

The Catholic Register,

PUBLISHED EVERY THURSDAY,
AT THE
OFFICE, 40 LOMBARD STREET, TORONTO.

TERMS OF SUBSCRIPTION:
TWO DOLLARS PER ANNUM.

FOR ADVERTISING RATES APPLY AT OFFICE.

TRAVELLING AGENTS:
Messrs. Patrick Mungovan, C. N. Murphy,
O. J. Kornahan and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY, JULY 5, 1904.

Calendar for the Week.

July 5—SS. Cyril and Methodius, Bishops and Confessors.
6—Octave of the Feast of the Apostles.
7—Blessed Benedict XI., Pope and Confessor.
8—Eighth Sunday after Pentecost. Blessed Eugenius III., Pope and Confessor.
9—Wonders of the Blessed Virgin Mary.
10—The Seven Brothers, Martyrs.
11—S. Pius I., Pope and Martyr.

The Mail on Catholic Education.

If the *Mail* attracts a good deal of attention from us it arises from the peculiarity of its logic and the still greater peculiarity of its historical views. In an article entitled "Campaign-coloured History," which appeared in the issue of June 28th, both of these idiosyncracies display themselves with an unbecoming zeal and a danger of misleading its readers. The article claims to be a rejoinder to a very able letter in the *Globe* upon the P.P.A.; but the most of it is taken up with irrelevant quotations from a pamphlet by a Dr. Maguire, and from the *Dublin Review*. The *Mail*, while claiming that it "holds aloof from such controversial movements" as the P.P.A., is of the opinion that this organization is a "defensive" one and "not an offensive one; and "is formed to withstand Ultramontane sapping-and-mining tactics. It is not directed against moderate Catholicism." The first duty of a logician is to define his terms. And if the *Mail*, in the face of the authenticated programme of the P.P.A., regards it as defensive and not offensive both the *Mail* and the P.P.A. remind us of the character in an American poem:

"For ways that are dark,
And tricks that are vain,
The heathen Chinese is peculiar."

But what is "moderate Catholicism?" Are the P.P.A.'s acting the role of so-called moderate Catholics and "keeping the Ultramontanes in bounds?" That is a novel way of putting it. But who are the Ultramontanes in this country? The learned and valiant Archbishop of Kingston is the only one mentioned. Surely there are others. Let us have them. Perhaps the crystallized vote. What are the Ultramontanes demanding which requires the P.P.A.'s and the *Mail's* direction of what it is pleased to name as moderate Catholicism?

One of the leading, but little known, aims of the Ultramontane bishops who rule that country, and who practically nominate seventy-seven Irish M.P.'s, is explained by the famous pamphlet of Dr. Thomas Maguire, Professor of Moral Philosophy at Trinity College, Dublin. He is a Catholic. He graphically shows what Ultramontanism is. He quotes from the *Dublin Review*, the leading Catholic organ in the United Kingdom. He states: "Each article in the *Dublin Review* is submitted to three censors, appointed to examine its bearing on 'Faith, Morals and Ecclesiastical Prudence. It is therefore authoritative as an exponent of

opinion." It states (see vol. 20, page 102, second series): "We are very far from meaning that ignorance is the Catholic youth's best preservative against intelligent danger, but it is a very powerful one nevertheless. . . . The Church's interest is not in higher education as such, but in Catholic higher education." This latter is precisely what the moderate Catholics in Europe have successfully fought against.

The quotation from the *Dublin Review* is altogether misleading. Whether it is Dr. Maguire or the *Mail* that quotes thus, we are not prepared to say, as we do not happen to have the pamphlet in question. We have, however, examined the *Review*. The article, a very able one, is entitled "Catholic Higher Studies in England," and is a critique upon a "Circular on College of Higher studies," by Cardinal Manning, Archbishop of Westminster. So far from drawing any conclusion like that which the *Mail* attributes to Dr. Maguire, who says that the Irish bishops would crush out higher education for three generations, the writer in the *Dublin Review* says in his opening paragraph: "The Irish Bishops, finding their just demands set at defiance by Parliament, have resolved to lose no further time. They have accordingly applied themselves to the work of so strengthening and consolidating Catholic education in their country that the whole shall form one system, having the University as the centre and principle of cohesion." That is not the action of men who wish to crush higher education. Let us come to the quotation.

The writer is reviewing the dangers arising to a Catholic young man from higher education. He says with truth that "it is a plain fact that by giving Catholic youths a higher education, you open a new and very large avenue by which the godless spirit of the time may gain admittance." He goes on:

And unless they be furnished with fully sufficient moral and intellectual protection, you expose them to imminent danger—not merely of holding the Faith with less simplicity and heartiness (though this would be bad enough)—but of wilfully admitting a fully deliberate doubt as to its truth; or (in other words) of actual apostasy. It is this which makes the whole subject so anxious; and which makes one a little impatient with common-places, about marching with the times, and aiming at progress, and growing in largeness of thought. We are very far from meaning that ignorance is the Catholic youth's best preservative against intellectual danger; but it is a very powerful one nevertheless, and those who deny this are but inviting a theory in the very teeth of manifest facts. A Catholic destitute of intellectual tastes, whether in a higher or lower rank, may probably enough be tempted to idleness, frivolity, gambling, sensuality; but in none but the very rarest cases will he be tempted to that which (in the Catholic view) is an immeasurably greater calamity than any of these or all put together; viz., deliberate doubt on the truth of his religion. It is simply undeniable we say, that the absence of higher education is a powerful preservative against apostasy, and those who watch over souls will reasonably refuse to bear part in withdrawing that preservative, until they are certain that some other very sufficient substitute is provided. In the present case then, it was their bounden duty to pause and deliberate, and make sure that the higher education offered be really Catholic. It is the work of higher education as such to cultivate and enlarge the mind, as of guard against the danger that such cultivation do immeasurably more harm than good. Now the Church's interest is not in higher education as such, but in Catholic higher education.

Now we ask: is this the crushing of legitimate aspirations? Is this precisely what the moderate Catholics in Europe have fought against? Why is the quotation not given as it appears? It may not be the *Mail's* fault, but a wrong argument is based upon it. Here it is:

That is Ultramontane opposition to higher education.

Archbishop Cleary is an Ultramontane. Therefore Archbishop Cleary is opposed to higher education.

The corollary is the necessity of the P.P.A.'s or the moderate Catholics. "You pay your money and you take your choice."

Archbishop Cleary is doing all that a zealous, energetic Bishop can do for Catholic education. He will lead his people far up the hill of learning, for he is a learned man himself. As far as opportunities can be used he will mould the Separate Schools into a proper form and system. It is second nature for the *Mail* to attack the Archbishop of Kingston; and at present it is a taking subject with many; but we require that history be not falsified, writings be not misquoted and logic be not entirely despised. With the rest of the article, which deals with the penal laws, we shall take up some space next week.

Should Not—Why?

The *Evening News* in its issue of Friday last gives the following potent reasons why Separate Schools should be abolished, under the caption of Should—Why?

- (1) Because a double system involves needless expense;
- (2) Because the schools of a weak minority cannot possibly give the training necessary to fit children for the duties of life under modern conditions;
- (3) Because they cause a line of cleavage in youth that lasts all through life, thereby dividing into factions people who should be common citizens of a common country.
- (4) Because so long as they exist they must continue to inject into political contests the bitterness of sectarian conflict—a conflict from which the whole country, and particularly those of the minority, must suffer.

We answer categorically—Separate Schools should not be abolished.

(1) Because a trifling difference in expenditure, offers as little ground for an act imposing a wrong on the consciences of parents as the "money" argument of the *World* does for the union of Churches.

(2) Because "the schools of a weak minority," if properly dealt with, can and do furnish as good an article of even worldly education as the schools of the majority. and because there are those among us who recognize that, however old this earth may become, the conditions which may happen to be "modern" must subserve the conditions which are eternal.

(3) Because the same argument will apply to a measure which not even the *News* will advocate—to enforce uniformity of religious practice on all citizens; and because the children in Catholic schools are instructed in the principles of Christian charity and obedience to authority, to the effect that they make the best and most tolerant citizens of the country.

(4) Because "the bitterness of sectarian conflict" has never been of our seeking in this country, because it is just such articles as this in the *News* which stir up sectarian hatred, because a free and intelligent people can never be forced into silence by a despotic deprival of their natural rights as parents.

And because of all these reasons we think it ill becomes a journal like the *News*, which deliberately sets to work stirring up strife, to throw at us the slur that we forsooth are the causes of all the trouble. It matters little whether we drink up or down stream—we always disturb the water, and should be eaten up for our temerity.

His Grace of Kingston.

The partizan press, even after the elections, managed to keep up a series of slurs on the noble prelate who stepped into the breach in a trying time against the enemies of Catholic schools. Why they have treated his stand on the matter in such a puerile fashion seems difficult to answer, except on the supposition (a very probable one) that they found his arguments too solid to be taken up in honest fashion. It requires a skilful and valiant combatant to take up a gage of battle thrown down by our champion, as more than one unhorsed knight can touch for. His Grace of Kingston is armed with the full panoply of the Christian soldier, and possesses, moreover, a brilliance of intellect and thoroughness of training unsurpassed in this Dominion; and his puny opponents have been content with standing outside the lists, and flinging their potty darts of malice at a supposed weak point in his defence. Such a course is surely unworthy of the men who are supposed to represent the intellect of the people, and who probably rejoice in the fulness of knowledge which results from the wondrous superior public school system of the country.

In several utterances of these journals last week the system of personal warfare was dropped and an attempt was made to shelve the disagreeable duty of answering Dr. Cleary by repeating the old cry of "no clergy in politics," or better still, "no priests in politics." Verily, the Canadian public is a strange being in some respects. A blatant ex-priest, who has been cut off from his Church for his crimes, would be received by a certain class in Ontario with open arms, and his political utterances are treasured up as gems beyond the most solid maxims of a Burke or a Jefferson; while if the saintly and learned prelate who has been forced to dismiss him were to utter his carefully pondered ideas regarding the best interests of the country, his words would be received with a storm of jeers and jibes. A clergyman of little education, a former stage-driver, was set at the head of a party which we were told, was to save this country from ruin, and a large number of people accepted his miserable farago as the highest ideal of patriotic government; but when a prelate with the experience of long years of government and the advantage of education in the best institutions in the world, together with a minister of brilliant parts and undoubted integrity, advance their views, they are greeted by these same men with the cry "no clergy in politics." The great majority of our people have shown that they trust the better men, but it is a sad fact that unfrocked priests and professional clergymen of the worst stripe possess unbounded influence with many voters in this enlightened Province, and a still more lamentable fact that the editors of the "onlighteners of the people" should bend to the mob, and adopt the levelling tactics of Voltaire in default of solid argument.

The National Bank of Scotland announces the issue of £140,481 four per cent. Toronto Local Improvement debentures at 101, repayable in 1904.