

The Catholic Record

Price of subscription—\$2.00 per annum.
United States and Europe—\$2.50.

Publisher & Proprietor, Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.
(Rev. James T. Foley, D.D.,
Editor) (Thomas Coffey, L.L.D.,
Associate Editor—H. F. MacIntosh.

Manager—Robert M. Burns.
Address business letters to the Manager.

Classified Advertising 15 cents per line.
Remittance must accompany the order.
Where CATHOLIC RECORD Box address is
required send 10 cents to prepay expense of
postage upon replies.

Obituary and marriage notices cannot be
inserted except in the usual condensed form.
Each insertion 50 cents.

The Editor cannot be held responsible for
unsolicited manuscript. Every endeavor will
be made to return rejected contributions when
stamped addressed envelopes are enclosed.

The Catholic Record has been approved
and recommended by Archbishops Falconio
and Sharrett, late Apostolic Delegates to
Canada, the Archbishops of Toronto, Kingston,
Ottawa, and St. Boniface, the Bishops of
London, Hamilton, Peterborough and Oshawa,
New York, and the clergy throughout the
Dominion.

LONDON, SATURDAY, JULY 26, 1924

"CIVIL AND RELIGIOUS LIBERTY"

The great Orange festival of
"Civil and Religious Liberty," the
glorious Twelfth of July, has come
and gone. It calls for some reflections.
Whether we like it or not the
Twelfth—and what it stands for—is
an institution and an influence
in the national life of Canada, and
especially in Ontario. Now what
should be the attitude of Catholics
to Orangism and Orangemen? We
think that where Catholics and
Orangemen live together in what
are called mixed communities—
especially rural communities—they
have solved the problem quite
satisfactorily. They get on to-
gether as good Canadians and good
neighbors, clashing not at all on
religious grounds. Not only does
this condition obtain generally in
many places where the writer has
lived but he has always found
instances of intimate friendship
between individual Catholics and
individual Orangemen. And there
is the further notable fact that in
the case of these friendships
between individuals the Catholic is
a staunch, well-informed, outspoken
Catholic, and the Orangeman
thoroughly convinced of his position
without the slightest "leaning
towards Rome." In fact we have
never seen a half-hearted, apologetic,
ill-informed Catholic a warm,
personal friend of an Orangeman.

These good neighborly relations
and personal friendships found in
so many rural communities of
Ontario, we repeat, show the solution
of the Orange-Catholic problem,
if, indeed, problem there be. We
have never had any sympathy with
diatribes against "Ontario Orange-
men" by ill-informed or misin-
formed Catholics of other provinces.
They would be better advised
to leave that subject to Catholics
"to the manner born" in Ontario
who know what they are talking or
writing about.

It is all to the good that Orange-
men should make "Civil and Reli-
gious Liberty" the keynote of their
annual celebration. For, by the re-
iteration of that precious principle
they cannot fail, in some measure,
to inculcate it in the minds of the
younger generation of Orangemen.

But there is the implication that
the placing of William of Orange
on the throne of Great Britain as
William III. put an end to an era of
Catholic tyranny and inaugurated
the era of civil and religious liberty
under which we now happily live.

Nothing could be farther from
the truth.

John Richard Green was a Pro-
testant, an Englishman, and filled
the Chair of History in Oxford
University. In his History of the
English People he writes:

"The history of Ireland, from its
conquest by William the Third up
to this time, is one which no Eng-
lishman can recall without shame.
Since the surrender of Limerick
every Catholic Irishman, and there
were five Catholics to every Pro-
testant, had been treated as a
stranger and a foreigner in his own
country. The House of Lords, the
House of Commons, the right of
voting for representatives in Par-
liament, the magistracy, all cor-
porate offices in towns, all ranks in
the army, the bench, the bar, the
whole administration of government
or justice were closed against Cath-
olics. Few Catholic landowners had
been left by the sweeping confiscations
which had followed the suc-
cessive revolts of the island, and
oppressive laws forced even these
few, with scant exceptions, to pro-
fess Protestantism. Necessity,
indeed, had brought about a prac-
tical toleration of their religion and
their worship; but in all social and
political matters the native Catho-
lics, in other words the immense
majority of the people of Ireland,
were simply hewers of wood and

drawers of water to their Protestant
masters.

"The English Parliament, too,
claimed the right of binding Ireland
as well as England by its enact-
ments. . . . England did her
best to annihilate Irish commerce
and to ruin Irish agriculture.

Statutes passed by the jealousy of
English landowners forbade the ex-
port of Irish cattle or sheep to Eng-
lish ports. The export of wool was
forbidden, lest it might interfere
with the profits of English wool-
growers. Poverty was thus added
to the curse of misgovernment, and
poverty deepened with the rapid
growth of the native population,
till famine turned the country into
a hell."

Evidently Irish Catholics owe no
great debt of gratitude to William
of Orange.

Dr. E. A. D'Alton, M.R.I.A.,
author of a "History of Ireland
from the Earliest Times to the
Present Day," thus writes of the
same period:

"But even when William of
Orange had triumphed, toleration
of Catholicity was expected. For
the Treaty of Limerick (1691) gave
the Catholics 'such privileges as
they enjoyed in the reign of Charles
II'; and William was to obtain
from the Irish Parliament a further
relaxation of the penal laws in
existence. The treaty was soon
broken. The English Parliament,
presuming to legislate for Ireland,
enacted that no one should sit in
the Irish Parliament without taking
the Oath of Supremacy and sub-
scribing to a declaration against
Transubstantiation; and the Irish
Parliament, filled with slaves and
bigots, accepted this legislation.
Catholics were thus excluded; and
in spite of the declared wishes of
King William, the Irish Parliament
not only refused to relax the Penal
Laws in existence but embarked
on fresh penal legislation. Session
after session, for nearly fifty years,
new and more galling fetters were
forged, until at last the Penal
Code was complete, and well merited
the description of Burke: 'As
well fitted for the oppression,
improvement and degradation of a
feeble people and the debasement
in them of human nature itself as
ever proceeded from the perverted
ingenuity of man.' All bishops,
deacons, vicars-general, and friars
were to leave the country and if
they returned, to be put to death.
Secular priests at home could
remain if they were registered; in
1709, however, they were required
to take an oath of abjuration which
no priest could conscientiously take,
so that registration ceased to be a
protection. They could not set up
schools at home nor resort to
Catholic schools abroad, nor could
they receive legacies for Catholic
charities, nor have on their churches
steeples, crosses, or bells.

"The laity were no better off than
the clergy in the matter of civil
rights. They could not set up Cath-
olic schools, nor teach in such, nor
go abroad to Catholic schools. They
were excluded from Parliament,
from the corporations, from the
army and navy, from the legal pro-
fession, and from all civil offices.
They could not act as sheriffs,
or under sheriffs, or as jurors,
or even as constables. They
could not have more than two
Catholic apprentices in their trade;
they could not carry arms, nor own
a horse worth more than £5; they
were excluded even from residence
in the larger corporate towns. To
bury their dead in an old ruined
abbey or monastery involved a
penalty of £10. A Catholic work-
man refusing to work on Catholic
holy days was to be whipped; and
there was the same punishment for
those who made pilgrimages to holy
wells. No Catholic could act as
guardian to an infant, nor as
director of the Bank of Ireland; nor
could he marry a Protestant, and
the priest who performed such a
marriage ceremony was to be put
to death. A Catholic could not
acquire land, nor buy it, nor hold
a mortgage on it; and the Catholic
landlord was bound at death to
leave his estate to his children in
equal shares. During life, if the
wife or son of such became a Pro-
testant, she or he at once obtained
separate maintenance. The law
presumed every Catholic to be faith-
less, disloyal, and untruthful,
assumed him to exist only to be
punished, and the ingenuity of the
Legislature was exhausted in dis-
covering new methods of repression.
Viceroys were constantly appealed
to to give no countenance to Popery;
magistrates, to execute the penal

laws; degraded Irishmen called
priest-hunters were rewarded for
spying upon their priests, and
degraded priests who apostatized
were rewarded with a government
pension. The wife was thus encour-
aged to disobey her husband, the
child to flout his parents, the friend
to turn traitor to his friend. These
Protestant legislators in possession
of Catholic lands wished to make
all Catholics helpless and poor.
Without bishops they must soon be
without priests, and without schools
they must necessarily go to the
Protestant schools. These hopes,
however, proved vain. Students
went to foreign colleges, and
bishops came from abroad, facing
imprisonment and death. The
schoolmaster taught under a shelter-
ing hedge, and the priest said Mass
by stealth, watched over by the
people, and in spite of priest-hunter
and penal laws. Nor were the Catho-
lics won over by such Protestant
ministers as they saw, men without
zeal and often without faith, not
unlike those described by Spenser
in Elizabeth's day—'of fleshy
incontinency, greedy avarice and
disordered lives.' In other respects
the Penal Laws succeeded. They
made the Catholics helpless, ignor-
ant, and poor, without the strength
to rebel, the hope to redress, or
even the courage to complain."

The implication, then, that the
patron saint of Orangemen was the
founder of civil and religious
liberty is a grotesque perversion of
historic truth. The rather lengthy
extracts we have quoted crowd out
our reflections until next issue.

THE HOME BANK

The House of Commons without
demur and without debate con-
curred unanimously in the report
of the Banking Committee with
regard to the Home Bank.

Briefly, that means that though
there is no legal ground for the
claim of the unfortunate depositors
for compensation, the moral right
and justice of their claim is
admitted and unquestioned.

Had Sir Thomas White, then
Minister of Finance, exercised the
discretionary power with which he
was invested in 1916 or 1918, when
the rotten condition of the Home
Bank was brought to his official
attention, the depositors would have
suffered no loss. He failed to do
so because of the War and the
harm that might in his opinion be
done to Canada's credit in the midst
of the stupendous task of financing
the War.

Sir Thomas has emphasized the
fact that he was not legally obliged
to take action. However, when a
responsible Minister of the Crown
is invested with discretionary
power to be used in certain
conditions, and when these condi-
tions obtain he is bound by his
dignity and responsibility of his
office, bound in decency, bound in
justice if not in law, to exercise
this discretionary power; and the
condition of the Home Bank, as
revealed to him as Minister of
Finance, imperatively demanded
action in 1916 and in 1918.

Parliament acted wisely in re-
ferring these questions of fact to
the impartial and unbiased inves-
tigation of Mr. Justice McKeon of
New Brunswick.

The unanimous action of the
House of Commons removes the
matter from acrimonious or parti-
san discussion. It is well. No one
questions that Sir Thomas White in
the stress of War conditions acted
according to his best judgment.
But since the Minister of Finance
deemed it in the best interest of
Canada practically to sacrifice the
Home Bank depositors in order to
preserve the country's financial
credit at a time of crisis, the action
of the House of Commons makes
it clear that no one now questions
the logical conclusion that the
country owes them compensation.

"GIRLS A LA MODE"

By THE OBSERVER

Under this heading, there is an
article in America by Ella M. E.
Flick, in which the girl of today,
or, as she calls her, the girl a la
mode, is defended and even praised.
No doubt she may be well defended
and even justly praised within
reasonable limits. But why not
deal with all sides of the question.
The lady who writes in praise of
the modern girl ought to be frank
enough to discuss all aspects of the
question, of the manners and habits
of the interesting young person she
takes up the cudgels for.

Miss, — or is it Madam—Flick's
theory seems to be that the free
manners and customs of the girls
of today are due to an economic
movement having to do with ways
and means of earning a living.
But when an employer has to
rebuke his stenographer for not
wearing enough clothes in the
office, a thoughtful observer will
realize that there is something in
the question that is not a matter
of economics. For, men have been
under the necessity of earning their
living ever since God cursed Adam
but they do not therefore expose
their persons indecently in office
and in workshop.

A distinction must be drawn
between that degree of freedom
which is necessary in order that
women may earn their living, and
that further degree of freedom which
is sought in the manner of dress
and in the laxity of social customs.
The need for freedom in competing
with men in the business world has
nothing to do with jazz dancing,
petting parties in darkened auto-
mobiles, and with the rapidly
spreading custom of drinking from
the flasks that are expected from
the male escort. It is the sensu-
ality of modern customs that is
criticized and not the amount of
freedom which is reasonably neces-
sary in order that women may earn
their living.

When women who practice this
new and vicious "freedom" are
pressed with criticisms of their
conduct they sometimes attempt to
hold men responsible. They say
that the men demand that girls
dress scantily, and that they dance
suggestively, and that they take
a drink or smoke; and good women
have been heard to say that if a
girl refuses to do these things she
will be neglected and will not get
married. But we wonder whether
they are serious about this. Were
men really less fond of the opposite
sex when they wore crinolines?

Some years ago it was the fashion
for women to wear a wire machine
which was called a "bustle." Did
the men invent that? Or, were they
even consulted about it? A
few years ago it was the fashion
for women to wear balloon sleeves.
Were those adopted to please men?
Then there was that bit of rather
painful contortionism called "the
dip." Were the men consulted
before the women began walking
as though they had a severe pain in
their stomach?

Then came the little-girl-skirts—
only they were less modest than
any decent little girl had been accus-
tomed to wear. Were the men
consulted? They were not. Nor
were they consulted when last year
fashion decreed that the sidewalks
should be swept again as they used
to be twenty years ago, by women's
skirts; and at a moment's notice
dresses became long—but only on
one side. Were men consulted when
women began to wear overshoes
with the buckles loose, or when
they adopted that pneumonia-in-
viting custom of wearing a heavy
fur coat with the front open to
make dead sure—"dead" is good—that
Jack frost would have his full
chance to kill them?

Having adopted the fashion of un-
covering their chests when the ther-
mometer was below zero, the fashio-
nable sex began to wear furs when
the thermometer was eighty in the
shade—summer furs they called
them. Were the men consulted
about that? They tell us now that
the men will not love them if they
do not take up and practice every
silly fashion that the dancing mas-
ter or the dressmaker imposes on
them. But when did men come to
have so much to say about all that?

Next year, or whenever fashion
changes its arbitrary whim, the fair
sex will change to clothes that will
cover them from chin to toes and
sweep the dust besides, and the
men will have not a word to say
about it. And, strange to relate,
the men will be just about as much
devoted to the fair sex then as they
have always been; as they were
when bustles were in fashion; and
when the foolish "dip" was in
fashion.

Miss Flick will have it that the
modern girl is to be accounted for
on economic grounds. We have
said enough to show that many
other considerations arise; but
suppose for argument's sake that
economic considerations govern the
phenomena which are so much com-
mented upon. What sort of success
is the economic movement—if it is
an economic movement—meeting
with? During the War hundreds

of business girls earned from eighty
to a hundred dollars a month, and
joyfully spent every cent of it on
dress; girls who lived at home and
paid not one cent for their board
and lodging. Was that an economic
success? Any young man who has
considered marriage will tell you
that the modern girl expects to be
provided for not on the scale to
which she has been accustomed, but
on the scale to which she expects to
become accustomed if she can get
a young man to promise it
to her. If this is the sort of eco-
nomic question that is involved in
the modern girl's entry into the
world of business, there is not much
in it to excite congratulations. If
Miss Flick could show us an eco-
nomic movement on the part of
girls which gave some hope of relief
from any sort of economic burden
or difficulty, we should be disposed
to join her in her praise of the
modern girl. But if, on the other
hand, this much praised young
person is succeeding principally in
making the high cost of living
higher yet, unstinted praise may
well be deferred.

And it is to be feared that this
is just what she is doing. Pass as
granted that thousands of girls
must earn their living. The fact
must be added that thousands of
them are increasing their demands
upon society in luxuries and pleas-
ures, which they have begun to call
the necessities of life, as fast as the
thing can be done. Housekeeping
ought to be getting cheaper. It is
getting dearer. It is far dearer
than it was when the man had to do
all the earning for both while the
young folks were preparing to get
married. The average business
girl does not put one cent into the
making of a home, and never even
thinks of such a thing. What sort
of economic movement is it which
only increases the general extrava-
gance of society?

But, after all, as we have said
above, it is not the business dol-
lings of the modern girl that are the
subject of criticism, nor the slight in-
crease in freedom of manners which
may be necessary in such occupa-
tions as she may take up. There is
a much more serious question about
the modern girl; that is, what part
is she playing in the moral advanc-
ment or retrogression of society?

The earning of a living does not in
any way necessitate that laxity of
deportment which has been so much
remarked upon in the last few years.

Swearing, smoking, drinking,
voluptuous dancing, immodest
dressing, are not excused by re-
marking that grandma never had to
earn her living, and it may be re-
marked in passing that Grandma
saved her husband's money; and the
modern girl does not intend
ever to do that. Grandma had an
old-fashioned thing called conscience
which would have told her to die
sooner than earn her living by sac-
rificing her modesty and her inno-
cence. But, it is not true that girls
"a la mode" are under the necessity
of making such a choice. They take
up the customs of the age just be-
cause they are the fashion and there
is no compulsion about it.

NOTES AND COMMENTS

A LEADING Anglican Church in
Toronto has had erected on the wall
of its interior a piece of stone from
the ancient Catholic monastery on
the Island of Iona with a glowing
inscription to that effect. It would
not surprise us to learn that the
same thing had been done with a
fragment from St. Ignatius cave at
Manresa. Consistency has never
been an Anglican virtue.

AN ANGLICAN missionary in China
writes to the Guardian (the leading
organ of the Establishment) deplor-
ing the difficulties Protestant mis-
sionaries have to contend with by
reason of their variations of belief,
and at the same time expressing
admiration for what he terms the
"magnificent unity and marvellous
organization" of the Catholic
Church in China. "Out here," he
writes, "it is absurd to ignore the
Roman communion. Their work ex-
tends everywhere, their numbers
are at least four times those of all
other Christian bodies put together,
and many of their 'results' are
altogether admirable." This is
really but re-echoing the testimony
of every independent observer.
And, it is to be borne in mind, that
Catholic missions are maintained on
less than one-tenth the resources of
Protestant organizations. It is,
after all is said and done, the
Divine commission that counts.

COMMENTING ON an assertion of
Dean Inge in a recent sermon in St.
Paul's Cathedral to the effect that
"organized Christianity has visibly
lost ground," an East Indian con-
temporary remarks: "The most
perfectly and widely organized sys-
tem of religious belief and practice
is represented in the Catholic
Church which certainly has not lost
ground. On the contrary she is
ever making fresh conquests
throughout the civilized world,
and today as a spiritual
force her influence is unrivalled."

Skeptical philosophers and
historians (Gibbon, as an example)
have sought in various ways to
account for the triumph of the
Catholic Church in the early ages,
but her secret of perennial youth
in this later time is as much a
puzzle to the unbelieving as it was
then.

THIS UNDYING vitality of the
Church is the theme of a Protestant
writer (Dr. J. A. Faulkner in the
Quarterly Review.) His tribute is
somewhat reminiscent of Macaulay's
famous outburst, it is true, but it
has its force and value none the
less. We reproduce the passage in
full: "The Papacy has come down
through the centuries without the
same power that she had in the
Middle Ages, but with large
remnants of it, her spiritual vigor
still almost unimpaired, assured
that next Sunday whosoever
pastor's parishioners do not go to
church, hers will go; whatever
theology is changing and vanishing,
hers is still the same; and she will
still have her seat on the Seven
Hills in the year 2124, and her
ramifications in every country
where she now exists, with perhaps
many new lands added to her
domain. In this year of grace 1924
she is the only historic Church
which faces the future calm and
unafraid, because she is the only
Church without schism or schisms,
without everchanging religious
values, which is sure of her
creed because she is sure of her
Lord, the only Church which is not
afraid of some new philosopher
Kant or new theologian Ritschl
Unitarianising her, and thus evis-
cerating her. I speak simply
historically. If you would ask
Papal theologians the secret of
their confidence in the future, of
their assurance that in 2500 they
would still be offering the body of
Christ in the Mass, they would give
many answers, but they would all
unite in one: This is the victory
that overcometh the world, even
your faith."

WHAT A secular periodical terms
a "feature of outstanding interest"
in the Byron Centennial Celebration
in Greece was the presence at Misso-
longhi of a direct descendant of the
poet, the Hon. Anne Lytton, who is a
Catholic. Because of her relation-
ship to the Poet of Greek Indepen-
dence, Miss Lytton won the hearts of
the Greeks, who acclaimed her as
the "adopted daughter of Athens
and Missolonghi." The Prime
Minister presented her with a
medal, recording her great ances-
tor's heroic services to Greece,
which on behalf of the nation she
was commissioned to lay on his
tomb when she returned to Eng-
land.

It is noteworthy that all Lord
Byron's direct descendants are
Catholics, and it may be that in
finding their way into the Church
the inspiration was drawn from
the poet himself. The Hon. Miss
Lytton is a great-great-grand-
daughter, through her mother,
Lady Wentworth, who was the
only child of Lady Anne Blunt,
wife of the celebrated poet and
traveller (also a Catholic) Wilfred
Scawen Blunt. Lady Blunt was
the only daughter of the first Earl
of Lovelace, her mother being the
only child of Lord Byron by his
wife the Baroness Wentworth.
Byron certainly had his weak-
nesses, but had spirituality enough
to recognize the Catholic as the
"best religion." Thus the Faith
which the "Bard of the Broken
Heart" looked upon with reverence
is now the cherished possession of
his descendants. And this is a
glory which he shares with many
another English writer of name.

It is not only Italy that has shown
the American Y. M. C. A. the door.
News from Turkey is that that
institution has made its presence so
objectionable at Constantinople by
reason of its underhand proselytizing
methods as to have been ordered
by the Government to cease its pro-

paganda. This is the burden of a
decree issued by Mustafa Kemal.
It is not the preaching of its
peculiar tenets that are in them-
selves objected to, but, as in Italy
and other countries, the in-
sidious and dishonest methods
employed. Evidently, thinks an ex-
change, the Turk, no matter how
many bushels of American dollars
the Y. M. C. A. has to dispose of,
has made up his mind to stand on
nonsense from this organization
which meddlesomely worries itself
about the religious ideas of every
other country but its own.

FAMOUS OLD IRISH SCHOOL RESTORED

By Rev. J. Van der Heyden
(Louvain Correspondent, N. C. W. C.)

Louvain, Belgium.—The piety and
munificence of an American Catho-
lic layman is to be the chief instru-
ment in the rehabilitation of the
ancient College of the Irish Fran-
ciscans here, one of the most glori-
ous monuments to earlier Irish
learning and zeal. Erected three
centuries ago through the gift of a
king, the college was suppressed in
1797 and has since been only a
memory.

The distinguished American lay-
man who has taken on himself this
great work in the interest of Catho-
lic learning is Marquis Martin
Maloney, K. S. G., of Philadelphia.
His philanthropy and deep interest
in education already are exemplified
in large gifts to the Catholic Uni-
versity of America.

One hundred and twenty-seven
years ago, January 8, 1797, the Col-
lege of the Irish Franciscans at Lou-
vain met the fate of all the reli-
gious institutions within the bound-
aries of the First French Republic;
it was ruthlessly suppressed, after
an existence of 191 years, and its
inmates were dispersed by the
newly-fledged apostles of "liberty
equality, fraternity."

Sold at public auction April 22 of
the same year, the house was
bought back again by the Guardian,
the Rev. James Gowan, with scripts
received from the spoliators by him-
self and his religious brethren for
their share in the property. As the
university, with which the college
had been connected, had not yet
reopened its doors in 1829, Father
Gowan disposed of the property
that year in favor of the Catholic
missions of Great Britain. In 1830
it became a Brothers' school for
children of the poor, and it has con-
tinued as such to this day.

MONUMENT TO IRISH NATION
The Franciscan College was the
first of those three Louvain colleges
which a noted historian has called "a
proud and lasting monument of the
learning and zeal of the Irish
nation."

Of the "Pastoral College," which
trained secular priests for the Irish
missions, nothing remains now but
two stones set in the garden wall of
one of the houses that replaced the
school buildings razed in the year
1835.

Of the study house of the Irish
Dominicans, founded in 1628, as was
also the "Pastoral College," the
sole vestige left is the name of a
street—"Rue des Dominicains
Irlandais"—where the institution
had its last refuge. The buildings
were demolished in 1799-1800.

Lovers of the past acquainted
with the achievements of the Irish
race can best conceive the feelings
of the sons of St. Francis upon the
eve of the return of some of theirs
to a house linked with the most
glorious annals of their order during
two centuries.

A king, Philip III. of Spain, urged
thereto by an Irish prelate, Florence
Conry, Archbishop of Tuam, contrib-
uted the funds for the erection of
that house three centuries ago; an
American citizen, Marquis
Maloney, of Philadelphia, under the
inspiration of another Irish prelate,
Monsignor J. Ryan, late President
of the Seminary of Thurles, is to
contribute the funds for the restora-
tion of the hallowed premises to the
legitimate successors of the noble
men who made it illustrious by
their faith, their learning, their
unbounded zeal—all for the service
of their people and of their religion.

A proof of the sympathetic esteem
enjoyed by the first Franciscans
from Ireland who dwelt in the Lou-
vain House of Study was the pres-
ence, May 9, 1617, at the corner-
stone laying of their chapel, dedi-
cated to St. Anthony, of the beloved
rulers of the order, Archduke
Albert and Archduchess Isabella.
The princes were not deceived in the
men who had provoked this mani-
festation of their good will. They
furnished proofs sufficient of their
superior worth and of their activity.
While the teachers achieved renown
through their contributions to the
stores of the Sacred Sciences, of
philosophy and of history, the
pupils imbued themselves with faith
and zeal as well as with knowledge
—to meet the persecutions and tor-
tures that awaited them at home,
to bring the strayed sheep back to
the fold, and to keep the light of
eternal truth, despite the fury of
the English tyrants to extinguish it,
shining brightly in their native
land.

To Father Bonaventura O'Hussey,
under whose presidency the college
began its long career of usefulness,
Hibernia owes the first book printed
in Irish characters—a catechism of
the Christian doctrine published at
Louvain in 1608.