

The Catholic Weekly Review.

A JOURNAL DEVOTED TO THE INTERESTS OF THE CATHOLIC CHURCH IN CANADA

Reddite quæ sunt Cæsaris, Cæsari: et quæ sunt Dei, Deo.—Matt 22: 21.

Vol. III

Toronto, Saturday, Oct. 19, 1889.

No. 35

CONTENTS.

NOTES.....	561
MADMOISELLE ANGELOUQUE.....	John J. A. Becket, Ph D 562
AMALGAMATION OF LAVAL AND VICTORIA.....	571
AT THE BASILICA.....	566
THE FATHER TABARET STATUE.....	563
EDITORIAL—	
Letter from the Archbishop of Halifax.....	568
A Phillistine Abroad.....	568
A Glance at Catholic Canada.....	569
Mr. Lilly on Religion and Science.....	569
Mr. McCarthy's Course.....	570
Mr. Healy M.P., and the Archbishop of Armagh.....	570
The Primat's Remonstrance.....	570
Father Drummond, S. J., at Hamilton.....	572
Three Doctors of Law.....	572
The Age of Self-Conceit.....	563
The Clergyman and his Bishop.....	567
Correspondence.....	571
Catholic and Literary Notes.....	571

Notes.

Mr. Justin McCarthy, M.P., contributes to the *Contemporary Review* an article on the Irish University question, in which he says that there is not a single Nationalist ecclesiastic in Ireland who would compromise with the Tory Government for the sake of any university education measure. "I very much wish the English public," says Mr. McCarthy, "had the advantage which I have had of reading the memorandum prepared by the Catholic Archbishop of Dublin, Dr. Walsh, on this whole subject. It ought to have been published for the benefit of all the people in Great Britain who take an interest in the subject of Irish education."

Mr. McCarthy ridicules the suggestion that the Irish party or the Irish people would compromise for a moment their political claims for a prospective Catholic University. Apart from all other considerations Mr. McCarthy agrees that the question of University education for Ireland will be much more effectively dealt with by an Irish Legislature than by the Imperial Parliament. "I have read," he writes, "a great deal of wild, alarmed discourse concerning the expected breach between the Irish Nationalists and the English Liberals on this subject. It actually amazed me to see the seriousness with which my friend, Mr. Davitt, has expressed himself on the possibility of a surrender by the Irish National party of the claim of Ireland to Home Rule and of the alliance of the Liberals of Great Britain for the sake of a sham measure of University education in Ireland. I read all this with astonishment. Can a man like Mr. Davitt really suppose that there is one single member of the Irish party in Parliament, or one single Nationalist archbishop, bishop, parish priest, or curate in Ireland who would surrender Home Rule or compromise with the Tory Government for the sake of any University education measure? Why, we are within sight of Home Rule, and when we have got that we can give ourselves a far more satisfactory measure of University education—far more satisfactory to all classes and all denominations—than Mr. Balfour could possibly carry through the Imperial Parliament."

As regards the political consequences which might attach to the proposal Mr. McCarthy speaks as follows:

"Let the Tories try it if they have the courage. Let them adopt and bring in a Bill for University education in Ireland, prepared and drafted by Archbishop Walsh, Archbishop Croke, and Mr. Parnell. Let them appeal to the country. Let them take the opinion of the constituencies. The offer to the Irish people a perfected University Education Bill. Mr. Gladstone, for his part, offers to the Irish people Home Rule for Ireland. What would be about the first thing to happen in Ireland? Simply that Archbishop Walsh, Archbishop Croke, and Mr. Parnell would vote in their different polling-places for Mr. Gladstone and against the Tories. The whole mass of the Irish people would follow their example."

It would be interesting to know what the promoters of Imperial Federation think of the present course of Mr. D'Alton McCarthy. Mr. McCarthy is the president of the organization in Canada. Do they regard the course he is pursuing as of a sort to conciliate the French-Canadians and draw to the movement the support and confidence of the general public?

The Rev. C. E. Whitcombe, of St. Matthew's church, Hamilton has been delivering a series of special sermons bearing more or less directly upon the ritualistic forms of worship. On Sunday last he spoke on the subject: *Are Ornaments Essential to Service?* and we observe that in the course of his remarks Mr. Whitcombe made some astonishing admissions for a Protestant. The use of ornaments in the Church service is in accordance, he held, with the practise of the Church in its purity down to the present day. "One reason why they are not in general use," he is reported as saying, "is because of the decay of religion since the Reformation." He referred also to the objection of their similarity to the custom of the Church of Rome. "To such an extent is this objection used," said Mr. Whitcombe, "that a man has only to cry 'No Popery' and he will have a crowd about him ready to support him to any extreme. And men are making terrible use of that knowledge to-day."

Mr. Whitcombe, if we may judge from the reports of his sermons, is an Anglican who holds instinctively Catholic ideas as to the Church and as to worship, and we can wish for him nothing better than that the fulness of grace may be given to him, and that the way may be made clear for him in good time, which leads from out the House of Bondage and the City of Confusion.

The sum of the returns of the French elections shows that of the whole number elected 365 are Republicans and 211 anti Republicans. Of the Opposition 100 are classed as Royalists, 60 as Bonapartists, and 50 as Boulangists. The Republicans themselves, it must be understood, are divided into a number of groups which are far from harmonious, whence follows the uncertainty and difficulty of carrying on government.