

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:

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

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

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, NOVEMBER, 1881.

No. 7.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE.
I.—To our Subscribers	97
II.—Events of the Month	97
III.—The School Question Again.....	99
IV.—The Life and Works of Oliver Goldsmith—I.....	100
V.—Horre Innes	101
VI.—Half Hours with Modern Philosophers—III.....	102
VII.—Ireland and the Land Question	104
VIII.—Church Chimes.....	105
IX.—Educational Notes.....	110

PUBLISHER'S NOTICE.

The following gentlemen are authorized to receive subscriptions for the CATHOLIC SHIELD:—

General Agent—ED. CASS, 565 Sussex St.

Canvassing Agents—JAMES HOLLAND and G. O'GORMAN

Agent for Pembroke and vicinity—J. E. GORMAN.

All communications and remittances to be addressed:—

The Publisher,

"CATHOLIC SHIELD,"

OTTAWA, ONT.

TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS.

In the initial Number of the CATHOLIC SHIELD we requested all persons receiving copies of the paper through the post, and not wishing to become subscribers, to notify us in the usual way. Since then we have been advised of not more than ten refusals. We now request all those who have regularly taken the paper from the Post Office-subscribers of their own free will—to remit to us without delay the small amount of their annual subscription fee. As this is our 7th issue, we consider that we are asking nothing but what is fairly due.

We intend to publish next month a brief history of the Separate School Question before the Parliament of Canada.

EVENTS OF THE MONTH.

The day following Mr. Parnell's speech at Wexford, Her Majesty's Secretary for Ireland—She has no *Irish* Secretary—was heard to say, that before long he would have Mr. Parnell kicking his heels together in Kilmainham jail. And sure enough, twenty-four hours later that historic prison had closed its doors upon the Irish leader. Mr. John Dillon, whom Gladstone had just belabored with fulsome flattery, was the next victim; and soon most of the principal members of the Land League were behind the bars. Fortunately, Biggar, Healey and Egan succeeded in making their escape, the two former to England, the latter to France.

Almost simultaneously with these arrests appeared an address by the League to the Irish people, bearing the signatures of Parnell, Kettle, Davitt, Brennan, Dillon, Sexton and Egan. With the exception of Dillon and Egan all were prisoners, and how their names were affixed, or authorized to be attached to the document, puzzled the Government officials. "Fellow country men," they said, "the hour to try your souls and to redeem your pledges has arrived. The Executive of the National Land League, forced to abandon its policy of testing the Land Act, feels bound to advise the tenant-farmers of Ireland, from this day forth, to pay no rents under any circumstances to their landlords, until the Government relinquishes the existing system of terrorism and restores the constitutional rights of the people. Do not be daunted by the removal of your leaders. Do not let yourselves be intimidated by threats of military violence. It is as lawful to refuse to pay rents as it is to receive them. Against the passive resistance of the entire population military power has no weapon. Funds will be poured out un stintedly for the support of all who may endure eviction in the course of the struggle. Our exiled brothers in America may be relied upon to contribute, if necessary, as many millions of money as they have contributed thousands to starve out landlordism, and bring English tyranny to its knees. You have only to show that you are not unworthy of their boundless sacrifices. One more crowning struggle for your land, your homes, your lives—a struggle in which you have all the memories of your race, all the hopes of your

kindred, and all the sacrifices of your imprisoned brothers."

Following closely on the heels of this manifesto came a proclamation by the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, warning all persons that the association styling itself the Irish National Land League, or by whatsoever other name it might be called or known, was an unlawful and criminal association, and that all meetings and assemblies to carry out or promote its designs or purposes were alike unlawful and criminal, and would be prevented, and, if necessary, dispersed by force; warning too all persons connected with the said association to disconnect themselves therefrom, and to abstain from giving further countenance thereto; and declaring that all the powers and resources of the government would be employed to protect the Queen's subjects in Ireland in the free exercise of their lawful rights and in the peaceful pursuit of their lawful callings and occupations, to enforce the fulfilment of all lawful obligations, and to save the processes of the law and the execution of the Queen's writs from hindrance or obstruction. The plain meaning of this was that the Government was determined, *per vim et arma*, to uphold Landlord tyranny, and drive the people into the catacombs— to conspiracy and mad insurrection.

But from all friendly quarters, from the imprisoned leaders, from the clergy, from the press, even from such organs as the *Irish World*, wise counsels came, and wise counsels prevailed. People who were determined to pay no rent would not be provoked into an armed resistance. They could be patient and wait, and were sure to win in the end.

At this point, Archbishop Croke published a letter disapproving the Land League manifesto, and repudiating the doctrine of the nonpayment of rent in unequivocal terms. He declared that he held to the original platform of the League; that there was no more reason for abandoning it now than there was when Davitt took possession of his cell in Portland. It was a sufficiently elastic policy. It was a righteous policy; it was a successful policy; and it pained him to think that any attempt should be made to displace the old lines, especially by the very men by whom they were so judiciously laid down. Thoroughly believing in the policy of the past in all its substantial branches, he quite as firmly believed that the policy now so impetuously recommended to the country, besides being condemned on grounds of principle and expediency, could lead to nothing but disintegration and defeat.

From Paris Mr. Egan immediately telegraphed to Archbishop Croke, that the original programme of the League was not "Fair Rents," but the abolition of Landlordism! He pointed out that there was no comparison between the present situation and that when Davitt

and the first of the "suspects" were arrested. The government had now thrown away all pretences, appealed to brute force, and suppressed all forms of constitutional expression. He asked whether the Archbishop advised the people to surrender at discretion, pay rent to their real jailors and resuscitate the corpse of Landlordism; and said that the executive of the Land League had long and carefully considered the advisability of a strike against rent, and believed it the only wise and courageous course.

And the opinion of the Irish in America was voiced by the *Boston Pilot* in the following words:—At first view, it must have appeared to many that the "No Rent" manifesto was precipitate and mistaken. It would seem to be an utter refusal to recognize the rights of property. But it is not so. It simply means that, until the Government returns to constitutional practices, the Irish farmers refuse to move in any way. They do not rebel: they stand with folded arms. Leaping to the first conclusion, even the Prelate who had taken the first place in Irish affection, without one hour's consideration, issued a condemnation of the manifesto. This action, we believe, Archbishop Croke will profoundly regret in the near future. The leaders were in prison. The great organization, perfect and unbroken, was resting and waiting. The only officer at liberty, of its old command, was one whose head was known to be unequal in ability to the impulsive dictates of his heart. Action under such leadership might naturally be shrank from. Above all requirements for the moment, Ireland needed those of coolness and foresight. But the "No Rent" policy was not the thought of any one man. It was the surging and suppressed opinion of Irishmen everywhere that flamed out at last when patience was no longer a virtue, when the Government had outraged law, when the people of Ireland were a proclaimed slave-population, when public meetings were scattered by bayonets, when legal agitation was declared a high crime, when the leaders of the people were in irons, and the people themselves were under orders to lie down and be manacled.

Meantime Mr. T. P. O'Connor and Dr. Dillon Egan, delegates of the Irish Land League to the people of America, had arrived on this side, and were addressing nightly immense assemblages in the principal cities of the United States. Defending the attitude the League had adopted, previous to Mr. Parnell's arrest, towards the Land Bill, Mr. O'Connor said: "We are accused of not giving the mice to go into a court where the bench was exclusively occupied by cats. We are accused of not giving it a fair trial because we refused to tell our people that they should have confidence in a court presided over by a converted rebel and the most abject flunkey lawyer alive. We are accused because we kept up an organization which we would be willing to dis-

solve if the organization of landlords in the shape of the British House of Commons was likewise suppressed. By our legal, constitutional, patient attitude we put the Government in a dilemma, and they are now, like foiled gamblers, putting down their last trump and playing their last trick."

As to the effect of the Government proclamations on the popular movement, Mr. A. M. Sullivan's opinion is worth taking. He believes that the work of the organization will, despite what any man may wish or say, be carried on very largely throughout Ireland by secret organization. The feeling of the country is too intense, too much aroused, the question at issue too real, too terrible, to think that the land movement can subside in a night because a printed paper with the lion and the unicorn at its head and Mr. Forster's name at its foot, declares the League to be proclaimed. The thing is preposterous. The movement will go on, but, unfortunately, instead of going on henceforth on an open, public platform, where every one can see the measure of good and ill, the wisdom or mischief of what is said or done, the people will now be driven into secret conclaves, the nature of which it is hard to foresee.

THE SCHOOL QUESTION AGAIN.

We have exposed some, and *only some*, of the defects of the Separate School Law of this province. We have shown, that in failing to reach the High School, it halts far short of the end its promoters had in view and every true Catholic wishes it to attain; that in not providing for a Catholic Deputy Minister or Superintendent, it sacrifices our rights and interests to the encroachments, not always wilful, of the majority; that the system of inspection it tolerates is repugnant to the principle of Separate Schools, and injurious alike to our children and their teachers.

Thus far, can it be said we have exaggerated anything? Who that has had experience, as trustee or teacher, will gainsay us in a single particular?

Have we any more complaints to make? Oh yes, lots of them, if we thought a more successful issue would come of a multifarious indictment. The flaws in this piece of legislation are as numerous as the "Wants" in a column of the *Mail*. Why, if you take away the flaws there is hardly anything left.

But most of them are harmless. Are they indeed? Experience reports otherwise, and charges very heavy damages to some of the most harmless-looking. Nay, experience proves that some of the presumably good points—late amendments for instance—are absolutely worthless in action.

It would not facilitate our purpose to recite all these grievances specifically; the most glaring—those already specified among others—will suffice to make out an unanswerable case against the existing Act, and obtain the unanimous verdict of the Catholics of Ontario

in favor of the amendments suggested in these pages or elsewhere.

Up to the present, our course has been approved and indorsed by priests and laymen, and by the Catholic press, who have given the question their attention. We hope, as we advance our lines, to preserve their favorable opinion and good will.

At the very base of this Law, which professes to establish Separate Schools, lies a *weakness* which has caused it to totter on several occasions, and will bring it tumbling down some day if not repaired. It is the weakness of granting to Catholics the privilege of withdrawing—with or without reason—their support from Separate Schools, and turning it over to the Public, non-sectarian, godless Schools.

This is liberty of action, with a vengeance directed against Catholic education. Only Catholics enjoy it; and it is conceded to them for the plain purpose of crippling or killing Separate Schools.

A non-Catholic, so long as he remains such, cannot, under any circumstance, refuse his material support to the Public Schools. They may be a *public failure*—many of them are—but, as a tax-payer, he cannot escape being taxed for their maintenance. He may consider the teachers morally or intellectually, or both morally and intellectually unfit for their position; he may refuse them his *moral* support, and engage a private tutor for his children; but he must pay the Public School tax just the same. There is no appeal.

But a Catholic is more *favoured*—to the end that Catholic Schools may be dis-established, and that scandals may come. He has a chance, once every year, to turn his coat. If a teacher of the Separate School displeases him, he may *boycott* teacher and school most effectively, by transferring his money to the Public School treasury. If he find the school house, furniture, or grounds not up to the mark in his opinion, he may proceed to *separate* himself from Separate Schools. If he and a trustee happen to disagree on any subject, from the market price of cabbages to the Franco-Tunisian business, he may order his name off the roll, and *ipso facto* become a Public School rate-payer. It is always in his power to stop the supplies—with or without cause. He can unfurl the banner of *no rents* or *no taxes* to Separate Schools, and keep it flying with impunity. The Government will not attempt to arrest and suppress him; and the Public Schools will pocket his money without a single qualm of conscience.

What are the results of this two-faced legislation? On the Public School side there is security and steady progress; on the Separate School side, insecurity and irresolution. A Board of Public School trustees can go into the money market, offer its own debentures for sale, and borrow any sum it may require for ten, twenty or thirty years, upon the assessed valuation of the taxable property of Public School supporters, as its security. A Board of Separate School trustees cannot borrow the smallest sum, for a time exceeding one

year, without personal or collateral security. The taxable property of actual Separate School supporters counts as nothing in such a transaction, so long as all Catholics are not held by the Law rate-payers to Separate Schools, as all non-Catholics are held, *as in a vice*, rate-payers to Public Schools.

With such advantages in their favor, *resulting from the denial of liberty of action to non-Catholics*, is it surprising that the Public Schools are officered, equipped, and lodged in such princely style? And, disintegrated as we are, is it not folly on our part to attempt to compete with them in these respects?

The Church supplies in her decrees (not always effectively) what the State omits in its enactments; and imposes an obligation, in conscience, upon all Catholics to support Separate Schools wherever established. And for thus ruling for Catholics what the State so rigorously enforces upon non-Catholics, she is denounced as bigoted and tyrannical even by some of her own children. The Church is so narrow-minded, so imperious! And the sects (who are the ruling majority or State) so liberal, so tolerant!

There are to be found professing Catholics who deny *in toto* to the Church the right to interfere in the education of their children, but freely concede it to the State. Of such is the kingdom of Satan. Others there are who will innocently tell you, that the restrictions of the Church apply only to elementary schools; that there is no danger to faith and morals in the High School and College, which do not come under the ban. We have already protested against this loose, this false interpretation of the decrees of the Church; and pointed out that faith and morals are even more imperilled in the High School and College than in the elementary schools. Godless High Schools and Colleges not condemned by the Church! Hear the Bishops of Ireland, in the address adopted at their recent meeting in Maynooth:—

"The Bishops, informed of false reports, which appear to be industriously circulated, of an alleged change of arrangement between the Catholic Colleges of Ireland and the Queen's Colleges, do hereby in the discharge of their sacred office warn their flocks that *the Queen's Colleges are still as much as ever intrinsically dangerous to faith and morals, and are still under the ban of the Church; that Catholic parents should not send their sons to those condemned institutions, nor Catholic young men receive instruction in them; and that although Catholics may henceforth be examined and receive degrees in the new Royal University, they are not allowed to study in Queen's Colleges to prepare for those degrees and examinations.*"

What have our very liberal Catholics to say to this?

And what are we doing to secure a thorough Catholic education for our children, from the A. B. C. to their B. A. and M. A? Are we going to allow the Law to stand as it is, an obstacle in our way to improvement? It is time to come to a common understanding. If we delay much longer, we shall be too late.

THE LIFE & WORKS OF OLIVER GOLDSMITH.

BY T. O'HAGAN.

I.

I purpose in these short papers, after having sketched briefly the life of Oliver Goldsmith, to consider him in succession as historian, essayist, dramatist, poet and novelist. In the bright literary galaxy of the age of Johnson, Goldsmith holds a distinguished place; for although Burke excelled him in splendor of diction, and Johnson in depth of thought, neither of the two has secured so rich a heritage of love; and this, undoubtedly, as a tribute to genius, is the most desirable. It is, therefore, very interesting, very pleasing, and very profitable to recur to the literary history of Goldsmith, and seek the principles in his writings that have made him a general favorite of mankind.

Oliver Goldsmith was born November 10, 1728, in Pallas, County of Longford, Ireland. According to William Black, the Goldsmiths were of English descent. Goldsmith's father was a Protestant clergyman. This was the village preacher, who, at the time of Oliver's birth, was passing rich on £40 a year. Shortly after this the Rev. Charles Goldsmith removed to the village of Lissoy, in the County of Westmeath, where is supposed to be laid the scene of that beautiful poem, the *Deserted Village*. Macaulay, however, denies this; and further maintains that no such place as Auburn ever existed in Ireland; and calls the *Deserted Village* an incongruous poem. Although Macaulay supports his criticism with a good deal of plausibility and ingenuity, we think it is unsound. The Lissoy that called up so many pleasant memories in Goldsmith's mind was a reality; it was the Lissoy of his youth, with its familiar scenes, where heaven stooped down to bless the innocent pleasures of the village rustics; it was the Lissoy ringing with the glad laughter of young people, in the twilight hour; it was the Lissoy—*The Deserted Village*—which he regarded so wistfully in after years; within whose bowers he had wooed so oft' the rosy lipp'd hours of joy, that, seen from his dreary lodgings in Fleet Street Court, seemed to glorify all his griefs, his wants, and his woes. "If I go to the opera where Signora Colomba pours out all the mazes of melody" he writes to Mr. Hodson, "I sit and sigh for Lissoy's fireside and *Johnny Armstrong's Last Good Night from Peggy Golden*." Goldsmith appears to have been first intended for the Church; and he received an education such as his father, the Rev. Charles Goldsmith, then a poor Irish clergyman, could afford to give him. At the age of six, he was sent to the village school. Of Goldsmith's career at school we know but little. That he was a sharer in many a frolic, suffered much ridicule at the hands of his schoolmates, and was oft' one of those who learned to trace the day's disasters in his master's face, we have but little doubt. There is, however, one great feature in Goldsmith's

school days which will make them over memorable, and recall to the reader, as he scans the bright pages of *The Deserted Village*, the character of each successive knight of the rod, who guided his destiny within the sovereignty of the old old school. To how many millions of readers has not the village schoolmaster, armed with the sceptre of his authority, the importance of his mission, and the grave air of his demeanor, bowed his introduction? Yea, the school may be changed; the scene may be a Canadian, not an Irish village; but Goldsmith's village schoolmaster will ever be to the mind a type of our first teacher.--

"Who was kind or if severe in ought
The love he bore to learning was in fault."

While at school, Goldsmith exhibited no great talent; in fact he was estimated as a stupid, heavy blockhead. Nor is it authentic that he early showed poetic powers. True, an anecdote is told, how he once turned the tables on a fiddler at his uncle's dancing party. The fiddler, who was desirous to have a joke at young Goldsmith's odd appearance, called out, "Aesop!" To which Goldsmith immediately replied,

"Our herald hath proclaimed this saying
See Aesop dancing and his monkey playing!"

When in his eighteenth year, Goldsmith entered upon his college career at Trinity College, Dublin. How he lived and what he learned at Trinity are both, to a great extent, matters of conjecture. One thing is certain, that he was almost continually in want of funds. To replenish the chambers of his purse, he resorted to various means. Now it was the pawnbroker, who rescued him from difficulties; now the sale of a street ballad that strengthened him for a new frolic. At length Goldsmith graduated at the age of twenty-one. We know not what scholarship marked the graduation of Goldsmith at Trinity; but he at all events acquired a classical taste; and, although he appeared lowest in the list, his degree bore testimony to the fact, that he must have learned something. And now the question was as to what the young graduate should turn his attention. He was yet but little desirous of fame; her rosy wings had not yet fanned his brow; besides, he enjoyed better the company of a few boon companions than the ambitious circle of learned men. He loved the story, the pipe, and the glass; and when evening came he joined the happy assemblage in Conway's inn, and mingled with his jovial companions in pleasure, in jest, and in song.

—:o:—

—Although genius always commands admiration, character most secures respect. The former is more the product of brain-power, the latter of heart-power; and in the long run it is the heart that rules in life.

HOÆ INANES.

Discipulus.—What is your opinion, most worthy Master, of the scientists of the day? Such men, I mean, as Herbert Spencer with his evolution dependant on the co-relation of forces—Sir John Lubbock, with his origin of civilization—Darwin, with his origin of species and a host of other congenial spirits.

Magister.—I think of them, most worthy Disciple, exactly as I think of murderers and swindlers and highwaymen and communists—as men who, for the good of the community should not be allowed to run at large, but who should long ago have been shut up in our Sing Sings, our Kilmainhams, and our Clerkenwells.

Dis.—You horrify me, most worthy Master, what crime have these men been guilty of, that you would thus consign them to such horrid dungeons?

Mag.—What crime? The most horrid of crimes. Is it no crime think you to shake the throne of the True God? Is it no crime to destroy God? But this is what these men have done and are doing. Was it no crime, think you, in Guiteau to shoot the President? But these men are as much more culpable than Guiteau, as God is above Garfield, or rather, I should say, as the reign of religion and revelation in the world is above the reign of order in the United States. It is true, these men cannot destroy God in himself, but they can, and have destroyed Him in the souls of thousands of men, and in as much as in them lies, would destroy Him from off the face of the earth, if they could. Hence their crime. You separate with an all time separation the leper from the rest of mankind; nay, the leper has the good sense to separate himself; but these men are worse than lepers, and have not their good sense. Why do you separate the leper? Because he has a loathsome disease which his very presence would communicate to his fellow-men. A shake of the hand; nay the very winds may bear the disease spores to your body. But these men—these moral or rather immoral lepers shake hands with their thousand readers, and breath the disease spores in each one's face. Men are as morally responsible for the opinions they publish as they are for the deeds they do; no man has the moral right to publish any thing, that he knows to be false; nor has he any right to assert anything against Christianity that he does not know to be absolutely true. Morally man is not allowed to think these opinions much less to express them. It is true, that so far as the civil law is concerned, it cannot punish a man for his opinions so long as he keeps them to himself. As long as he does that, they are no matter of ours; they belong alone to himself and his God. But the moment he publishes them, that moment he comes under the law, and should be punished for them, if they are contrary to either faith or morals. You do this in matters of sedition—in matters of revolt against temporal rulers why not also in that worst of sedi-

tions—the revolt against God and his holy faith. Is God less than an earthly being?

Dis.—But these men do not believe in either God or religion.

Mag.—That does not alter the case. Possession stands for God and revelation, with a prescription of fully 5,800 years for God and 1,850 years for the whole corpus of revelation. By this title God and revelation stand in the world, and until our scientists can prove a better, they are out of court. The *onus probandi* is on those, who arraign the faith and convictions of the Christian world, unless indeed they are content to go and live with the Hottentot, or the Fii—Jii Islanders, and to propagate their opinions there. The anti-christian scientist as long as he remains in christian society must prove that his theory not only *may* be true, but that it *is* true, and prove it with scientific certainty. Thus only can he oust the Christian doctrine, or overcome the presumption in its favour. Until his theory is proved more probable than revelation he cannot be heard. A probable hypothesis no more destroys revelation than a cannon ball destroys a tower. It may shake it, it may dint it, but it does not destroy. Hence then from the point of view of morals, as well as by the rigid ethical standard, these men who publish opinions, theories and hypothesis, which are only plausible, and not fully sustained by all the tests of science—that-is-science, are fearfully guilty and a thousand times more dangerous to society than burglars or swindlers or midnight assassins, and instead of being honoured and lauded as the great men of their time, are worthy only of the cart-tail and the lash, if not of the dungeon and the gallows.

Dis.—But at least there is consolation in that truth of the Latin Poet, *magna est veritas et prevalebit*, or as Milton puts it "Error is powerless, whilst truth is free to combat it."

Mag.—Alas, small comfort, most worthy Disciple. Would that saying were as true as it is often quoted. Truth is proverbially a slow coach, at least so think the Chinese. Error, says the Chinese proverb, "will run twice round the world, whilst Truth is pulling on its boots."

H. B

Men are born with two eyes, but one tongue, in order that they should see twice as much as they say.

A great many people—perhaps a third of the population of large towns, and three-fourth of those in small one—are far more anxious about the concerns of their neighbors than about their own—that is, if we are to judge from what they say.

HALF HOURS WITH MODERN PHILOSOPHERS.

III.

On one side we have seen arrayed the system, which by marvellous intellectual gymnastics succeeded in spinning out fantastic idealistic principles; and on the other a school of thinkers who by ignoring all that is highest in themselves, have constructed degrading materialistic doctrines; thus gaining a temporary glory, and winning the admiration of the educated vulgar. But between the outraged limits of the two, there runs a highway, which leads not to the mystic Ideal of Hegel, or the bestial Dagon of Condillac, but unto the very footstool of that God who spoke in thunder tones to Moses upon Sinai. And during the baleful strife which marked the course of misguided reason, chosen pilgrims have trod its mighty pavements, until Time receeched their world voices, in the grand old days when its furthestmost destination was lit up by the giant intellect of a Cajetan, and a Thomas Aquinas. When we reflect upon such names as Albertus Magnus, Thomas Aquinas, St. Augustino and St. Bonaventure, whose memory lends a glory to our day, our feeble intellect can barely grasp the immensity of their intelligence. These were minds whose inspired genius gave Scholastic Philosophy its priceless worth; and imparted to its sacred doctrines the life, which truly is divine, and leaves it changeless and unchanging, the science of light and truth.

Among this galaxy of great Doctors of the Faith stands preeminent for his wonderful depth of thought, and lucidity of demonstration, St. Thomas, the Angel of the Schools. And none too greatly can we honor him, so divinely fitted as a teacher of his kind, and the central luminary of mediæval metaphysicians. Upon the eternal truths, which had been partly taught since the writings of the grand old Stagirite, he built his immense Summa, weaving a stupendous chain of principles which led fairly to the threshold of Eternity itself. Never since have men beheld his equal; and when to day the student of Philosophy ponders upon the truths which burst upon the mind of St. Thomas in all their perennial splendor, he feels himself lifted up and purified by their very simplicity of treatment, and sublimity of utterance. And the beautiful inspirations which thrilled his soul and sense, whilst standing rapt before the crucifix, have been incorporated by the Church into its ceremonies, as fresh to day and breathful of "the splendor of the true," as when they streamed in upon the midnight vigils in that venerated cell whence Thomism stirred the world. In his system, his principles are truly the golden mean. He explains the creation of the world neither leaning to Pantheism nor to the atomism of Materialism; accepts the dictates of reason, without ignoring the testimony of revelation; does not take as supreme the criterion of authority, nor that of universal consent; admits the evidence of common sense and of sensation within their proper

limits. Besides supporting and enforcing moral teaching, he harmonizes with the declarations of religion; and fully establishes his own truth, in affirming the validity of our primary intuitions. In this philosophy we find no testimony rejected which intelligence admits; and find the supreme criterion of knowledge to be objective evidence, where our higher perceptions recognize the Divine Idea exemplified in the True, the Beautiful and the Good. Here we see the basis of true art; for unless we know objects as they really are, as they were created by the Divine Intelligence, we can never imitate nature. The province of art is to body forth the lineaments of nature, and when it succeeds we have the Ideal which the philosopher contemplates as true, the moralist as good, the artist as beautiful, and the world, in its honest dicta, the simply beautiful. Poetry has the strongest claims upon its aid; while painting, architecture, and sculpture, are all dependent upon objective truth. Filled with this conception, Dante the singer of true philosophy, rung his undying changes upon the world's heart, and his familiar lines are foot-paths for the thoughts of Italy; Shakespeare became the singer of nature, and mankind as it is, and his characters have become as household gods, crowding every niche of memory; and Corneille, the singer of our better self in thoughts which fix themselves deep in the soul, as meteor stones in earth, dropped from some higher sphere. Raphael and Angelo, were devoted students of St. Thomas, and their creations can never die. When we turn to its often maligned influence on science, I will but quote the words of Professor Mivart, a philosopher of no mean pretensions, in his refutation of Mr. Herbert Spencer. "In fact," he says, "Mr. Spencer's system, by its inconsistencies and lacunæ cries aloud for the Scholastic Philosophy to sustain and complete it; while it brings to the support of that philosophy a great variety of considerations, and helps to show how thoroughly it harmonizes with the most advanced science of the day—as fully with the science of the 19th century, as with that of the 13th., indeed, in some respects, much more completely!"

I have herein touched but a few of the great principles of Scholastic Philosophy; for the treatment of power and act, matter and form, substance and accident,—the key notes of its doctrine,—by which they investigate the rules, the principles, the classification of everything which exists, would each require volumes. And this is the philosophy which during all outside change and error has remained immutable and resplendent; which the great Roman colleges and universities of Europe have taught, and in which a great army of writers have found their inspirations. Here then will I rest my meagre exposition of modern doctrines, and notice the attitude of the hour. America and Europe feel deeply the evils of Materialistic and Skeptical Philosophy. Nihilism, Red Republicanism, Socialism, and what is more dangerous, Liberalism and

Indifferentism, are the results. The popular press serves up in the most seductive style, and at the most accommodating price, the lectures of Darwin, Huxley, Tyndal, Molescott, Bain, and a host of others of all nations. Men of the Ingersollian stripe, whom it would be sacrilege to honor with the name of philosopher, trumpet it forth from the lecture platform; newspapers are even catching the infection, while men of common education think it an indication of scientific abilities to canvass its surface matter in a dangerously ignorant style. Idealism has, 'tis true, many followers; whether we know them as Spiritists or Pantheists; whether we perceive it in the vagueness of Emerson, or in the strange weariness of England's great essayist, whose ashes are hardly yet cold in the quiet churchyard of Ecclefechan. But the practical nature of the American mind is mostly inclined to Materialism, leaving God and the soul aside, while only their good common sense keeps them from more violent extremes. Christian men long since foresaw the dangerous tendencies of false philosophy, and brought to bear upon it all the powers of true educational teachings; and during our century the world has known the influence of a Sanseverino, a Liberatore, a Ventura; whose vast attainments and invincible logic placed a powerful barrier to the force of Cartesian and Lockian errors. What was needed was the issue of text-books, periodicals, and reviews, which would present the immense treasures of Scholastic Philosophy in a clear and comprehensive method to the world; refute the day in an able and precise manner; and serve to make the Catholic world one in unity of thought.

Following the example of his saintly predecessor, the illustrious Leo XIII issued his famous Encyclical *Æterni Patris*, impressing upon the educational institutions of his fold the necessity of teaching one philosophy only; which he intended should effect no violent change; no radical cut-off of Catholic thought from the world around it; but a steady, healthful, drawing together of its forces, a knitting together of its principles under one true doctrine, that of St. Thomas Aquinas. This communication of the Holy Father was not intended alone for the abstract sciences, but for all science, and chiefly the positive sciences of our time, which unattended by sound metaphysical training, lead to Materialism. The impetus which this Encyclical has given to the issue of works based upon the *Summa* of St. Thomas has been wonderful in its effects; and among the numerous text-books brought out before and since its issue, I think worthy of notice here the works of Father Harper in England; Bensa in France; Kleutgen of Germany; Gonzales, in Spain; and Zigliara's, Palmieri's and Cornoldi's in Italy; and since the days when the famous Quarterly of the lamented Brownson made Scholastic Philosophy a shining mark, we have none so mighty in unmarking and refuting error, as the "Civiltà Cattolica," and *La Scienza e la Fede*, two Italian reviews. The works of Cardinal

Zigliara have already won the notice of the educational world; and I must be pardoned for exhibiting a little weakness for Alma Mater in stating that the College of Ottawa was the first institution to appreciate this faithful disciple of St. Thomas, and introduce his textbooks of the Summa as an auxiliary in preparing Catholic young men for the battle of life.

Having now reviewed the systems, whose influence on Church and State, Society and the Individual, Science and Art, I trust you have been able to appreciate from this necessarily brief paper, we may reflect a little on the lesson which they bear us. Men have erred, as it was natural they should. But their errors may be of service to us, if we see in them the true distinguished from the false; holding to the true but rejecting the false. The history of their errors will serve us as a chart, and enable us to avoid the rocks and shoals whither we might drift. The words of the Pope are more than empty signs; they are the prelude, I may safely say, to a new era in philosophy: they tell us to study the true, and prepare ourselves to meet error in any guise. They say to us:—

— Stay, stay the present instant!
 Impriat the mark of wisdom on its wings!
 O, let it not elude thy grasp, but, like
 The good old patriarch upon record,
 Hold the fleet angel fast until he bless thee."

That angel is none other than the spirit which breathes through the sublime pages of St. Thomas; through whose intellect the Cross of Christ has become the tree of science; whose doctrine is the bulwark of our Church which made Luther well say: "*Tolle Thomam et ego destruan ecclesiam*;" and whose principles will be the weapons we must use against the enemies of truth, until we can truly exclaim. *Christus vincet: Christus regnat: Christus imperat!*

E. J. O'S.

IRELAND AND THE LAND QUESTION.

(From the "Catholic World.")

Whether Plantaganet, Tudor, Stuart, or Brunswick—"a plague on all their houses!"—the end in view was the same, the trail of the serpent was over them all: the aggrandizement of England was to be reached, be the method of doing it never so repugnant to the dictates of justice and humanity. One million, sixty thousand, seven hundred and ninety-two acres of land were confiscated. Catholics, the great majority of the population, were disqualified by law from voting, from sitting in parliament, from carrying arms, from serving on juries, from the bench, the bar, and the university, from acting as school-teachers, and from going abroad to receive an education which they could not get at home unless they were brought up as Protestants. They could neither buy nor inherit land, nor receive it as a gift, nor lease it for a longer time than thirty-one years, and then only on condition of paying two-thirds its value. If the profits exceeded a third an informer who made the discovery at once entered into possession. The few Catholics who owned land were deprived of

the testamentary rights accorded to others. When the owner died his land did not descend to the eldest son; it was divided equally among all the children (as the old Irish code had it). But if the eldest son became an apostate the estate reverted to him, and the father lost all power of disposition over it. If the wife of a Catholic became a pervert she was free from his control, and entitled at once to a fixed share in his property. If a young Catholic child apostatized it was taken away from its parents, and the chancellor provided for its present and prospective wants from its parents' estate. These are but samples of laws "written in blood and that should be registered in hell."

Property begets a sense of independence and confers a certain rank in social life; therefore the law robbed the Irish of the right to acquire property, and for more than a hundred years they were half buried in the grave of social ostracism and seclusion. Knowledge imbues the mind with breadth of vision, enables man by word and pen to point out and lead the way to civil and political well-being; therefore, for the same period, the Irish, by English laws, were plunged in the night of ignorance, merged in the flood of political annihilation. Religion builds a ladder to the heavens, and angels ascend and descend to comfort man in the stress of his grief, to bear on high the incense of his prayers and aspirations; therefore the law banned the religion of the Irish, that not a green thing might bloom in the desert of their lives. Domestic love sweetens the bitterest lot, and invests with a halo of joy the most woe-begone surroundings; therefore the law gave a prize to filial ingratitude, and did all it could to rend in twain the holiest affections of married life. Truly a "mater dolorosa," a veritable mother of sorrows, was the island queen, mother Erin. But perhaps there is one avenue—the avenue of trade—left open for her progress. Even here she is weighted in the race. The woollen trade was a thriving branch of industry in Ireland, therefore enactments were carried to suppress it. The linen trade was next encouraged and gave promise of great prosperity; but the evil eye of English selfishness withered its budding hopes, for "if Ireland should fall into the making of fine linen it would affect the trade of England." In 1785 a petition against the Irish linen trade, signed by 117,000 persons, was presented from Manchester. Since the reign of William III., however, this branch of industry has flourished. The exportation of beef, of mutton, of hides, all were in turn prohibited, or such a tariff imposed as was equivalent to prohibition. The "Navigation Laws" affected Ireland as they did the other countries of Europe, rendering all subordinate to English supremacy on the ocean. She was not allowed to draw wealth from the soil, neither could she win it by the enterprise of her sons on the sea, by manufactures, nor by their traffic with foreign powers; and, therefore, she remained a commercial cipher. But the Argus-eyes sometimes slept, and the twenty-five hundred miles of coast-line were utilized by the smuggler. And thus Ireland remained, with a short respite of independence, until the dawn of the present century. Yet is she dotted with land-locked bays, and the tonnage of the world might find anchorage in her harbors. Before the "curse of Cromwell" fell upon it like the breath of the plague, Galway was, next to London, the greatest emporium of trade in the three kingdoms. After that its marble mansions and warehouses crumbled to ruin, barks and sloops rofted in the docks, and grass grew in the streets. Its importance was blasted, its prosperity withered, by the famine-breeding laws of England.

Like desolation visited the other parts. The laws bore down with the weight of mountain upon mountain of iniquity on the strength, the energies, the enterprise of the Irish. Compared with English law in Ireland, the Draconian code is not unworthy of Justinian, of Alfred, or St. Louis of France. But in spite of it all, with exuberant life and unconquerable vitality, the old land has outlived the seven hundred years of war and legislation, and, though wearied by the strain, weakened by the loss of the young and the brave of successive generations, she stands forth to-day, begrimed with the dust of the conflict, wearing the print of the chains, it is true, yet radiant with the consciousness of work well done, and likely to bear the palm of success in the near future.

The famine-wail that rings out through the earth calls forth the echoes of charity to the stricken cabin-homes, and various remedies are suggested to prevent the recurrence of so appalling a visitation. This same cry was heard more than once in the last century. In the famine of 1741 greater loss of life took place than during the war a hundred years before. In 1846-7 famine smote its tens of thousands, typhoid decimating those whom it had spared; and rightly did coroners' juries bring in verdicts of willful murder against Lord John Russell and his cabinet. If not a chronic, famine can hardly be called an exceptional, product of English law in Ireland. Driven to one employment, with nothing to stimulate increased industry, nothing to discountenance increased idleness, the mass of the Irish tilled the battle-vexed soil, and out of the fruits of their toil came the fund to pay the owner of the fee-simple estate, to pay the four or five middlemen who at times came between the owner and the tenant, to pay the draper, the grocer, the lawyer, the doctor, and to provide for the wants of a multiplying offspring. Improvements made by the tenant served but to raise the rent for the landlord. And when an unpropitious season came, when a blight fell on the staple crop, at once the fund vanished, eviction or famine supervened.

Having proscribed commerce and manufactures in Ireland, English law forced its people to agriculture. Even in this one pursuit they were constrained to work under manifold disadvantages. The old school of land-owners, rich in acres and with but little hard cash, adopted something of a *laissez-faire* policy. When the harvest was abundant rents were promptly paid; when it was otherwise "the master" did not push the tenant to the wall. But with the sales made under the Encumbered Estates Act—and these in a few years amounted to more than a hundred millions of dollars—a new set of proprietors came into possession. Five-sixths of the purchase-money was Irish capital, and the purchases were made with a single eye to a large percentage on the amount invested. Little if any allowance was thereafter made for defective crops. The law gave the owner of the soil arbitrary power over the fate and fortunes of the hapless tenant. No matter what the nature or expense of improvements made, they were confiscated to the use of the landlord if the late "gale" was in arrear. In the province of Ulster, indeed, the tenant had a prescriptive right to a fair market price for his improvements; yet in the other provinces he was liable to be dispossessed without compensation, and this whether the rent was paid or unpaid. In such a condition of insecurity has he remained, and this precarious state is an anachronism in the nineteenth century. Many well-meaning men suggest a wholesale emigration as a panacea for the ills of Ireland. But it would be a crime against civilization,

a sin against God, to depopulate a land that has done so much for progress and advancement, to wipe out a race that has battled for the right against tremendous odds, that never once as a people did an act which should bring the blush of shame to their cheeks. Be it with the pick-axe, the ploughshare, the sword, or the cross, they have given proof in every field of a magnificent manhood; never false to the trust reposed in them, never recreant to the word that was pledged, or false to the apostolate for which they were ordained.

How long shall England remain in her pride of place? Shall the sceptre slip from her grasp when the chalice she made other nations drink of is at last presented to her own lips? When that hour comes will it be a death-draught or a healing potion? With Ireland it may rest to give the answer. Now, if she is so minded, England may make partial atonement for the unparalleled wrong she has done, for the hecatombs her fury has butchered. Never again can she with impunity subject to another ordeal of vivisection a nation of soldiers that time and again has beaten her to her knees at home, yet won half her battles abroad. The land question is the key of the future. It is a problem that challenges the highest intelligence and statesmanship, and imperiously demands a fitting solution. In other lands a peasant proprietary has been established with the best results for the governed and governing: with a due regard for vested interests, why may not a similar experiment be tried in Ireland? Such a measure would be fraught with incalculable good for both countries, alike the fore gleam of commercial splendor for England and the dawn of a golden era of prosperity for Ireland.

—:o:—

CHURCH GILMES.

The ambassador of one of the great powers in Paris was asked the other day what he thought of the present position of the Holy See; and of the chance of the Pope's departure from Rome. His Excellency replied: "It is too much the fashion now to vilipend the influence of the Holy See. Napoleon I taught the lesson of the power of the Papacy to Europe; but she seems to have forgotten it." To the question of where the Pope would go to if his position in the Holy City became intolerable, the Ambassador (who is not a Catholic) replied: "It would matter very little where he went. In the end we should have to bring him back again. Of one thing, however, you may be certain, viz; that the King of Italy would soon follow the Pope; and one more Republic would exist in Europe. Although we should put the Pope back, we should not restore the King of Italy. King Umberto would then be a pretender like the late Prince Imperial or Don Carlos. But the Pope can never be a pretender. He is always the *Summus Pontifex*. He has no rival, and no Catholic disputes his sovereignty. As there are millions of Catholics under every government, I again say that we should have to interfere. We do not want the Pope anywhere else. His proper place is in Rome."

The conquest of Algeria by the French in 1830 restored to Christianity that portion of African soil, but the authorities, fearing by any appearance of proselytism to excite Musulman hostility, permitted no missionary enterprises. But in 1868 occurred a famine which destroyed in some districts of Algeria a fifth of the population, and left thousands of native children in

utter destitution. The Archbishop of Algiers then sent out priests and nuns to bring these little unfortunates to his palace. They came in lively terror, under the painful impression that Christians were, like the giant in Jack the Giant Killer, particularly fond of the blood of young children. These apprehensions were soon agreeably dispelled, and now those 9,000 children are growing up in establishments formed especially for them in the villages of St. Cyprien and St. Monique on the railroad line between Algiers and Oran, the same route which was once the road from Carthage to the pillars of Hercules. Archbishop Lavignerie has further extended Christianity among the Arabs by means of medical missionaries. It is the rule of the order of Algerian missionaries to tend with their own hands all the sick who come to them. Their fame extended through the back country, and, by the aid of Gen. Wolff, commandant of the military division of Algiers, who had at his disposal a large fund destined for charities among the natives, the Archbishop was enabled to raise in the village of St. Cyprien a hospital where natives are gratuitously attended.

The natives of India, who certainly ought by this time to know something definite of the British character, have a firm conviction that their rulers have no faith. If asked to define an Englishman, nine out of ten would reply, "He is a man without a religion."

J. G. S. writes in the *Catholic Universe* :—

The first ship built in this country was *La Gavarra* built in South Carolina by Lucas Vasquez de Ayllon in 1526 and blessed by a Catholic priest.

The first vessel built on the northern lakes was the *Griffon*, built above Niagara Falls by Robert Cavalier, Sieur de la Salle, in 1679 and blessed by a Catholic priest.

The first who made known the existence of petroleum was the Franciscan Father Joseph de la Roche d'Allion who was at Niagara in 1629.

The first who discovered the salt springs of Salina, N. Y., was the Jesuit Father le Moyne, in 1654.

The first who worked the copper of Lake Superior was the Jesuit lay Brother Giles Mazier, about 1675, who also made a mon-stance of native silver.

The first who raised a crop of wheat in Illinois were the Jesuit Fathers.

The first who introduced sugar-cane into Louisiana were the Jesuit Fathers.

The first who identified the American ginseng with that of China and opened a new trade with that country was the Jesuit Father Lafiteau.

The first Christian worship in Maine, Vermont, Maryland, Virginia, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, Mississippi, Louisiana, Texas, Ohio, Indiana, Michigan, Illinois, Wisconsin, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri, New Mexico, Oregon, California, Arizona, was forced by Catholic priests.

The Catholics of Rome, and indeed of other countries also, have recently been startled by the apostasy of Monsignor Enrico Campello, one of the Canons of St. Peter's. This gentleman gave up his office and joined the Episcopal Methodist Church in the Piazza Poli at Rome. On the evening appointed for his public abjuration, which was made to Professor Alberto Lanna, an ex-monk, the little Methodist church was filled by a

curious crowd. The principal actor on the scene delivered a speech intended as an explanation of the reasons which induced him to take such a step, and he also wrote a letter to Cardinal Borromeo, Archpriest of the Vatican Basilica, to the same effect.

"Progress and liberty" were his special pursuits, as he intimates, and these were barred against his approach by the Roman Church. The ministry of that church was placed in the condition of an Indian caste in modern society. These and other like evils caused all the veils of prejudice to fall from his eyes and forced him to sever all these ties. "I leave," he said, "the ranks of the Roman priesthood to fight as a pure evangelist of Christ, remaining in so much faithful to my vocation and persuaded that I shall find in this peace for my soul; for, strong in the doctrines of the Divine Master (doctrines unadulterated and undisguised), I shall with bold front avow myself a Christian without hypocrisy and an Italian citizen without the mask of a traitor to my fatherland."

This is the Monsignor's explanation of his change of religion. He sought for pure doctrine and patriotism in the Methodist Church. Each to his taste. But his friends, enemies of Pope and Church, explain his conduct differently. We quote the journals by name that speak of him. *Capitan Fracassa* (and all who know the journals of modern Rome know the spirit of this one) says:—

"It is not yesterday he left *in spirit* his stall and his prebend...it is at least seven years ago since he ceased to say Mass and to wear the tonsure. He loved jewels and rings, which he never laid aside, not even when vested as a canon; he practised *spiritualism* successfully, and enjoyed high repute as a man of culture and grace amongst the ladies, and he reached the height of happiness when he completed his travesty with a pair of false mustachios, which, in his delirium for *secularization*, he caressed and fooled about with the affection and persistency which some people have for the natural and legitimate article. Events drove him on...Afterwards Don Enrico gave himself up to the reading of the works of Strauss, of Renan, and of Dollinger, and he often spoke to his friends and his colleagues, the Canons, of the ideal which he felt in his soul of a non-Catholic Christianity, of a religion, according to him, simpler and purer. He had doubts, torments, and at least, a monomania for religious polemics. He proposed to condense in a volume what seemed to him his new faith, and he wrote so much that his abjuration will soon be followed by a theological-polemical religious political volume which will relate the torments of a soul."

We might ask the Methodists, in the words of Shakespeare, "Canst thou minister to a mind diseased?" For, if *Capitan Fracassa* is to be credited, Mgr. Campello's mind is off its balance. The *Gazzetta d'Italia*, whose color and politics are well known, even outside of Italy, throws further light on the question. This journal writes:—

"In 1872 he began to visit frequently the Princess W—an Austrian or German, if we mistake not, in whose house he held religious conferences...Henceforward Canon Di Campello became another man; both his life and his way of talking showed clearly how his ideas were entirely changed. Many times have we seen him, in the evening hours, lay aside his cassock and don the elegant dress of a stylish dandy. In this case likewise we must remember the famous *cherchez-a-femme*—seek the woman. Without entering into family secrets, or very intimate matters, we limit ourselves to

say that the ex-Canon was madly in love with a young girl, by whom this love was ardently returned, and perhaps in a very short time we will see him united to her in matrimony."

It is the old, old story of Erasmus; the Reformation, ending in a marriage: Luther and Catherine Bora, Henry VIII, and Anne Boleyn, and a host of others too numerous to mention, down to Father Hyacinthe, whose doctrine was illumined by the bright eyes of the Widow Merriman, and Mgr. Campello, who learned the errors of his ways from the rosy lips of the young girl whom he madly loved, and who loved him foolishly in return.—*The Pilot*.

Dr. T. F. Mahar, contributes the following article on "Hearing Mass"—a subject which many Catholics need to study—to the *Catholic Universe*:—An article we have noticed in a contemporary on this subject has reminded us of the usefulness of a few remarks on it. All understand very well that the precept of assisting at Mass binds us under penalty of grievous sin. Not only is this well understood but it is also appreciated to such an extent that after all there are few Catholics who fail without sufficient reason to fulfil this duty. It is not so much in abstaining entirely from it that people fail as in being late. Of course this happens as a rule through some inadvertence rather than from any other cause. We do not suppose that in one case out of twenty anybody wilfully goes late to Mass. We have heard that in some places it is considered fashionable to enter the church after Mass has begun. We have known instances of persons who desired to enter when the church was filled, in order to attract more attention to some particularly pleasing dress or the like. But these are thank God exceptions. Certainly very few Catholics go late to Mass wilfully.

Hence it is scarcely of any use to discuss the point as to when a person sins grievously by going late to Mass. The useful point is to determine when a person is bound to attend a second Mass. On this question there are different opinions as we might expect. [It is about the same as the question of what sum of money constitutes a grievous theft.] Some draw the line at the Epistle, some at the Gospel, some at the Offertory. And as this last is as sound an opinion as any we may very safely follow it. Of course the precept extends to the whole of Mass. We are bound to hear Mass from beginning to end. But there is an important difference between what follows the Creed and what precedes. With the Offertory we commence that portion of the Mass which is scarcely ever changed. What precedes varies frequently, and besides bears no very close relation to the Holy Sacrifice. With the Offertory direct preparation commences. The prayers that follow, unlike those that precede, contain direct reference to the Sacrifice.

Thus we have an important line drawn in the prayers themselves at this point. Besides this was the line between the Mass of the Catechumens and the Mass of the Faithful: the Catechumens left at this point. These are certainly good reasons for drawing the line at the Offertory.

A person then who would omit the Offertory would be obliged to attend another Mass. Since by remaining a person could still be present at the essential portion of the Sacrifice, it follows of course that he should do so when he cannot go to another Mass. It follows also that if he should go to another Mass after having previously assisted from the Offertory to the end, he would not be obliged to wait after the Offertory. We

know that few who go to a second Mass would go out then, but it is well to know just what our duty is lest imagining the burden too irksome we should fail to do what we would do if we were to know the exact limits of our duty.

It is easy to understand that the precept of the Church in regard to attendance at Mass refers to one Mass. That is the primary natural sense of the precept. Yet we cannot but say that substantially it is fulfilled when a person attends parts of two Masses and the Consecration and Communion are in the one Mass. And even if they are not in the one Mass some would still hold that the precept is substantially fulfilled. We ought to hear the whole of one Mass, and to wilfully and without reason plan any division such as the above would be a venial sin, but no sin at all when there is the least reason to excuse it. Certainly when a person has already assisted at the Consecration and Communion in one Mass he is not bound under penalty of any sin to hear further than the Consecration of a second. The very inconvenience of the additional time used exempts from the venial fault in such case. The teaching that the precept in question is substantially fulfilled by hearing two parts as above must not be understood as admitting the fulfilment when two priests say simultaneously one the first the other the second half of the Mass. A condemned proposition settles that point as all students of moral theology know. It is easy to understand that when a person omits for instance what precedes the Gospel or in a word any portion which does not carry more than a venial obligation, a slight reason justifies neglect to supply it by a portion of a subsequent Mass. The delay for instance of an hour or two in waiting for another Mass, the trouble of returning a distance to the church are reasons to justify us in failing to supply minor portions such as those mentioned. So that admitting as certain the opinion that we are obliged to supply such minor defects, practically such obligation hardly ever exists. And even as to greater portions of the Mass, for instance from the beginning to the Canon, the obligation of supplying such when omitted is removed for a much less reason than is required to dispense us from hearing Mass entirely. A distance, for example, which would not be sufficient to exempt us from the obligation of hearing Mass might still be sufficient to exempt us from supplying even such serious portion as that mentioned above.

When was the first Mass offered up on the point of Yorktown? Some think it was when the Spanish Navigator ascended the waters of the "Bahia de Santa Maria" fifty years before the Pilgrim stood on Plymouth, and explored all the neighboring points. All we know for certainty of that time is that those explorers "erected crosses" on the promontories, and that they had a log chapel somewhere in this neighborhood, a long time before the English landed at Jamestown, dedicated to "La Madre de Dios de Jacan." The Yorktown Celebration was the first time we can say with certainty that the Holy Sacrifice was offered there. The French chaplains came with their countrymen and prayed while the soldiers fought, and after the fiery ordeal, the hostile array, and processions drawn up to fight, Washington on the 20th, ordered divine services to be held in the different brigades, in thanksgiving to the God of battles. Rev. Mr. Evans, an untrammelled minister of the Established Church, performed religious services for the members of his denomination, and the French Chaplains for the Catholics.

So the first Mass at Yorktown was celebrated during the first fiery celebration at Yorktown. And may the thanksgiving of Mass ever go up to God, for the blessings of Yorktown, as long as sand enough of that bluff remains above the water's edge, to support an altar, and the rights of our own country are under the guardian-hip of heaven.—*Catholic Visitor*.

The famous Fisherman's Ring used by the Pope to seal Papal Briefs and Bulls, is a steel seal made in the fashion of a Roman signet (*signatorius anulus*). When a brief is written to any distinguished personage, or has relation to religious or general important matter, the impression from the Fisherman's Ring is said to be made upon a gold surface; in some cases it appears upon lead, and those seals are generally attached by strings of silk. Impressions of this seal are also made in ink, direct upon the parchment on which the brief is written. During the ceremonies attendant upon the death of a Pope, the figure of St. Peter upon the ring is destroyed with a file, and thereupon all the authority and acts of the late Pope pass to the College of Cardinals. When a new Pope is consecrated the renewed Fisherman's Ring is presented to him by the Cardinal Chancellor or Chamberlain.

"But, avoiding exclusiveness, Catholics ought to support one another, and to support one another in a conscientious manner. A Catholic, in whatever grade his career is cast, has not the same influence amongst Protestants that a Protestant often has amongst Catholics. No generosity on his part could ever gain him that influence, whilst the most trifling generosity on the part of a Protestant would gain it for him amongst Catholics. To use a racing phrase, the Catholic is 'overweighted' in his career, and, if we expect anything from him, we must take a little of the 'lead' off him by giving him a helping hand, with the recollection that we are brethren of the household of the Faith."—*Baltimore Mirror*.

Referring to the death of President Garfield, Archbishop Lynch said:—"As a Christian and Catholic prelate we have to deplore with heart-felt regret, that in the hourly bulletins which were issued from the sick-room during the illness of the President, at the moment of his death the public were not informed of his religious exercises, if any, nor of his words of Christian repentance, hope, and resignation to God's will, nor of his confidence in the merits of our divine Redeemer. How edifying and instructive would it be to the millions who read these daily accounts, to hear that the last words of this brave man were those of Christ on the cross, 'Into thy hands, O Lord, I commend my spirit'. The same reliance was observed when the papers recorded the death scenes of some late illustrious men of England: 'The funeral pageant was all for the body and memory of the departed, but nothing for the soul!—alas for the want of faith 'In the Communion of Spirits' here below, in heaven, and in purgatory."

It says the *Catholic Union*, the faith of many Catholics in the Real Presence of Christ on our Altars were measured by its exterior manifestation, how faint and frail—how all but dead—would it be deemed! We speak not now of merely nominal Catholics, but rather of those who count themselves, and are accounted,

practical Catholics. How few of them, decently careful though they be to attend Mass on Sundays, ever think of sparing five minutes from the week-day business or rest or pleasure, to visit our Lord in the Blessed Sacrament! They would hesitate to pass the house of a valued friend without stopping at least for a cordial salutation or enquiry; but they go by unheeding the open doors of the church, where the Friend of friends is day and night awaiting them.

Does it ever occur to those people that it is any concern of theirs how that Divine Guest is lodged? They are solicitous, according to their means, for the beautifying of their dwellings. No time is lost that is spent on dainty nettings and embroideries for furniture or raiment. There is silver for the table and jewelry for the person; rare flowers abloom in the summery atmosphere, when the winds without are wintry; and all the while, no thought of the hundreds of poor churches, with rude altars, shabby vestments, and miserable excuses of ornaments. None of the scarlet and fine linen has been spared for the sanctuary, not a flower for the altar, not an hour of time, nor a suggestion of their refined and discriminating taste towards beautifying the House of God.

It was not thus in the ages of faith. It was then the delight of noble ladies to spend hours in preparing fair linens, and delicate laces and embroideries of silk and cloth of gold for the altars. But now work like this is left almost entirely to religious. It should not be. Yet we believe that this apparent apathy results from thoughtlessness, rather than from any lack of faith: and that if Catholic ladies—even those of but moderate means and occasional leisure—understood the many wants that are best supplied by feminine taste and industry, there would soon be no dearth of beauty in God's House, the place where—however closely veiled—His glory dwelleth.

At the banquet of the citizens of Kingston, in honor of the elevation of Monsignore Farrelly, Bishop Cleary delivered a remarkable discourse, from which we extract the following passages:—"They lived in a free country, and they should recognize it as such. No man should quarrel with his neighbor because he expressed a different and free opinion on public matters. If one wished to deny a statement he should sustain it by argument and in a constitutional way. If he had a grievance he had as much right to express his soreness of soul as a sick man had to express the soreness of his body. In a free country, however, the honest man should be open to argument. In any occurring difference it should be opinion against opinion, argument against argument, and mind against mind. Therefore he should never quarrel with any man because he believed he had a grievance; if necessary he would meet him with argument, nothing more. Such was the rule of a free country. The expression of good will towards the ecclesiastical body to which he belonged, and of which he was the head in this Diocese, he regarded as a testimony to the course of conduct observed by him and his predecessors. They had, he thought, been good citizens, loyal to the constitution, and they were desirous of preserving and maintaining peace.

He trusted that he would preserve the dignity of his office so long as he lived, and he would also defend it, and he hoped no one would seek to deprive him of those rights and liberties which all men should have in a free country. All men were equal so far as good conduct in life and good reason in argument were concern-

ed. He esteemed the expressions of good will towards him on several occasions as a compliment not to him personally but to the office which he held, and nothing would please him better as he went to the grave than to have the conviction that he left a monument of good works performed for the benefit of the city. That would be his aim, and with the blessing of God, he hoped to succeed. He referred to some ideas advanced by the American Consul, to the effect that he had almost grown to maturity before he had seen a priest, that he had thought the typical priest a dangerous man, that study and experience had modified his early opinions, and that during the war he had found that the Catholic was as willing as the Protestant to contribute his quota of blood to cement the Union. He was glad to hear these admissions, as a man in the position of the Consul did not speak by random; and he further took the utterances of Colonel Twitchell to be the feeling of the people of the country he represented in Canada. He went on to illustrate the position of the Catholics in so far as they recognized authority, whether monarchical or republican. He said the feeling had animated some men that because the Catholic Church was by divine constitution monarchical therefore it was in favor of such governments and institutions rather than those of a republic. There never was a greater error. Any honest historian would tell them that. The Catholic Church supported those who held the sceptre of authority, whether obtained by hereditary means or vote of the people. Once this authority was constitutionally established it was obeyed and respected by the Church, because, he said, "all power is from God," and the person legitimately vested with it is the delegate of God, who alone can give to man authority to bind the conscience of his fellowmen. The power resides radically in the people, as an essential attribute of social existence; but since life must be organized, the subject of this divinely ordained power must be some one or more persons selected by the community, to whom God has left the choice in the present Dispensation. The person or persons thus selected hold authority directly from God, and must exercise it as a trust from God for the benefit of the community; to God it reverts again should he persist in employing it for the detriment of society. He alluded to the monarchical opinion that was formerly entertained in respect to the divine right of kings and queens to rule - and by divine right (hateful, odious word) it was meant that because a man or woman was born in a palace, and rocked in a silver cradle, by virtue of his or her inheritance could claim absolute, irresponsible Dominion over the people. The Catholic Church never said yes to the assertion; on the contrary, during the reign of Elizabeth, when that doctrine prevailed in England, the one who was foremost in arguing against it was a cardinal who said that it was contrary to the law of God, and laid down the principle that no man could assume authority unless it came through the people. He cited the case of King James, that royal pedant, that robber of Ulster, who laid down the doctrine of Kingship by divine right, and held that the people should not remonstrate nor resist any of his royal behests. He wrote a book setting forth his views. Who took up the right of the people? A Jesuit named Francis Suarez, of Portugal, one of the most learned men of the day, whose many works were in their libraries. He wrote from his cell against James, and although himself under an absolute monarchy declared that no king on earth ever had any power to rule over the people except that power came through the people as a trust

to him. King James could not have his arguments refuted, could not silence the Jesuit's argument, and what happened? He sentenced the latter's book to be hung in the square of London by the common hangman. He proceeded to note what Cardinal Langton did in demanding the charter from King John, and the assistance rendered by Louis XVI. and Catholic France to America when the liberty of the Republic was threatened in the time of Washington. The speaker referred to the republics of Venice and Genoa, fostered and controlled in the ages of faith by the teachings of bishops and popes, and asked was it not the spirit of commercial enterprise and national glory, developed to the highest degree in the Catholic republic of Genoa, that fired the soul of her noble son, Christopher Columbus with the grand idea and grander achievement of the task that gave this Western Continent to society of nations. In conclusion, after having shown that the Catholics were always desirous of freedom, of observing the right, whether of a monarchy or republic, when fixed by society and sanctioned by God, he said he would be surprised if ever it was said that a Catholic priest was not as loyal to the United States as any Protestant clergyman. In the neighboring republic, as in France, the Church was loyal to existing authority. He asked which did they think the late Pope liked best, the French republic under Thiers or the empire under Napoleon? Whatever Government, by proper means, was adopted by the people, to it allegiance would be paid by the spiritual power.

Here is a grave matter against you, that you are so well with the Protestants about you; I do not mean to say that you are not bound to cultivate peace with all men, and to do them all the offices of charity in your power. Of course you are, and if they respect, esteem, and love you, it redounds to your praise and will gain you a reward; but I mean more than this; they do *not* respect you, but they like you, because they think of you as of themselves, they see no difference between themselves and you. This the very reason why they so often take your part, and assert or defend your political rights. Here, again, there is a sense of course in which our civil rights may be advocated by Protestants without any reflection on us, and with honor to them. We are like others in this, that we are men; that we are members of the same state with them, subjects, contented subjects, of the same Sovereign; that we have a dependence on them, and have them dependent on us; that, like them, we feel pain when ill-used, and are grateful when well-treated. We need not be ashamed of a fellowship like this, and those who recognize it in us are generous in doing so. But we have much cause to be ashamed, and much cause to be anxious what God thinks of us, if we gain their support by giving them a false impression in our persons of what the Catholic Church is, and what Catholics are bound to be, what bound to believe and to do; and is not this the case often, and the world takes up your interests, because you share its sins?

Nature is one with nature, grace with grace; the world then witnesses against you by being good friends with you; you could not have got on with the world so well, without surrendering something which was precious and sacred. The world likes you, all but your professed creed; distinguishes you from your creed in its judgment of you, and would fain separate you from it in fact. Men say, "These persons are better than their Church; we have not a word to say

for their Church; but Catholics are not what they were; they are very much like other men now. Their creed certainly is bigoted and cruel, but what would you have of them? You cannot expect them to confess this; let them change quietly, no one changes in public, be satisfied that they are changed. They are as fond of the world as we are; they take up political objects as warmly; they like their own way just as well; they do not like strictness a whit better; they hate spiritual thralldom, and they are half ashamed of the Pope and his Councils. They hardly believe any miracles now, and are annoyed when their own brethren officiously proclaim them; they never speak of purgatory; they are sore about images; they avoid the subject of Indulgences; and they will not commit themselves to the doctrine of exclusive salvation. The Catholic doctrines are now mere badges of party. Catholics think for themselves and judge for themselves, just as we do; they are kept in their Church by a point of honor, and a reluctance at seeming to abandon a fallen cause."

Such is the judgment of the world, and you, my brethren, are shocked to hear it;—but may it not be that the world knows more about you than you know about yourselves? "If ye had been of the world," says Christ, "the world would love its own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you." So speaks Christ of His apostles. How run his words when applied to you? "If ye be of the world, the world will love its own; therefore ye are of the world, and I have not chosen you out of the world, because the world loveth you." Do not complain of the world's imputing to you more than is true; those who live as the world give color to those who think them of the world, and seem to form but one party with them. In proportion as you put off the yoke of Christ, so does the world by a sort of instinct recognize you, and think well of you accordingly. Its highest compliment is to tell you that you disbelieve. Oh, my brethren, there is an eternal enmity between the world and the Church. The Church declares by the mouth of an Apostle, "Whoso will be a friend of the world, becomes an enemy of God;" and the world retorts, and calls the Church apostate, sorceress, Beelzebub, and Antichrist. She is the image and the mother of the predestinate, and, if you would be found among her children when you die, you must have part in her reproach while you live. Does not the world scoff at all that is glorious, all that is majestic, in our holy religion? Does it not speak against the special creations of God's grace? Does it not disbelieve the possibility of purity and chastity? Does it not slander the profession of celibacy? Does it not deny the virginity of Mary? Does it not cast out her very name as evil? Does it not scorn her as a dead woman, whom you know to be the Mother of all living, and the great Intercessor of the faithful? Does it not ridicule the Saints? Does it not make light of their relics? Does it not despise the Sacraments? Does it not blaspheme the awful Presence which dwells upon our altars, and mock bitterly and fiercely at our believing that what it calls bread and wine is that very same Body and Blood of the Lamb which lay in Mary's womb and hung on the Cross? What are we, that we should be better treated than our Lord, and His Mother, and His Servants, and His works? Nay, what are we, if we be better treated, but the friends of those who treat us well, and who ill-treat Him?—*Cardinal Newman.*

EDUCATIONAL NOTES.

To the appeal for aid to rebuild Ste. Therese Collego the alumni are nobly responding. Father James Lonergan of St. Bridget's, Montreal, contributes \$1000, Father Simon Lonergan, \$100, and Father Corbett of St. Andrew's, \$50.

It is said that an effort will be made to convene representative Separate School trustees and teachers, for the purpose of discussing the School Question, before the next meeting of the Legislature.

Mr F. J. Lynch, Principal of the Separate School, Peterboro, says, of the SHIELD: "The publication has, I feel certain, appeared at a most opportune time, and when some progress must be made in the direction of improving our Separate School system which has so long remained stationary.

The establishment of a system of inspection for Separate Schools on the lines advocated in the SHIELD would receive my most hearty support."

The President of the Literary Society, lately formed by the Ottawa Normal School students, is Mr. M. J. Harrington, a young Catholic of great promise.

Chatham Separate School Board desire a Principal for their Separate School and offer a salary of \$700 a year. We hope they will secure the services of an able teacher, for those who are willing to pay a good salary deserve a good teacher.

Right Rev. Monsignore Farrelly was accorded a reception by the pupils of Loretto Convent, Belleville, on the occasion of his recent elevation to the dignity of a Prelate by His Holiness the Pope.

Brother Tobias, Director of De La Salle College and Superintendent of the Toronto Separate Schools, is an indefatigable worker in the cause of Catholic education. Under the supervision of Brother Tobias, the Separate Schools of Toronto are making excellent progress.

Mr. W. A. Shannon has received an appointment as teacher of the Catholic children in the Blind Institute of Brantford. Mr. Shannon was a student of the Brantford Collegiate Institute for two years, and has been recently engaged in Public School work in the County of Hastings.

There are 325 pupils registered in the Separate Schools of Stratford.

Miss O'Grady, who has taught the Brantford Separate Schools with great success during the past three years, is about to withdraw from the profession.

C. Donovan, Esq., B. A., Principal of the Hamilton Separate Schools, has purchased the SHIELD from our old friend Mr. Gillies of Montreal. Mr. Donovan, who is an able teacher and a clever writer, will, we have no doubt, conduct that magazine in a very capable manner. We commend his enterprise, and heartily wish him success.

There are ninety pupils at present in attendance at Loretto Convent, Belleville.

Mr F. J. Lynch is Head-master of the Peterboro Separate School. Mr Lynch is a very superior classical scholar, and many a Catholic young man holding a high position professionally owes his education to Mr. Lynch.

There are 720 pupils attending the London Separate Schools. The teachers consist of one male teacher, six Sisters of St. Joseph, and two Sisters of the Sacred Heart.

Mr. Gormley is Head-master of Cobourg Separate School. Mr. Swift the former Principal having lately accepted a position in the Port Perry High School.

Mr. J. F. White has resigned his position as Principal of the Lindsay Separate School.

Brother Halward is Principal of the Kingston Separate Schools.

There are in Ontario 4 Catholic Colleges, (one with University powers) 20 Convents and 177 Separate Schools.

The teachers of Trenton Separate School consist of Miss White Head-teacher, and Miss Buckley, Assistant.

Alderman Holden is Chairman of Belleville Separate School Board. Mr. Holden works hard in behalf of the interests of Separate Schools.

Pembroke has done a wise act—increased the salaries of its Separate School teachers. Under Mr Walsh, the boys are making satisfactory progress. Sister Mary of Mt. Carmel, well and favorably known in this city and wherever the Grey Nuns are established, directs the girls schools with success.

The late Prince Consort frequently visited the parish schools in London, and remained while the children were examined. Upon one occasion the master, anxious that his pupils should distinguish themselves, inquired, "Can you tell me anything about heat?" A bright little boy put up his hand and at once said, glibly, "Heat expands, cold contracts." The teacher looked at the Prince for approval; he smiled approbation, and the teacher continued: "Very good: now give me an example?" "In summer," said the boy, "the days are long, in winter they are short."

STRATFORD, Oct. 20th., 1881.

Editor of the CATHOLIC SHIELD.

DEAR SIR,

Permit me, as a Separate School Teacher, and one heartily interested in the cause of Catholic education, to express my gratification at seeing a journal devoted to the interest of Separate Schools and Catholic education in general.

An exchange of opinions between those who, however they may differ in details, are heartily united in the wish to see Catholic Schools increase in number and efficiency, and to endeavor by all means in their power to increase their stability and improve their deficiencies, whether arising from defective legislation or from any other cause, cannot fail to do good.

As the SHIELD will furnish an easy and pleasant means of allowing a full interchange of views, I do not doubt it has a wide sphere of usefulness before it. I wish it success.

Very truly yours,

KATHERINE BALLASTINE,

Teacher Separate School.

To the Editor of the CATHOLIC SHIELD:

SIR,

The SHIELD was recommended to me last week, by that earnest friend of Catholic education, Mr. T. O'Hagan, as an organ devoted, among other good things, to the cause of Separate School education. A perusal of last month's issue, the first number that has reached me, convinces me that such recommendation was based on truth. I am satisfied that the SHIELD will exert no small influence in the coming struggle for greater freedom in carrying out to its fullest meaning the principle of Separate School education. An organ battling for such an object cannot fail to be invaluable to the workers in the cause, and therefore the Separate School Teachers and Trustees of Ontario could not do better than cordially support the SHIELD. Wishing it a large circulation and the best success in its good fight

I remain, Yours truly,

P. J. O'ROURKE,

Separate School Trustee.

TRENTON, Oct. 24th., 1881.

The school authorities of Hanover have directed the teachers under their jurisdiction to submit a detailed account of how they spend their time out of school hours. One of the teachers answered at once in the following manner: "Rise at 6 A. M., and as soon as I am dressed I look out of the window. But if this is against pedagogic dignity, you will please advise me. At 7 A. M. I take a cup of coffee and dry bread. After that I read a chapter of Cæsar's de bello Gallico, so that I may always keep in mind how Cæsar crushed the Gauls until they could no longer move a limb. Now it is about time to go to school. What I think on the way to school I do not want to disclose, even if you decide to dismiss me from the service. After school I give a few private lessons, in order to keep my family from starving. A little later I take a glass of water and retire. I do not meddle with politics, and I never go into society. I only meddle with Xenophon, Cæsar, and grammar."—Zacharias Schulz, teacher.

A delicate and nervous child, eleven years old, committed in a Cincinnati public school last month the grievous crime of resting his head upon one hand. Rebuked by his teacher for this terrible infraction of order, he lifted his head, but a short time after rested it upon his hand again. The teacher first imitated his position in such a way as to cause the pupils to laugh, much to the lad's discomfort; then when he called upon the little fellow to recite, and he laughed or smiled, this stupid person slapped him severely on his face and head, causing a bruise and subsequent sickness through the night. The case was brought to court, and Judge Higley, who himself recited the facts given above, pronounced the teacher guilty of assault and battery, saying: "The defendant first employed ridicule, which should never be resorted to in the government of the young. As a result of this the pupil laughed, probably through a sense of degradation, or through nervousness, and the defendant slapped him on the head, which is certainly an improper mode of punishment, whatever the aggravation might be. From the testimony I can discover no reasonable grounds for inflicting corporal punishment. There was no open insult or disobedience. If there was it was caused by the improper conduct of the teacher himself, and was the result of anger rather than judgment. I must therefore conclude that the punishment, though not excessive enough to cause continued or permanent injury, was nevertheless injudicious and improper." There is in the public schools too much of this military drilling which forbids a timid and restless child to change its position and rest from a cruel constraint. It is sometimes absolute torture to a delicate child to maintain the stiffness and stillness enjoined by a foolish teacher. A moderate amount of freedom of movement cannot be productive of disturbance in a well-managed school. The teacher who thoroughly knows his business and is born to his work is never an unreasoning martinet.—*Catholic Review*.

Welcoming their new bishop, the Right Reverend Dr Wigger, to his episcopal see, the laity of Newark, N. J., said: "We hail in you, Right Reverend Prelate, a new and powerful patron of Christian education—that training which alone educates the whole man and fits him for his duties as a citizen and as a member of the Church. The philosophers of the time would train the intellect only. What would they say, what could they not say, if we insisted upon educating the feelings only, if such a thing were possible? They need not fear that we shall try to fill the land with men of stunted intellect; but may we not beseech them, in these days of so many tragic deeds, to spare us the sad spectacle of men of ordinary, often more than ordinary, intellectual power, totally devoid of feeling—without heart, without soul?"

To which the Bishop replied:—"I am also happy to see that you consider me a true friend of education. You take care to explain that by education you mean not merely the development of the mind but also, and principally, the cultivation of the heart and of the affections. For this correct idea of education I honor and respect you. True education—education that is such in every sense of the word—is the development, the cultivation of all the faculties of man, both mental and moral. Man has not only an intellect, by which he can grasp and understand truth but he has also a heart, by which he can love what is good—a will by which he can determine to do what is right and to avoid what is wrong. Man has been created not only for this world, but also, and principally, for another world, in which he is to live forever. He has duties to perform towards himself, towards his fellow-beings, towards God. That system of education which takes account of all these things—which, besides teaching man

the natural sciences, shows him also what are those duties of which I have just spoken, and how he is to fulfil them—that system of education, I say, is the only true one, and of that I am a true, sincere friend, and a devoted admirer, and to further it I shall use my best endeavors

On a recent occasion Father Lennon, preaching in St. Patrick's Church, Hamilton, referred to the dangers attendant to the faith and morals of children sent to non-Catholic schools. Parents are required to give their children a secular education (according to their means, sufficient to enable them to fight successfully the battle of life. Catholic schools are quite competent to give this and if the contrary be asserted it is generally false.

Education, says the *Catholic Review*, does not commence with the alphabet. It begins with a mother's look, a father's nod of approbation or his sign of reproof, with a sister's gentle pressure of the hand, a brother's noble act of forbearance, with a handful of flowers in green and daisied meadows, with a bird's nest admired but not touched, with pleasant walks in shady lanes and with thoughts directed, in sweet and kindly tones and words to nature, to beauty, to acts of benevolence, to deeds of virtue, and to the source of all good—God himself.

In a recent discourse, before a mixed audience, Cardinal Manning said:—I do not believe religion to be an adjunct, nor an adjective, nor an ornament super-added to education. I believe that without religion education does not exist and cannot exist. And now, Mr. Mayor, I feel that in touching this subject I run counter diametrically to the convictions of some here. Nevertheless, I call upon them as honest and candid Englishmen, to listen to what I have to say. Now, I will begin by saying that by religion I first of all do not mean a religion of doctrines, of catechisms, of dogmas and the like. I go lower and begin upon the very lowest grounds and I believe I shall be able to prove what I say. There is a religion which lies at the base of all doctrines. There is a religion which comes with the nature in which we are born, and upon that comes the religion of revelation which makes it perfect. For the present I can speak of nothing but the religion of nature. And I affirm that it is impossible to educate man without that religion. I don't believe there is anyone here, if he be thoughtful, conscientious, and has ever given a moment's reflection to what he thinks or says, who will not say this—that he believes in the religion of nature as the highest dignity of human nature itself. Our religion perfects our nature intellectually and morally. Just as the tree needs culture, and to be planted in a chosen soil, and then the atmosphere will feed its growth, and being attended skilfully and watchfully, the tree will develop itself into the full perfection of its nature—so religion, duly formed and cultured by the law of its nature, will do with man. Now what is the nature of man? Well, he has an intellect and he has a conscience, he has a heart, he has a will and I utterly deny to any system of instruction which only shall develop the powers of the intellect and leave the conscience dark and the heart hard, and the will undirected—I deny to that the name of education. Call it instruction if you like, education it is not. The man must be formed in all his powers, he must be educated in all the functions and faculties of his nature to be called an educated man—he must be educated all round, as we say, and the most active intellect that has been formed, and a heart that has never been unfolded by human sympathy, and a will that has never been directed and strengthened to refuse what is evil, and do what is good—I deny to that man the character of an educated man. I know this will be very displeasing to what are called scientists, and to men who cultivate one lobe, or one region of the brain, who become great mathematicians, or great physicists, as they are called, and who neglect utterly and turn their eyes away from every other form of human knowledge.—I know that; but I regard them as men like the fabled Mills, whose one excellence was a gigantic strength, so they may have a gigantic intellectual strength, I do not call that education. A very early Christian writer said, "*Homo sine cognitione Dei jesus*"—Mankind without the knowledge of God is cattle." What did he mean? He meant the whole heathen world—the world without God.

Children brought up in a school where they have never been taught the doctrines of a Christian religion, will they go into Christian places of worship when grown-up men? Why should they? Perhaps you will tell me they have been educated at home, or in private, or in the Sunday School. I have a very great love of the Sunday School, and that love and veneration spring among many other reasons from the fact that that great saint Cardinal Borromeo was the founder of Sunday Schools. I do not believe that in the

history of Christianity there was anyone before him in founding the confraternity of Christian doctrine. I have seen the Milan churches full of children, boys and girls, divided by screens and curtains, and teachers and presidents over each class. This most perfect organization, as founded by him, has continued for three centuries, and unto this day, I will say that with great eulogy and joy. A very great lawyer and Lord Chancellor of England—Lord Hatherley—through his long life and with all the heavy duties of office, and in the midst of the most laborious duties, spent his Sunday afternoons in teaching little children in the Sunday school. I wish all laymen would follow this example. I wish they were a little more self-denying, and that instead of taking the full rest on the Sunday afternoon they would give a few hours for this work. Therefore do not think for a moment that I undervalue Sunday Schools. But if you think you adequately educate the children there in one day out of the seven, you surpass my understanding; education is a daily, hourly work. It is a continuous formation and training of the whole heart, and mind, and will, and character of the child. Do you wish that we shall continue to be a Christian people? Then educate the rising generation in Christianity.

The following sensible remarks are from the *N. Y. Journal of Commerce*—

The common-school system, as it is called, which prevails in most parts of this country, is so much a matter of boast, that any criticism of it as a system meets with great contempt from the average American. There is a prevalent idea that "education" can be given to any and all classes of young people in one and the same way, and that the result of a certain number of years of schooling is a tolerably complete "education." It would probably strike most readers as a very extravagant statement if one were to say that the money expended on common schools in this country is in vast measure a waste, and that the system is a device for spending the most money with the smallest results. But there is a measure of truth in such a statement. It is the purpose of the system to benefit the great body politic by making an intelligent citizenship. This is not the result accomplished. If a sensible father has the means of educating his children, he directs the course of that education according to the position in life the child is expected to occupy. The mechanic of sound mind will try to give his son a practical education for mechanical pursuits, if he intends to have him follow his own walk in life. The professional man who intends a similar life for his son prepares him for college in a specific order of studies. In the colleges and universities the old system of universal curriculum is abandoned in the higher classes, and young men pursue the course of study most likely to fit them for this or that walk in life. But the result of common-school education in the highest order of schools is to turn out boys and girls all alike, with a smattering of knowledge on subjects of greater or less or no importance in their future lives. Time is wasted in laborious teaching in branches which should be left for many students to be learned in the ordinary reading of later life. There is no truth in the sweeping answer to this, that every American boy and girl ought to be taught all these branches of learning. The teaching is to a large proportion of them of no practical use, for the reason that they will never afterward pursue the studies. The blunder consists in the idea that an education in any branch can be completed. The school is at best only a place to learn the use of the tools of study. The education is a life-long process, to be continued in this or that line of study, according to the occupations of the growing mind. Neither is it true that a little knowledge of every subject of study is a good thing, contributing to make intelligent men. There is no less intelligent man or woman than one who knows a little about all sorts of subjects, and imagines he or she knows enough about all. A semi-educated population is not an intelligent people. Money expended in teaching many of the so-called higher branches of education to the masses of children or youth who now receive that instruction, is in large degree money thrown away. This subject is of high importance. We can only hint at the general aspect of it for the calm consideration of our readers. If the millions now expended in common schools were judiciously expended in technical and industrial schools, as well as in schools now established, the results would be sensibly better. It is unnecessary to say that we make these suggestions as an improvement of the existing system, but not in approval of any universal education at the expense of the tax-payer. The best reform of all would be to reduce the public schools to places where the rudiments of education alone are taught. When reading writing and arithmetic are put in the possession of a youth as tools for acquiring education, he has received quite as much as it is necessary for the tax-payer to give him gratis.