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

Price of subscription—82.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of " Mistakes of Modern Infidels."

THOMAS COFFEY.
Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey. Messrs, Luke King John Nigh. P. J. Neven and Joseph S. King, are fully authorized to re-ceive subscriptions and transact all other busi-ness for the Catholic Record.

Approved and recommended by the Arch-bishops of Toronto, Kingston, Ottawa, and St. Roniface. the Bishops of Hamilton and Peterborough, and the clergy throughout the Dominion.

Correspondence intended for publication. a well as that having reference to business should be directed to the proprietor, and mus reach London not later than Tuerday morning Arrears must be paid in full before the paper can be stopped.

London, Saturday. November 27, 1897

SHOULD BE STOPPED.

The flippancy with which some preachers nowadays speak of the most sacred subjects is exemplified in a sermon delivered a few days ago by the Rev. Lewis E. Pease, in the Church of our Father, Brooklyn. His theme was "Christ as a newspaper man." This Adorable Trinity to the level of a reporter for a daily paper, or of any human being, cannot be too strongly condemned. The preacher condemned the evils of irresponsible journalism, but he might justly have condemned more strongly still the evils of irresponsible preaching. When preachers are permitted without rebuke to utter in the pulpit all the fancies and levities of a wild imagination, the injury done to religion by such utterances is far greater than any evil produced by an irresponsible granted for any cause, is to be seen in Such things are the inevitable result of the unrestrained private judgment which Protestantism has substituted for the authority of the divinely instituted Church of God.

TRE SCHOOL QUESTION IN ENGLAND.

In London, England, there is intense excitement regarding the approaching school elections. The two opposing parties are called the Progressists and the Moderates, of whom the former comprise the opponents of religious teaching, while the latter are in favor of incorporating the religious voluntary schools into the Public school system. These two parties have hitherto been very evenly divided, but last year the Progressists had a small majority. Minority representation on the board is secured by the peculiar way in which the city is divided into school districts, the number of votes to be given by each voter being less than the number of candidates to be elected. The dividing line between the two parties is not exactly formed according to religious belief, but it is so to a considerable extent, the Moderates being chiefly composed of Catholics, Anglicans, and Methodists, who have voluntary schools, while the Progressists, who want secularized education, consist chiefly of non-Conformists outside SIR OLIVER MOWAT AMD THE the Methodist body, together with a proportion of Anglicans and Method ists. Besides advocating voluntary schools, the Moderates point out that they are in favor of more economical management of the schools, the expense of which has greatly increased under Progressist administration. without equivalent increase of efficiency, as the Moderates maintain.

CHANGING CHURCHES.

An example of how trivial are the causes which are considered by non-Catholics to be sufficient reason for changing one's religion is reported from Princeton, N. B., Presbyterian University. Professor C. W. Shields was censured by members of the New Brunswick Presbytery for signing a petition for a license for the Princeton inn, whereupon he sent to the Presbytery, which met last week, a letter announcing his withdrawal from the Presbyterian Church "in order that he may enter some other portion of the visible Church to which the good hand of God may guide him." The Rev. J. Dewitt, Professor of Church history, moved in Presbytery the accept ance of the resignation, but there were protests, some members desiring that an expression of regret be added to the resolution of acceptance of the withdrawal. The matter was finally arranged by the adoption of a resolution that a committee of three clergymen and two laymen should confer with Dr. Shields, and report upon the whole case after investigation.

It appears from these proceedings that what one Church regards as a serious sin against the law of God, and deserving excommunication, is regarded by another as either no offence at all or but a trivial one, yet both these throughly. Churches are spoken of as if they were

equally branches of the one indivisible Church of Christ.

THE CHURCH AND THE BIBLE.

According to Cardinal Manning, the "master error of the Reformation" was the fallacy that Christianity was derived from the Bible, and that from the Bible alone are dogmas of faith to be proved. The fact is that Christianity existed and was preached before even the first of the gospels, that of St. Matthew, was written, and long before the writing of the fourth gospel by St. John, St. Matthew's gospel was written in Hebrew about five years after Christ's Ascension into heaven, and was not translated into Greek till about ten years after the Ascension. St. Mark's gospel was written about this time, St. Luke's twenty four years, and St. John's sixty years after the Ascension. The Epistles were written from fifteen to thirty years after the same event. And when these books were all written they were in the pos session of local churches, and were not bringing of the second person of the known to the whole Church for at least three generations or about one hundred years after Christ's Ascension, though during this period the Church became spread throughout the whole Roman Empire, and far beyond it, even to India, Spain, Armenia, and to some extent probably to Egypt and Britain.

VERBAL CRUELTY.

The tendency to extend the number of legal causes of divorce when once it is admitted that divorce may be a recent decision by Judge Roger A. Prvor of New York, who granted a decree of divorce for " verbal crueity. The judge said:

In humanity may be evinced and cruelty inflicted by verbal outrage as well as by bodily abuse is a fact of human experience and judicial recognition. Whatever the rule elsewhere and at other times, in this jurisdiction at the present day meek submission and patient resignation is not a wife's sole resourse under a brutality that shrinks only from physical violence, but against such resourse under a brutality that shrinks only from physical violence, but against such misconduct of a husband the courts will afford her commensurate redress. Upon proof, therefore, of such angry, contumelious and degrading reproaches by a husband, applied maliciously and without provocation, as makes his presence an intolerable grievance, destructive of the happiness that is the end of the matrimonial association, a wife is entitled, without sacrifice of her right to support, to be relieved of the humiliating and tormenting companionship."

Cruelty which renders it impossible that a woman can live with her husband may justify a separation, until the husband's reformation be assured, but it will not justify the parties to marry other persons. But harsh words cannot be construed even into this kind of cruelty, and they do not justify the breaking up of family ties, much less do they suffice to cancel the marriage obligations, which are founded on the immutable law of God. But we cannot be much surprised at Judge Prior's decision while the law of the law of the land makes marriage a mere civil contract.

HON. DAVID MILLS

In accordance with the official announcement made some weeks ago, last week Sir Oliver Mowat resigned the office of Minister of Justice and his seat in the Senate of the Dominion, which he has worthily filled since the accession of Sir Wilfred Laurier's Government to power. Sir Oliver will now be Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

The Hon David Mills succeeds Sir Oliver as Minister of Justice, and no better choice could be made for this important position. The ability and integrity of Mr. Mills is admitted even by his political opponents, and the Toronto Mail and Empire even says that he should have been in the Cabinet from the beginning. No doubt if this had been the case he would have added strength to the Government. but with the limited number of port folios which are available at any time it would not be just to criticise harshly a new Premier who does not find it possible to offer a Cabinet position to every one who might very worthily fill it, especially when we are aware that he has made otherwise a satisfactory selection. But we may express our satisfaction that at the first favorable opportunity which has presented itself since the ministry was formed, Mr. Mills has the portfolio of justice.

The parliamentary record of Mr Mills has been a brilliant one, and his masterly speeches on all the great questions of the day as they have come prominently before the public are full of instruction for those who wish to understand these problems

Mr. Mills was sworn in as Minister of disclaimer: "As regards the Decalo- of day does not appear to have been

Lieutenant Governor of Ontario.

THE REV. MR. PETERS IN TROUBLE.

TROUBLE.

Some astonishment was created in Bloomingdale Reformed Church the other day when Rev. Madison C. Peters, a man famed for the odor of his sanctity if not of his tolerance, burst forth into a strain of soul stirring elequence over the death of Henry George. It was altogether unlike the reverend gentleman's style, and the audience, who had long been accustomed to the manner of his perorations, wondered wheenee came the change. But not for long, for it was quickly charged that the panegyric was purloined from the eulogy of the Rev. Eliphalet Not upon Alex ander Hamilton, whom Aaron Barr had killed in a duel. The attitude of the Rev. Mr. Peters over the matter, since the discovery was made, is admirable. He has not condescended to take any notice of those who fail to appreciate his talent in selection. He models his conduct on that of the famous Benjamin Disraeli, afterward Lord Beaconsfield, who preserved a similar dignified silence under circumstances equally trying to the finely-strung mind. He delivered an original oration over the remains of the Prince Consort, and when the obsequies were over it was found that over the remains of the Duke of Wellington—twenty years before—the same sentiments, by a strauge coincidence, had been uttered by another orator. What is the use of looking around for ideas when there are so many fine ones to be had by merely referring to the library? This is the most sensible thing we have ever seen credited to the Rev. Madison C. Peters.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and Times. seen credited to the Rev. Madison C Peters.—Philadelphia Catholic Standard and

This reminds us once again of the Rev. Mr. McDonagh, a Methodist minister of these parts, who, some years ago, while engaged in a controversy. copied whole pages from "Junius" and signed his own name thereto. On being charged with the theft he frankly admitted the charge but gave as an excuse that he had become so thoroughly inbued with the writings of "Junius" that he had to adopt them as his own. The excuse, however, was as bad as the crime.

THE LORD'S DAY OR THE SAB. BATH.

At a meeting of the Ministerial Association held last week in this city, the discussion turned upon the keeping of the Sunday or Lord's day, the first day of the week, instead of the Saturday or Jewish Sabbath, the seventh day, as was commanded to the Jews under the Old Law.

It appears from the statements made by several of the speakers that the Second Adventists, a sect very similar to the Seventh Day Baptists, have recently made considerable inroads on the sects represented in the Association, who are for the most part Meth odists, and the discussion was brought on chiefly for the purpose of meeting the arguments of the Adventists. So great was the diversity of opinion manifested that Captain Kimball very aptly remarked that he was "pleased to be present to witness such delightful diversity of opinion, as it illustrated what a large superstructure can be built upon a small fact." (Laughter.)

There is undoubtedly a feature in the discussion at which it is difficult to refrain from laughter, but it appears to us rather a matter of regret than amusement that there should be so much groping in the dark in regard to the fulfilment or non fulfilment of

We are all aware how pertinaciously the ministers of the various Protestant sects have instilled Jewish Sab batarian views in the minds of their followers. They have taught hitherto that the Apostles established the Sun day as the day of rest instead of the Jewish Sabbath, and they have given to the Christian Lord's Day the name Sabbath. This was one of the peculiar ities of so called Evangelical Protest

antism. In vain, as far as they were concerned, have Catholics pointed out that there is no Scriptural proof that the Apostles made the change indicated. The sects have always contended that certain passages of Scripture amply prove that the first day of the week was substituted for the seventh day by Apostolic authority, and on this ground the ultra-Sabbatarian views universally held by Protestants of the Evangelical school have been based.

But the ministerial meeting of last week shows a remarkable change of front in regard to this matter. The Sabbatarian view was almost unanimously repudiated, only one or two of those present having raised their voices in its favor amid the din of the clamor against it. A resolution was passed even without a dissenting voice been selected to fill a position for tendering ahearty vote of thanks to which he is so eminently qualified as the Rev. George Fowler for reading a

paper which refuted it. Mr. Fowler's view of the matter was very extreme. Basing his argument on 2 Cor. iii, 4, 11, he maintained, not that the Old Law was abrogated, but that as we are Gentiles, not even the ten commandments apply to Christians. This statement elicited from

Justice on the same day on which Sir gue being done away with-Never! Oliver entered upon his duties as As long as God exists and the constitu- reign of Constantine. tion of man is the same, the ten commandments will remain. If one can be abolished, all can be."

> The passage quoted by Mr. Fowler certainly does not prove what he attempted to deduce from it, nor is there any passage in the New Testament from which it can be shown either that the obligation of keeping the seventh day was abrogated, or that the first day was to take its place under the Christian dispensation.

There are at the most four passages of the New Testament which can be interpreted as bearing on this point. One is (Col. ii, 16,) "Let no man judge you in meat or in drink : or in respect of a festival day, or of the new moon or of the sabbaths."

Let us not be misunderstood in regard to this point. Knowing from other sources that the change from the Sabbath to the Lord's day took place at a very early date in Christianity, and probably in the time of the Apostles, we may reasonably interpret this passage as referring to a change of some kind in the manner of observing the Sabbath, but independently of this tradition of the Catholic Church the text by itself does not demonstrate what that change was. Neither do the other texts which have been used for this purpose, as Acts xx, 7, where we are told by St. Luke, "we assembled to break bread." There is here a good reason given for the assembly on that day and for St. Paul's discourse to the brethren, independently of its being the Christian weekly festival, namely, that "Paul was to depart on the morrow." Besides, we learn from Acts ii, 46, that it was the practice of the first believers to visit the temple daily breaking bread from house to house

. . praising God together," and receiving daily into the Church "such as should be saved." It is not extraordinary, therefore, that St. Paul should discourse to them at one of these daily assemblies, just before his departure.

Of a similar passage in 1 Cor xvi, 2 we may say the same thing. The first day of the week was appointed for a collection for those saints (who were poor) so that the gatherings might be ready for the Apostle on the occasion of his visit, that he might take them to Jerusalem with him.

The only other passage in which the where it may signify a day of special devotion is Apoc. i, 10, (Rev.) where St. John declares "I was in spirit on the Lord's day." It is here indicated that on that day the Apostle received part of his revelation from heaven, but this revelation was not necessarily given on the day of the weekly Chris tian festival. Besides, it is only by the tradition of the Church, and the testimony of the early Christian Fathers, that we know it was customary to call the first day of the week "the Lord's day." None of these passages, therethat the change was made, the more especially as the Protestants who quote them for this purpose proclaim it to be their doctrine that no dogma of religion is to be received which is not clearly found in the Scripture itself. They reject entirely the authority of the Church and the teachings of the early Fathers, by which alone these texts can be interpreted as meaning that such a change was made, and even these testimonies do not show that

the change was complete all at once. To the Catholic the matter is clear and easy. We believe that Christ established a Church with authority to define doctrine, and establish laws which put into order all things we are to believe and practice, and as the Church commands that the Sunday is to be kept holy, we obey this precept, and we know in what way the day must be kept, but it is plainly pre scribed by the Church to be kept in the Christian and not after the Jewish manner. Oa all these points Protestantism is in the dark, and this is the cause of the Babel of opinions expressed at last week's ministerial meeting.

The Council of Laodicea in A. D. 363 ordered the Lord's day to be observed. and Eusebius, who wrote in the early part of the same century, declares that the same day was then observed by Christians, and the Emperor Constantine, in obedience to the wish of Pope Silvester, decreed that the day should be kept throughout the Roman Empire.

The Apostolic Constitutions which certainly show what the Church observed during the third century, if not during the second, order the observance of the Lord's day, but they imply also that the Sabbath was observed at Rev. Mr. Jackson the indignant that time, so that the complete change

made all at once, until perhaps the

We see by this how little value is to be placed on the pompous pronounce. ment of the Anglican Bishop Hessey which Mr. Fowler quoted as if it settled the matter :

"We keep the day because it has ever since (the time of the Apostles) been kept. The meetings of the been kept. The meetings of the Christian Fathers of the second and third centuries all attest to the fact. It is not a day set apart by the Pope All centuries later. such assertions are contrary to the plainest and most evident facts of history.'

The Archbishop draws this conclusion from the inconclusive texts of Scripture we have already referred to ; but from the facts as we have stated them it will be seen that it was by the authority of Catholic Popes and Councils that the matter was really settled -not indeed "centuries later," but at a very early period: that is, by the authority of the Church, which Protestantism has always declared ought not to be received as obligatory at any period, early or late.

We have said already that it is in consequence of pressure by the Second Adventists that the Methodist clergy have changed their basis of argument. One speaker said that the Adventists contention would not "worry him;" for they "border on insanity." Nevertheless, Rev. Mr. Fowler reminded the meeting that they confuse church mem bers by their puzzling questions, " bringing their doctrine into orthodox homes and crippling Christian life,' and that "there is method in their madness." Another speaker said that the homes of Church members are affected by these doctrines, and that so successful have the Adventists been that "they are planning a campaign of the city and are going to build a church here. We should be alive to this matter."

On Protestant grounds, the Advent ists have certainly the best of the argument, as it is impossible, on such grounds, to refute them. The whole matter illustrates the fallacy of the Protestant position of interpretation of the Scripture by private judgment, and the rejection of the authority of the Church.

The speakers at the meeting seemed to be of one accord on the point that Protestantism has been hitherto in the wrong in calling the Sunday "the Sabbath." They will now perhaps first day of the week is referred to adopt the Catholic practice of calling the two days by their right names.

UNITARIANISM.

The discussions which took place at the General Unitarian Conference which met recently at Saratoga throw considerable light upon the degree of negation with which the Protestantism of to day meets the most important teachings of Christianity. It is true that for the most part those who call themselves Evangelical Protestants repudiate the Unitarian claim to be Christianity. fore, nor all of them together, prove Christians, yet it is none the less true It is not by mere accident that one that Unitarianism is just as much based upon the fundamental principle of Protestantism as Evangelicalism itself, that is to say, on private judg. to the same effect. Thus Dr. Beane ment as opposed to the principle of said "Man is the only revealer of him-Church authority; and on the other self. The old idea of a revelation imhand Evangelicalism itself has, of late years, been verging rapidly towards Unitarianism.

> This is made clear by the following sentiment of Rev. Edward Everett Hale. This gentleman, who delivered one of the evening addresses, explained that the claim of Unitarianism to support consists in the greater liberty it affords to human thought. In explain. ing this liberty he said he had been told by a Unitarian clergyman who established a Church of his denomina tion in St. Louis, under the name of "a Liberal Church," there were "people who were delighted with the proposition, because they wanted to be set free from all law; and one of the prime difficulties of our early Churches in the West was the fact that people poured in upon them who supposed that liberal religion means permission to do just what they choose, just when they choose."

We do not by any means wish to as sert that Unitarians generally are disposed to consider themselves free from the observance of the laws of morality by which Christians are governed. As a body the Unitarians are a lawabiding community, while for liberality toward their neighbors, and for tolerance, they excel most of the other Protestant denominations. In this respect we must accord to them only words of praise.

Nevertheless we must say that the religious principles they uphold, and which have been unhesitatingly main- ject, and so ancient Pagan and

conference, if carried out to their legitimate consequences will lead to the very results which the speakers say were expected from them by the people of St. Louis and the West, referred to by Mr. Hale and his friend Mr. Elliot.

Mr. Hale was careful to explain that this is a wrong notion of Unitari. anism which, he said, offers " the lib. erty with which Christ makes us free, a liberty from the old yoke of bondage. It is a freedom from a fixed ritual : it is freedom from the direction of any body of men who shall presume to dictate to us our opinions.'

These rev. gentlemen lay it down that for the perfection tof a religious system we must reject the authority of the Christian Church of eighteen and a half centuries, and must substitute for its traditions merely what we may draw from reason to be our guide in morals. This he plainly sets forth in the following terms:

"It has been well said that the law by which Liberal Christians are bound is all the more emphatic because it is the foundation law of the universe. Honor, truth and justice are no provincialisms of this little world. They are the language of the universe of Oar business to day is to impress this on the heart and conscience of every man and woman. And this means that our business is to tear away all the rags of ritual and dogma, to teach each child of God to commune with God. He is to seek God and to find Him, and so he is to enlist in the service of God, which is perfect free-

This is nothing more than a flourish of rhetoric. Stripped of verbiage, it means that the duties we are to fulfill are not to be found in the teachings of Christianity, but are to be looked for merely in what the human heart dictates and that we must not confine our justice and charity to this earth. but must extend it to the inhabitants of Mars and Jupiter, if there are any. In fact all Christian morality is to give way to the more extensive theories of the speaker.

It might be very well for us to include the sun and moon and planets in our theory of morals and other Christian charity if we were sure that there are inhabitants there, and that we could reach them, but as all this remains still a mystery, and is likely to continue so for many years, and probably for many centuries, life is surely too short for us to defer the performance of actual duties till we can extend their operation to these unknown spheres.

And yet Mr. Hale concludes this flash of rhetoric by saying :

But he (man) is not to be his own God. He is not to live without law. He goes about his Father's business. He is in God and God is in him.

No further comment is needed to show that this rationalized man spoken of by Mr. Haleis a mere phantasy. He has not, and probably never will have, existence. Yet it is this phantom which he would substitute for practical

speaker has thus shown what Unitarianism really is. The general tendency of the speeches and addresses was parted from afar is vanishing from men's minds." The Rev. John Snyder, of New York, also made an address on "Loyalty Without Bigotry," wherein perfectly similiar views were set forth. The object of all the speakers was to belittle Christianity, and to substitute for it a religion of the fancy and the imagination.

We will add a few words of comment on the address of Rev. G. C. Cressey, of Massachusetts. Mr. Cressey said:

"The doctrine of immortality is not ecclesiastical. It is not even primarily theological. It is a doctrine of natural and universal religion, born in the impulses of the soul and confirmed by the highest grasp of human reason.

The purpose of this sentiment is to make it be believed that reason is a sufficient guide to teach man his duties, and that therefore no revelation from God is needed for this. To this we feel bound to say that though it is very true that there has existed among all nations a belief in the immortality of the soul, and of a future life of rewards and punishments, according as man has fulfilled or neglected his duties on earth, reason alone would not have taught men this truth. It must, therefore, have originated with a primitive revelation given by God to

Reason affords us proof that the soul is distinct from the body, but the inference is not quite clear that the soul is immortal, if we depend on what reason alone teaches on this subtained by the speakers at the recent modern infidel philosophers have

almitted their doul expressing their hope tality. Tom Paine hope, while rejecting he implicitly acknowledge hope was based upon upon conviction ar demonstration of t declared his belief trine, but he said f assured of it we nee divinity.

Unitarianism has faith in it than it nings, and year afte ing more and more Daism. We regret testantism itself is t same condition. A and illustration of in our last week's entitled "Whither

DIOCESE O Lecture by Rev. Fa

On Sunday last, the tion of Our Lady, Re tion of Our Lady, Re the Congregation of in St. Peter's cathedring his discourse the the cause which brothere that evening we charity—to aid the Cexercise of the virtu their model, was chaided. And it is fits should imitate he well as in every of Mary visit the these confined in prisendeavor to alleviate ness no matter where it was for this socie appealed that eveni Paul tells us that Jest to give than to receiunder which these wo how very important them. He was on to suffer, when he kn to see certain of his fits. how very important them. He was on to suffer, when he kn to see certain of his fu-when he spoke those to his brethren of Ep how they were to gu other place in holy s words, except wher We do not, the our Blessed Saviour e-must have received other apostles who our Divine Master. of the savings of Jes our Divine Master of the sayings of Jes ing. The lecturer amine the words: give than to receive. refer to temporal a true to speak in things, unless the property of principal of the control of the saying the saying the saying the saying of the saying the saying of the saying the saying of the saying the say true to speak in things, unless the greeipt of spiritual to overflow. St. Paul men, yet he says "bring it into su preached to others castaway." It may —indeed sometimes but if we do give we in the long run it happiness than if in the long run it happiness than it the good things G is not a solitary goc which came from t are, all of them. His things of this world bility, for we will count of how we us self from the things said, denotes freedo fournees. It was of purpose. It was

> chance for us to a cry is a passpor wise who is cc God sends him dom of the Fatt riches and we hungry the rew given as follows thou call, and thou shalt cry, I am. Then sh the Lord, and I wi places of the ear Lord hath spoken Immediately at Immediately at Children of Mary poor of the city. of the Blessed S Tiernan. His Lo

secondary matter. any of us, and he s to be content with v

Hi was a strong him adversity, broken by it. Wi this world are mea life everlasting, order to help us s When the rich m

everlasting.
He came not using his gifts everlasting. Let

and if we have pove

ARCHDIOC A Very Succes the Church itation, Sou Redemptoris

For the C

A mission of eig Chirach of Our L Gloucester, on Su exercises were cofferenters. The Chirach of the Chirach of