

WANTED.—Superior Male **TEACHER**, for Catholic School. Apply to Father Cummins, Reefton.

NOTICE.

BOUND COPIES of Vol. II of the **NEW ZEALAND TABLET** on Sale at the Office. Price, £1 5s.

Persons having copies ready for binding can have them bound neatly and cheaply.

THE 'TABLET' NEWSPAPER COMPANY.

THE ANNUAL MEETING of the Shareholders in the above Company will be held on **TUESDAY EVENING**, the 6th July, at 8 p.m., in St. JOSEPH'S SCHOOLROOM, Dunedin.

JOHN DUNGAN, Secretary.

New Zealand Tablet.

FIAT JUSTITIA.

SATURDAY, JUNE 26, 1875.

CANT.

WHILST other men seem anxious to purify their language from cant, newspaper writers remain deaf to the call of truth and decency, and persevere in loading their columns with the slang phrases of ignorance and bigotry. We have been prompted to make these remarks by some passages of a leader lately published by our evening contemporary, and to which we invite attention. In introducing an extract from the London 'Times,' the writer of the article to which we refer permits himself to write thus:—"The determination of BISMARCK to free Germany from ecclesiastical dominion, and the resistance of the Romish Church to patriotic measures, could not be overlooked, nor could the attitude of the dignitaries of that Church towards Protestant institutions in all Protestant countries throughout the world."

In this extract it is impossible to discover evidence of even one grain of common sense; but it abounds in the slang of those who have, for three hundred years, found that calumniating the Church has been a paying occupation, as well as an immense relief to minds insane in their hatred of the Church of Rome. Such expressions, too, help to round off a sentence, and make it musical and telling in the ears of many readers in these days of superficiality in education and judgment. "The determination of BISMARCK to free Germany from ecclesiastical dominion" are words that will no doubt sound well and find an echo in the breast of all the enemies of the Catholic Church, who really applaud BISMARCK'S ruthless persecution of the most loyal as well as the best men and women in Germany on account of their Catholicity, whilst they are sorely puzzled to discover some plausible excuse for the utter cruelty of the German Chancellor, who, both in religion and politics, happens to be one of themselves. "Ecclesiastical dominion," and "the attitude of the dignitaries of that Church towards Protestant institutions in all Protestant countries," dispose of the matter at once! Here is to be found BISMARCK'S justification. He is the grand champion of Protestantism and Liberalism, consequently he is right, truthful and just, when trampling on Catholics.

It is only necessary merely to write down "ecclesiastical dominion" and "attitude towards Protestant institutions." No further proof is required to establish the treasonable projects of fifteen millions of German Catholics, and the deep criminality of Catholic ecclesiastics everywhere. BISMARCK has himself been challenged a thousand times to give even one proof of the designs which he untruly attributed to his fellow citizens and the Court of Rome, but he has not even attempted to do so. And for the simple reason, that no such designs were ever entertained. A more unprovoked attack than the persecution of the Church by Germany was never made on any body of men. It has no justification,—no excuse. It has arisen purely from hatred of Catholicity, and it is for this reason precisely and for no other, that it is approved either openly or tacitly by the Liberal press everywhere. This is the reason, too, we are bold to affirm, why our evening contemporary has had recourse to cant phrases when writing on the subject. Lost for a reason, perplexed at having none to give, for the tyranny of its admired German friend, our contemporary takes refuge in "ecclesiastical dominion," which only exists, however, in ecclesiastics who are in prison, or exile, or in the midst of poverty; and in "the attitude of the

dignitaries" of the Catholic Church, which has no existence outside the imagination of the writer; unless, indeed, he considers it a crime in a Catholic dignitary to be what he professes himself to be—a Catholic and not a Protestant.

Of course Catholics are opposed to Protestants and Protestant institutions; and why not? Is that a civil crime in them? Is the State to rob and incarcerate and banish them because they refuse to abandon their religion, and embrace the religion of apostates and persecutors? Has it, then, come to this? Is this the demand of the open mouthed advocates of civil and religious liberty? Is this what they understand by freedom? It is, and always has been so. Their idea of civil and religious liberty, so well exemplified by hundred of years of the most cruel persecution, renewed again in our own day, to the intense satisfaction of the *Liberal* Press, is that they shall enjoy the license to deny all truth, should they think fit to do so; to revolutionise the State whenever they please, when they are strong enough to do it—to rob, banish, imprison, and slaughter people who refuse to become traitors to the commands of God, at their bidding; and that all who will not join them in doing what they please, even in defiance of truth and justice, shall be trampled under foot and reduced to slavery. Has not Liberalism in Germany put its foot on the necks of bishops, priests, and nuns in that unhappy land? Has it not framed laws in direct antagonism to the constitution of the Kingdom of Prussia and of the Empire, for the express purpose of plundering, imprisoning, and banishing Catholics, whose conduct had, all their previous lives, been so exemplary, so law-abiding, that not even one breach of the laws of the State could be alleged against them? This is notorious. And these *May Laws*!—who made them? Not the German or Prussian Parliament, but one section happening for the time being to be in a majority, for the sole purpose of inflicting the greatest injury on the section which unanimously resisted their enactment and protested against it. These laws are not the outcome of reason, of Parliamentary discussion, of fair compromise, of statesmanship,—but the result of brute force, of the stubborn unreason and persecuting proclivities of a heartless and Godless majority, determined to ride rough-shod over fifteen millions of Catholics.

In the framing of these laws the Catholics had no part, though these regard their most vital interests. Their opinion was disregarded, their reasonings unattended to, their unanimous opposition treated as a thing of not the least moment. Men not members of the Catholic Church made laws affecting the relations of Catholics towards one another, in defiance of the doctrine, discipline, and rights of these Catholics who are and were unanimously and determinedly opposed to such legislation. It is a legislation, therefore, imposed on Catholics against their will by anti-Catholics, and imposed for the purpose of destroying their Church. And this is called legislation; these miserable enactments are called laws. Laws! An enactment to have the force of law must be in accordance with reason and justice; but that one section of the people should insist on forcing its will on another section, in matters affecting itself alone, is contrary to both reason and justice. And this is the case in reference to the *May Laws*. No amount of cant can rehabilitate the character of BISMARCK and recent German legislation, and our contemporary had better give up the vain endeavour to justify the conduct of the German Chancellor.

GOVERNMENT GRANTS TO EDUCATION IN GREAT BRITAIN.

It is not yet forty years, since the British Government seriously undertook the work of aiding popular education. The condition of the British masses at the time when a poor beginning was made, was lamentable in the extreme—their ignorance was truly appalling. This may be seen from Parliamentary reports and other sources easily accessible to such as may be curious on the subject. But since that time the English Parliament has labored zealously to make amends, as far as possible, for past apathy and neglect. The system of education then inaugurated, and which, whilst it helped to promote the harmony of all classes, has been attended with very considerable success, and which still prevails, was denominational. This is a fact which English colonists would do well to bear in mind.

In the year 1840, when, it may be said, Government addressed itself for the first time to this important subject, the Parliamentary grants in aid of popular education