

inspection of Government officials in order to save the rising generation from the evils of inefficient schooling.

But the editor of the *Times* is presumptuous, as well as unjust. He speaks upon a subject of which he is manifestly ignorant, praises where he should blame, and blames where he should praise. The fact is that although in some places denominational schools are guilty of the crime of poverty, the teaching even in these is at least fully equal to that of the Government schools in their neighbourhood; whilst in most places denominational schools are immensely more efficient than Government schools.

The editor of the *Times* is hard pushed for an argument when he has recourse to the following mode of reasoning:—"Even in those separate schools under denominational teachers it is boasted that the teaching is purely secular, and that children of any denomination can attend them without the risk of their faith being tampered with. We believe this assertion on their part to be quite true, but if this can be done in separate and denominational schools, will anyone give a valid reason why the same thing cannot be done with safety in a State secular school?" In reference to this we have to say, in the first place, we do not boast that in our schools the teaching of Catholics is purely secular. On the contrary, such teaching is religious, and that it may continue to be so we Catholics labour and make many sacrifices. As to children of other denominations who may be sent to our schools on the understanding that we shall not interfere with their religion, we religiously keep our word and observe the precept of the natural law, which imposes on parents the right and duty of directing the education of their children. But our loyalty to our promise made to the parents of non-Catholic children is not permitted to prevent us from giving a thoroughly religious education to our own children.

In the second place, the question is not, what can, within the range of possibility, be done in Government schools; but what has been, what is, and what is likely to be done. In our schools the teachers are all Christians and Catholics, whose principles are well known. In Government schools no teacher need be a Christian, and practically no teacher can be a Catholic. In point of fact, many Government teachers are not Christians, have either no religious principles, or principles antagonistic to all revealed religion; and the others are Protestants whose chief aim seems to be to instil into the minds of the pupils a most intense hatred of everything Catholic. Such has been and is the state of the case, and he would be a sanguine man, indeed, who could expect anything different in the time to come. We know for a fact that in schools built and supported to a great extent by the public at large, elaborate pains have been taken to render Catholics and Catholicity odious, and no other line of conduct can reasonably be expected from the class of teachers likely to be employed in such schools. But even if Government schools were all the editor seems to think they might be, we Catholics would not accept them.

The editor of the *Times* says "the State cannot possibly incur the expense of planting schools of various kinds in every little place where a few people may be pleased to desire one after another their own particular shibboleth." With this we quite agree. The Government cannot afford to do anything of the sort. But if it cannot, why should it insist in taking on itself the entire expense of the education of one class of the community to the exclusion of all others? Why should it undertake to do more than provide education for those who are absolutely unable to do so for themselves? Our contention is that the Government undertakes to do more than it ought, or than it really can, and whilst falling into this blunder, directs all its activity in the wrong direction. If instead of attempting an impossibility and oppressing one part of its subjects to pamper another, it aided all alike, it would be able to incur all necessary expense.

The editor of the *Times* calls the present system of education excellent. In what, let us ask this gentleman, consists its excellence. Is there a sufficient number of schools? if not, are there means to supply a sufficient number? Is there a sufficient number of qualified teachers? if not, where are they to come from? Is the administration satisfactory, in which a considerable portion of the people takes no part whatever, and would not be permitted to take any part? Is that system excellent which provides free education for well-to-do children, and neglects the destitute—the gutter children? Is that system excellent which puts it in the power of exclusively Protestant Boards and committees to enquire when applications are made for the situations of teachers what is their religion, and to reject Catholics for no other reason than

because they are Catholics? We know that such a question has been asked; and we know more—that candidates were rejected because their names were thought by committees to smack of Catholicity. And yet the editor of the *Times* insists that such a system as this shall be forced on Catholics, and that they shall be compelled to pay for it. In Otago, what the law calls secular education is so administered as to be exclusively Protestant—and so also it is in Canterbury, Wellington, Auckland, and elsewhere. Under it Catholics obtain no justice, and never hope to obtain any. It is a farce to call it secular education. How can that be secular which enables teachers to inculcate, it may be in some instances right down infidelity, and in all anti-Catholicism? There is no such thing in all New Zealand as a purely secular Government school, nor can there be.

News of the Week.

THE sale of the valuable property known as Crichton Park will take place at the rooms of Messrs. McLandress, Hepburn and Co., on Wednesday next. This is an opportunity which no one desirous of obtaining thoroughly valuable land should let slip.

WE are obliged to hold over to next week an article on the Bill for the promotion of intermediate education in Ireland, which all important measure has passed both Houses of the Imperial Parliament *nem. con.*

IN consequence of its being desirable for us to insert this week the letter of His Holiness the Pope to Cardinal Menaco La Valetta, and a portion of the lecture lately delivered at Wellington by His Lordship the Bishop of that diocese, and which has reached us at the eleventh hour, we are obliged to cut short the space usually allotted by us to Current Topics, Telegrams, and News of the Week.

WE have been requested to beg of all persons who have disposed of tickets for the Art-union in connection with the Rev. Father Hennebery's likeness to communicate as soon as possible with the Lady Superior, Dominican Convent, Dunedin. It is desirable that arrangements should be made for holding the drawing, but this cannot be done until it is ascertained whether the proceeds of the tickets sold will cover expenses which, so far as can at present be judged, does not seem to be the case as yet.

THE Melbourne *Advocate* says:—We regret to hear that the Catholics of Melbourne are about to lose the valued services of the Rev. W. Kelly, S.J., and the Rev. J. O'Malley, S.J. Father Kelly will very shortly leave the colony to join the house in Sydney, and Father O'Malley, with Father M'Enroe, goes to New Zealand to form a new house in the Right Rev. Dr. Moran's diocese.

WE publish elsewhere a letter written by the Sovereign Pontiff on the necessity for the religious education of youth. Like everything that has emanated from the Holy Father, it is of astonishing vigour and clearness. Lucid, comprehensive reasoning, masculine force, and the authority of Rome are discernible in it from one end to the other. At all times the voice of the Pope is heard with attention and obedience by the sons of the Church, when he speaks all is decided. But such utterances as we have now become accustomed to must of necessity arrest the attention of the civilized world; non-Catholics as well as Catholics must lend an attentive ear to them. Whatever the other trumpets may be that alarm the world this is a very horn of Poland, whose tones might pierce even to the muffled hearing of the deaf. It may well be expected that he who sounds it bears also a Durandal with which ere long we shall see him cleave the mountains that obstruct his path. We recommend this powerful letter to the attention of our readers.

WE are informed by a private telegram from Reefton that the richest reef as yet found in that district has just been discovered by Mr. Mathew Byrne. It is said that it will yield sixty ounces to the ton.

Many of our readers will be glad to hear that Mr. A. E. Bridger, formerly of Dunedin, has succeeded in honourably passing his final examinations, having obtained the degrees of Bachelor of Medicine and Master of Surgery, with certificate of first-class honours in the practice of medicine.

THE *World* says—Everyone knows that Mr. Gladstone's anti-Turkish zeal has been very displeasing to the Court; but I cannot help thinking that the Queen's advisers in such matters are mistaken in departing from the politic traditions of the Albert epoch, and are showing rather a petty spite in omitting the ex-Premier's name from the list of the guests invited to State banquets. The proceeding is the more marked, as Mr. Gladstone does not appear to have been even included in the evening party at Marlborough House which followed the official dinner in honour of the German Royalties. Of the few Liberals invited to meet their Imperial Highnesses at Windsor, it was observed that one was of Hebrew origin, and that another is married to a Jewess.