The Catholic Record. Punitahed Weekly at 484 and 486 Richmond

street, London, Ontario Price of subscription-\$2.00 per annum.

EDITORS: KEV. GEORGE R. NORTHGRAVES, Author of "Mistakes of Modern Infidels," THOMAS COFFEY.

Publisher and Proprietor, Thomas Coffey. Messes. Luke King, John Nigh and P. J. Ieven are fully authorized to receive subscrip-ions and prosset all other business for The

CATHOLIC RECORD.

Agent for Newfoundland, Mr. T. J. Wall. St. caof Advertising-Ten cents per line each

sof Advertising—Ten cents per line each on, agate measurements of Toranto, Kingston, Otlawa and Stee the Bishops of London, Hamilton, or righ, and Ogdensburg, N. Y., and the dependence intended for publication, as so that having reference to business, the directed to the proprietor, and must London not later than Monday morning a subscribers change their residence it ortant that the old as well as the new she can us.

Agentor collectors have no authority to stop our caper unless the amount due is paid. Matter intended for publication should be mailed in time to reach London not later than Monday morning. Please do not send us overy. Obliviry and marriage notices sent by subscribers must be in a condensed form, to licer insertion.

LETTER OF RECOMMENDATION.

UNIVERSITY OF OTTAWA.
OTTAWA. CANADA. MARCH 7th. 1990.
he Editor of THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
ondon Ont:
av 3ir: For some time past I have read
estimable paper. THE CATHOLIC RECORD,
congravilate you upon the manner is you estimable paper. THE CATHOLIC RECORD, and congresulate you upon the manner in which it is published. Its matter and form are both good; and a trajy Catholic spirit pervades the whole. Therefore with pleasure, I can recommend the athe faithful.

ssing you, and wishing you success.
Believe me, to remain Yours faithfully in Jesus Christ, +D FALCONIO, Arch, of Lariese Apost, Deleg.

LOYDON, SATURDAY, Jan. 2, 1904.

To all our readers we wish a happy and prosperous New Year.

MODERN ATHEISM.

We are never surprised when from some German Professor there comes forth a new attack upon Christianity, masquerading under the name of science; or perhaps it is more accurate to say an old attack dressed up in a new garment of tinsel.

It is but a few months since one Pro fessor raised a considerable commotion by lecturing in the presence of the Emperor William on the impossibility of reconciling what is said in the Bible with discoveries which have been made by Assyriologists in their researches in the region of Babel, and the Emperor himself, though a religious man and a sincere Christian, was entrapped into practically admitting just what Herr Dislitsch wanted, making at the same time profession of his unchangeable belief in Christianity.

Another Professor is now announced with a great flourish of trumpets that he has made the discovery that all religion is "the fantastic work of human imagination." This gentleman is Professor Ladenburg of the University of Breslau, who is also the President of the National Society of Naturalists which met recently at Cassel. Before this learned assembly he had the assurance to assert that the creation of the world by God, and miracles such as are spoken of in the Bible, are all myth cal stories. The Darwinian theory of evolution must, according to him, be substituted for the history of Creation, "And mankind can only progress by setting aside all ideas of the supernatural.

These statements are all mere assertions without any attempt at proving ave already been refuted over and over again by theologians. So Dr. A. Greve of Sundershausen states in a pamphet which he has recently issued refuting P ofessor Ladenburg's state-Dr. A. Greve says :

1. What Herr Ladenburg asserts is nothing new, but has been taught in substance by Hacckel and other Darwindsts and materialists. The state ments are merely words without any proof to back them.

2. The propositions are exceedingly superficial, and show that the speaker is entirely ignorant of leading theologic cal and phil sophical problems.

3. The glorification of the French Revolution of 1789 shows that Professor Ladenburg's sentiments are the result of a blind hostility to the Christian religion, and not of close, accurate and scholarly investigation.

From the ingle fact that any beings exist, it follows that there is a God infinitely perfect, the Great First Cause from Whom all existence must spring, and that God is eternal, infinite in wisdom and power, and thus the words of the prophet and king, David, are

verified : "The heavens show forth the glory of God, and the firmament declareth the work of His hands. Day to day uttereth speech, and night to night showeth knowledge. There are no speeches nor languages where their voices are not heard." (Ps. xviii. 1-4:) that is, not only does the creation of h aven and earth prove God's existence and His glory, but the wonderful order of created nature, whereby day and night, season and season, succeed each other, proclaim God's perfections to all ions of the earth, whatever language they speak.

atheistic utterances were applauded

by the Association before which he ectured, and that not one had the courage to call his statements into question. This give us a sad insight into the degradation of unbelief into which the University to which Professor Ladenburg is attached has fallen, and we learn that other German Universities are sunken to a level just as low.

The Professor's argument against miracles, that "God is not above His laws in nature," is the climax of absurdity, and his inference is equally absurd that, "it is now almost an axiom that a miracle never did, and never will take place,"

What we call "the laws of nature " are simply the generalization of man's necessarily limited observations on the properties of created matter. Those properties being given to matter by the Great First Cause, Who is God, are necessarily subject entirely to God's will, and if His will for their continuance were to cease for a single moment, they would for that moment cease to exist. Hence God is the constant Preserver of nature and nature's laws, as He is likewise their Creator.

It must be admitted, therefore, that as God, even by the withdrawal of His will for the permanency of nature's laws, would cause them to cease entirely, much more by the positive act of His will can He suspend them. Further, it is rational to believe that when the occasion arises for the manifestation of His greatness, He may suspend them, and this suspension is what we understand by a miracle.

A miracle may be attested to us either by our own observation of the fact, in which case we are made eyewitnesses of it; or it may be made known to us by the same means as any historical fact, that is to say, by the testimony of witnesses who were not themselves deceived, and of whose truthfulness we are certain. If in addition to this, the facts attested were so public that it would have been impossible for the witnesses to deceive, even if they had wished to do so, there is a superabundance of proof that the facts were so narrated.

We have this superabundance of proof in regard to the miracles recorded of Moses and the prophets in the Old Testament, and of Christ and His Apostles in the New Testament.

The ten plagues brought upon Egypt, the passage of the Red Sea, the miraculously supplied quails and manna on which the Israelites were fed in the Arabian deserts for forty years, the miracles of Christ wrought by Him whether present or absent, whether by word or physical act, or by a mere act of His will, as the change of water into wine at Cana of Galilee, and the feeding of many thousands at a time with a few loaves and fishes, on two different occasions, the raising of the dead to life, and His own resurrection from the dead, besides innumerable other mir acles, were all public facts, the witnesses to which could not have been deceived, nor could they have been imposters. We say, therefore, that reason tells us that miracles are possible to the Almighty, and indubitable testimony assures us that they have occured. There is even satisfactory testimony that they have occurred down to the present day.

It was by His miracles that God, both under the Old and the New Law, made manifest that He was with His ministers and His Church, and by those miracles He exhibited His power, and convinced those who believed in Him of the truth of His assurance to them:

"I will be your God, and you shall know that I am the Lord your God."

Professor Ladenburg's fancies are therefore founded on a false philosophy which is refuted both by the exercise of right reason and by demonstrated

RATIONALISTIC TENDENCIES. There was a sharp discussion at a ecent meeting of the Toronto Knox College Postgraduate Conference on the Morality of the Old Testament," and an opportunity was afforded to those ministrers who hold discordant views in regard to the inspiration of the Holy Scripture to make known the tendency of modern Presbyterianism n this question.

The discussion arose from the reading of a paper by Dr. I. F. McCurdy, Professor of Oriential Literature in Toronto University. The Doctor took the ground that the accounts given in Scripture of the great patriarchs were meant merely to convey the belief that under God's protection and favor, the people of Israel had prospered beyond the surrounding nations, but that they were not strictly true. They are more like the modern ethical ideas which make heroes of such men as Palmer ston, Bismarck, Gladstone, Jamieson, Funston, and Roosevelt, who were ready to attack the territories of their neighbors, and whose aggressiveness found many defenders who believed their aggressions to be carried on in We read that Professor Ladenburg's the interest of human freedom. He could not believe, however, that Saul's

expedition against Amalek, which is said to have been undertaken on God's instigation, was really commanded by the God of Love.

Several clergymen spoke in favor of these views, among whom were Rev. Thos. Eakin of Guelph, Rev. T. L. Turnbull of Oneida, and Rev. Robert

This attitude toward Holy Scripture Drs. Gregg and Caven, both of whom maintained that the Bible is truly the Word of God. Professor Caven had much sympathy for those who found difficulties in the Pentateuch, and other those who attack the veracity of these books go too far. Dr. Gregg strongly condemned the disbelief in the historicity of the Bible, and especially of the Pentateuch, as expressed by Dr. Mc-Curdy, and in fact he was tempted to think that Dr. McCurdy does not believe in God at all.

Dr. McCurdy did not withdraw one inch from his position, but stated plainly that many of the younger ministers of the Presbyterian Church are of views similar to his own on this and other questions. He asked that the older ministers should excuse these younger ones who do not attach so much importcal accuracy of the Old Testament as the older clergy do.

The Rev. Professor Gregg suggested that the Toronto Presbytery should have a conference in which these questions which are causing a good deal of bother should be carefully discussed.

Our reason for calling attention to this discussion is to show to what extent the modern rationalistic views of Holy Scripture have impressed themselves upon the minds of the rising generation of Presbyterian clergy. We have no doubt that this change will continue to operate among the clergy, until some day, unexpectedly, they will declare themselves as no longer bound by the traditional teachings of the Presbyterian Church in regard to the truth of Scripture as God's unerring Word.

A PROPOSED CHURCH UNION.

Delegates of the various Presbyterian churches of the United States met recently in New York city for the purpose of preparing the way toward effecting a union on the basis of their common creed, which is the Westminster Confession of Faith, modified by the revision which was adopted by the General Assembly which met in Philadelphia last May.

The delegates who met in conference were from the Northern and Southern Presbyterian organizations, the Reformed Church, the American Reformed, the "Cumberland," and "the United Presbyterian" Churches. A resolution was adopted to the effect that "after full, frank and prayerful conference it is agreed that some form of union is desirable, which shall consist in either the complete consolidation of some of the Churches, or such federation as shall preserve the identity of the various bodies, and provide for effective administrative co-operation, which means that the union shall be make it real.

So far as doctrine is concerned, there is no very great difference between the various branches of the Presbyterian body. The revision of the Westminster Confession which was adopted last May by the Northern General Assembly seems to have been rather a step towards promoting the union movement, instead of being, as might have been expected, an obstacle thereto. The Northern Presbyterian Church of America which adopted the revision is itself the most numerous of all the Presbyterian bodies, and it is almost certain that the Southern Presbyterians are generally of opinion that it is desirable that they themselves should adopt an amendment to the Creed, similar to that which now forms part of the creed of the Northern Church.

The Cumberland Presbyterians had long ago adopted an amendment which they intended should cover the same ground over which the Northern revision extends. Thus the three principal Presbyterian bodies will find no cause for perpetuating their schisms in the fact of the recent revision, which will, therefore, prove rather to be an assimilation of doctrine than otherwise.

But there is a serious diversity in regard to the attitude of the different bodies toward the civil Government of the country and the wording of the Constitution. The Cumberlanders maintain that the Constitution of the United States having in it no reference to God's existence, or His supreme authority over the universe, is, therefore, an atheistical document which no true Christian should countenance, and they infer that to vote at elections under the Constitution, or to accept any civil office is a denial of God. This antagonism to the Constitution of the country is regarded by the other Pres-

byterian bodies as unreasonable, and the chasm betweed these and the former organization is wide. It is possible, however, that this difficulty in the way of union may be bridged over by a compromise in the articles of union, which might leave all parties concerned free to believe as they choose on this point. If a union were effected on these grounds, we have no doubt was vigorously combated by the Rev. that Cumberlandism would gradually disappear by absorption, as the difference is one of practical life, and the Cumberland peculiarity would naturally give way by close contact with the more practical and reasonable doctrine books of Scripture, but he thought that of the great bulk of the united Church.

The Cumberlanders themselves would undoubtedly foresee this natural outcome of union, and would be prepared to accept this consequence if they are not over strongly attached to their peculiar belief.

But there is another point on which the difficulty appears to be more formidable: that is, the race question.

In 1861, on the outbreak of the American civil war, the Presbyterians of the Confederate States formed themselves into a distinct Church, owing partly to differences in regard to the status of negroes in the Church, and the same question forms a stumblingance to the belief in the strict histori- block to reunion even now. The Chris tian Observer of Louisville, says:

"The Cumberland Presbyterians are hesitant about a union which brings them back into ecclesiastical relations with the colored people. The Presby terian Journal tried to suggest an arrangement which shall be satisfactory to both parties, to this effect: recognize the right of the colored brethren to have separate presbyteries and synods, with either presbyterial or synodical representation in the united general assembly.' And lo! it has fallen upon the very plan which has been in use for years in our Southern Presbyterian Church.'

Another Presbyterian organ, the New York Observer, approves this proposition, saving:

"Should the Cumberland Presbyter ians composing the Cumberland Presbyterian Church, colored, prefer to con-tinue as a separate body, they might be allowed representation in general assembly by a commission without the right to vote, so that the great united Presbyterian Church might keep in touch with all the colored Presbyterians in the South, and be able give such help as we should give in the effort of Christians to elevate evangelize the race that has been so long oppressed."

St. Paul wrote to the Colossians (iii. 4-11.)

"When Christ shall appear, Who is your life, then shall you also appear with Him in glory. . . Where there is neither Gentile nor Jew, circumcision nor uncircumcision, Barbar ian nor Scythian, bond nor free, but Christ is all, and in all."

And again: (1 Cor. xii. 13) "For in one Spirit we were all bap-tized into one body, whether Jews or Gentiles, whether bond or free."

But it appears that this rule does not prevail with the white Presbyterians of the United States and their colored brethren.

The Presbyterians are not alone in obliging their colored brethren to form distinct Church from that of the whites, as all the principal Protestant denominations do the same. Thus the Protestant Episcopal Church Standnominal, if it be found impossible to ard, commenting on the proposal in the recent Pan-American Council of the Episcopal Church to give the colored people colored bishops, says:

"It is a work of great perplexity and difficulty on account of the antipathy of race which prevents the colored people and the whites from cooperating with each other on terms of even in ecclesiastical affairs. That fact being admitted, the remedy seems to be to permit the two races to conduct their ecclesiastical affairs sep arately from each other, while both their allegiauce to the authority of the Church to which they both belong.'

The truth of the matter is that the Catholic Church is the only one which treats her children alike, whether rich or poor; white, red, black brown or yellow.

If the matter of the unity of Christ's Church which is "one fold, under one shepherd "were not of so great importance, it would be amusing to note that the whole question is treated by all concerned as one to be arranged according to the whims of men and not the laws of God and the institution of

CHURCH MUSIC.

W. M., of Chatham, N. B., enquires: 1. Why are the first words of the floria and Credo sung in a loud voice n the celebration of Solemn Mass, in the celebration of whereas other parts of the Mass are When was the custom of so doing

introduced :

What does this mode of singing symbolize?

Answer. 1. Some parts of the Mass are sung or said in a loud, and others clergy and press throughout the counare said in a low voice to signify the various emotions of the soul proper to the different parts of the Mass. The ordinary loud voice expresses desire, as when we pray; and as the Mass is, for the most part, a prayer common to priest and people, the tone used is that of conversation that all may join in the Conference and revival of the Method.

against the teaching of any specific doctrine by the Christian Church.

At the last great Northfield (Mass.)

Conference and revival of the Method.

sentiment expressed. The subdued, or low tone is used in the most solemn parts of the Mass, namely, during the Canon, because we naturally express in a low tone the solemnity of the occasion. The congregation, however, may and ought to join in prayer with the priest, and for this purpose prayers appropriate to this part of the Mass are given in the prayer-books with which the people should be supplied. The very words of the priest may be accurately followed by those who use books in which an exact translation of the prayers of Mass is given. The higher tones employed in singing

express vehemence, either of desire or joy. They may be also used for the outward expression of thoughts in which we desire all to participate. Thus it will be understood that the tidings of great joy announced by the angels to the shepherds of Judea that "this day is born to you a Saviour, Who is Christ the Lord, in the city of David," and the triumphal hymn sung by the angels at the birth of Christ are appropriately sung in the loud tones of gladness. The beginning of this hymn is "Glory to God in the highest; and on earth, peace to men of good will." This hymn is represented by the "Gloria in excelsis Deo," which is sung in part by the priest, and in part by the choir representing the congregation. The part sung by the priest and the sentiment of joy which prevails in this hymn are to be found described in St. Luke's Gospel, ii, 10-14.

The Nicene Creed is the profession of Catholic Faith, as opposed to the Arian heresy which was condemned by the Councils of Nice and Constantinople in the years 325 and 381. This Creed was made by these two Councils. Nice, and completed by that of Constantinople. It is sung aloud at Mass because our profession of Faith should be public, according to the words of Christ and His Apostle St. Paul:

"Whosoever, therefore, shall confess Me before men, I will also confess him My Father Who is in heaven.' (St. Matt. x. 32.)

(St. Matt. x. 92.)
"Every tongue should confess that
the Lord Jesus Christ is in the glory
of God the Father." (Phil. ii. 11.) The priest sings part of these hymns,

and the choir part to show that priest and people unite in the sentiments ex-2. We learn from the "liber Pontificalis" or "Pontifical Record" that

the "Gloria in excelsis" was added to the Mass by Pope St. Telesphorus who occupied St. Peter's Chair from A. D. 127 to 138. The date of the Credo, we have given

above. St. Damasus, who ordered the singing by priest and people (or the choir), reigned from 366 to 384.

3. Our correspondent's third ques tion is answered under the first heading.

THE UNITED STATES SENATE CHAPLAINCY.

A despatch from Washington informs us that the Republican Senators assembled in caucus, decided on Dec. 14 to select Rev. Edward Hale of Boston as Chaplain of the United States Senate, his term of office to begin on January 14, 1904.

Dr. Hale is a Unitarian clergyman aged eighty three years. He has ac- fear and awe. He was so wise and cepted the nomination, and as the Republicans rule the Senate, there is no doubt that he will be the coming chaplain of that respectable body.

Dr. Hale is personally very highly esteemed for his amiability of character and for his learning: but, notwithstanding all this, as a Unitarian, he is regarded by all the so-called Evangelical or Orthodox Protestant churches as outside the pale of Christianity Every one knows that Unitarianism denies the most fundamental doctrines of the Christian religion, the divinity of Christ, the everlasting torments of hell, the miracles of the old and New Testaments, the efficacy of Redemption, and other most important truths.

Dr. Hale is the same venerable clergyman who was admitted somewhat over a year ago to receive the communion in a Boston Episcopal Church while two Bishops of that Church were officiating on an occasion of extraordin ary solemnity. The whole Episcopal Church of the United States was set into commotion by the fact, the more so as it was understood to be the second time that such an intercommunion of the Episcopal (the Anglican) and Unitarian Churches was proclaimed by a similar demonstration of common faith! The Rev. Dr. Hale was the medium of that intercommunion on both occasions; but on this most recent occasion, the incident became the cause of an almost universal protest from the Episcopalian try; and other denominations took a hand in the discussion, some being for and some against the proceeding, according as their sentiments were for or against the teaching of any specific

ists, also, the opportunity was taken to denounce Unitarianism in the most public manner as a denomination without any claim to be regarded as being part of the great Christian " Church," or " Confederation of Churches," whichever may be the most accurate designation.

It is now a foregone conclusion that the aged Unitarian divine will be the next Senatorial Chaplain; and thus it will be the deliberately declared conviction of the Senate of the United States that Unitarianism is one of the forms of Christianity to be recognized as on a par with other Christian Churches, so called.

Will it be said again, after this, that the United States is a Christian coun-

try? As an organized Church, Unitarianism is but a small sect in the United States, but the Unitarians point out with pride to the fact that their principles are widely diffused throughout the country, and form a prevailing belief among Protestants of all denominations. The choice of a Unitarian Chaplain for the Senate may be taken as a confirmation of this assertion.

It is not to be wondered at that the system which lays down as its primary and fundamental principle that each Christian has the inherent right to judge for himself what is the actual teaching of Scripture, should finally reach the conviction that Christianity has no real doctrines which all Christians are bound to accept. European Continental Protestantism long ago reached this stage, and we cannot be greatly surprised should the Protestantism of America arrive soon at the same conclusion. The Senate's choice of a chaplain is an indication that even It was issued substantially by that of now it is very near the goal to which it is rapidly tending.

LORD WOLSELEY AND THE RED RIVER REBELLION.

To the Editor of the London, Eng., Times, Sir — All Canadians will read with surprise, many with regret, and net a with some indignation, the chapter in which Lord Wolseley sums up his recollections of his Canadian career. That career is inseparably connected with the Red River Rebellion of 1870. That rebellion is not yet a part of ancient history. Many are alive who took part in it. Many are dians of middle age remember its de-tails. To all of them the account and the comments of Lord Wolseley will seem inaccurate, unkind, and untair.

To write a controversial chapter after so many years seems to indicate a state of feeling which ought not to exist, or which, if it existed, should have been suppressed. Will you kirdly permit me to occupy enough space for a nece

sarily controversial reply?
In describing the origin of the rebellion at Red River, in 1870, Lord Wolselion at Red River, in 1818, Lord Wolse-ley says that the French Canadians of the West were "ruled over by a clever, cunning, unserupulous Bishop" —a description of Archbishop Tache which will hardly be recognized by any one who had the honor of his acquaint-ance. After so many years it seems odd that Lord Wolseley should retain what seems to be personal animosity towards a man so long held in honor all over Canada. Lord Wolseley says of the Archbishop that the Hudson Bay Company had "used him" to keep out settlers—a statement which will cer-tainly be news to the Hudson Bay people as it will be to the friends of Archbishop Tache. As well talk of "using" Richelieu! Archbishop Taché as it will be to the friends of was so great a man that ordinary human cunning shrank in his presence into werful Rome in 1870 to try to settle the rebe lion. He was so trusted a man that the Governor-General sent for him, and pledged to him, viva voce and in writing, the honor of the Crown for any settlement he might be able to make o disturbance which threatened to be disastrous. To call such a man "clever, cunning, and unscrupulous" shows a ingular want of fitness in the choice of

Lord Wolseley says that the French Canadians "saw with envy and dread the steadily increasing power and position of Western Canada," and wanted country westward of the great lakes. He ignores what ought to be the ol vious fact, that, if Bishop Taché was in league with the Hudson Bay Company to keep out settlers, it would not be easy to create a new State. And he does not seem to know that from the moment of its purchase in 1870 the North-West country came under the control of the Federal Government of Ottawa; that Sir John Macdonald was the head of that Government; and that every step taken in regard to the purchase and the government of that country was taken by an Administration in which the French Canadian Ministers were only three out of thirteen. No French Canadian "wire-pullers," as he calls them — as he calls men like Sir George Cartier!—could have prevailed in so sinister a policy against the abil-ity and the strength of the majority of the Cabinet. Had the "wire-pullers so prevailed there was Parliament ready to crush all of them.

Lord Wolseley goes on with a high degree of inconsistency to point out how the Government of Canada, in the beginning of the troubles, sent out surveyors to survey the lands of the Half - breeds; how the surveyors offended the people by their off-hand manners and ignorance of the French language; and how the Half-breed very naturally jumped to the conclusion that there was some plot on foot to was "very na we do not need a French-Can count for the acy theory is With regar which Colone General Lin officer, the pa exact that my not reflect on expletives re ing, so cons Commission. ernment were people to de placed the wh try at his dis French-Car bigoted pries if such disco sequence to fully equi

He goes on t

politicians they were si ous; to der space. He
"scheming
to save Rie admits that with the and all his him! Lord Wol pedition wa the whole b the control Colonel Wo makes this and the Pa War Office t good militar little or not to last. W of State for in war affair

Office, thou

timate kno

emptory ter

would gla

I may simp lar instanc attack is si tion. The civilian aff bellion of agricultura legislated tion. The teers. Th planned ar Dawson, a Russell, a officers, all lie Works hopelessly the exped experience ienced civ he sent l when, owi were ren indeed, a in consequ Indians, voyagers pedition : was saved

Lord W

tary char

publishin

It was su

There wa

for a larg

fields.

troops;

carry, ha highway municati over it though Romans Wolseley John Ma tunate tunate i whose I priests expedit I hav

Kingsle BY BEV

Fath

from m posed 1 given Father truth v entire church ation every speak

trust among Donol