

Technical and Bibliographic Notes / Notes techniques et bibliographiques

The Institute has attempted to obtain the best original copy available for filming. Features of this copy which may be bibliographically unique, which may alter any of the images in the reproduction, or which may significantly change the usual method of filming, are checked below.

L'Institut a microfilmé le meilleur exemplaire qu'il lui a été possible de se procurer. Les détails de cet exemplaire qui sont peut-être uniques du point de vue bibliographique, qui peuvent modifier une image reproduite, ou qui peuvent exiger une modification dans la méthode normale de filmage sont indiqués ci-dessous.

Coloured covers/
Couverture de couleur

Coloured pages/
Pages de couleur

Covers damaged/
Couverture endommagée

Pages damaged/
Pages endommagées

Covers restored and/or laminated/
Couverture restaurée et/ou pelliculée

Pages restored and/or laminated/
Pages restaurées et/ou pelliculées

Cover title missing/
Le titre de couverture manque

Pages discoloured, stained or foxed/
Pages décolorées, tachetées ou piquées

Coloured maps/
Cartes géographiques en couleur

Pages detached/
Pages détachées

Coloured ink (i.e. other than blue or black)/
Encre de couleur (i.e. autre que bleue ou noire)

Showthrough/
Transparence

Coloured plates and/or illustrations/
Planches et/ou illustrations en couleur

Quality of print varies/
Qualité inégale de l'impression

Bound with other material/
Relié avec d'autres documents

Continuous pagination/
Pagination continue

Tight binding may cause shadows or distortion along interior margin/
La reliure serrée peut causer de l'ombre ou de la distorsion le long de la marge intérieure

Includes index(es)/
Comprend un (des) index

Blank leaves added during restoration may appear within the text. Whenever possible, these have been omitted from filming/
Il se peut que certaines pages blanches ajoutées lors d'une restauration apparaissent dans le texte, mais, lorsque cela était possible, ces pages n'ont pas été filmées.

Title on header taken from:/
Le titre de l'en-tête provient:

Title page of issue/
Page de titre de la livraison

Caption of issue/
Titre de départ de la livraison

Masthead/
Générique (périodiques) de la livraison

Additional comments:
Commentaires supplémentaires:

Copy has manuscript annotations.

This item is filmed at the reduction ratio checked below/
Ce document est filmé au taux de réduction indiqué ci-dessous.

10X	12X	14X	16X	18X	20X	22X	24X	26X	28X	30X	32X
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

THE CATHOLIC SHIELD.

A MONTHLY CHRONICLE AND GENERAL REVIEW.

"Scuto circumdabit te veritas ejus."

Subscription: \$1.00 per annum in advance.

Single Copy, 10 Cts.

VOL. I.

OTTAWA, FEBRUARY, 1882.

No. 10.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I.—Publisher's Notice.....	145
II.—Events of the Month.....	145
III.—The True Idea of Canadian Loyalty.....	146
IV.—A little Bit of English (Mis) Rule in Ireland (continued).....	151
V.—The Appointment of a Catholic Inspector <i>vice</i> Mr. Buchan, promoted.....	153
VI.—Disease Gardens.....	154
VII.—Louise Latéau—The latest account of her life.....	155
VIII.—Church Chimes.....	157
IX.—Educational Notes.....	159

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

The next issue of the CATHOLIC SHIELD will appear on the 20th of March or thereabouts, and will be a double (March and April) number. As it will be the last of Vol. I, and the present Publisher's responsibility will end therewith, he has decided not to receive new subscriptions after date. Prompt payment is expected of all subscribers to Vol. I.

OTTAWA, Feb. 1, 1882.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH.

The third session of the fourth Parliament of Ontario was opened on January 12th. The following day the House began discussing the reply to the Lieutenant Governor's Speech from the Throne (this is a great country for thrones) and continued hard at it until the 27th, just a fortnight, when it passed after votes on two amendments, showing a large majority for the Government. During this long and tedious debate, the question of Free Trade *versus* Protection was dilated on by speakers on both sides, with just as much earnestness as if it were within the province of their legislation. Mr. Nowat's policy concerning the Boundary Award will likely be supported by the whole province. His grabbing policy *in re* the Mercer case is not approved by many friends of his administration.

Nova Scotia legislators were also convened for the transaction of business on January 19th. The province by the sea has caught the Railway fever, and a Syndicate of speculators is to be called in to bleed the public purse. One day sufficed the "Blue-noses" for the consideration of the Address, as they evidently meant work, not talk. One paragraph in the Lieutenant Governor's Speech cannot fail to interest Oscar Wilde and the big Sunflower school. It is that in which His Honor states, that "the Art Exhibition which took place in the city of Halifax last summer, under the patronage of His Excellency the Governor General, will no doubt be productive of good result in the development of taste and refinement among our people."

The jury trying Guiteau did not take long to arrive at a unanimous opinion that he was guilty of murder in the first degree. If the public hang-man could once get his hands on the murderer, he would do his duty with equal dispatch. But it appears that the end is not so near. There is a question of jurisdiction and several nice points of law to be first disposed of, and the blasphemous wretch may yet die a natural death.

Another wholesale slaughter charged to drink. New York State politicians, drunk and disorderly on a Hudson River Railway train, brought the cars to a sudden stop at Spuyten Duyvil, where no stoppage was expected. Another train running close behind, receiving no signal of the obstruction, plunged into the rear parlor car with terrible effect. Nine passengers were killed, and an unknown number injured, some of them fatally. Among the dead was the well known Jesuit missionary, Father Marechal, and Senator Wagner of "Wagner Coach" fame. The culprits escaped.

The Corporation of Dublin by a vote of 28 to 18 refused to pass the customary vote of thanks to Dr. Moyers, the retiring Lord Mayor, in consequence of his refusal to convene a special meeting to confer the freedom of the city on Parnell and Dillon. The newly elected Council, under the presidency of Lord Mayor Dawson, passed the resolution conferring the freedom of city on these gentlemen by a vote of 29 to 22. The city of Cork unanimously conferred the same honor on

Mr. Dillon, having already offered its freedom to Mr. Parnell. Thus does Irish public opinion condemn the Gladstone dictatorship.

It was Mr. T. D. Sullivan, M. P., who moved the resolution in the Dublin Corporation, in substance the same as that previously introduced by Mr. E. Dwyer Grey, M. P., since appointed High Sheriff of Dublin—another protest against coercion. In the course of a very able speech, Mr. Sullivan said: "An attempt would no doubt be made to get up a strong feeling against the 'No Rent' manifesto. It was very easy to get up strong feeling, and it was very easy to denounce the 'No Rent' manifesto, and to orate on it, but let them recollect this, that if 'No Rent' be a very bad boy, they had a right to have some sympathy for him when he was engaged in fighting a much greater rascal than himself, and that rascal was the monster of iniquity which goes by the name of Irish landlordism. Let them further consider that if 'No Rent' be a very bad boy, rack-rent was his father and starvation was his mother." All of which is respectfully submitted to the consideration of those Irishmen, and descendants of Irishmen, whose fine religious and moral feelings have been so severely shocked by this attempt to rob the landlords of their rights—their inalienable rights to starve their tenantry.

Mr. Chamberlain is not happy in his efforts to explain the "buck-shot" conduct of the Government towards the Land League. Recently he made an assertion that the avowed objects of the League prior to the "No Rent" manifesto were legal and approved by the Government. In reply to this the Duke of Argyll publishes a letter—his lordship has the *cucoethes scribendi* bad—declaring that the Government during 1880, when he was a member, proclaimed the objects of the Land League to be unlawful and unjust, and founded a State prosecution on their illegality. Mr. Chamberlain ought to read the story of George Washington and his little hatchet.

Public sentiment in England is aroused against the Russians on account of their persecution of the Jews. At a meeting in London, chiefly attended by lords and bishops, resolutions were adopted condemning the "resources of civilization" as applied in the Empire of the Czar, and appealing to the humanity of the world for a verdict against the Russian authorities. This is just like John Bull all through history—plucking the mote from his neighbor's eye, heedless of the beam in his own. "O generation of vipers—how can you speak good things whereas you are evil?"

Gambetta has been shoved aside for the moment. His little bill for the revision of the French Constitution met with a reception which he evidently did

not anticipate. The principal changes proposed were: 1. Election of Senators by both chambers for a term of nine years instead of life; 2. Adoption of the *scrutin de liste* principle; 3. Depriving the Senate of the power of restoring items stricken from the Budget by the deputies. Gambetta desired the bill to be submitted to a committee of nine; but the extreme Left would not hear to this, and sent it to a committee of twenty-seven. This was a snub, the meaning of which the uncrowned Caesar was not slow to understand, and after some swaggering, which only made matters worse, he prepared to step down and out with the best possible grace. The committee, while refusing to entertain the principle of the *scrutin de liste*—a system of voting which would destroy minority representation—found his project of revising the Constitution altogether too limited, and, egged on no doubt by Louise Michel and Rochefort, demanded a more sweeping measure. In their report they vigorously denounced the would-be-dictator. The result was the rejection of the Government policy by an overwhelming majority, and the resignation of Gambetta and his colleagues. De Freycinet has succeeded in forming a ministry, but the disturbed condition of the *Bourse* shows that he cannot command public confidence.

THE TRUE IDEA OF CANADIAN LOYALTY.*

Time was, and not so very long ago, when an article such as Mr. Le Sueur has contributed to the *Canadian Monthly* would have caused writer and publisher to be "reasonably suspected" of divers nefarious designs against Her Majesty the Queen, her Crown and dignity, and exposed them to the most virulent newspaper abuse. Until quite recently the press of this country was almost entirely controlled by "Mother Country" vigilants, and woe betide the unfortunate scribe who incurred their displeasure. Within a short time public opinion has undergone a remarkable change in this respect, although even now some of the most prominent journals are so utterly British in sentiment, that the slightest favorable allusion to Canadian Independence is sufficient to throw them into a frenzy; and Mr. Le Sueur tells us, towards the close of his clever paper, that he is not forgetful that the foremost statesman of Canada has recently denounced all our aspirations towards a change of political status for Canada as "veiled treason." But the foremost statesman might as well try to check the ocean wave with a besom, as hope to divert Canadian political thought from its natural channel. Civic corporations, in fawning addresses, may assure His Excellency the Governor General of their sympathy and attachment to the person and government of Her Most Gracious Majesty

* W. D. Le Sueur, B. A., in the *Canadian Monthly*.

My copy, lent to
 Fr. Whelan was never returned. As
 his death it could not be found
 in the library.

the Queen, and of their unalterable desire for the happy perpetuation of British connection; but if His Excellency accepts their gushing protestations of loyalty as an expression of popular feeling, then he does not know what kind of stuff mayors and aldermen are made of in this Canada of ours. The young men of Canada have outgrown the colonial apron strings; they are tired of a mock Court and a sham House of Lords; they want a simpler form of government—a system more in keeping with the resources of the country and the requirements of the population. To them Canadian loyalty has but one meaning—"devotion to the land of their birth, respect for its laws and institutions, and faith in its future."

Mr. Le Sueur's exposition of "The True Idea of Canadian Loyalty" was called forth by an article from the pen of Mr. Todd on the question, "Is Canadian Loyalty a Sentiment or a Principle?" By Canadian Loyalty he meant the loyalty of Canada to the Parent State, which, whether sentiment or principle, Mr. Le Sueur considers, "the march of events has, for years past, been more and more rendering obsolete."

He then proceeds to demolish Mr. Todd's argument, and show that he did not place before the readers of the *Canadian Monthly* a true idea of Canadian Loyalty:—

"According to him it consists in a strong desire and determination to preserve the present colonial status of Canada. To be loyal as a Canadian is to wish to maintain Canada's present relation to Great Britain and to the British Empire as a whole. To be disloyal, therefore, would be to wish to disturb that relation, either by making Canada entirely independent or by attaching her to some other political system. Loyalty is a duty and a virtue; it is something which no one can reputably disown; therefore it is the duty of every Canadian to strive to maintain the existing connection between Canada and the Mother Country. Only those who either are indifferently so duty, or who have very mistaken ideas of duty, can countenance any effort or scheme to disturb the *status quo*."

Now these I respectfully submit, are not self-evident propositions; and yet, strange to say, the able writer whose name has been mentioned makes no effort to prove them. He thinks it sufficient to try and give an historical explanation of what he takes to be the dominant, and all but universal, feeling of Canadians towards the political system under which they are living. He assumes an abounding loyalty of the type above described—a loyalty to Great Britain—and then sets to work to show how the feeling was developed. His illustrations unhappily hardly serve even the purpose for which they are intended, far as that falls short of the proper scope of any general discussion of Canadian loyalty. The chief point made is that Canada was settled in part by U. E. Loyalists, men who failed to sympathize with the resistance made by their fellow-colonists of America to the tyranny of King George the Third, and who, either voluntarily or upon compulsion, forsook their homes and sought refuge under the British flag. The force, however, of this argument is greatly weakened when we are expressly told that the great majority of these would willingly have remained in the United States, sacrificing their allegiance to Great Britain, if the odium into which

they had fallen with their neighbours had not made life there unendurable. A thousand citizens of Boston, we are assured, though opposed to the Revolution, declared that they 'would never have stirred if they thought the most abject submission would procure them peace.' One can read this over several times without being profoundly impressed by the 'loyalty' of these thousand citizens. That being compelled, in spite of their readiness for abject submission, to seek homes in another country they should have carried thither a strong aversion to the land that had cast them out, is quite conceivable; the difficult thing is to suppose that they should furnish to their adopted country any very admirable type of loyalty, unless by loyalty we mean the mere habit of submission to arbitrary authority. If these were conspicuous 'loyalists' then perhaps their successors of to-day would be equally prepared for 'the most abject submission,' if a majority of the people of Canada were to decide in favor of independence. I do not say that they would; it is Mr. Todd who somewhat infelicitously forces upon us the suggestion that they might.

When therefore, Mr. Todd speaks of 'our forefathers' having 'deliberately preferred the loss of property and the perils incident to their flight into the wilderness rather than forego the blessings of British supremacy and of monarchical rule,' we are compelled to remind him that, according to his own express statement, this was not the case. They were prepared to let British supremacy and monarchical rule go by the board, if only their fellow-citizens would have pardoned them their lukewarmness in the great struggle. 'Their only safety,' we are told, 'was in flight.' 'They sought refuge in Canada and Nova Scotia from the hardships to which they were exposed in the old colonies because of their fidelity to the British Crown.' We may therefore infer that had the colonists in general been a little more magnanimous or forbearing to the non-sympathizing minority, the latter would never have trodden the wilds of Canada, or furnished an argument for Canadian loyalty as understood by Mr. Todd."

The United Empire Loyalists then were not such "stalwarts" after all. Had the American colonists only trusted them after the war, and given them a chance to redeem themselves, they would have whistled "Yankee Doodle" like the best of them. But, as there was no room for them on the other side, they came northward, swearing undying allegiance to the Throne, because they could not help it. And Mr. Le Sueur insinuates, that "perhaps their successors of to-day would be equally prepared for 'the most abject submission,' if a majority of the people of Canada were to decide in favor of independence." We do not doubt it. While Mr. Todd believes that Loyalty is a sentiment and not a principle, Mr. Le Sueur contends that it is both a sentiment and a principle, and that there is no contradiction between the two. "It is a sentiment in its essential nature, and a principle as being a source and rule of action." This is the correct idea, and is beautifully elaborated by Dr. Brownson, who says: "Loyalty is not simply an amiable sentiment, but a duty, a moral virtue * * * The American people have been chary of the word loyalty, perhaps because they regard it as the correlative of royalty; but loyalty is

rather the correlative of law, and is in its essence love and devotion to the sovereign authority, however constituted or wherever lodged. It is as necessary, as much a duty, as much a virtue in republics as in monarchies; and nobler examples of the most devoted loyalty are not found in the history of the world than were exhibited in the ancient Greek and Roman republics, or than have been exhibited by both men and women in the young republic of the United States. Loyalty is the highest, noblest, and most generous of human virtues, and is the human element of that sublime love or charity which the inspired Apostle tells us is the fulfilment of the law. It has in it the principle of devotion, of self-sacrifice, and is, of all human virtues, that which renders man most God-like."

Having defined Loyalty, Mr. Le Sueur continues:—

"The word loyalty calls up many ideas, but the more we examine it the more clearly we see that the largest element in it is the element of fidelity upon the part of an inferior to a superior, or of a lesser to a greater power. We do not talk of the loyalty of Great Britain to Canada. If in any relations between the two we were to speak of Great Britain having followed a 'loyal' course of conduct, the loyalty in that case would be towards some high standard of national duty conceived as equally binding upon great states and small. We speak of the 'loyal' observance of a treaty, and there again the loyalty is towards an abstract conception of right and equity, that conception ranking in our moral estimation far above the mere expediencies of the hour. Canada or any other country could thus loyally fulfil an obligation, whether contracted towards an equal, a superior or an inferior power. But when loyalty to England is spoken of the idea that comes to our mind is not the loyal fulfilling of engagements, but fidelity as of a person to a person, and, it must be added, of a dependent to a patron or protector. And, just as in personal relations, this feeling is only justified where services are rendered by the stronger to the weaker which the latter is unable to render to himself; so, between countries, an occasion for loyalty only arises when the stronger community does that for the weaker which the weaker is unable to do for itself. In such a case the stronger country has a right to expect that the weaker will show a due appreciation of the benefits it derives from the connection, and will brave perils rather than forsake its protector in an hour of trial. We must, however, assume that the services rendered by the stronger power are rendered disinterestedly. If a state plants a colony in some distant land, and there seeks to control its commerce in its own interest, without regard to the interests of the new settlement, I fail to see that it can justly claim the loyalty of the latter. I do not think that any loyalty was due from Ireland to England in the days when England was oppressing, in every possible way, Irish trade and industry. The loyalty of the American colonies survived, as it seems to me, by many years any equitable claim of the Mother Country to such a feeling on their part. There are those, no doubt, who admire a loyalty that no injustice can quench; but there are others again who see in loyalty carried to such a length only a servile lack of self-respect, and who would rather have in their veins the blood of 'some village Hampden' than that of a 'loyalist' who offered in vain 'the

most abject submission' as the price of remaining in a country that, *without his aid*, had vindicated its liberty."

The writer next undertakes to show that England no longer desires to preserve the connection with Canada, and to this end quotes from the speeches of several distinguished members of the British Parliament, including cabinet ministers under different administrations. He first refers to the discussion which took place in the House of Commons on the 28th March, 1867, upon the application of the Canadian Government for the guarantee of a loan of £3,000,000 sterling for the building of the Intercolonial Railway. Mr. (now Sir Charles) Adderly, then Under Secretary of State for the Colonies, who moved the resolution, said that he did not approve in the abstract of guarantees of colonial loans, and the reason he favored this one was because it appeared to him "the only way of making the new Confederation independent of the United States was to construct this important railway (the Intercolonial) which would enable Canada to develop itself, and rely entirely upon its own resources * * * The Confederation would take away *the langor of dependence upon England*, which had hitherto paralysed the divided government." Mr. Cave, member for Barnstaple, who opposed the motion, denounced the whole thing as "a colossal job," and said that he did not see what interest England could have in so entirely severing the Canadians from the United States. "He thought the safety of that country consisted in friendly communication with the United States. * * * It would be better to have the whole onus of its defence thrown upon Canada itself. If, instead of giving £3,000,000 with a view of separating it from the United States, we were to give £10,000,000 to join and unite them, it would be more patriotic." "Did these sentiments," asks Mr. Le Sueur, "provoke a perfect storm of indignation in the House of Commons? By no means; nobody was moved to indignation at all, and Mr. Gladstone, who followed, did not think it necessary to do more than repel the insinuation of jobbery that Mr. Cave had (of course most unjustly) thrown out." Had one of our foremost statesmen been there, he would have done the "indignation" with grand effect. Mr. Gladstone looked upon the proposed guarantee as "auxiliary to the great work of Confederation, the purpose of which was the development of the resources of the colonies, and, along with that, the gradual and speedy development of their self-reliance." England had herself in the past weakened the self-reliance of the colonies by too visibly taking them under her protection; and the way to remedy that was now "to raise their political position to the very highest point, in order that with that elevated position their sense of responsibility may also grow." Mr. Lowe, now Lord Sherbrooke, objected to the guarantee, because it was calculated to teach Canadian colonists the very false lesson that England took "a peculiar interest in the

manner in which they chose to regulate their internal affairs and their relation with the United States. Now that we have given them self government, let them manage their affairs their own way, and do not let us make ourselves responsible for the manner in which they regulate their internal or foreign relations. The management of our own affairs is quite sufficient for us, without mixing ourselves up in matters with which we have no concern, and over which we do not for a moment profess to exercise the slightest control."

If any change has since come over the feeling of the British public towards the colonies, Mr. Le Sueur would like to see some distinct evidence of it. The British public and British representative men, he thinks, would have to push want of interest and sympathy almost to the point of brutality if, in spite of the effusive character of Canadian loyalty, as officially and conventionally expressed, they absolutely refused us, on their part, any answering expressions. "But where," he asks, "are the signs that Great Britain desires any closer union with, or responsibility for, Canada now than she did at the time of that debate?" Echo answers, where? Certainly there are none in Lord Lorne's reply to a "trooly loil" address presented to him by the Ottawa City Council on his return from England. "I beg to thank you" he said, "as the representative of Her Majesty, for the loyal words contained in your address." But he immediately added: "During my visit to England I have been impressed by the great attention which is now being paid to any matters connected with Canada. I think that the opening of the North West has shown the people in the old countries that the capacity of this country must be considered in a totally different light than formerly, when the population extended only over the older provinces. *The possibilities of a national existence for Canada are re-ognized* now that you have an immense unoccupied territory whose value and character are known and with which you are about to be placed in full railway communication." A curt "thank you" was all the mayor and aldermen of Ottawa got for their enthusiastic assurance of super-abundant loyalty to the Crown, while it was strongly intimated that England didn't expect them to make such a show of themselves, since the possibilities of a national existence for Canada were fully recognised.

Mr. Le Sueur thinks that Canada has been a little to blame in being so slow to read the signs of the times, or to draw the lessons which practical men in England were drawing from the political and commercial development of these North Western colonies. "We have been to blame," he says, "in allowing the organ of a purely conventional opinion to persuade us that what meant everything meant nothing, and that what meant nothing—namely, the expressions of interest extorted from British politicians by our persistent and

almost pathetic loyalty—meant everything." To which he adds:

"However, there is not much harm done. To have moved too slowly in such a matter is better than to have moved too fast. There exist no impediments at the present moment to the most amicable and cordial relations between Canada and the Mother Country; only, what the latter desires, and is quite right in desiring, is that Canada shall offer, not her loyalty—that is too much—but her friendship as an independent state. To have on this Continent a nation bound to her by the strongest ties of sympathy and good will, a nation whose institutions would, in the main, be hers, and that would be disposed to throw whatever influence it could exert on the side of any reasonable claims she might make, would be a real and, one would judge, important advantage to Great Britain; while the knowledge that she could not be attacked on Canadian territory would take an immense burden and responsibility off her shoulders. Those who look favourably upon Canadian independence are sometimes asked what grievance they have against the Mother Country. We have no grievance; far from it, we feel that we have every reason to cherish the warmest feelings towards that country, and we do cherish such feelings. We hold (if I may venture to speak for many who I know share the views expressed in this article) that the public policy of England to-day is governed by higher moral standards than that of any other nation of the world. We consider our country fortunate in having learnt in the British school; and our hope is that when the people of Canada shall have relieved the Parent State of all responsibility on their behalf, they will show the world that their education has been a good one, and that if they have not got on in all respects as fast as certain more highly stimulated communities, they have at least learnt a few important things well. Grievances! the idea is proposterous. Would England ask us what we had to complain of if we were respectfully to suggest that the time had come for us to start upon an independent career of our own? Imagine such a question being asked by the House of Commons that listened either approvingly, or else with indifference, to the speeches of Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Lowe, to say nothing of Mr. Cave."

Now there are many who share Mr. Le Sueur's views on the subject of his article, and form a considerable portion of the population of this country, who do not cherish, and feel they have no reason to cherish, the warmest feelings towards the "Mother Country;" who, to tell the truth, would not shed a single tear, but on the contrary would heartily rejoice if, tomorrow, England were made to bite the dust. There are French Canadians here, children of the soil, who indignantly deny that they are "Englishmen speaking the French," as the late Sir George Cartier used to boast. Here too, in large numbers, are the descendants of Irish exiles who, like the Irish everywhere, hate England with an undying hatred. By them, scarcely less than by the Irish at home and in the United States, "the wrongs which England has inflicted are faithfully remembered; her services are viewed with incredulity or resentment; her name and fellowship are abominated; the news of her prosperity heard with disgust; the anticipation of her possible reverses nursed and cherished as the best

of consolations...It is as if the air rang with the old Jewish words, 'O daughter of Babylon, blessed shall he be who shall repay thee as thou has paid to us.' * Speaking for the latter, who are as loyal to Canada as those for whom Mr. Le Sueur ventures to speak, we ask him not to expect us to participate in the sympathy and good will so eloquently professed towards the "Mother Country," which by the way, has no parental claims to one half of our population at least.

The loyalty of Canadians to Canada means then, in a word, "that we feel there is a place in the family of nations for Canada, and that our ambition is that she should fill it." This much settled, Mr. Le Sueur proceeds:—

"Considering the matter further we find that whereas there is little or nothing we can do by way of giving a practical turn to our loyalty to England, there is every thing to do when we once make up our minds that what is needed is loyalty to Canada. Not a day passes over our heads without bringing us opportunities of doing something directly or indirectly for the good of our common country. The true patriot is not he who swaggers over what his nation can do, or who waxes eloquent over its vast extent of territory, its boundless resources and its unimaginable future; but he who labours practically, in however humble a sphere, to advance its interests. Every honest vote cast is a service to the commonwealth. To pay honest dues to the Government, to do honest work for it at an honest price, is a better proof of loyalty than to make loyal speeches or to drink loyal toasts. If the practical good sense and good feeling of our people had not taught them better, there would by this time have been in their mind an almost complete divorce between the ideas of loyalty and the general idea of good citizenship; seeing that loyalty, as presented to them, was almost wholly a thing of phrases and vague sentiment. As it is, there is no doubt that Canada has suffered much from the weakening of the idea of loyalty consequent upon the uncertainty existing as to its proper direction or object. The effort to sit on two stools generally results in sitting on neither. The loyalty heretofore preached was loyalty to Great Britain; the loyalty demanded by circumstances, but never preached, was loyalty to Canada, as a country destined to enter sooner or later on an independent career. The result has been a lack in Canada of that public spirit which depends for its development upon a 'strong sense of political existence,'—to recall an expression used by Mr. Gladstone. This lack nearly all thoughtful Canadians feel: it constitutes one of the leading differences between Canada and the neighbouring republic, where public spirit has been developed in an eminent degree. To take but one illustration. We have two cities in Canada of considerable population and wealth. In many respects we feel that we can be proud of them; but in neither does there exist such a thing as a public library accessible to all classes. Yet, in either city, a very small percentage subtracted from the superfluous wealth expended upon private residences would have provided such a library, and done away with what has often been felt as a reproach. Upon this point, however, it is needless to insist. It is vain to look for a healthy

growth of public spirit so long as the position of Canada is as indeterminate as it is to-day. If there have been any recent grounds for encouragement in this respect, it is because something in the air tells us to prepare for the better destinies awaiting us in the future."

We would strongly advise Mr. Le Sueur and others who have faith in a Canadian nationality, to study the Encyclical *Diuturnum*, published by the Leo XIII on June 29th, 1881. The reciprocal duties of governments and citizens are there distinctly traced. "In order that justice may be preserved in government," says the Holy Father, "it is of very great moment that they who rule states should understand that political power is not devised for the profit of any individual whatever, and that public affairs must be administered for the advantage of those who are committed to their charge, not of those to whom the charge is committed." Again he says: "Touching political government, the Church rightly teaches that it proceeds from God; for she finds this clearly attested by the Holy Scriptures and the monuments of Christian antiquity, and besides no doctrine can be conceived which is more agreeable to reason, and more conducive to the welfare of both ruler and people.* * The teachings upon political power invented by modern persons have already brought men great afflictions, and it is to be feared that they entail great evils in the future. For, to refuse to refer to God, as its author, the right of governing, is nothing less than to shear political authority of its finest glory, and cut away the nerve of its strength. As to their saying that it depends on the caprice of the multitude, in the first place it is a false opinion; then, it is to establish authority on too light and unstable a foundation. Roused and stimulated by these theories, popular passions will grow more and more insolent, and to the serious injury of the republic will slip easily and smoothly into secret movements and open seditions.* * Therefore we must have recourse to a higher and more efficacious principle of obedience. Men yield to a sense of duty and are moved by a wholesome fear of God. Religion, which, by her own force, influences men's minds and bends their very wills, can demand of them to be attached to those who govern them not only for obedience sake, but also for benevolence and charity which is the best guardian of their security." Here is the true basis of a Canadian nationality. A structure raised upon any other cannot last. "Except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it."

The concluding part of Mr. Le Sueur's article is devoted to the opinions on Canada's future held by Sir John A. MacDonald and Mr. Blake, neither of whom believes a separate national existence possible. The writer ably supports his own views to the end, as the following will show:

"I am not forgetful that the foremost statesman of Canada has recently denounced all our aspirations

* Cardinal Newman—"Historical sketches," Vol. 3, p. 257.

towards a change of political status for Canada as 'veiled treason,' and has avowed his preference for annexation to the United States, if independence were the only alternative. That opinion will carry great weight; but the question is one which interests too intimately every Canadian, whatever his position in society, for any weight of authority to be wholly conclusive. We must all think this matter out for ourselves, and shape our conclusions under the gravest sense of responsibility. Canada must belong, we are told, either to the British system or to the American system. Strictly speaking, however, there is no 'British system' for Canada to belong to. There is a kingdom of Great Britain which Canada can continue to make responsible for her foreign policy, or rather whose foreign policy—without having any voice in the matter—Canada may bind herself to follow and accept the consequences of; but there is no such organization of the British empire as a whole as there is of the different states of the American Union, and consequently there is no British 'system' in which Canada can claim to have a place. Mr. Blake's suggestion of an Imperial Federation aims at creating such a system; but the idea is characterized by Sir John A. Macdonald as wholly impracticable. We are told that as a separate country we should be obliged to raise 'the phantom of an army and navy;' but it was no phantom of an army at least that British statesmen plainly intimated to us in the debate referred to, we should have to raise if we wished Great Britain to assume any responsibility for our defence. What did Mr. Gladstone mean when he said (*u. s.*, page 752): 'If Canada is to be defended, the main element and power in the defence must always be the energy of a free people fighting for their own liberties. That is the centre around which alone the elements of defence can be gathered; and the real responsibility for the defence must lie with the people themselves.' Would a phantom army meet this requirement? I hardly think Mr. Gladstone would say so. The lesson drawn by Mr. Gladstone from the Fenian invasion was that Canada should 'take on herself, as circumstances shall open themselves, the management and control of her own frontier,' not only as 'a means of raising her position in the world by the fulfilment of her duties of freedom,' but 'as an escape from actual peril.' He did not mean to say 'that in the event of the occurrence of danger, the arm of England would be shortened, or its disposition to use its resources freely and largely in aid of the colonies would be in the slightest degree impaired;' only he wished the colonies to understand distinctly that henceforth they were to bear their full share of peril, responsibility and expense.

"It is unfortunately the opinion of many that the experiment of complete self-government in Canada would not be worth trying; and not a few, probably, will be found to echo the sentiment that annexation would be preferable. To my mind, this seems to argue a low estimate of the value of the institutions we now enjoy. If there is no special virtue in them, and if our civilization has no characteristics worth preserving, then, no doubt, annexation *might* be preferable. The opinion, however, seems a reasonable one, that, considering how different our political education has been from that of the people of the United States, and considering that, if our connection with Great Britain is severed, it will be with the heartiest good will on both sides, and on our side with not a little of the regret that arises in the heart when the vessel's prow is turned from the land we love, it would be in every way advantageous that we should abide in our lot and main-

fully try to work out our own destinies in our own way. The people of the United States have abundance of territory, and have all the political problems on their hands they can satisfactorily grapple with. What their system needs is consolidation and compression, not extension with added strain. Here we are, indeed, but four millions and a half to day; but it does not yet appear what we shall be. To ask for annexation would imply that we do not hold ourselves competent to manage our vast heritage of fertile soil, and noble rivers, of forests and mines and harbors. Is it so? Let the youth of Canada answer. And, as they answer, let them tell us also how they understand 'Canadian loyalty'—whether in the antiquated sense of continued dependence upon an overburdened Parent State, or in the new sense of earnest devotion to the land that has borne us, of respect for its institutions and faith in its future."

M. J. Whelan.

A LITTLE BIT OF ENGLISH (MIS) RULE IN IRELAND.

(Continued.)

To prove that we have not brought this charge of "hired assassination" ("guiltful murder" as he himself afterwards calls it) against Raleigh in vain, we must continue our history.

His latest biographer, Mr. Edward Edwards, thus deals with these hired assassinations and the factors thereof.

"On one other important matter Raleigh, Carew and Cecil wore at one. In regard to what in the phrase "of the day were called 'practices against rebels' they were as little troubled with scruples of conscience as Sir Humphrey Gilbert or Sir Henry Sidney, or Arthur Lord Grey of Wilton had been a few years earlier. In plain English 'practices against rebels' meant the deliberate assassination of rebels, or even of persons vehemently suspected of an intention to rebel."

This assassination not only of actual rebels but even of persons suspected of an *intention to rebel*, is a curious phase of retributive justice, and would startle the modern reader by its thoroughness, were it not that we have it in a refined manner in these our days. Our "suspects" are only suspected of an intention to rebel, and though not assassinated are lauded in Kilmainham Jail, to be dealt with, as bad provisions, bad ventilation and solitary confinement have ever dealt with men of ardent minds and aspirations.

Mr. Froude quotes a letter from Carew, written in 1602, to the Lord Deputy Mountjoy, in which he describes with commendable coolness, how Hugh O'Donnell, who had gone to Spain for assistance, was followed by a hired assassin, who poisoned him in the Castle of Simancas. "The assassin at his coming in "Spain," writes Carew, "was suspected by O'Donnell, because he embarked at Cork, but afterwards he insinuated his access, and O'Donnell is dead. Ho

"(the assassin) never told the President in what manner he would kill him, but did assure him it should be effected."

A letter written by Raleigh, Mr. Payne Collier thinks in 1598, proves that these "practices against rebels," in plain English, "hired assassinations," were in full swing, and gives us likewise our Knight-of-the-Velvet-Cloak's estimate of them.

"It can be no disgrace," he writes, "if it weare knowen that the killinge of a rebel weare practised; for you see that the lives of anoynted princes are daylye sought, and we have *always in Ireland* given head money for the killinge of rebels, who ar evermore proclaymed at a price. So was the Earl of Desmoude, and so have all rebels been practised against."

These two sentences form one of Elizabeth's pet gentlemen teach us much. In the first place, they show us conclusively and beyond cavil, that hired assassination was an ordinary mode of warfare in those days in Ireland, and that Raleigh at least, if not the rest of the gentlemen, thought it no disgrace. In the second place, they teach us, that theology was not one of Raleigh's strong points, whatever assassination may have been. That "it can be no disgrace to assassinate a rebel because the lives of anoynted princes are daylye sought" is a strange argument, and may show forth Raleigh as a trickster to his conscience, but will hardly satisfy even a school boy theologian.

But things did not always go smooth between assassin hirer and assassin, as Raleigh regrets in one of his letters. "I am more sorrye for being deceived" he tells us "than for being declared in the practice."

Sir George Carew, it appears, had hired an assassin to whom he gave "a pistol, some munitions and ten pounds in money" to kill John Fitz Thomas, the owner of a fine estate, but "one Coppinger sometime a footman to Sir Walter Raleigh, who had promised the assassin faythfullye to assist him" snatched the weapon from his hand, as he was about to shoot Fitz Thomas in Arlow Woods, where they were passing with him alone.

Raleigh thinks it a greater disgrace to have been deceived in this footman, than to have been discovered in the practice of assassination. Elizabeth's gentlemen had strange ideas of ethics.

And why not, since these same ethics were inspired from the highest quarter? Manuscripts published in our time by the Rolls Office prove this. When Sir Henry Sidney, three hundred years ago, invited John O'Neill, the great chief of Ulster, to an interview within the Pale, O'Neill answered that "he had much affection for Sir Henry, but that the Deputy's predecessor, the Earl of Sussex, had twice attempted to assassinate him. That after such experience his timorous Irish would not trust him any more in English hands." Now let it be noted, that up to a recent period historians have always denounced this accusation as "a foul libel upon the blunt and honest

Sussex." Irish tradition however was against them. It was a question of a long memoried people and unwritten history on the one hand, against partial writers on the other. A letter lately unearthed from Essex to Elizabeth, written from Ardrachan on the 24th August 1561, vindicates O'Neill's charge and proves that "practices against rebels," in plain English, assassination of rebels, were not unknown, nor even distasteful to England's greatest Queen. Sussex, writing to the Queen, describes the arrival of two messengers from O'Neill's camp, one of whom, named Grey, he forthwith attempted to hire for the assassination.

"I swore him upon the bible," he writes, "to keep secret that I should say unto him, and assured him, if it were known during the time I had government there, that besides the breach of his oath, it should cost him his life. I used long circumstance in persuading him to serve your Highness, to benefit his country and to procure assurance of living to him, this forever by doing of that which he might easily do. He promised to do what I would. In fine I brake with (to) him to kill Shan O'Neill: and bound myself by oath to see him have a hundred marks of land by the year to him and to his heirs for his reward. He seemed desirous to serve your Highness and to have the land; but fearful to do it, doubting his own escape with safety."

That all this was by no means distasteful to Elizabeth is evident, since as Mr. Froude naively puts it, "it is sadly certain that Sussex (after this letter) was continued in office." Mr. Froude thinks "the Lord Deputy's assassination plots were but the forlorn resources of a man who felt his work *too much for him*." Carrying our minds down to another Lord Deputy's time, may we not say that my Lord Deputy Forster's imprisonments of "suspects" are but the forlorn resources of a man who feels his work *too much for him*; or, as Punch, in one of his inimitable cartoons in Lord John Russell's time ("the little Lord") immediately after the passage of the Ecclesiastical Titles Bill, had it: "John I am sorry—but you are too small for the place."

And there is another consideration which suggests itself to the mind from my Lord Deputy's letter. If your modern Irish Landlord is in any way descended from this man, who got a hundred marks of land to him and his forever, for killing Shan O'Neill, your modern Irish Landlord has less than no title to his land.

Two years later O'Neill again ranted the English troops. A treaty of peace was accordingly made. Not indeed that Essex intended to give up there ways that are dark. He had failed to accomplish his plots in the field; he hoped now to succeed under the cover of friendship. As a first evidence of returning cordiality, a present of wine was sent to Shan O'Neill from Dublin. It was consumed at his table, but the poison

had been unskillfully prepared. The poisoner had been too eager. The drugged wine brought Shan and half his household to the edge of the grave, but no one actually died.

It is true the guilt of this transaction could never be fixed on Essex. The poisoning of the wine was traced to an English resident in Dublin of the comprehensive name of Smith, who confessed his guilt and took the entire responsibility upon himself. This was not to be wondered at, neither does it exonerate Sussex. If Smith, like Grey in the former attempt, had been "sworn upon the bible to keep secret that should be said to him," and had been reminded by "long circumstance" that "any other conduct should cost him his life," it is not to be wondered at that he did not betray his employer; and all the more so indeed because he knew that he had that employer in his power, and that he felt secure, that that employer would not dare allow him to be punished lest in his extremity he should be driven to betray him. There are wheels within wheels in crime as in all other machinery.

Raleigh know all this, and a great deal more. He knew that if Sussex' poisoner had been a bungler, Sir Henry Sidney had finally succeeded, and that Sidney's success was due to one of that band of gentlemen with whom he himself was associated.

H. B.

(To be continued.)

THE APPOINTMENT OF A CATHOLIC INSPECTOR *vice* MR. BUCHAN, PROMOTED.

The editorial article in the January number, advocating the appointment of a Catholic Inspector of Separate Schools, and showing the justness of the demand for such an officer, has met with the hearty approval of all friends of Catholic education, who recognize that what our schools need, what is essential to their highest efficiency, is a constant, thorough and impartial supervision. It has been said, with truth, that the most important branch of administration, as connected with education, relates to Inspection. In fact "Inspection is the salt of elementary education." "A school," says Everett, "is not a clock which you can wind up, and then leave it to go of itself. Our railroads and factories require some directing, controlling and constantly supervising mind, for their highest efficiency, and do not our schools need the same?"

To what can we trace the present superiority of the High Schools compared with their position a dozen years ago, except to the energy, ability and watchfulness of the Inspectors placed over them? These same officers are directed to examine Separate Schools in cities and incorporated towns. Though excellent men for the positions to which they were first appointed, they are in no way suited to inspect the lower classes

of Public Schools. For it must necessarily result that gentlemen accustomed to examine in classics, in the higher mathematics, and in the master compositions of our own language, cannot readily bring their minds to take an active interest in the feeble efforts of a child in mastering the difficulties of the alphabet, or in wrestling with the perplexities of subtraction. Indeed, it is too much to expect; and the Minister of Education in asking them to undertake such duties must either have deemed them many-sided men capable of doing all kinds of work; or else, (which surely is not the case) must have meant to deprive our schools of any efficient inspection.

Let us note the result of imposing upon the Inspectors work of such widely different nature. Ask the teachers in the towns, if their schools have adequate inspection? Nay; excepting half a dozen of our foremost schools, if they have any inspection at all by the High School Inspectors? And the answer will be they *have not*. The custom has been, when inspecting a school with a staff of four to six teachers, that they occupy, at most, two *hours*, not two or three *days*, as by law required. The examination never extends to classes lower than the fourth. The other divisions may indeed be looked at, but the Inspector stops not a moment to find out the standing of the pupils, or to speak to them an encouraging word.

In many instances the High School Inspectors never visit the schools, but allow the inspection to be done by the county Inspectors, who, presumably, are paid for their work; both practices contrary to law.

When such has been the rigid (?) inspection to which our schools have been subject once a year, while there were *three* Inspectors, what may we expect when there are but *two*?

But after all, may we not be requiring too much from these gentlemen? Besides their duties as examiners which occupy a considerable portion of their time, they have one hundred and four High Schools to visit twice a year, and about eighty-four Separate Schools in cities and towns to examine once a year. In the comparatively short time allowed for the inspection so much work cannot be properly performed. To this may be added another reason, perhaps more powerful than the foregoing; the Minister of Education has attached no additional salary for inspecting our schools. Then, though the work of inspection is wretchedly done, its value is at least equal to what is paid for it.

Surely the Minister of Education does not intend to humbug us any longer with this farce of supervision. Surely he will give us an opportunity of placing our schools on an equal footing with the Public Schools, that our children may derive the fullest benefit from that system of education for which we struggled so hard, and which we prize so highly. Then let all teachers and friends of education unite in a firm and respectful demand for the appointment of an officer who

shall devote his whole time to the care and improvement of our one hundred and ninety-one schools, in cities, towns, and incorporated villages.

Let this officer be a person whose educational standing is fully equal to that of the other Inspectors, and in whose ability all our teachers will have perfect confidence. Then his experience as teacher should have made him so thoroughly familiar with the best modes of teaching all subjects prescribed for our schools, that he can fully explain and exemplify such methods.

Comparatively few persons possess the numerous qualifications so indispensable to success in this delicate and important work. Let us then seek our Inspector "lantern in hand." For the man who aspires to the office without being thoroughly qualified, and thoroughly competent to discharge all its duties, commits a gross injustice against teachers, against children, and against all the interests of education.

M.

DISEASE GARDENS.

It must have been a thrilling moment when at the great meeting of the Medical Congress, the huge audience of St. James's Hall rose to cheer the French Chemist, Mr. Pasteur, as he entered the hall with Dr. Carpenter. And indeed never was tribute better deserved. To Mr. Pasteur we owe the discovery that yeast and all forms of fermentation are in reality only vegetable growths, and the analogous discovery of the vegetable character of the curious germs multiplied in the blood in certain forms of disease. Following out this discovery, Mr. Pasteur has instituted *disease gardens*, in which he has cultivated the disease germs of all forms of anthrax (blotch) diseases. He is able at pleasure to grow a crop of cholera, scarlatina or diphtheria virus, just as a gardener grows water-lilies, cucumbers or mushrooms. This is a discovery the importance of which cannot be over-estimated, because the knowledge of the cause of disease must ultimately lead to the discovery of the remedy, and because the range of diseases caused by germ propagation will undoubtedly be extended. But another fact attached to this discovery makes it all the more important. Just as the cultivation of the potatoe (poisonous in its wild state) renders it wholesome and edible, so the cultivation of these disease germs renders them so much less poisonous that the human body may be inoculated with them to the producing a mild type of disease as a preventive of the deadly type.

The soil for the cultivation of these disease germs is somewhat different from that of cucumbers and mushrooms. In fact the "disease garden" may be a bowl of broth, or milk, or meat juice, or it may be the human body.

But here a terrible truth comes to light—that just as the malignity of the "wild" virus can be diminished by cultivation, it appears equally certain that it may be increased by transmission through several bodies of *progressive age*. This will be a matter for future research. It leads, however, to certain practical results as far as vaccination is concerned. Dr. Carpenter strongly recommends, that the stock of vaccine matter should be kept up in all cases by a continual transmission through heifers, lest the original protective power be cultivated away; or to speak more correctly, lest the cultivation be backwards towards the "wild" type rather than forwards towards the mild type.

These discoveries are already bearing practical fruit. A destructive silk-worm disease, which was more ruinous to the Italian peasants than the phylloxera amongst the vines, has been stamped out, and the virulent sheep fever known in France as "charbon" (and frequently fatal to the wool sorters of Bradford) is proved to be readily conquerable. A flock of fifty sheep was put at Mr. Pasteur's disposal. Twenty-five of these he marked, and then inoculated them with the cultivated germs from his "disease garden." These animals all passed through a slight indisposition without loss of flesh, appetite or liveliness. A short time afterwards all the fifty sheep were inoculated with the strong or "wild" disease germs, and Mr. Pasteur then predicted that on the following day the twenty-five inoculated for the first time would be dead, whilst the twenty-five which had previously been inoculated would be in perfect health. A large assembly gathered to see the result. At two o'clock on the day named 23 of the unprotected sheep were dead, the 24th died an hour later, and the 25th in another hour: the 25 sheep which had been previously inoculated were in perfect health.

H. B.

By the death of Cardinal Giannelli the number of Cardinals living is reduced to sixty-three, and the Sacred College is, with the exception of one hat, equally divided between Italians and foreigners. There are, however, three names reserved *in petto*.

The late Cardinal Borromeo belonged to a great family of Milan, which, during five centuries has had its fortunes closely linked with those of the Roman See. He was the seventh member of it that had been a Cardinal. When only 24 years of age he became the Chief Chamberlain of the late Pope, and in that capacity accompanied his Holiness during the flight to Gaeta. In 1868 he became Arch priest of St. Peter's, a position which gave him authority over the basilica. Many great public ceremonies in St. Peter's have been arranged by him, including the Oecumenical Council of 1869-70, the funeral of Pius IX, and the coronation of Leo XIII. Cardinal Borromeo died at a comparatively early age; he had just completed his fifty-ninth year.

LOUISE LATEAU—THE LATEST ACCOUNT OF
HER LIFE.

(From the *Catholic Times*.)

A few weeks ago it was the privilege of the writer to have the opportunity of visiting Louise Lateau, the humble ecstasica of Bois d'Haine, Belgium. There may be a considerable number of very well informed readers perfectly acquainted with the wonders that occur in the modest cottage of Louise Lateau, but, owing to the want of any popular work on the subject, the bulk of our countrymen are totally unaware of those marvels of grace which are manifested so close to our own doors.

The first question one expects to hear, and one which I myself have put to those who had seen Louise Lateau, will be, "Are these wonderful manifestations genuine? Is there no deception?" From the learned and astute gentlemen of whom I inquired—men who had seen jugglery in all its forms and in all climes—the answer was clear and emphatic. It was their opinion that, under the circumstances, deception was impossible. The impartial and unbiassed spectator at Bois d'Haine is not annoyed with fears or doubts of deception or imposture. There is so much unaffected simplicity and candor about Bois d'Haine and its occupants, that the idea of double-dealing or imposition never occurs to the visitor; he simply admires the wonders that Divine Providence so generously places at his disposal to strengthen his faith in Him.

Very early on the morning of Friday, the 14th of October, I arrived at Manage, a little town in the Province of Hainaut, between Mons and Charleroi. Bois d'Haine is about two miles distant from Manage. On my way I met a poor workman of whom I made inquiries. With innate politeness and good breeding the poor man led the way through some bypaths till we got on the high road, whence he pointed out the cottage of Louise Lateau and the village church farther on. As I passed the neat, though modest and even poor cottage, I marvelled how God, according to His unfailing promise, had used the weak and lowly to confound the mighty ones of the earth. At six o'clock Mass was said in the village church by the venerable Curé, M. Paul Niels, so well known to all visitors. After Mass, tickets being given to those who applied to see Louise Lateau, preparations were made to carry the Blessed Sacrament to the ecstasica. The function of torch-bearers fell to four gentlemen; the first was a Dutch gentleman; the second, a merchant from Namur; the third, Brother Sulpice, formerly Superior of St. Joseph's College, Dumfries; and the fourth was the writer. The Blessed Sacrament was borne by a Curé from Namur, assisted by M. Niels. As our little procession marched along, headed by the sacristan, bell in hand, it was very touching to an English Catholic to see how the peasants and the working-people whom we met, or whose houses we passed, reverently paid homage to Our Divine Lord. After eight minutes' walk, having crossed a railway line, the cottage of Louise Lateau is reached. M. Niels at once proceeds to place in Louise's room as many as can be packed into it. The less fortunate have to remain in the ante-chamber, but as the door is kept open they manage to see pretty well all that takes place.

In this little room, remarkable only for its simplicity and cleanliness, lay Louise Lateau, so singularly favored by Heaven. She is now in her thirty-third year, and has been confined to bed by her sufferings

the last two or three years. She has not taken any food or drink during the last ten years and a half, nor has she slept any during that period. Till her sufferings compelled her to remain in bed she took an active part in all the ordinary household work.

Being favorably placed for observation, I watched with a lively interest the scene before me. The first object that caught the eye was Louise, her eyes and mouth firmly shut, and her breast heaving in a most alarming manner, just like a person in agony. After the usual prayers, the priest approached with the Sacred Host and Louise opened her mouth gently. As soon as the Host touched her tongue her mouth closed suddenly, all signs of breathing or consciousness instantly disappeared. She was now in ecstasy. The Curé removed the white cloth which covered her arms and they were now seen resting on the coverlet, the blood flowing from the stigmata on the back of the hands. Many prayers were recited aloud by the Curé, those present taking part in them. During this time all who were anxious to carry away a souvenir of their visit touched the bleeding hands with religious pictures or handkerchiefs, which were thus stained with her blood.

It may be well to remark that this was the seven hundred and fourth Friday that Louise had had the bleeding stigmata of Our Lord, as had the seraphic St. Francis and several other saints. The stigmata appeared on Louise Lateau for the first time on the 24th of April, 1868. At present Louise's stigmata appear like blisters, which increase in size till about midnight on the Thursday, then they burst, and the bleeding begins. The blood continues to flow all Friday, and the wounds heal of themselves. Most minute details as to the character of these stigmata, their rupture, etc., are given in Dr. Lefebvre's splendid medical work, entitled "Louise Lateau," and which has been translated into English by Dr. Northcote.

Before leaving the house another glance round tends but to confirm the impression made by the genuine simplicity and modesty of the good people. Adeline, Louise's sister, is sitting in the ante-chamber (the principal room in the house) sewing. Beside her are two sewing machines, one of which was often covered with the blood of Louise when, by way of trial and experiment, she was ordered to continue her work on the Fridays. Rosine, the eldest sister, I am informed in reply to my inquiry, is out working *à la journée*. We then all leave the humble abode of Divine favors, to return at 2 p. m. But then we shall see the ecstasica during an hour, and be less crowded, as no ladies will be present.

It was my honor and privilege to share the hospitality of the good Curé of Bois d'Haine all that day, and thereby the opportunity was afforded me of noting several facts hitherto unpublished and not generally known concerning Louise Lateau. I was thus enabled also to read many criticisms on the saintly ecstasica which M. Niels is not afraid to keep on his table. These range from the exceptions taken by a Redemptorist Father to some of the phenomena, to the frantic ravings of a Dr. Charbonnier, of Brussels. This impious man winds up one of his diatribes by declaring that, rather than throw in his lot with the miracle-loving God of the devout, he would prefer to share his faith with the honest, matter-of-fact devil! May the poor fool live to regret his delicate choice! And this is but a specimen of the blasphemous rhetoric with which the *liberal* press of Belgium greets the name of the inoffensive and saintly village girl.

The Curé from Namur, who had carried the Holy Communion to Louise that morning, told me privately that he could not say he had given her the Holy Communion. It seemed to him that the Sacred Host had left his fingers of itself when he was about to place it on her tongue. M. Niels stated that she had thirty or forty ecstasies each day, and it was his own private opinion that during those ecstasies her soul was united to God and her body was then like a corpse, soulless. He attributed her sufferings in good part to the repugnance the soul felt to return to the body. It is a noted fact in the life of Louise Lateau that she suffers very much when any calamity or scandal afflicts the Church. Many wonderful instances of this are related in her life by Henry Van Looy, showing that the seizure of Rome in 1870, the atrocities of the Commune, etc., were faithfully mirrored in the sufferings of this holy victim, although she was, humanly speaking, completely ignorant of these events.

At 2 P. M. we started from the presbytery. The good Curé had preceded us. In deference to the oft-repeated request of Louise, that she might be freed from the embarrassing visits of numerous persons from every quarter of the world, the Bishop has ordered that the visitors shall be admitted only after the ecstasy is begun, and leave before it is over, so that Louise is unconscious that she is still the object of so much observation. When we arrived at the cottage our number had increased to about fifteen. There were six or seven priests, some from the vicinity and some from a distance. The laymen included a doctor from Brussels and two French gentlemen. At about 2.10 the Curé came to the door of the cottage, invited us to enter, and arranged us in the little room in the most advantageous manner. The doctor was seated on a low chair at the side of the bed, near the head, so that he was in the most favorable position for observation. The writer was placed next him, and had to kneel the greater part of the time to give those behind him an opportunity of seeing. When we entered the room we could scarcely repress an exclamation of surprise. There was Louise, but her eyes were now very wide open. Her head was slightly turned to the right, and her eyes seemed fixed on some distant object in the direction of the remote corner of the ceiling. Her countenance bore a mixed expression of pain and wonder, as if she witnessed something awful and surprising.

Some of the ordinary phenomena were then produced. The Curé invited a young gentleman present to move his hand before Louise's face—no result. He then asked a priest to do the same, and the awe struck expression gave way to a smile. Blessed rosaries, medals and, above all, reliquaries were now brought near the ecstasica, and although often wrapped up in an unrecognizable way, the blessed objects never failed to make Louise smile and extend her bleeding hands towards the holy object until she touched it. I carefully noted these surprising effects, and can describe them no better than by comparing the effect of a blessed object on Louise to the effect of a loadstone on a piece of iron. When the blessed object was withdrawn Louise fell back on the bed like a corpse. Yet withal the eyes were never removed from the one spot. The priests present recited Vespers and Complin, and during all the time the smile, the raising up of the hands, showed how the prayers of the Church had the same wonderful "electrical" effect on the ecstasica as the blessed objects.

All prayers produce visible effects on her, and many have been the trials in all languages, from that of the North American Indian to that of the Maori, but the poor, illiterate girl is never deceived. Her smiles challenge the prayers, even when mixed up with secular discourses. During the recital of the Divine Office the Doctor was not idle. He examined the wounds on the back of her hand and also the wounds on the palms, which likewise bled a little. He felt her pulse also several times and invited me to remark how cold her hands were; they were indeed as icy cold as if they belonged to a corpse. During the "Magnificat," in which by the raising of her hands and the smile on her countenance she seemed most sensitive to what was going on, the doctor pinched one of her fingers with all his might, but of course Louise did not feel it, although the doctor pointed out to me the marks left by his nails.

Dr. Lefebvre in his work describes a multitude of experiments which he made during the ecstasies, but all to no purpose, as Louise's body is completely insensible. Later on the doctor caused some surprise by presenting to Louise his purse, on which was printed in large gilt letters "porte-monnaie." What was still more surprising, Louise smiled and put up her hands to touch it. Every one was eager to know what was the cause of this unlooked for phenomenon, and M. Niels asked him if he had any blessed object in his purse. The doctor then opened it, and from the midst of his money produced two venerable little blessed medals. The Curé of a neighboring parish caused a large covered object with a white cloth to be brought in. Judging at first from its shape and size, I took it to be a sugar-loaf, but when held near Louise she expressed extraordinary symptoms of pleasure and joy and sat upright in order to touch it. The Curé then informed us that it was the statue of his Lady Chapel, to which in her early days, Louise had great devotion. When this covered-up statue was removed Louise fell back like a dead body and her countenance instantly resumed its expression of sorrow. Many have been the experiments to show with what delicacy the ecstasica recognizes the blessings and prayers of the Church. One of the commonest is to present a medal or a rosary which has never been blessed—Louise is insensible to its presence. If it be now taken away, blessed privately, and then presented, she smiles and seeks to touch it.

As has been already stated, medical men have entirely failed, with all the means at their disposal, to restore Louise to consciousness during her ecstasy, but the merest word or sign from her spiritual superiors—that is, the Bishop or the Curé—never fails to cause the ecstasy to cease. What is strangest is that this authority can be exercised from any distance and can be delegated to any person. Wonderful instances of this marvellous obedience to legitimate authority—no matter by whom exercised—can be seen in all the works that have been published about her. However, this recall to consciousness is seldom practiced now, as it causes her to suffer, and she has already passed through years of trials and experiments in the hands of eminent learned men.

Suddenly, and without any premonitory sign, Louise stretches out both arms in the form of a cross. Her head turns considerably to the left, but she still keeps her eyes fixed in the same direction as before. Her mouth half opens, and her whole countenance expresses the most lively horror, fright and consternation. During her ecstasy she has been following the Passion,

and she now sees Our Lord expire on the Cross. "It is three o'clock! leave the room!" exclaims M. Niels; all obey, for in a few minutes Louise shall have regained her consciousness. It is worthy of note that this phase of the ecstasy has occurred exactly at three o'clock every Friday from the very beginning.

Amongst those who had witnessed these consoling and faith-strengthening phenomena there was but one opinion concerning the consummate virtue and holiness of Louise Lateau; and when one is acquainted with the holy and self-sacrificing life of the "good Louise," it is not possible to look on her otherwise than as a saint.

CHURCH CHIMES.

In 1871 the Pope received 13,893 pilgrims from all parts of the world; in 1872, 17,477; in 1873, they diminished to 8,115; in 1874, 9,129; in 1875, they increased to 15,673; in 1876, still more, 19,780; in 1877, they amounted to 34,508; in 1878, 13,625; in 1879, 10,171; in 1880, 10,827. In 1875, Pius IX received in solemn and particular audience 30,357 persons; in 1876, 51,243 were admitted; and in 1877 as many as 68,221. In 1878, Leo XIII received 33,065 persons; in 1879, only 24,284; in 1880, 25,953. These figures suffice to show the veneration of the faithful toward the Vicar of Jesus Christ, and how vain are the efforts of his persecutors to prevent his communication with his flock.—*Catholic Times.*

From a list, compiled by Canon de Montault, of the Saints canonized since the tenth century, we learn that the Church has decreed Supreme honors to 225 of her children, 47 of whom were martyrs (not inclusive of their companions in martyrdom), 46 being Archbishops or Bishops, 59 Religious of both sexes, 21 Founders and Foundresses of Orders, 10 Abbots, 3 Cardinals, 3 Laics, 4 Canons, 3 Hermits, 2 Popes, 3 Doctors of the Latin Church, 3 Virgins, 1 Widow, 1 Lawyer, 1 Emperor, 1 Empress, 7 Kings, 2 Queens, 2 Dukes, 1 Duchess, 2 Priests, 1 Deacon and 2 Armenians. The tenth century witnessed 3 Canonizations; the eleventh century, 19; the twelfth century, 40; the thirteenth century, 27; the fourteenth century, 11; the fifteenth century, 15; the sixteenth century, 11; the seventeenth century, 24; the eighteenth century, 29. The nineteenth has already 66 canonized Saints, including the 26 Japanese martyrs, and the 19 martyrs of Goreum, canonized by Pius IX.

The Catholic party have won a great victory in the German Reichstag. Dr. Windthorst, the leader of the Centre, presented a motion to abolish the law forbidding the exercise of ecclesiastical functions without government authorization. This motion strikes at the very heart and centre of the May Laws. After a prolonged and animated debate, in which the leaders of all the parties in the German Parliament participated, the motion passed its second reading by a vote of 223 to 115. Professor Virchow, the eminent scientist, supported Dr. Windthorst's motion in the majority of the Progressists.

The moral as well as the actual effect of this victory will be very great. In January, 1871, King William of Prussia was proclaimed Emperor of Germany in the

palace of Louis XIV at Versailles, just on the eve of the capitulation of Paris. The war with France was scarcely ended when Prince Bismark began a new war, a moral war with the Catholics of the newly merged Empire. The ostensible and alleged reason for his attack on them was that they were hostile to the State and the Empire for the very reason that they were Catholics. He asserted that they took their order in civil as well as spiritual matters from a foreign prince and power, the Pope. He fired Germany and all anti-Catholic Europe against them claiming for the State dominion and precedence in the kingdom of this world.

To carry out his ideas against the Catholics and give legal shape to his animosity, Prince Bismark choose as his minister of public worship, Dr. Falk, much as Gambetta to-day chooses Paul Bert. The Catholics at this time had members in the Reichstag, some of them very able men, but had, properly speaking, no party, while they were in point of numbers a hopeless minority. The majority of the Reichstag was hostile to them; Prince Bismark was then in the first flush of his crowning victory over France; and the great mass of the German people, as well as of the deputies, was prepared to follow his beck or call. Accordingly Dr. Falk's elaborate scheme known as the May Laws, whose object was to stifle all Catholic life in Prussia, and cut off the Catholic Church in Prussia from communion and intercourse with Rome was passed in May, 1873. The Catholics were humiliated and persecuted. Prince Bismark and all the anti-Catholic elements of Prussia and the Empire were jubilant and triumphant.

With this persecuting act began, properly speaking, the formation of the Centre or Catholic party, at whose head stood the keen, cool, wary, great hearted and indomitable leader, Herr Windthorst. His temper was as imperturbable as Beaconsfield's, his wit as caustic, his knowledge and mastery of parliamentary life and politics as complete, while his soul was wholly possessed with the spirit of a noble and patriotic cause. He wished to restore real freedom, civil as well as religious, to the Empire, and for this he strove, and the Catholics to a man with him, with unflagging patience and inexhaustible courage.

This began in 1873. The details of the long up-hill battle are sufficiently known. The Catholics rallied, and at each new election added to the number of their representatives. That number so increased in power and significance, while the effects of the May Laws were so disastrous in every sense, that Prince Bismark soon realized his mistake. He had alienated the best and bravest. The parties that at first supported him split into fragments and became unmanageable. The Catholics profited by every split, and six years after the passage of the May Laws the man who would not "go to Gossa" is seeking alliance with the very Catholics he had denounced. He still staggered and tumbled down the stairs he had erected for himself, and begged aid from the Catholics with only vague promises in return. But the Catholics stood proof against cajolement and threat. The last elections decided matters. The Prince encountered his most signal repulse at the polls, the Catholics scored their greatest victory. Without their aid he could count on no majority in Parliament. He had been softening and toning down the May Laws for some two years past. Now the most vicious of these laws is moved to be abolished by an overwhelming majority in the very Chamber that eight years ago passed them.

This is a lesson for Catholics in other lands than

Germany. It is a lesson for them in France and Italy, in Spain, Austria and Belgium. They have power if they will only get together and use its pressure to secure civil and religious freedom not to themselves only but to all citizens. If a German minority can accomplish so much in so short a time, what ought to be expected of a single minded Catholic majority in Italy or France?—*Catholic Review*.

The following, from the Paris correspondent of the *London Tablet*, shows that in high places in France there are those who have the courage of their conviction despite the browbeating and cajolery of Gambetta. Says the correspondent:—

The nomination of General Campenon to the War portfolio was a measure which caused surprise to many, and you may remember I predicted that M. Gambetta was likely to discover before long that he had made a mistake, and called in an auxiliary who might prove too strong for the *Grand Ministre*. General Campenon's first step on entering, on taking possession of the War office, was to appoint as his "Chef de Cabinet" General de Mirabel, an officer who stands high as a military man, and equally so as a man of honor and a gentleman, and who is well known as a staunch royalist and, last and worst, as an uncompromising Catholic. The surprise caused by this bold stroke in the *Grand Ministre* soon expressed itself in hot indignation, and there was an outcry from all the little Ministers to the great one, urging him to nip the scandal in the bud, and dismiss General de Mirabel. The result was—I have the story on good authority—that M. Gambetta summoned General Campenon to the Foreign Office, and assuming the Imperial tone which he takes on occasions to his subordinates, demanded what he meant by appointing such a man as Mirabel to the first post in the War Office. "Monsieur le Ministre," replied the General, "I have no explanations to give you, or any one, as to the persons I select for my Ministry. I name the best men I can find. I shall dismiss them if they don't do their work well."

"But Mirabel is a Monarchist, a rampant Clerical! It is really a scandal in the Government."

"Scandal, is it? I can't stop to consider that. I don't inquire what a functionary's political or private opinions are. I look to his capacity for doing the work I want done. General de Mirabel will do it better than any one else that I know of, and so I have called him to my assistance. I am sorry it does not please my colleagues, but I fail to see that they have any licence to interfere in the matter. I will never interfere in your office, M. le Ministre, but neither will I tolerate that you should interfere with mine. I must be master in my own department (*chez moi*) I remain there only on that condition."

M. Gambetta controlled his feelings so far as to expostulate with his stiff-necked colleague, and observed that it was always unadvisable to introduce an antagonistic element into the Government, and that he had held especially to his Government being homogeneous.

"My duty is not to think of the Government," retorted the General "my duty is to think of France. I know the state of her army, and I know the state of the Prussian army. If a war should break out—which is not improbable—I don't wish to be found unprepared."

The interview ended in a kind of armed truce; but the General had the best of it.

He went home to his own house, and before an hour had elapsed, the door was opened and M. Spuller was

announce. Before the right hand man of M. Gambetta had time to open speech, the General said: "Sir, I receive no one here but my friends. If you have business with the Minister of War, be good enough to call at the War Office."

M. Spuller tried to obtain a hearing, but was peremptorily ordered away. Whether he accepted the invitation, such as it was, to call at the War Office, I did not hear.

The independent, and to a certain point, hostile attitude of General Campenon is the more surprising because of his well-known and tried Republicanism. He was so open in his opposition to the Empire that the Emperor expelled him from France, and, though it was the ruin of his career, he never abated an inch of that opposition.

The "Hail Mary," as we now recite it, dates from the year 1515; originally it consisted only of the words of the Archangel and St. Elizabeth. Pope Gregory the Great (590-604) ordered this primitive "Hail Mary" to be said at the Offertory of the Mass of the Fourth Sunday in Advent, and there we find it as follows: *Ave Maria gratia plena, Dominus tecum, Benedicta tu in mulieribus, et benedictus fructus ventris tui*—"Hail Mary, full of grace, the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed is the fruit of thy womb." In the thirteenth century, according to Durandus, it was recited after the "Our Father" in beginning the Divine Office. Pope Urban IV in 1263 added the holy name of Jesus after the Scriptural sentence, as the devotion of the faithful had introduced the name Mary after the first greeting. (*Grandeolus. L'ancien Sacramentaire de l'Eglise*, 1 vol., 1649, page 419). The addition "Holy Mary, pray for us sinners, Amen," was made in 1408, and the Franciscans were accustomed to say, "now and at the hour of our death." A few years later Pope Pius V showed his approbation of the prayer, as we now have it, by allowing its insertion in the Roman Breviary.

The Greek Church has employed the words of the Angel Gabriel and St. Elizabeth in her rituals from the earliest days of SS. James and Basil, and claims to have received the addition "Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us sinners," as early as the Council of Ephesus, in the beginning of the fifth century. It is an undeniable fact that the Greeks had the "Hail Mary" almost as complete as we have it now as early as 647. St. Severos, Patriarch of Alexandria, wrote in his formulary of the Sacrament of Baptism in the following manner: "Peace be to thee, Mary, full of grace; the Lord is with thee, blessed art thou amongst women, and blessed the fruit that is in thy womb, Jesus Christ, Holy Mary, Mother of God, pray for us, I say, sinners, Amen." (*Grandeolus*).

It was in about this time that Saint Idefonsus, Bishop of Toledo, knew the "Hail Mary," 900 years ago. Still the Western Church did not accept it as a general prayer until the eighth century. From the time of the Crusade, it became the custom to say the "Hail Mary" every morning and night, at the sound of the church bells. Pope Urban II, 1090, ordained that from the day the army of the Crusades started, the church bells should ring three times, morning, noon, and night, to remind the faithful to recite this prayer. There exists a document from Eudes de Sully, Bishop of Paris, 1195, by which he urges his priests to see that the people know and recite the "Hail Mary." From that time forward, the sweet "Hail Mary" be-

came the universal prayer of the Christian world.

Saint Bonaventure, at the General Chapter of the Franciscans, held at Pisa in 1262, ordered his religious to encourage the faithful in honoring the mystery of the Incarnation, by saying the "Hail Mary" three times at the sound of the church bells towards evening. Hence the ringing of the *Angelus* bell, which became a general practice in the Franciscan Order. On the 13th October, 1318, Pope John XXII issued a Bull at Avignon by which he indulgenced this pious practice. But the Indulgences which are now attached to this devotion were not given until the 24th of September, 1724, when Pope Benedict XIII granted them by the Brief *Injuncta Nobis.—Ave Maria.*

The poor old dying Catholic Church, as our friends of *Zion's Herald* and the Methodist pulpits love to call her. This is how she dies: In the year 1559 a Diocesan Synod was held in Edinburgh, Scotland. On that occasion, after passing thirty-four canons, it was agreed that the bishops and clergy should meet in the following year to see that their enactments had been carried out. They never met again, however, for before the year was out the "Reformers" had put them under ban and outlawry. But on Tuesday, Dec. 13, 1881, that Diocesan Synod reassembled in Edinburgh, and the splendid ceremony was witnessed, says a Protestant paper of that city, "by a large and devout congregation." The poor old decrepid Church!—*The Pilot.*

The "Catholic Directory," for 1882, published by Messrs. Burns & Oates, of London, Eng., by the authority and under the sanction of the Cardinal Archbishop of Westminster and the rest of the Bishops of his Church, shows some interesting and instructive facts relative to the progress of the Catholic religion in England. The archbishops and bishops in England and Wales are 14, not reckoning those of the Sees of Shrewsbury and Southwark, which are vacant. There are also in Scotland six other archbishops and bishops. The priests in England and Wales now number 2,036, serving 1,190 churches, chapels, and missionary stations; in Scotland there are 295 more, serving 286 chapels, etc., thus showing that both clergy and chapels have doubled in less than 25 years. In 1858 there was only 749 chapels in England and Wales, and 177 in Scotland, the total of the priests who served them being 1,179. The Catholic peers in the three kingdoms are 38; the baronets are 47. There are six Catholic members of Her Majesty's Privy Council, and the Catholic members of Parliament are 56, all representing Irish constituencies, except Mr. Jerningham, M. P. for Berwick-on-Tweed. The Sacred College of the Cardinals at Rome at this moment consists of 59 members, the vacant hats being 11; and no less than seven cardinals have died during the year 1881—viz., Regnier (Archbishop of Cambray), Kutschker (Archbishop of Vienna,) Gii (Archbishop of Saragossa,) and Cardinals Borromeo, Moretti, Caterini, and Giannelli. Of the existing College, 32 are Italians, nine Austrians or Germans, seven French, three Spanish, three English (viz., Newman, Manning and Howard,) one American (McCloskey,) one Belgian, and one Armenian. To the present volume is prefixed an interesting list of the Catholic prelates who have presided over their Church in England during the last three centuries as "Vicars Apostolic" down to the re-establishment of the hierarchy in 1850.

EDUCATIONAL NOTES.

A letter writer in an Irish paper makes some telling points in favor of the loyalty of Catholic Paris to Christian education: "The loyalty and devotion of Irish Catholics to their brother Catholics of France form a cherished chapter of our national history, and one over which we delight to linger. So, too, is the history of the countless deeds of chivalrous generosity by which France has repaid our love. Many and grievous were the tests by which that love of ours was tried—never more grievous than now, when France seems, through Gambetta and Paul Bert, to have laid the axe remorselessly at the very root of the Catholicity of her people by a general introduction of the secular education, and by the expulsion of all religious teaching from her schools. The religious orders who, in every department of France, had been entrusted with the instruction of her youth, have been banned and plundered, and many driven into exile, while the State ("L'Etat c'est moi," says Gambetta) has carefully provided for them a training from which a knowledge of God and of morality is laboriously ostracised. But Catholic France has proved herself equal to the crisis, and by a series of sacrifices like those to which our poor people freely submitted themselves has caused schools and colleges worthy of the days of the faith to spring up for the religious education of her children in every hamlet, town, and city. The results are cheering and full of hope. Statistics of the attendance of children at the proscribed religious schools and at the laicised—that is, the secularized—establishments are in course of publication; and in the present letter I gladly, and with thanks to God, ask the attention of your readers to a few extracts from the return made for the city of Lille and published on the 30th of last month. It may be found in the *Univers* of December 5th, 1881—

"The sum total of contributions from the Faithful for the erection of the Catholic schools at Lille amounts now to 1,200,000 franc; that of annual subscriptions to 120,000 francs.

"The number of boys' schools is 3,000. A still larger number of girls' schools have been established. The following returns show the relative attendance of pupils:—

PARISH OF ST. MARY MAGDELENE.	
Laicised Girls' School	15
Free (Religious) do	169
Laicised Infant do	6
Religious do do	236

PARISH OF ST. CATHERINE.	
Laicised Girls' Schools	15
Religious do do	210
Laicised Infant do	16
Religious do do	223

PARISH OF ST. NAVIDER.	
Laicised Girls' Schools	5
Religious do do	315

PARISH OF ST. MARTIN.	
Laicised Boys' Schools	15
Murist Brothers' Schools	339

PARISH OF NOTRE DAME.	
Laicised Boys' Schools	15
Brothers of St Gabriels' do	459

PARISH OF ST. ANDREW.	
Laicised Girls' Schools	9
Religious do do	200

Total of Boys and Infants in Laicised Schools	96
Total of Boys and Infants in Religious Schools	2,219

Thus glorious France maintains her proud claim to be the first Catholic nation of Christendom, and holds out the hope, even in "dark and dreary days," that her faith is firm and her future full of promise."

There is a vulgar opinion shared in by the critics of some would-be scientific papers that arithmetic and algebra are of Arab origin. This fallacy is probably based on the testimony of Montucla, the author of a history of mathematics, who gives one Mahommed Ben-Musha, who lived in the ninth century, credit which he never deserved. This Moslem philosopher wrote a book, it is true, but it was a compilation from other sources, not the unaided product of his own brain. He was a clever fellow, and as he was intimately acquainted with the astronomy and computations of the Hindus, and had the fear of no copyright law before him, there was ground for assumption that he pretended to know more

than he knew. Indeed, the researches of Sir William Jones and other Indian archeologists, who were contemporaries to Montucla, and of whose labors he should not have been ignorant, threw considerable doubt on Mahomet Ben Musha's claims. The researches of Mr. Colbrooks have since placed beyond yea or nay that the Hindus in the fifth century, perhaps earlier, were in possession of algebra extending to the general solution of both determinate and indeterminate problems of the first and second degrees, and subsequently advanced to the special solution of biquadratics, wanting the second term, and of cubics in very restricted and easy cases. Priority, therefore, is decisive in favor of both Greeks and Hindus against the Arabs, who were avowed borrowers in science. This question was exciting up to Saturday lively discussion among the learned in Dublin, who have still some leisure from the turmoil of politics to devote to the nicer problems of the infancy of civilization. At one period the erudite wrangling promised to lead to serious results among some gray-haired professors; but a change has come over the scene. Dr. Haughton, like another Neptune, has interposed, and the angry waves are tranquillized. "High algebra," he says, "was taught in Sanskrit books centuries before the birth of the prophet Mahomet—A. D. 568, and, *a fortiori*, long before the Arabian mathematicians of the ninth century." In support of his assertion he cites the authority of Sir John Herschel and Augustus de Morgan. Surely, none will have the hardihood to stand up before such a triumvirate.—*Irish Times*.

—
READING.

—
II.

Reading, as the basis and instrument of all literary education, is the most important branch of school instruction. After the child has learned to talk, he may be taught to understand, and to give vocal expression to, such written language as is adapted to his degree of mental development. To do this involves an association, in the mind, of the printed form of the word (1) with its proper sound, or pronunciation, and (2) with the idea which it is intended to express. In teaching children to read, the first of these processes requires the principal attention; but, as progress is made, the second constantly increases in importance. The word, and not the letters composing it, is the true element in reading. No one can be said to know how to read who is obliged to stop at the word, and study its composition, before he can pronounce it. The due meaning and pronunciation of every word must be immediately recognized by the mind, without pause or hesitation, in the act of reading. But the word is made up of separate characters, representing elementary sounds; and hence arises a diversity of methods in teaching children to pronounce words. The *alphabet method*, or *A-B-C method* (q. v.), requires that the child should learn the names of all the letters of the alphabet, and then, by means of a spelling process, learn the proper pronunciation of their combinations. This process is condemned by most teachers of the present time, as long and tedious, as well as illogical; the method most generally preferred being that denominated the *word method* (q. v.), by which the child learns at once to pronounce short words, and is taught the sounds and names of the letters, by an analysis of them. When the sounds of the letters are used instead of the names, the process has been called the *phonic method* (q. v.), which, in modern didactics, is most generally approved. Certainly, it is more rational to expect that a child will perceive the true pronunciation of a word through an analysis of the sounds of the letters, than by using their names, many of which afford no key to the sound. For example, if the word be *cat*, the child reaches the pronunciation at once by enumerating the sounds *k a t*; while by spelling, he is obliged to say *c e a t e*, introducing sounds entirely foreign to the word. In the one

case, the mental association required is simple and direct; in the other, it is complex and indirect. It is true that, by long and diligent rote-teaching, children learn to read by the latter method; but the question arises, are they not to a certain extent unfitted for other instruction by so illogical a process? Auxiliary to the *phonic method*, and, indeed, dictated by its needs, is the *phonetic method*, in which the absurd contradictions of the alphabet are removed by using the letters slightly modified, so as to have a character for each separate sound, and each sound represented by one, and only one, character. These various methods are dictated by what may perhaps be called the mechanics of reading; but, in connection with that, the teacher must always bear in mind, that what the child is learning to pronounce is a symbol of thought; and, hence, at every step, the pupil's understanding is to be addressed. "Each sentence read," says Johonnot (in *Principles and Practice of Teaching*, N. Y., 1881,) "should be the embodiment of a thought which the pupil thoroughly understands, and should be delivered precisely as it should be spoken. The practice of allowing the words, of a reading-lesson to be pronounced separately should never be permitted." Reading, as a part of education, has a twofold object: (1) to understand what is read; and (2) to give proper oral expression to it; that is to say, reading is either for the purpose of gaining information for one's self, or for imparting information to others. To teach a pupil to read properly implies far more than correct elocution. It implies the development of that judgment and spirit which, being brought to the perusal of useful books, or other reading matter, will enable the student to gather up information, and, in every available manner, make the realm of books tributary to his own mental wants. Hence, as auxiliary to reading, the proper meaning of words, phrases, and idioms must be taught; and exercises must be employed for the purpose of ascertaining to what extent the pupil has received correct ideas from what he has read. When the object is to teach the pupils elocution, the exercises should be specially adapted to that end. Thus, the pupil having read in order to understand for himself, should be required to read the same passage for the information of his fellow pupils. For this purpose, it has been recommended, in class teaching, to permit only the pupil reading to use the book, all the others being required to listen; because, in this way, the pupils will be on the alert to hear and know the meaning of what is read, and will, besides, better appreciate the true end of reading; while, on the other hand, the one reading will endeavor to pronounce correctly, enunciate distinctly, and emphasize naturally. Reading-books should be constructed with a special reference to the accomplishment of this object; and, hence, the lessons should be adapted, at each stage, to the mental status of the pupils. Moreover, the material should not consist of mere fragments, without any logical continuity, but should be of such a character as to discipline the mind in connected thinking upon suitable subjects, and to awaken an interest in the minds of the pupils. Usually, this essential object of reading in schools is defeated by the use of extracts from essays on difficult, abstract subjects, or from authors whose style is too complex, and whose vocabulary is too ponderous for children. Simultaneous reading is commended by some teachers as an elocutionary drill, as being useful (1) to impart habits of distinctness of enunciation, (2) to remove the habit of too rapid or too slow a style of reading, (3) as means of voice culture for elocution.