

The Catholic Record.

Published weekly at 451 and 453 Richmond street, London, Ontario.

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.

REV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES. (Author of "Mysteries of Modern Infidelity") REV. WILLIAM FLANNERY, THE "SACRED COFFEE."

Proprietor and Editor—THOMAS COFFEY. Messrs. L. King, John N. P. J. Neven and M. C. O'Donnell, fully authorized to receive subscriptions and transmit all other business for THE CATHOLIC RECORD.

Catholic Record.

London, Sat., March 7th, 1891.

LENTE REGULATIONS.

[OFFICIAL.]

The following are the Lenten regulations for the Diocese of London:

- 1st. All days of Lent, Sundays excepted, are fast days. 2nd. By a special indulgent from the Holy See, A. D. 1884, meat is allowed on Sundays at every meal, and at one meal on Mondays, Tuesdays, Thursdays and Saturdays, except the Saturday of Ember week and Holy Saturday.

The following persons are exempted from abstinence, viz: Children under seven years; and from fasting: persons under twenty-one; and from either or both, those who, on account of ill health, advanced age, hard labor, or some other legitimate cause, cannot observe the law.

NOT PARALLEL CASES.

The New York Churchman, a Protestant Episcopal organ, condemns the conduct of the Catholic priest who administered Extreme Unction to General Sherman on his deathbed, and says that according to the rules of the Catholic Church, this sacrament is not to be administered to any who have not previously received Baptism and Confirmation, which sacraments were never administered to the General.

The Churchman is evidently not conversant either with the laws of the Catholic Church or with the circumstances connected with the General's death. The Church does not require Baptism as a preliminary to the reception of other sacraments; but where the Churchman says that Confirmation is absolutely required? We have seen hundreds of Catholics at a time receiving the Holy Communion before being confirmed; and it frequently happens that persons in danger of death receive the sacrament of Extreme Unction before they have been confirmed.

The Churchman is, therefore, quite astray in his statement of what is the practice of the Catholic Church.

As regards the individual case of Gen. Sherman, we have the assurance of his son, who is a Jesuit priest, that he was baptized and received into the Catholic Church long before the civil war, but that from the time of the war he discontinued the practices which are prescribed by the Church to all Catholics. Yet the General declared in his will that he desired to be buried in Calvary cemetery alongside his wife and family. He knew perfectly well that this wish could not be carried out unless he were a Catholic, and we may readily infer that it was his wish all along to die in the Catholic fold.

It was the case with him, as with many others, that until his last illness he did not fulfil the obligatory practices of his religion, though he was otherwise a man of exemplary life; but we have no doubt that when Father Taylor was called to attend him in his last moments it was with his consent and at his desire. It was on the Wednesday before his death that Father Taylor was called in, and remained with him about two and a half hours. Extreme Unction was administered to him the next morning, but it certainly would not have been administered unless it were his own desire. Rev. Father Sherman states that his father was baptized as a Catholic at the home of General Ewing when he was nine years of age. We have no information whether or not he had been confirmed; but this is nothing to the point.

In referring to this subject, the Toronto Mail of the 25th inst. remarks:

"It is odd to see a Church of England paper finding fault with the conduct of a Catholic priest."

What is there odd in the case? We suppose it is because the Anglicans are well aware that Catholic priests know their duties, and they have besides quite enough to do to get their own ministers to set in accordance with law and order. The Mail adds that the interference of the New York Churchman on the

present occasion was only "tit for tat," inasmuch as "the journal that was most exercised over the admission of Dr. McMullen to the Holy Communion by Rural Dean Wade was the CATHOLIC RECORD of London. That paper even advised Bishop Baldwin to call Mr. Wade to order."

The Mail is altogether astray in giving its readers this piece of intelligence. Of all the papers in Canada, the Mail most persistently stirred up the discussion in regard to Dean Wade's course last Christmas, by its editorials, and by the admission into its columns of scores of letters from correspondents who discussed the matter from every possible point of view, except the Catholic one.

The Dominion Churchman was the most indignant journal on the subject. For our part it mattered not whether Dean Wade's disregard of the canons of the Church of England were approved or disapproved by his Bishop. We merely called attention to the inconsistency of both actors, the Presbyterian and the Anglican alike, to show to what absurdities the golden rule of Protestantism—private judgment—leads its votaries. Public attention was called to the matter by nearly all the journals in the province, and in fact the whole thing seemed to have been got up for the purpose of giving notoriety to the principal actors in the case. It was scarcely to be expected that the Record should let it pass without some notice, and if we called attention to the absurdity of it, it was because we could not see it in any other light than as an absurdity. We had no desire at all to have Dean Wade called to order.

GROSS MISREPRESENTATION.

If the Mail were worthy of credit, we should believe that the hierarchy of Quebec are busily occupied in the work of endeavoring to tell the Catholic vote of that Province to the highest bidder during the contest now going on between the two parties who are contending for the government of the Dominion.

There is in reality not a particle of evidence that this is the case, nevertheless issue after issue of that journal is filled with unfounded statements that the Bishops intend to use their influence in sustaining one party or the other. It is quite true that His Lordship the Archbishop of Montreal has issued a circular wherein he advises the electors to vote according to conscience, but in giving this advice His Grace says absolutely nothing which can be construed into taking part with one side rather than the other. Yet by means of glaring headlines the Mail endeavors to make it appear that he is interfering unduly in the struggle; and, indeed, some of the Mail's correspondents whose letters have been published in that journal absolutely assert that such is the case. It is from the misstatements of that journal that they have drawn their inspiration.

In the issues of that paper of the 24th and 25th Feb. we find such headlines as these: "Monsieur Fabre conjures with his crosser. Quebec Catholics warned. The Church's understanding with Sir John Macdonald. Prelates' attitude in politics;" and besides we find long editorials headed respectively, "The Church in politics" and "The voice of the Church." There is, however, really nothing in His Grace's circular which justifies the assertions which are implied in these headlines, and the best proof that this is the case is that both parties are endeavoring to make it appear that they alone are in accord with the correct principles enunciated in the Archbishop's mandement.

The Mail itself acknowledges in the course of one of its articles, that "on the face of it the mandement is not an order that the Government be sustained. It is simply a declaration against a change which, in the view of the Church, would imperil the language, the religion, and the race," of the people of Quebec. By what right, then, does the Mail draw the inference that it is meant as a partisan document, or that it "appeals with a voice which almost assumes a tone of command" that the Government of Sir John Macdonald should be sustained? The only foundation which the Mail has for its implied assertion is because the Archbishop inculcates loyalty to our present form of Government and British connection, to which we owe the civil and religious liberty we enjoy. The circular adds:

"It is as a result of this sacred and inviolable liberty that fathers of families can give their children a Christian education in the schools of their choice that within a short period the country has been overpowered with religious edifices; that parochial and other undertakings are founded and prosper without interference; that the construction of churches and the administration of church property are placed under the protection of the laws, without being subjected to any odious control; and, finally, that the Church, thus independent in its action, can display the majesty and splendor of its worship."

Thus His Grace very properly points to the liberty which Catholics enjoy under British connection, as a motive why they should be loyal thereto. Surely loyalty is a sentiment which a

Bishop or Archbishop may suitably recommend to his flock. Surely also he has a perfect right to enumerate the motives which should contribute towards strengthening such a sentiment, and we have good reason to doubt the loyalty of the journalist who, for the sake of exciting dissension between Protestants and Catholics, misconstrues the Archbishop's noble words.

We may here add, that on Sunday, February 23rd, one of the Presbyterian ministers of Toronto, namely the Rev. G. M. Mulligan, uttered sentiments from his pulpit very similar to those of the Archbishop, exhorting his congregation to loyalty, and we have not seen that any one has put a misconstruction on his words, similar to that which the Mail has put upon those of Archbishop Fabre. We may infer that the Mail has no desire to misrepresent any except the clergy of the Catholic Church.

Monsieur Fabre may have his private preference for one party rather than the other, and as a citizen he has a perfect right to his opinions on the subject as any other citizen. And, moreover, if there were any danger threatened against religion in the present contest, it would undoubtedly be his right and duty to put his flock upon their guard to avert it if possible. But his circular makes no allusion to the existence of any such danger in the contest which is taking place this week; and even in one of the articles in which the Mail misrepresents him so grossly, the force of truth obliges that journal to acknowledge that "the elector who feels in his heart that unrestricted reciprocity does not mean annexation can vote with the Liberals, assured that he is not antagonizing the views of His Grace." Why then does the writer say "that the Church should interfere at this juncture is entirely in harmony with her policy?"

A NEW ANGLICAN BROTHERHOOD.

The "Brotherhood of St. Paul" is the name of a new Order which has been established in the Church of England with the sanction of the Bishop of London. The purpose of the Brotherhood is to lead a disciplined, devotional life in common, and to devote themselves entirely to the service of the Church in union with the parochial clergy. The chief officer will be the Warden, who is to be appointed by and responsible to the Bishop. The warden's duty will be to encourage, advise, and, if necessary, correct and admonish the brethren. The rules which these Brothers will follow are formed somewhat on the model of religious orders of the Catholic Church, but they will only bind themselves to remain one year in the community, and will renew their promise from year to year. After the expiration of the second year, however, they may at their choice make a promise for five years, or continue, as before, the promise from year to year.

During their stay in the Brotherhood they agree to abstain from all worldly occupations, and to be obedient, in all things lawful, to the Warden.

The London Telegraph, which gives a description of this new religious order, is doubtful whether it will be a success in the Church of England, though it acknowledges that religious orders in the Catholic Church have been very successful in works of charity, and it expresses the hope that as the methods of the Catholic Church have been successfully tested by time, that this new association, formed upon principles similar, may also prove itself "adapted to the needs of the day."

It will be noticed that the vow of obedience to the Superior of the Brotherhood of St. Paul is limited to "all things lawful." This is, of course, as it should be, but even with this limitation, which exists also in Orders which belong to the Catholic Church, we have been accustomed to hear it stated by Protestant writers and lecturers, that this vow is an unlawful one; that it is, in fact, unlawful for a reasonable being to submit his will in all things, even though the restriction be in all things lawful, to the will of another.

It is evident that the Bishop of London does not agree with these anti-Catholic polemists; and, indeed, if it be intended that a religious order fulfil its purpose at all, it should observe obedience within these limits. The rules of the new order, though they are not to be of perpetual obligation, fully justify the wisdom of the Catholic Church in establishing religious communities.

Much stress will of course be laid upon the fact that the members of the new Anglican order do not take their vows for life; but the only result which can be expected to follow from this is that it will be the less efficient. The good to be derived from a religious community and the principle of the lawfulness of such a community are conceded by the very fact that such a community is now held to be a desirable institution, and if it be lawful to make vows for one year or for five years for life. The principle is precisely the same in both cases. It is to be remarked also that in some Catholic religious orders the vows are taken for only one

year, after which they may be renewed for the same period.

The new institution is an admission that the denunciations which have been so freely uttered against all religious communities since the time of Luther have not any foundation in the laws or principles of Christianity, but arise solely from hatred of the Catholic religion.

A RAVING FANATIC.

The Rev. Dr. Carman, on whose uncharitable and un-Christian attacks upon 46 per cent. of the population of our Dominion we have several times had occasion to make some comments, is out with another of his "political sermons." It is somewhat noteworthy that the Mail, which is so ready to distort the patriotic utterances of the Catholic episcopate, should permit Mr. Carman to make, through its columns, the frantic appeals to the bigotry of Ontario for which he is so noted, without rebuking undue ministerial interference in political matters. The explanation is that the Methodist General Superintendent is endeavoring to accomplish a work similar to that which the Mail is itself trying to promote, namely the disruption of the Dominion by rendering it impossible for the people to live together in harmony.

To the credit of the Methodists of the Dominion, it must be said that, last June, the General Conference while in session at Ottawa repudiated Dr. Carman's violent language uttered before that body, and we presume that they have in general no sympathy with the fanaticism which their General Superintendent so persistently manifests, so that his appeals to their prejudices of Protestants need only excite contempt.

Still there are undoubtedly many who will be moved by Dr. Carman's mendacious attacks, and it is, therefore, proper that we should take some notice of them.

He commences his latest specimen of bilgewater by stating that the people of Canada are "bewildered, betrayed, perplexed, and confounded," and he calls upon them to get themselves out of their sad plight by praying and "voting as they pray." And what has brought them into this deplorable condition? He tells us that "wrongful aggression and oppression ran riot in the land," and this state of things is brought on by "political subterfuge allying itself to ancient, priestly tyranny against itself free government, to insult the royal dignity we reverse, and to incorporate and endow, in the perverted name of provincial rights, leagues and conspiracies that like a fire through a noble forest have left a blackened and barren track in the pathway of the nations."

Of course, knowing as we do Mr. Carman's antecedents, it would be easy for us to tell against whom these diatribes are aimed, even if he had not explained a little lower down that he has in view the much-abused Jesuits. He asserts that there exists "a Jesuit conspiracy against our liberty, or a political struggle to get into power and keep in power by Jesuit votes."

When it is borne in mind that there is not more than seventy one Jesuit priests in all Canada, of whom perhaps one-third have votes, the empty folly of such language will be evident. But there is a certain shrewdness in the General Superintendent:

"Wisdom and cunning have their shares of him. But he is shrewish as a wayward child, and pious again by toys when childhood passes."

It seems to please the Doctor to heap vituperation on the Jesuits, because he knows that there are bigots to whom such folly is palatable.

As we have said, the number of Jesuit votes in Canada is exceedingly small. But we may presume that this is the Doctor's way of speaking of the votes of the Catholics of Canada. The Doctor evidently, in his love for Equal Rights, would be very glad to have the Catholics of the country deprived of the franchise entirely. This is a state of affairs, however, which Dr. Carman's abusive language will not bring about. Catholics contribute, equally with Protestants, towards the maintenance of Government, and in proportion to our numbers we shall continue to have a voice in the choices of a Government in spite of Dr. Carman's ravings.

Let us now see by what means the charitable and benign Dr. Carman proposes to get rid of Catholics, and especially of Jesuits. He says: "The prayers of Elijah and the seven thousand that had not bowed the knee to Baal effectually disposed of Jezebel. And what right have we to expect different or contrary results while the same God holds the same law in His omnipotent right hand?"

It is, therefore, the fate of Jezebel to which the Doctor would, if he dared, consign the Catholic people of Canada: that is to say, as Jehu commanded, concerning Jezebel: "Throw her down headlong, and they threw her down headlong. . . and the wall was sprinkled with her blood, and the hoofs of the horses trode upon her."

It is a mercy that the Catholics of Canada are not at the disposal of this gentle General Superintendent.

It is not necessary for us to vindicate the Jesuits from the absurd charges which Dr. Carman makes against them. These charges are as false as the doctor is himself blood-thirsty, yet as he only generalizes, a general denial will suffice on our part.

Another extract will show the extent of the Doctor's historical knowledge. He says: "The medieval abominations of the Jesuit, and the character they have thought centuries won and established make asthmatic and uncertain breathing in a free land."

This is a rare specimen of bombast and balderdash. But where did the doctor discover that the Jesuit order existed during the medieval period? And if they did not, how could they be guilty of "medieval abominations?" But we shall not dwell any longer upon the vagaries of this "Danish come to judgment: yea, a Daniel." The subject is too farcical to require serious treatment.

THE CHURCH IN GERMANY.

The North German Protestants are greatly alarmed at the good will manifested by the Emperor William towards the Pope and the Catholic Church, and protests have been sent to the Emperor against any relaxation in the law excluding the Jesuits from the empire. Among those who have protested are the Freemasons and several Protestant religious organizations.

The restoration of the Jesuits, should it be conceded, will finish the work of the abolition of the last remnant of Bismarck's persecuting code, and the Catholic party are resolved to maintain their present firm position in the Reichstag until it be gained.

The Kaiser is said to be in favor of readmitting the Jesuits to the empire, all other religious orders being already freely admitted; and it is certainly a strange state of affairs that the whole hate and power of Protestantism should be directed against one community which has been of the greatest benefit to the country, a community which was sustained by Frederick the First, when the irreligious Governments which for the time ruled in the Catholic States of Europe too successfully directed all their energies towards obtaining its total suppression. As the Catholics are, however, at the present time 36 per cent. of the German population, it seems incredible that their firmness should not in the end be crowned with success; and Herr Windthorst is not the man to relax his efforts until his purpose be attained. We may, therefore, confidently predict that the day is not distant when the Jesuits shall be recalled, though the existing laws are at present carried out with almost as much severity as is shown against the Jews in Russia.

It is known that the Emperor is at the present time very cordial with Pope Leo XIII. When the former visited Rome he was much impressed by the dignity and statesmanlike views of the Holy Father, and the two have been in constant friendly correspondence since.

It is understood that on the question of socialism there is a perfect accord between them, and that the Pope has written to the Bishops of Germany requesting them to combat vigorously the communistic and socialist theories which have recently taken hold of the popular mind both in Germany and elsewhere, and the Emperor has thanked the Pope for the interest he has taken in endeavoring to prevent false theories on this question from spreading.

The Pope on his side regards the German Empire as a Conservative power which will use its great influence in preventing the spread of these false doctrines. As a consequence of this accord of sentiment, the friendly relations between the Pope and the Emperor have been greatly strengthened, and in spite of the anti-Catholic stand taken by the Freemasons and the sectaries, the Emperor will make substantial concessions to the Church.

The Kaiser further recognizes that fair treatment should be accorded to the Church, and that he will contribute much to the stability of the Empire by giving the fullest liberty to the Church which, though comprising a minority of the people, is a powerful and influential minority, and is rapidly increasing its percentage on the whole population of the Empire, and has been doing so gradually but surely during the last twenty years. She is, besides, the only power which is able to assert unflinchingly the correct Christian principles which are the basis on which society rests.

Recently an autograph letter was written by the Holy Father to the Emperor, thanking the latter for the disposition he has shown to put an end to the difficulties which had arisen between the Church and the State. These difficulties were shadowed solely by the State, without a shadow of reason, and with the change which has taken place recently in the attitude of the Government, they must soon entirely disappear.

The sum of \$4,000,000, of which the Bishops and clergy were deprived, during the operation of the Falk Laws, is also to be restored under a law which has been introduced into the Reichstag by the Government. This is another evidence of the good-will entertained towards the Church.

A BIGOT REBUKED.

The spirit of fanaticism exhibits itself in about the same way in Canada and in the United States. In both countries it is the custom at fanatical gatherings to abuse the Catholic clergy and especially the Jesuits, and in Chicago recently at a meeting of the Junior Order of American Mechanics, a know-nothing organization, the Rev. E. O'Murray ranted in the usual style. He said, amid the loud applause of his audience, that he wished the Jesuits to be banished from the country. The Irish of America were consigned by Murray for the same fate.

But bigotry had not all its own way at this meeting. Judge R. S. Tuttle, of the circuit court, arose when the font-tongued fanatic Murray was seated and gave him a most well merited and stinging rebuke. He said:

"I am not a Roman Catholic, nor the son of a Roman Catholic, neither am I an Irishman. My ancestors were Protestants, and I am an American, but as an American and a gentleman I must refuse to sit still in any gathering where any religious denomination, be it Protestant, Methodist or Catholic, is denounced as the Catholics have been denounced to night. I fought through the war by the side of Irishmen and Catholics. I fought under the gallant Sheridan, who, more than any other of our generals, with, perhaps, one exception, was instrumental in bringing that starry flag through danger and peril to victory. You, I notice, have Lincoln's picture on your banners. What would Lincoln say if he were here and heard the attack on the countrymen and on religious institutions of Archbishop Hughes, who did so much to aid him in his efforts to bring our land safely to peace?"

General Sheridan is so well known and his memory so beloved in Ontario that it would not suit the atmosphere of that city to hiss his name, yet there is no doubt the inclination of the Know-Nothing present would have been to do so, just as Sheridan's name was received with hisses in Boston at a similar anti-Catholic gathering, but the Chicago meeting, abashed by Judge Tuttle's noble language, received the rebuke in silence.

Sheridan and Sherman were two of the three most respected and brilliant generals of the North during the great civil war, and notwithstanding that Sherman was not a practical or devout Catholic for many years, it now appears that he was at least nominally such, and that he never gave up his faith, in which he died. The people of the United States have these two men too fresh in their memories that they should at this particular moment allow bigots of the Murray stamp to insult with impunity their race and creed. We may, therefore, expect that there will be a respite for a while from such talk as that of the Rev. Murray, at least on public platforms.

RITUALISTS AND EVANGELICALS.

A very strange scene occurred in the Anglican church of Orono, Castlemacdonald, Ireland, on Sunday, Feb. 24th, yet not so strange but that it has had its parallel in Canada within not a long time.

For some months past the congregation of the above mentioned church had the notion that their rector, Rev. J. M. Robinson, is a Ritualist; and as they are chiefly what are termed "Evangelicals," they determined upon making a quarrel by creating in the church one of these scenes which have become so common in the Church of England of late. The rector at first began by reading, after which he intoned the words of the general confession. While he intoned them, the congregation, by a preconcerted movement, drowned his voice by reading the same words as loudly as they could. The clergyman was obliged to discontinue his attempt at chant, so he closed his book, and leaving the reading desk walked into the vestry. The congregation waited for some time, expecting a continuation of the service, and of the battle, but the rev. gentleman refused to put in a second appearance, and in the end the congregation dispersed.

It will be remembered that not long since a similar scene was enacted in St. George's church, Ottawa, when a large part of the congregation left the church because the Kyrie eleison was chanted, and established a new congregation.

Except as a means of making manifest to the world the fact that the Church of England is most hopelessly divided, we cannot see the common sense of such exhibitions. Once in a while there is an approach made by individual ministers of the Anglican and some one or other of the non-Conformist sects to a union church service, such as that which took place recently in Woodstock, and as in such case it is always in the Evangelical wing of the Church that such exhibitions take place, all the sects join in praising the act as an evidence of the good will which is arising between the different sections of Protestantism. They ignore entirely the breach of Church law which both parties commit on such occasions. But here, in one church, the people and the pastor disagree on details in the form of Church service, and the congregation, taking the law into their own hands, will not tolerate a form which is acknowledged to be perfectly legal; yet all the other sects, practically, if they do not

openly, approve of the action of a contented part of the congregation.

Of course, we are well aware of the essential difference between the two lies in this, that in cases like that of which we speak there will result some blending of the different but ultra Protestantism, whereas in the case of so-called Ritualists practices, an unaccounted suspicion that the approach to much dreaded Popery is to be avoided at all hazards and cost.

But this being the case, where pretended zeal for Christian unity and peace which the Evangelicals profess their sole thought when they their method of unification?

As to the Ritualism which is strongly objected to, because it is supposed to favor of Popery, we can pretend zeal for Christian unity and peace which the Evangelicals profess their sole thought when they their method of unification? As to the Ritualism which is strongly objected to, because it is supposed to favor of Popery, we can pretend zeal for Christian unity and peace which the Evangelicals profess their sole thought when they their method of unification? As to the Ritualism which is strongly objected to, because it is supposed to favor of Popery, we can pretend zeal for Christian unity and peace which the Evangelicals profess their sole thought when they their method of unification?

We have in the Apocalypse a vision of St. John the Apostle a vision of the glory of heaven, and a description of the Ritual of Christ. Surely the imitation of imperfect, is lawful in a Christian for heaven ought to be our aim.

We read there (Chap. Incense of sweet odor represent prayers of the saints, and that angels sing before the throne new canticles acknowledging the hour Redeemer. Why, then, at slapping of such canticles be made of schism in the Church now?

"Through the fear that Popish may be gradually introduced into local denominations." Well, then, denominations cease to proclaim their universal charity and the character of their respective ages they will neither extend charity to Catholics nor all practices approved in Scripture full of giving encouragement to

LORD SALISBURY'S PROACHING DOO.

Distribution swift and sure against Ireland adopted Salisbury Government five years ago. In all directions troubles of character are looming up Tory Government of England at its very commencement, coercion law of endless duration the struggling farmers and imitators of the sister kingdom tyrants and plutocrats who eye against eviction scenes ears to the wailings of helpless mothers with children as driven from the shelter of their homes—the Balfours and Auburys—may get their just due have trouble enough on their own heads before the indignant mass Irish Liberals hurt them from the coming elections. Last despatches tell of the alarm of the Foreign Office in London attitude of France in refusing to any accommodation with on the Newfoundland fisheries. The same power is determining the last of England's red coatian soil. Lord Salisbury has years dillydallying with France on both those issues, but the prevalent that an end must come to all this dodging on the British Government. The intimates that "it is deemed to protract negotiations with Another year must see an injurious to the Government" or a grave diplomatic collision France must supervene which the endurance of both our Salisbury is going to escalation or war no peace forecast. The Behring Sea although for the present peace, is far from being a Canadian Minister of Justice in diplomacy all the accumen of England's great Sir John Thompson, but in case of the seal fisheries Judges of the Supreme Court United States, has proclaimed while the day of humiliation Salisbury has taken advantage to perfectly legal; yet all the other sects, practically, if they do not