

The Catholic Record.

"Christianus mihi nomen est, Catholicus vero Cognomen."—(Christian is my Name, but Catholic my Surname).—St. Pacian, 4th Century.

LONDON, ONTARIO, SATURDAY, MARCH 4, 1893.

NO. 750.

VOLUME XV.

My Beads.
Sweet, blessed beads! I would not part
With one of you for richest gem
That gleams in kindly diadem;
Ye know the history of my heart.
For I have told you every grief
In all the days of twenty years,
And I have moistened you with tears,
And in your decades found relief.
Ah! time has fled, and friends have fallen,
And joys have died; but in my needs
Ye were my friends, my blessed beads:
And ye consoled me when I weaned.
How many and many a time in grief,
My weary fingers wandered round
Thy circled chain, and always found
In some Hall Mary sweet relief.
How many a story you might tell
Of inner life to all unknown;
I trusted you and you alone,
But ah! ye kept my secrets well.
Ye are the only chain I wear—
A chain that I can but adore,
In life, in death, beyond the grave,
Of Jesus and His Mother fair.
—Abram J. Hyatt.

BEFORE UNITARIANS.

Lecture by Bishop Keane of the University.

Bishop Keane of the Catholic University at Washington lectured before the Unitarian Club of Boston on Wednesday evening, Feb. 8. The occasion was the regular monthly meeting of the club, and the only other guest was Dr. G. Stanley Hall, President of Clark University, Worcester. After President Elliot of Harvard had read a set of resolutions on the death of Phillips Brooks, Dr. Hall opened the discussion of the evening, the topic being "New Problems and New Movements in the Field of Higher Education." After describing the wonderful strides which education has made throughout the world during the last twenty years, Dr. Hall said: "Everywhere it is the problems of the university, distinct from the college that is upon us. Everywhere the university is trying to free itself. The two institutions represented by your speakers tonight (Clark University of Worcester and the Catholic University of America), although small as yet, are the only ones in this country under undergraduate work, and they are striving to be the first on this higher plane.

Chairman Thayer, after delivering a graceful eulogy upon the character and high intellectual attainments of Bishop Keane of Washington, introduced that gentleman as the next speaker. When the applause had subsided, the Bishop proceeded as follows:

MR. PRESIDENT AND GENTLEMEN OF THE UNITARIAN CLUB: From the depths of my heart I thank you for the very kind words in which I have been introduced, and for the exceedingly kind greeting with which you have received me. It is only what I should expect from such a body of men as this. I may as well begin by saying that of all that Dr. Hall has so beautifully presented on the subject before us this evening, with my whole heart I say amen. Dr. Hall has been an inspiration to me and my work for many years past. I firmly believe with him that in the future there must be a more

CLEAR-CUT DISTINCTION between the school, the college and the university—that the school must educate the boy, the college must educate the youth, and the university must educate the man. I firmly believe that our aim must be quality and not quantity. I firmly believe that in the future most of the work must be done by the students, and that the great aim of the professor must be to make the student work, as Dr. Hall says, and while guiding youthful genius to find for himself that precious leisure which will make him give to posterity the intellectual fruit for which the providence of the Creator has fitted him.

And I firmly believe—as one who believes to the depths of his soul in American institutions—that the freedom of the university of the future ought to be freedom and not license. How to determine what is freedom and what is license may be harder in a university than it is in a form of government.

I firmly believe, as Dr. Hall was telling us a few moments ago, that over the university of the future will preside that Providence which it is declared presides not only over idiots and drunken men, but also over the people of America, the Providence which will enable us to draw the line. I also most profoundly agree with Dr. Hall that the great aim of the university of the future must be character—to produce not merely calculators, but to produce men.

The test of education, after all, is this: What sort of men does it give to the generation and to the country? Excellent must be the motto. What else could it be? Who is there that knows men and could have any other motto than that?

I have heard it said that you can tell the difference between men and mere animals by this single fact, that there is simply no limit to man's aspirations, while the animals have no aspirations. We have known the dog and the horse for thousands of years, and they are to-day what they were when they served prehistoric man.

NOT SO WITH MAN. Pitch him out there in the backwoods, or on the prairie where his life has

been spent in wringing bread from a stubborn soil, and his leisure spent in defending his wife and little ones from this ravenous wolf and the blood-thirsty savage. Then surround him with his kind and let the amenities of social life encircle him and at once the instinct in him develops. He demands a school, and then he wants a theatre and an opera house, then the college and afterwards the university.

There is no end to the man. You can't stop him. He is always reaching farther, and he will not stop short of the farthest realms of space. God made him that way, and we can't make him otherwise. And we have got to develop systems of education that will give that aspiration its broadest, wisest, noblest and deepest satisfaction.

The motives that impel him to aspiration nowadays are manifold, and all of them legitimate and natural. First of all, we know all these researches into chemical, physical and biological science pay; and after all that is just as much a craving in the heart of man as knowledge. Man loves what pays, and it is only right he should.

It is only by what economists call wealth that human life can be elevated. Leisure should be obtained that man should be able to go on thinking and broadening and deepening mentally and spiritually. In my own experience I know how impossible it is to do anything for God or man without money. There are higher motives than that. Man is a microcosm, and he has kinship to all that is beneath him.

And that thrill of kinship which makes the poet or artist is felt also in the heart of the true scientist when he dives down into all things that God has made in nature, but in order to feel the thrill of the intensest pleasure by becoming better acquainted with his kinship. How beautiful it is, as the poet says, "to look through nature up to nature's God." New England has been taught by Emerson and his followers never to stop at the crude material, but through the material to read the spiritual, and even in a distant vista to see the divine.

Side by side with these profound researches in nature must go on profound researches in man. Man is

ANOTHER MATERIAL NATURE after all. The life of man is the great study for man. We see that in all ages men have built up those special schools in which men learn the rudiments of history. Go back to the ancient records and we study the old monuments; and go down into the bowels of the earth for little records that were baked in clay thousands of years ago by man, and in every way we search for the rude implements made use of before man learned to write at all, and we find out how men lived and worked and grew in all the ages back.

And it does my heart good when I see these great schools of archeology and history so hard at work in Syria, Babylonia, Egypt and Greece, and it does my heart good when I visit Rome to again see them. It rejoiced me to see Leo XIII opening the archives of the Vatican, and calling all the scholars of the world to build up this great school of history and give all its treasures to mankind.

And then with man's study of history see how they are building up everywhere great universities and schools of social science; because you cannot possibly study history intelligently without going into those great questions of politics, economics and jurisprudence, all arising from the great principles of ethics and all crowned by the great principles of religion.

And when was there a time when it became so necessary for every intelligent man to know how the world ought to live; how human society ought to be directed and managed? Just in proportion as men grow under the guidance of providence and of God humanity grows from childhood and youth to manhood and comes to the years of self-possession and self-government.

We Americans are only just running ahead, taking the lead of what is going to be the whole world over. And just in proportion as self-government becomes the rule of all nations, so important it becomes for every intelligent man that he who must be the moulder of the action of his fellowmen should understand the great social problems of the past, and the experience of men under all social conditions, in order to know what shall be the result of social adjustments now. And the great schools of

SOCIAL SCIENCE will call for the great schools of philosophy. How can you have social life without philosophy? It is all based on ethics. And ethics, right or wrong, are not made by man; they coerce man and they command man.

Therefore we must have the schools of philosophy that will give us the record of how men have thought in the past, not with the object to prove from the oscillations between extreme idealism on the one hand and extreme materialism on the other, but to show how all the time between the extremes is the great conservative truth in the middle uniting the extremes, which was a system of truth, worthy of man—the microcosm. Not to tell you what everybody thought, but that, while it is not possible to give a cut-and-dried

system of philosophy that it will embody the fulness of human thought, we ought to know where the extremes are, and so that we will see in the future that our philosophy is not one-sided.

Then we must have the great schools of religion; for how can we have society or philosophy without religion? In every true and noble life religion is the supreme thing after all. And as it is in every individual life so it is in the life of humanity. Cicero told us that nowhere in the world, or in history, could there be found a tribe or race of men, who, even if they did not know what sort of a god to have, did not know that there was a God to have. Atheism and Deism are alien to mankind. And any system that does not square with human nature is false. You see I am no Calvinist. (Laughter.) I don't believe in it; but it rejoices me to see that Calvinists are coming back home, and believe just as we Catholics do.

So you see, therefore, that religion is the natural instinct in man. You know the great scientist has said that religiousness is so absolutely universal that it must be put down as one of the essential characteristics of humanity. What sort of a higher educational system would you have unless it did full justice to this highest fact of all? Therefore, with the schools of science of every kind, and the schools of philosophy of every kind, we must have great

SCHOOLS OF RELIGION that will open up all the records of the past and study the relationship between comparative religions of the past. I am sorry for the religion that is afraid to look into the past, that is afraid to look all the forms of religion in the face that ever have existed. I am sorry for the form of religion that is afraid to find a bit of goodness which is not in its own religion. If a man does not find a bit of goodness in his own religion he had better go, where he can find it. And, therefore, we can approach great study, the study of comparative religions, without fear. I am sorry for the man who is afraid of facts. Between truth and facts there can be contradiction. I do not believe in that Frenchman who once devised for himself a theory of things, and who, when some one said, "Look, the facts are to the contrary," answered, "So much the worse for the facts." (Laughter.)

We have no reason to be afraid of the religious facts of the past, and therefore, we should study them all carefully, knowing if we have any convictions worth keeping that the result of it will be not to work downwards to naturalism and humanitarianism, but to work upwards to the fulness of truth, as found in Him who said, "I am the truth and I am the light of the world."

I have been studying sciences and philosophy all my life, and I have studied the old Catholic Church, and in all science and philosophy I do not know a single truth that in the slightest degree staggers my faith as a Catholic Christian. So in the building up of education let us look into facts, whether in nature or in man, without fear; and that in religion, science and philosophy we will have the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth.

The great work of the future must be done by specialists. No man can be more than a Jack-of-all-trades if he attempts all. But the great schools must never lose sight of their kinship. They must stand side by side in the spirit of fraternity.

THE DANGER OF THE FUTURE is one-sidedness. Specialists are in terrible danger of becoming narrow. They will go away down in a hole or away up on a tangent, but they will be as narrow as the point of a crowbar, or as narrow as the stick of a rocket. "I fear the man of one book," said the old wise man; and I fear the man of one science. It is not human. Man's being, man's mind, man's whole composite being, was not made to be one-sided, because if one-sided it becomes lop-sided, and is sure to tumble over some precipice or another. We must stand as men on the earth, seeing the brotherhood of all truth. As all truth springs from one great fountain, all truth grows on one great organic tree, and we must, as Dr. Hall said, balance one set of knowledge with another.

Therefore, I want to see the universities of the future constructed in such a way that the schools of science and philosophy and religion will stand in the same campus, and that men engaged in all various avocations will have opportunities to meet, shake hands, compare ideas, and be with no antagonism between brothers in learning and with no antagonism between these three great branches.

There cannot be antagonism between God and man and nature; nor can there be antagonism between the knowledge of God, the knowledge of man and the knowledge of nature. Men must come together just as Epicureans and Unitarians come together—with the knowledge that we are all brothers, without horns and hoofs; and these various forms of knowledge must stand together and build up the universities of the future. That is what I am trying to do in a little humble way in Washington.

We should try to build up that equilibrium which will be balanced by the spiritual; in which the theoretical will be balanced by truth.

So in these specializations we have a great work to do in the future. It must not be only a long and a strong pull, but a pull all together, in order to build up an all-round truth which will be useful and honorable to man and glorious to the love and esteem of the Creator.

EDWARD BLAKE.

Extracts From a Recent Able Speech.

At Bath, England, recently, the Hon. Edward Blake was the recipient of a perfect ovation. He was the speaker of the day, and the local papers reported his speech verbatim. It is a most complete and masterly exposition of the whole question. Two passages are especially worthy of quotation. Dealing with the claim that it would be wrong to pass a Home Rule measure while there is a majority of the English members opposed to it, Mr. Blake said:

"Unionists take no account of the United Kingdom when they talk of the elections. They cut it up in advance before the Home Rule Bill is passed. While they are protesting that they will perish their lives, their fortunes, and give their sacred honors (loud laughter), in perpetual defence of the condition of things as they are, they cut the kingdom up into divisions. They cut off Ireland, they take away Wales, they take away Scotland, and they take old England by itself; they say there is an overwhelming majority of 70—which, as I have shown, ought to be only 10—in England against Home Rule, that they do not attach much importance to it; and because England by itself has so decided it is impossible that the measure can be carried. (Laughter and cheers.) Well, now, I want no repeal of the union, but this is my contention, that I really must insist that while the kingdom is united we should talk of the United Kingdom, while the Parliament is one we should deal with its majority as a whole. There is, as I have said, a majority in the kingdom of 245,000, and in the House there is—or there was in the last session, for now there are about eight vacant seats—a majority of 40.

IRELAND IS FAVORABLE. That the majority is found in one part of the kingdom or another part of the kingdom has, I will not say nothing, but has not all to do with the matter. My own opinion is that it has something to do with the matter. If the Liberal-Unionists had been able to say that there was a majority in Ireland against Home Rule, they would have said that no matter how large a majority there was in England, Scotland and Wales for it, that the majority against it in Ireland was absolutely fatal to the idea. (Cheers and laughter.) I know they would, because they succeeded in getting a seat or two in Ireland by reason of some divisions and other circumstances. They speak great importance, peculiar, special importance, to the voice of Ireland if only to say "No." (Loud applause.) But if Ireland says "Yes," it might as well be a dumb dog. (Renewed laughter.) Well, now, let us look again; why should it be that of these four divisions of the United Kingdom, England should naturally be slowest to recognize the propriety of the change? Well, there are two reasons. First, England is the most Tory of the four divisions, the most Conservative, and therefore the most averse to change. But there is another reason, lying deep down, once again at the roots of human nature. It is because you have got Home Rule in England yourselves at present; you do not suffer under the grievances and difficulties which Ireland, and, measurably and considerably, Wales and Scotland do. You have got 470 votes out of 670 votes at common Parliament; you can pass any local law you please, no matter if every man from Ireland, Wales and Scotland in Parliament shall vote against it; you control your own affairs just now and ours too, and therefore are not quite so alive to the importance of the thing. No man knows so well how the shoe pinches as the man that is wearing it, you know (laughter and cheer), and you are not wearing that shoe.

A GLOWING FLOREATION. The passages which follow occurred in the peroration:

I say to you, then, that we want nothing but this, that Ireland shall control Irish affairs, that Great Britain shall control the affairs of Great Britain, and that Great Britain and Ireland in the great and supreme Imperial Parliament shall continue to control the common affairs of the two countries. (Applause.) I admit there are difficulties in the way. I admit that hair splitters may find something to cavil at in every line and word of a great constitutional settlement like this. I am a lawyer myself, but I devoutly thank God that the great Balfour made the mistake of attempting the defense without knowing his own mind. (Applause and laughter.) They will take very little account of these hair-splitting cavillings, of these far-fetched theories of the imaginations and suspicions of

question the great doctrine that it is impossible to provide against all conjecture, phantoms of the imagination, and that with good will and an earnest desire on the part of both parties to carry the matter to a prosperous conclusion, they are of no consequence whatever (cheers)—that the true concern and salvation of peoples, the true methods of achieving a constitutional settlement, are by teaching foundations of justice and fair play, of common interest and consent, and that then all other things will settle themselves, and therefore you shall not ask for complete logical accuracy, particularly when some of the gravest defects are due to the fact that some of the other divisions of the country are not yet prepared to accept what I have no doubt in a few years you will be disposed to accept—a further extension of Home Rule to the other divisions. You will not insist upon complete logical precision and reform in a matter we are bound to present before you somewhat imperfectly, because it is not ripe for similar action in other parts of the kingdom. (Applause.) I ask you to ponder over these things, and I ask you to consider whether there is anything inimical to this country and to the safety and security of this kingdom, whether they do not in fact constitute a proposal, a God-given opportunity for healing a sore centuries old, for making it, in truth, for the first time a really united kingdom, for setting forward Ireland on a fresh career of happiness and prosperity, and with that a fresh career of happiness and prosperity and renewed vigor and vitality to this venerable kingdom, to this ancient Parliament—to this ancient Parliament which I wish to see once again restored to its dignified and efficient conduct of its transcendent concerns, and it is the devout wish of my heart that it may live and flourish for centuries to come. (Loud and long continued applause.)

The Bath News published a splendid photograph of Mr. Blake, printed on fine paper, one of the best likenesses that we have seen.

ULSTER LOYALTY.

The Grand Orange Lodge of Belfast has sent out a vehement manifesto against Gladstone's Home Rule Bill. The manifesto demands either union with Great Britain or complete separation from Great Britain. "We would accept the latter," says the manifesto, "sorrowfully, but courageously, as the only alternative left to a deserted and betrayed people, but we would resist to the death any attempt to force upon us a bastard combination of the two."

The manifesto names March 2 as the date of a great Unionist demonstration in Ulster Hall, where the men of Ulster will formally declare their uncompromising opposition to the Home Rule Bill. The manifesto closes with the exhortation that the Unionists avoid anything calculated to cause disorder, and thus likely to betray them into the hands of their historic foes.

It is reported from Belfast that the Orange societies in the north of Ireland are preparing for forcible resistance to a Home Rule parliament should one be established. It is being arranged that all the Irish opponents of Home Rule shall simultaneously withdraw their deposits from the postoffice savings banks and purchase arms to be used in case physical force should become necessary to prevent the assertion of Irish Home Rule in Ulster. Inquiries are already being made with a view to contracts for a supply of the latest improved weapons, and an Orange club at Danganagh has received an offer from a Birmingham factory of one thousand Martini rifles. Excitement is running very high among the Ulster loyalists, and many of them declare that in the event of the enactment of Home Rule civil war will inevitably ensue. All of which is very extraordinary conduct on the part of men who have so loudly proclaimed their love of law and order.

SEXTON'S INVECTION.

A special dispatch from London to the Sun says: The episode in the House this week which of all others was most interesting from a tactical and spectacular point of view was the unanimous condemnation of the Times. The attack and the rout of their old enemy were most cleverly managed by the Irish members. Spite has reduced the erstwhile monarch of the press to a condition of impotent fury, which sometimes makes itself wounding rage almost pitiful. Even its disgrace by the Pigott forgeries has not taught it discretion where Ireland and Home Rule are concerned. Every accusation, provided it be black enough against the Irish members, it is ready to indorse and amplify.

It so happened that none of the Tories had read its article accusing the Irish members in wholesale fashion of being in the pay of English politicians, so when Mr. Sexton in most eloquent and incentive denounced the attack as a breach of parliamentary privilege, Mr. Balfour made the mistake of attempting the defense without knowing his own mind. (Applause and laughter.) They will take very little account of these far-fetched theories of the imaginations and suspicions of

little scene in the House than when Mr. Sexton turned upon the Tories, who were inclined at first to ridicule his resentment against the attack on the honor of his colleagues.

"Yes, you jeer," he cried with infinite scorn, "and you are the gentlemen of England. I tell you there is not a peasant in Ireland who would not be ashamed of your conduct."

The stinging words of the angry Celt not only shamed his opponents into silence, but won for him all their votes in condemnation of the cowardly attack of their principal journal.

HOME RULE NOTES.

ANOTHER LIBERAL GAIN.

The Liberals have recaptured Cirencester, Mr. Harry L. W. Lawson, the Liberal candidate, being elected by a vote of 4,687 to 4,445 for Mr. Colchester Master, Conservative. The victory is regarded with great satisfaction by the Liberals, as showing that the agriculturalists of England are true to Mr. Gladstone and his policy.

A POSSIBLE FEDERATION.

Among the party leaders of all sections the feeling is growing that the passage of the Home Rule Bill will be followed in a very few years by the granting of local parliaments to England, Scotland and Wales, the Imperial parliament remaining, in which all four countries, as well as the colonies, will be federated for Imperial purposes. Mr. Chamberlain is playing for that.

JUSTIN MCCARTHY'S HEALTH.

Justin McCarthy's health gets worse and worse. He was unable to attend to his parliamentary duties this week, being laid up with severe bleeding at the nose. He was last in the House of Commons a week ago Friday, when he came down at great personal risk to vote for the first reading of the Home Rule Bill. He looked very ill, and should be not be able to resume his seat, there would not now be the same difficulty in securing a successor to him as there would have been six months ago.

Lord Randolph Churchill has again this week appeared in the parliamentary arena, and, though he is still shaky and broken down, he made a much better showing than in the Home Rule debate. There is no doubt he has pulled himself together to a great extent in consequence of the significant criticism passed on his recent performances. Mr. Balfour is ill with influenza, so Lord Randolph seized the opportunity to take over the deputy leadership of the Tories, and he acquitted himself vastly better than Mr. Balfour had done; but the Unionists are still in a demoralized condition, and, as they lose another seat this week, they seem to be going from bad to worse. They are inclined to put the blame on Mr. Balfour, who, they say, has no enthusiasm as a leader. Although there seems to be truth in this, a more direct cause of their collapse is because they are intellectually outmatched by the present Government. In every debate they have been worsted. Lord Randolph Churchill was the only one who managed to infuse any reality into the attacks. There is no doubt, moreover, that the British public is increasingly inclined to give Mr. Gladstone a chance of settling the Irish question.

Religious Vocations.

A religious vocation is a matter of difficult recognition. Inherited piety is sometimes taken for a divine call. A love for prayer, church services and an occasional meditation are interpreted as evidences of a vocation to a religious life. Women who have these and nothing more misconceive their future and live on frittering their time away in the vain hope of being received into some religious community. The Dublin Review in an article on "Vocations of Catholic Women" has the following:

Is it not a little too much taken for granted among Catholics that every woman who has an inclination to work for others, and to lead a more or less regular and serious life, must therefore go into a convent, and that those who remain "in the world" have no vocation at all, but must lead a life of frivolous, aimless dissipation? Good women are needed also in the world, and there are vocations as true, as wives and mothers, whose duties are more difficult to fulfill than those directly withdrawn from the temptations and follies of society and who devote themselves to a life of contemplation and prayer within the sanctity of cloistered walls.

The expression has often been made with regard to the Catholic Church, that it is the best exemplification of a republic. Birth has nothing to do with preferment; even the Popes and Cardinals have risen from the humblest places in life. The present Archbishop of Cologne is the son of a butcher. The father of his predecessor, Cardinal Geisler, was a vintager, and his mother was a washerwoman. The Archbishop of Posen is the son of a shoemaker. The Prince Bishop of Breslau comes of a family of weavers. The Bishops of Strasburg and Munster were poor peasant boys, and the Archbishop of Olmutz is the son of a tenant farmer. —Baltimore Mirror.