

tion a few years ago, they sent a very polite invitation to the Holy Father at Rome to be present. Of course he could not accept. They then invited the Archbishop of Glasgow, and conferred upon him an Honorary Degree, stating that they did so because he was the representative of the successor to the founder of their University. Universities, as a rule, are supposed to be places in which science and scientific studies are pursued, and it would seem to be a little curious that a Church which was hostile to science should be the mother of all the oldest and most famous institutions of this kind in all parts of Europe, including the British Isles. That alone is sufficient proof, sufficient argument against such a theory, if any were required.

But I pass now from that. And I go on to ask you to consider some of the noted men of science, who have also been members of our Church. Please note:—that is what I limit myself to. I do not for an instant wish it to be understood that I am not fully aware of the fact that there is a very large and glorious list of men of science who are not members of our Church; some of them not members of any Church. I am not concerned with them. What I am concerned with is great scientific discoverers who were Catholic. And I will begin with those who are attached to the subject which I myself taught for over twenty years in England, namely Human Anatomy. There is hardly any subject in connection with which greater mis-statements have been made with regard to the attitude of the Church. You see it stated in some of the books, on the so-called Conflict between Religion and Science, that Boniface VIII. issued a bull forbidding all practice of human anatomy. Well of course if he had done that, it would have been a very serious thing. It would, as far as Boniface could manage, have put a final stop to all surgical and most medical investigations. One can see that bull gravely quoted in a certain number of books and held up as an ex-