

solution of a mental problem; yet she may be daily found in the circulating library, and is seldom visible on the street without a book or two under her arm."

This will have to suffice for the present issue. We will come again with opinions of prominent writers and critics. We prefer to allow others to set forth a case, especially when they are more competent to judge and to express their opinions than we are. However, we also have a few ideas on this subject, but in order that they may be the better understood, we preface the expression of them by quoting from the leading writers of the day. There is nothing so useful as to compare notes; especially is it so in cases of study, when the object of that study is to subsequently teach others. When not overcrowded with subjects demanding an immediate attention we will continue the study of novels.

CATHOLIC COLLEGES.

A friend sent us a number of the Portland Transcript, in which is reproduced an article by W. H. Manley, in The Independent, on the subject of "School and College," or "The Failure of Higher Catholic Education." In one of the concluding paragraphs the writer says: "An answer would gratify us highly; but somehow we apprehend it will never be given." Mr. Manley need be under no such apprehension, nor need he suffer any loss of sleep on that score. However, his statements are so numerous, so misleading and so unfounded that it would require, at least, a lengthy magazine article to deal with them properly. As to his remarks and statements about Latin in Jesuit colleges and the methods adopted in those institutions we will deal with them in another issue; we have only space, this week, to state—on that point—that our critic displays as much ignorance upon the subject as do all those anti-Jesuitical writers who undertake to deal with that Order.

Mr. Manley entitles his article, "The Failure of Higher Catholic Education." We take issue with him at once on that word "failure" as applied to the Catholic system. The first portion of his article may be reduced to the two heads marked by himself when he states "The difficulties are two: First, it will prove impossible for the president to gather a staff of professors truly first-class, he will have all he can do to get fairly efficient ones; and secondly, the young Catholics will repair in scant numbers only to this school for their education." He here refers to the difficulties that he supposes to lie in the path of the Catholic University of Washington. The first one—as to professors—is absolutely unfounded; the second one—regarding students—is an assumption pure and simple, a mere surmise accentuated by its author's prejudiced desire to see it realized. We will strive to deal with each of those three points in as short a space as possible: namely, the "Failure of Catholic Education," the "Lack of competent teachers," and the "Want of sufficient students." A vast subject for one editorial; but we will come back to it again, in order to save Mr. Manley from any worry about an answer.

As to the alleged "Failure" of our Catholic system of higher education, we have only to point to the great universities of Europe during the middle ages, to the shrines of learning upon the continent and in the British Isles as the foci to which converged all the rays of science and literature. Amidst barbarism they conserved the lore of centuries, and they handed down to this century all the

seeds of knowledge that have since fructified and fed the men of learning whose names are stamped upon the world's history. In our own day there is not a branch of science that has not its masters in Catholic graduates. Members of our Catholic religious orders have held the foremost places in astronomy, geology, medicine, chemistry, mathematics, philosophy, engineering and botany; the list of their names would fill a page of our paper, and even then we would not have space for the mere mention of their works. The Catholic exhibit at the Chicago World's Fair, last summer, was in itself a sufficient reply to Mr. Manley and a conclusive proof that Catholic higher education is far from being a failure. We would advise the Independent's critic to visit the Catholic Summer School next July, and perhaps he will there learn a little about the results of Catholic education.

As to the "Lack of competent teachers," it is merely an assertion entirely based upon his very limited knowledge of our Catholic professors. Evidently Mr. Manley has never studied in a Catholic College or University, and that he has no conception of the methods or curriculum of any one of these institutions. When we again refer to this subject we will go more into detail, and refute his gratuitous and illogical assertions regarding the system adopted by the Jesuits and others. Meanwhile we could point to hundreds of men today, who, as professors, are not only abreast of the age, but even away in advance of any non-Catholic teachers or scientists that our critic can name. These are merely our expressions of opinion, but later on we will furnish the evidence to substantiate our every assertion. The Catholic professor has more power than others, from the simple fact that he speaks with certainty, while others are liable to speculate more or less. The tendency of the non-Catholic is toward that school of materialism that finds its embodiment in Spencer, Huxley and Tyndall; the tendency of the Catholic is in the direction of positive knowledge and away from the domain of doubt.

Referring to the question of the want of students we have only to say that the experience of the past refutes Mr. Manley and the evidence of the present is a still more convincing proof of his fallacy. To no institutions in the world have more students flocked than to the Catholic universities of Europe, and from no institutions have more master-minds come forth to illumine the world with their erudition. If it has been so in the ages gone, why should it be otherwise in the present—and in America?

It is only necessary to note the course of Catholic youth in our Colleges all over this continent to form an idea of the members that will rush to a Catholic University as soon as one appears in their midst. The traditions of all the great universities of England are Catholic; from Catholicity have they drawn their systems—and Protestantism has only borrowed their weapons—or rather usurped them and used them as if belonging to the new and divided creed. However, the Catholic University of Washington, or any other Catholic University on this continent, will not have to go to Mr. Manley, when it requires a professor to fill any particular chair; nor will it require his services as agent to secure sufficient pupils to fill its benches. Such men as he would rejoice were they only to behold a real "Failure of Catholic Education," but unfortunately for their purposes no such thing exists. We are only speaking generally in this issue; but Mr. Manley has furnished us with a grand text whereon to write another

article upon the subject of Higher Catholic Education. We wish to analyze all his important statements, and prove for the benefit of all interested, that he knows not whereof he writes.

TOM PAINE'S DEATH.

A friend from Kildare, P.E.I., sends us an extract from a biographical sketch of William H. Burr, published by The Phonographic Magazine, which runs thus:

"After the death of Bishop Fenwick of Boston, in 1848, a letter was published purporting to have been written by him long before, describing a scene at the death-bed of Thomas Paine, in 1809, witnessed by himself and a fellow-priest. The letter was published from time to time and was embodied in the 'Lives of Deceased Bishops,' in 1872. At the request of the editor of the Truth Seeker, Mr. Burr exposed the letter as a fabrication, and the exposure is published as an appendix to Col. Ingersoll's 'Thomas Paine Vindicated.'"

The fact of the so-called exposure by Burr appearing as an appendix in Ingersoll's abominable work is in itself an evidence sufficient that there must be something suspicious about it. We may plainly state that Burr's attack on Bishop Fenwick's letter is merely a jumble of bald assertions without either proof or logical sequence. The appearance of the letter in that carefully edited work, "The Lives of deceased Bishops," gives at once a presumption that it was genuine. In the next place Bishop Fenwick could have had no possible motive in assuming the authorship of a document which was not his. And had any one undertaken to affix his name to such a paper, it would not have been allowed to go so long unchallenged. But, on the other hand, Ingersoll has every reason to make use of Burr's remarks, for his cause is so shaky that even the most slender props are a boon to him when he can fit them into the structure he is trying to construct.

But it is asserted that the exposure of this letter as a false document is an evidence that the Catholic clergy seek to impose upon the credulity and ignorance of their people. We fail to see in what way Mr. Burr's *rigmorole* can possibly give a shadow of truth to such a ridiculous contention. Firstly, how did Paine die? If Bishop Fenwick had stated that the infidel died a death of horrid despair, of terrible torture, of wild remorse and blasphemy, it could in no way serve as an imposition on the Catholic public—it would only be the account of a death like that of Voltaire and of other God-haters. But such an account would not suit Ingersoll's purposes; consequently Burr's fiction might aid him in preventing his dupes from being undeceived. If Bishop Fenwick had pictured Paine as dying in his infidelity, but still apparently confident of the rectitude of his opinions, it could not affect in any way the views of Catholics on the subject of Atheism—it would be a death like that of Renan, and others of his class. And even the Holy Father, in Renan's case, expressed the belief that his perseverance even unto death might prove his sincerity. It might serve Ingersoll's purpose to dispute the authenticity of the account. If Bishop Fenwick had stated that Paine died repentant, there would yet be nothing in the assertion that could possibly lead to a deception of Catholics; but there might be a great deal that would injure Ingersoll's cause in the eyes of his dupes. Consequently, no matter what the Bishop's letter contained on the subject, there is not any likelihood of it being a fabrication nor is there any

reasonableness in the supposition that it was penned for the purpose stated.

As a matter of fact, no sane man will to-day pretend that the Rev. Bishop Fenwick was not aware of the scene at the last struggle of the great infidel. Paine died in 1809; he had already become famous on two continents; he was drawn to Paris by the evil magnetism of the Reign of Terror; he found ready sale for his "Age of Reason;" and he had caught the fever of revolution against human authority, because his system was ripened for it by rebellion against the authority of God. He had done all the harm he could possibly do, and the manner of his death could in no way affect the immutable truths against which he contended; the Bishop could have no reasonable purpose in setting afloat any story that was unfounded; and even had the well-authenticated letter been a mere fabrication, the one who was credited therewith would have had every reason in the world to deny its statements, and the compiler of the work on "Deceased Bishops," which was issued in 1872, would have refrained from reproducing it. It was in 1846 that the letter was first published and commented upon. Quarter of a century was surely enough time to verify the facts therein stated by any careful student of an historical subject. But the truth is that Burr's explanations are nothing other than a string of assertions which, like Ingersoll's own vapourings, have neither solid connection nor logical conclusions.

It is a safe rule to take almost everything used by Ingersoll in the opposite sense, for he is decidedly the most unscrupulous firebrand of our day. Rev. Father Lambert, of the Philadelphia Catholic Times, could tell a nice story about that atheist's methods, and could also, we are sure, cast considerable light upon this particular case. And we feel confident that he would corroborate our statement of the question.

Our business office is now undergoing some very important improvements, as also the front portion of the building, by which we will have facilities to offer all our Catholic clubs and societies an opportunity to make a good display of all prizes and trophies which they offer annually for their sports and games. Two handsome plate glass windows have been put in the front of the building for that purpose.

Don't forget that on Friday night, the 16th instant, a magnificent concert will be given in the Academic Hall of the Jesuit College. One of the richest programmes of this year's celebration will be presented. Mr. C. R. Devlin, M.P. will deliver an address on the subject of "Home Rule." As the day chosen for the college celebration will be the eve of the 17th March, and as the *soires* will in no way clash with the other concerts, it is expected that a large audience will be present.

LORD ROSEBERY has not been backward in declaring his policy; he states that he will carry out Gladstone's programme, and that he will not fail in following the G.O.M. along the path that must lead to Ireland's Home Rule triumph. It is a relief and an encouragement to find such expressions coming from the new Premier. Please read our editorial on this subject and you will find that we were confident of the ultimate success of the cause, even before it was possible to know what line of action the recently chosen Prime Minister would adopt.

In the swim—A shoal of fish.