of morality. And wise men cannot survey without anxiety and alarm the demand for secular, as opposed to religious, moral instruction in our schools. As though children could be influenced by abstractions like the categorical imperative! "The non-religious adoration of duty for the sake of duty is a consciousness not easily maintained. In strong natures it passes easily into stoical and even cynical heartlessness, in formal natures into prudery, in weaklings into licence, and in the average man into indifference."