

townsmen the disappointment and surprise which they feel at seeing your name associated with so reprehensible a character."

Horrible to relate, Mr. John Morland, Mayor of Glastonbury was aware of it all. He replied, claiming liberty to act as President of the Glastonbury Liberal Association even though decorated with the mayoral chain. He had a bit of political philosophy to preach to the Unionists, too. "The great fact is," he replied, "that Mr. Sullivan in a special sense, for good or evil, represents the great bulk of the Irish people, and his writings express in vivid words their feelings and desires. If at a certain time he was opposed utterly to England, he was a mouthpiece of the National feeling. He did, indeed, hate England with bitterness, as the Power which, as he believed, was crushing down his beloved country, and as he associated England's Queen with England, he did not, as some might have done, toast her at banquets while feeling no true loyalty in his heart. This hatred of England led him to exult over her defeats and to belittle her greatness, whilst his Irish patriotism led him to glorify as martyrs the three men who were found guilty of, and executed for, the death of poor Brett, the policeman, who was shot, probably unintentionally, whilst a successful rescue of Fenians was made upon the prison van. In this connection we may note that John Bright expressed strong doubts of the justice of the verdict, and that Mr. Swinburne, the poet, unsuccessfully appealed in lines of great power and beauty for mercy to the prisoners."

"This hatred of England," continued Mr. Morland, "at the time of Mr. T. D. Sullivan's mayoralty, shared by three-fourths of the Irish people, was a terrible, a most deplorable fact, and the true Unionists are those who seek to find the causes of such a feeling and to remove them."

The reply was of that sensible and statesmanlike kind which Tories cannot swallow. Crush a Tory by reason and he flies for a brick-bat or a Belfast kidney. The Unionists of Glastonbury are of the same type as the Unionists of Sandy-row. They accordingly organised an attack on the Liberal meeting. But the Liberals were prepared. The rowdies were excluded from the hall, and taken charge of by the police outside. Mr. Sullivan addressed his meeting without interruption, and so convinced the reason of his audience and roused their enthusiasm for the cause of Ireland that the friends of the cause were strong enough to give him a safe escort through the streets of Glastonbury. The panegyrist of the Manchester Martyrs had his own celebration of their anniversary, and his victory was the vindication of their memories.

THE IRISH UNIVERSITY QUESTION.

(Continued.)

THE fundamental principle of the system of education embodied in those colleges was one that made it impossible to regard them as a provision for University Education, available, in any practical sense, for the Catholics of Ireland. Save in some special and exceptional circumstances, it could not be considered open to Catholics—I speak now, of course, of Catholics sufficiently instructed in the nature of their obligations as Catholics, and also conscientiously desirous of fulfilling them—of these, I say, it could not be considered that it was open to them to make use of the advantages which the State, through these colleges, placed fully and freely within the reach of the members of every Protestant denomination in Ireland. The reason of this is obvious. To us Catholics, it comes as a matter of fixed principle that every such institution, constructed on that which is known as the "mixed" system, is, from the nature of that system, a source of danger to Catholic students who may frequent it; a source of danger, in the first place, to the vigour and even to the integrity of their faith; a source of danger also to their constancy in the full and faithful observance of the practical duties by which they are bound as Catholics. That is what we mean by the expression "dangerous to faith and morals." That is what the Church has always meant, as often as she has, under that severe censure, condemned, as places of education for Catholics, institutions such as the Queen's Colleges, whether existing in Ireland or in any other portion of the universal Church. Even if no such condemnation had been issued, common sense would have sufficed to warn us of the danger. Let me quote for you a noteworthy expression of a former venerated member of our Irish Episcopacy—Dr. Moriarty, formerly Bishop of Kerry. In a letter to one of the numerous Commissions that from time to time have sat in Ireland to examine and report upon our public educational institutions, Dr. Moriarty wrote as follows of the official Training College of the national Board in Marlborough street. His severe strictures upon that College as a place of "mixed" education for the teachers are, as you will observe, fully applicable also to the case of "mixed" colleges of University education, and Dr. Moriarty, in fact, himself remarks that this is so. "The condemnation (he wrote) of the Queen's Colleges by the highest authority in the Church necessitated the condemnation of the Training College by the Bishops. The cases are perfectly parallel." And he then goes on to explain that the case is different from that of a school attended by children who are engaged in learning merely the rudiments of knowledge, such as reading, writing, and arithmetic, especially as they meet only for a few hours of the day at school and for the rest of their time are under parental control. In their case he says, "the dangers of the mixed system"—he does not say that they disappear, but that they—"may be comparatively remote, but," he goes on to say, speaking of colleges of higher education—"There is danger of that suppression of truth, and of that concealment of religious profession and observance, which necessarily lead to religious indifference. The danger is manifestly greatest for those who believe most. If Anglicans were associated under such circumstances with Unitarians or Socinians, the necessity of avoiding topics of discussion would bring them down to the lower level. The shortest rule of faith would become the common denominator" (loud applause). It would, I venture to say, be difficult to meet with a more striking example of one short sentence summing up, and at the same time illustrating, as this last sentence does, in less than a dozen

words, the whole of such a question. If I were to be asked to mention any other instances that occur to me of an argumentative statement worthy of being placed side by side with this, on the score at once of logical force and of compactness, I should without hesitation quote for you a sentence which, if I am not misinformed, you will find in a friendly essay—I do not happen myself to have met with it, but I have the quotation from a trustworthy friend—he tells that it occurs in a friendly essay on the university question by one of the most distinguished heads of Trinity College itself—one, indeed, whom I have had the pleasure of seeing here on two former occasions, and who, I have little doubt, would have been here to-day had he not been hindered by the severe illness in which I beg to tender him the expression of my sincere sympathy and best wishes for his recovery.—Dr. Haughton (cheers). The sentence in which I have introduced to you the name of Dr. Haughton is decidedly longer than that which I have to quote from him (laughter). Here is what I am told Dr. Haughton says:—"I should like to see the Catholic student that could pass through Trinity College without having the edge taken off his Catholicity" (cheers and laughter). I am glad to have this opportunity of quoting on the point the authority of so eminent a Fellow and professor of the college itself. It helps to guard me against at least one possible danger of my being misunderstood. In former days it was, we are told, far from unknown that efforts were deliberately made by men of high influence in Trinity College to undermine the faith of Catholic students there. I must not be understood as making any charge that such things occur there at the present day. I have no reason to believe that they do. The danger to which I allude, the danger, the nature of which is so admirably elucidated in the letter of Dr. Moriarty that I have quoted for you, is, as you observe, a danger of quite another kind. It is one that exists altogether independently of any conscious effort at perversion. It is inherent in the very nature of the mixed system as worked out amongst youth in such a place of education. And this is what the Catholic Church means when she condemns that system as "inherently" dangerous to faith and to fidelity to Catholic duty. That system, then, is simply out of joint with one of the fundamental principles of the teaching and the discipline of the Catholic Church. This, then, is the change that has been brought about in the constitution of Trinity College. I speak of the college, of course, only as a place of education for Catholics. The Catholics of Ireland—if we could imagine so shameful a capitulation, if we could think even of the possibility of their ever at any future time consenting to lower the flag that they have upheld in honour through strife and storm for so many years, if we could think of them as ever yielding to the temptation that was so often set before them, laying down their arms in dishonourable surrender and abandoning their claim to a system of universal education of their own—in such a case no doubt they would not find that, to have even the fullest share in the emoluments and other advantages which Trinity College has to offer as aids and as encouragements to learning, it would be exacted of them that they should forthwith renounce their faith. No; in this there has been a change. But it would be exacted of them that they should expose that faith to a danger that for most of them would be one of deadly peril. They should begin, remember, by setting at naught the voice of their Church, warning them in her most solemn tones of the danger that was before them. They should disregard that voice. They should disregard it with open defiance. And then, deprived for the first time in all their history, by their own act, of that protecting influence which has brought them safely through so many storms in the past, they should face out upon a sea of danger, through perils amidst which few indeed could hope to pass without making shipwreck of their Catholic faith or of their fidelity to the Catholic standard of moral and religious duty (applause). I may be told that individuals have passed, not only in safety, but in honourable fidelity to every Catholic principle, through Trinity College and other colleges of mixed education in the country. Yes; and there were survivors of the charge of the Six Hundred at Balaclava (applause). And men have passed in safety through the rapids of Niagara (applause). Does all this tend, even in the remotest degree, to show that there is no danger in such things? Even amidst the most deadly perils some favoured few, through a singular protection from the hand of Providence, may pass unharmed. I do not pronounce upon the case of any individual. The Church, except in the comparatively rare instances in which she exercises her judicial, as distinct from her legislative, or her general pastoral office, does not pronounce upon individual cases. The Catholics who have been educated in Trinity College may or may not be models of practical Catholicity in their subsequent lives. They may or they may not be noted for the regularity with which they attend to their religious duties, approaching the sacraments of the Church and observing her precepts with exemplary edification, keeping holy, for instance, the fast days that, for the mortification of sinful nature, she has commanded to be observed. Some, no doubt, of those who have been brought up in the atmosphere of mixed colleges, such as Trinity College, are, it must always be remembered, Catholics of truly exemplary life. The lives of others, of many others, were, it is notorious, the very reverse of exemplary. The dangers through which the practical Catholicity of all has passed, through which the practical Catholicity of some has passed without harm or stain, have proved fatal to the practical Catholicity of many more amongst them. They are Catholics, no doubt. Their Catholicity at all events has not been abandoned. But, to use the expressive phrase of Dr. Haughton, its edge has been taken off (applause). Here I must observe that those who enrol themselves as members of one or the other of the mixed colleges of the country, few comparatively as they are, may be divided into certain groups. First, there are some—from time to time such cases must arise—in which, when all the circumstances are taken into account and every element of the case has been carefully weighed and tested in the judgment of a disinterested and competent adviser, it will be found that the case is one in which but little choice of action remains, in which, therefore, with the special precautions, the need for which is suggested by even human prudence, God's grace may be relied upon to ward off all serious danger. But cases of this