

# 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,  
C. J. Keenan and L. O'Byrne.

THURSDAY MARCH 15, 1894

## Calendar for the Week.

March 16—St. Zachary, Pope and Confessor.  
16—The Seven Dolors of the Blessed Virgin.  
17—St. Patrick, Bishop and Confessor.  
18—Palm Sunday.  
19—Ferial Office.  
20—Ferial Office.  
21—Ferial Office.

*The devotion of the "Forty Hours" opens on Palm Sunday in the Church of the Sacred Heart.*

## Catholic Higher Education.

The last issue of the *Evangelical Churchman* is a very remarkable one. Its leading article is one entitled "Lenten Duties," from which we extract the following.

Christians are brethren. "Christians must draw closer together as Christians, if they are to fulfil their work for the world. They cannot live the Christian life alone; they must fulfil their mission, not simply as individuals, but as a society. 'See how these Christians love one another' was the wondering cry of the old world."

Side by side with such sentiments we find another article entitled "The Failure of Higher Roman Catholic Education." Relying upon the authority of the *New York Independent* our contemporary works upon Washington University as a failure. One reason is financial difficulty. Another reason is want of men, both properly qualified professors and students in sufficient numbers. But the principal reason is that the Church of Rome "has refused liberty of thought, and has well-nigh crushed out among orthodox Catholics the spirit of scientific research."

None are so blind as those who will not see. That calumny against the Church is so threefold that the *Churchman* ought to be ashamed to be seen wearing it. It was parted with long ago by everyone with the first claim to scholarship, refinement and charity.

To tell the *Churchman* the honest truth, we are delighted that the Catholic Church has some one to think for us. It is more than can be said about other churches. If the *Churchman* had some one to think for him it would be better every way. Life is too short for us to study all the departments of knowledge, from philology up to theology, and from biology to metaphysics. Who does the *Churchman's* thinking in all these subjects? Our Church does the thinking for her children in all matters pertaining to faith and morals, because it is her right and duty to do so. She is the divinely appointed guardian of both. It is another thing altogether with the English Church. If we were members of that church we would not let even the *Evangelical Churchman* do our thinking. We would not allow him to tell us that "to be a true Lent the spiritual aspect must dominate all

also." The *Churchman* has no right to decide between true and false, and should not use the word "must." As there is no authority, in the Anglican Church there is no thought worthy of the name. Doubt there may be, and guessing too; but none of that unerring, ennobling thought, that God-like knowledge, whose glory it is to bend the knee to legitimate authority and bow the head to every heaven-sent truth. Is such thought slavery? Then give us its bondage. Its chains are golden. They bind the soul to heaven in truth and right and duty.

"All the great modern thinkers," the *Churchman* says, "have been outside of the pale of Rome." We do not know to what modern thinkers our contemporary refers. If he refers to Mill, Huxley, Spencer, and the rest of the Materialist school, we can retort. These are not to be found even in the elastic pale of the English Church. If the proposition implies that English, French, German and Italian thinkers have all been outside the Catholic Church, we deny it. It just shows the ignorance some critics have of Catholic literature and philosophy. Men like Newman, Ward, Manning, Faber, are a guarantee for the stand Catholics have taken. Fathers Perry and Secchi, both Jesuits, were eminent astronomers. Barff and Mivart are distinguished in science, while Paley has given us some of the best editions of the classics.

"As to philosophy," again says the *Churchman*, "original thought has long been dead amongst orthodox Catholics, and their professional students of philosophy only ring over and over again countless monotonous repetitions of St. Thomas." All that is gratuitous assumption, and displays a most woful ignorance of Catholic thought. It would be well if the *Churchman* would spend some time in repeating our St. Thomas. He would acquire a system instead of the hotch-potch mixture doled out to himself and his class—neither sense nor nonsense, neither philosophy nor wisdom, but poisonous sophistry, which is accountable for the scepticism and the irreligion of the age.

But we deny the imputation. Newman and Ward, whose names we have already mentioned, were Catholic philosophers. The latter was the only man whom England could furnish able to measure swords with John Stuart Mill. The most philosophical mind of the American continent was Brownson, who thought himself into the Catholic Church; and when in it, brought an originality and power to bear upon every question which placed him amongst the foremost thinkers of the nineteenth century. Rosmini in Northern Italy and Balmeiz in Spain are likewise amongst the greatest philosophers of the past fifty years.

It ill becomes the *Churchman* to taunt English speaking Catholics with a want of literature. A hundred years ago we were serfs. It was a crime for a Catholic to educate his son. If he did so it was in a foreign land and a strange tongue. How could they rival their wealthy, cruel fellow-countrymen? Yet be it not forgotten that Pope and Dryden were Catholic, while the *Churchman* cannot prove that

Shakespeare was a Protestant. The argument of the *Churchman* is historically unsound and ungenerous. Its assumption that the Washington University is a failure, bears the same characteristics. Considering everything—the fact that our people are not wealthy, that they cannot afford long University training, that our priests are needed for the essential duties of the ministry, the Catholic University is steadily advancing. But to put any failure at the door of Rome is absurd on the face of it; because, if the Catholic University of Washington has a founder and a patron, it is Leo XIII. the head of the Catholic Church. With a word of advice to the *Churchman* we are done. Read something about Catholic philosophy and learning—then criticize. It will be found that, in spite of the terrible struggle in which the Church is engaged, it has made, and is making, gigantic efforts in every branch of higher education.

## The Situation.

While the world in general applauds the calm, dignified attitude of the Irish Nationalists in the present crisis, there be croakers of the illiberal, domineering class. They, while aspersing the motives of the grand old man, and minimising his greatness, predict the downfall of Ireland's hopes for home legislation, and as a necessary corollary, a long continuation of landlord tyranny and Orange coercion methods. "Lord Rosebery," quoth the *Mail*, "is not a man to be governed by sentiment, and he is not in the least what is commonly called a crank—an appellation that would long ere this have been applied, colloquially at least, to Mr. Gladstone, if Mr. Gladstone had not been lifted above such a disrespectful characterization by the greatness of his character and the splendour of his personality." The *Mail* alone of Canadian journalists can get off paradoxes of this nature. How the same personality could be a crank and a mere sentimentalist, while distinguished for greatness of character and splendour of eminent abilities and virtues, is a problem which its cranky editors only may solve.

The Prussian Minister of Finance, Dr. Miquel, discussing the retirement of Mr. Gladstone, spoke of him in eulogistic terms of praise, and characterized him "as the greatest financial genius of modern times." The *Toronto Mail*, however, insinuates that he was poor at figures, whereas Lord Rosebery, it declares, "to use a common expression, knows how many beans make five—who will be exceedingly undesirous to be hampered by legacies of the past." And therefore, concludes the sapient oracle of pessimism: "It is not likely that he will feel bound in every particular to carry out either Mr. Gladstone's ideas of Home Rule or every plank of the New-castle platform."

Our own opinion is that just because Lord Rosebery is far-seeing, and knows his arithmetic, he will not allow the Empire to be for ever weakened by Orange Ascendancy at home, or by hatred and threats of retaliation by Irishmen at home and abroad. Why should the Premier, with his

modern views and modern education, not grapple with the old foggyism of Tory Ascendancy and Landlord feudalism, which are the bane and curse of England as well as of Ireland? He succeeds to Mr. Gladstone's policy of educating and elevating the masses, while restricting the privileges and curtailing the power of the aristocratic classes. Long since he adopted the Gladstonian view of strengthening the Empire by securing the gratitude and loyal attachment of the Irish people; and just because he knows "how many beans make five," he is able to reckon up the millions of Irish hearts and Irish right arms he may win over to Britain's cause by framing laws that will make the Irish people free, prosperous, independent and happy.

The *Mail* assigns another reason for its prediction of ill to Ireland's cause. It says the appointment of Sir William Vernon Harcourt looks very much like a shoving for the present of the Home Rule question. The reason assigned is that Sir William, although a clever debater, is rather jocular in his manner, and makes of politics an excellent sport rather than a serious duty—in fact, "that there is nothing he would rather see sunk fathoms deep than Home Rule for Ireland."

Sir William Vernon Harcourt has made very eloquent speeches in favor of Home Rule. His jocular criticisms had the effect of shaming many Englishmen into adopting a Home Rule policy. It was his sarcasm, and the fun he made of it, that killed Mr. Balfour's County Councils' Bill for Ireland. Lord Rosebery is so adept at calculating "how many beans make five" that, while estimating Mr. John Morley, Mr. Asquith and Mr. Campbell Bannerman at their just value, as able and zealous colleagues, he can discern just exactly the fine points in Sir William's character and genius that will make of him one of the shrewdest and most successful, as well as to all parties most acceptable Leader that can well replace the Grand Old Man.

The *Mail* says: "It looks as though Lord Rosebery intends, perhaps, to take advantage of the character he enjoys in the eyes of the British people, viz: that of a man who holds strong views as to the permanence and integrity of the Empire, and as to the protection of its coasts at home and expansion of its power abroad." There could be no stronger inducement for him to exist upon Mr. Gladstone's policy of Home Rule being adopted, and settled once for all. The strongest and most reliable bulwarks of a nation are loyal hearts to make treason impossible, and stout right arms to man its ramparts and defend its coasts. Home Rule, contentment and justice can alone procure such national defenses. Lord Rosebery is well aware of this truth, and at the nation's peril he would not swerve from it for a moment.

It makes little difference, however, to the Irish Nationalist party what man is chosen by Lord Rosebery, or by the Queen, to lead in the House of Commons. The party in power is committed to Home Rule for Ireland, and the moment it abandons that policy its fate is sealed. There are