

THE AUCKLAND SUPERINTENDENCY CONTEST.

In the Auckland 'Herald' we read that Mr Somerville a Tauranga candidate for a seat in the Auckland Provincial Council, who spoke remarkably well, "deplored the education tax—a tax that was being collected at the point of the bayonet, and was a disgrace to New Zealand." Mr Somerville alluded to the various candidates for the Superintendency. Mr Lusk's policy was that of a subtle lawyer pleading on his own account. Mr Dargaville's was purely and entirely a policy of bombast and clap-trap. Mr J. S. Macfarlane had no policy at all; while Mr John Williamson's policy (cheers) was one of enlightenment, liberality, and progress. (Applause.)

The Wellington 'Independent' says:—For the Superintendency of Auckland there are practically only two candidates—Mr John Williamson, M.H.R., and Mr Dargaville. It is just possible that Mr H. H. Lusk may venture to contest, and it is not improbable, even at this late period, that Mr Gillies may seek re-election, but the probabilities of the case are that the contest will rest between Mr Williamson and Mr Dargaville; and, according to all appearances, the former gentleman has the best chance of election.

The Auckland 'Herald' gives the following extract from a private letter of a member of the Legislative Council to a gentleman in Auckland:—"Mr Williamson is going on very steadily, and bids fair for the Superintendency. Mr Macandrew, of Otago, told me he had done more for the Province of Auckland, and introduced more immigrants, than all the other Superintendents together. He also added that if Mr Williamson were again elected, he would introduce 20,000 immigrants in the first eighteen months of office. Mr Gillies in his speech, has been representing the province to be in a state of impecuniosity. Mr Williamson told me he had himself on a previous occasion assumed office under greater difficulties, and he was prepared, if elected, to carry on the Government." The 'Otago Guardian,' which appears to have an intimate knowledge of Auckland matters, puts Mr Williamson as the winning man. So also does the Auckland correspondent of the 'Daily Times,' who, we think, it is that has described Mr Williamson as having what the other candidates had not—a party.

These are the only opinions on the subject that we have observed in our exchanges.

SIR C. G. DUFFY ON M. THIERS.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR—Whatever falls in public from the lips of Sir C. G. Duffy is listened to with attention and respect. It is with that impression that I read his lecture on the present state of European nations, as published in the NEW ZEALAND TABLET. But I must confess that I was not a little surprised and even disappointed at some assertions of the grave statesman. I willingly forgive him his preference for democracy; besides I have nothing to forgive in this matter; everyone is free to cherish one form of government more than another. To an Irishman who has seen his country so long robbed and murdered by modern Pharaohs, with the assistance of a cruel, haughty, and hypocritical faction, it is difficult not to be a democrat in heart. He thinks that democracy is the only efficacious means to sweep away huge and long-rooted iniquities. However, one should not allow his judgment to be warped by political preference. For instance the illustrious lecturer would make his hearers regret with him the fall of Thiers in France; well, all the good men in France and elsewhere rejoiced at it. It is true that Thiers led France through two or three years of perilous difficulties; but what is the first and prime cause of perils and difficulties to France? Revolution. The late revolution in that country in September, 1870, was more fatal to France than the Prussian enemy. It deprived that unfortunate nation of the services of its best men, because jealousy and despotic revolution would not have them for leaders. Now let it be known M. Thiers is for revolution practically and theoretically. He said himself that by inclination and habit he is essentially revolutionist, and he proved it all his lifetime he gave lessons and examples in making revolutions; in his works, in his speeches, he praised the worst men of the first grand revolution save Robespierre and his gang. Thiers overthrew all governments he never supported one for any length of time. Thiers helped and succeeded in throwing down the King of France, Charles X, his benefactor in 1830. Thiers brought about the revolution of 1848, which sent Louis Philippe into exile. Thiers by his determined opposition prepared the downfall of Napoleon III., and the expulsion of his dynasty. At last he having become the leader of France in an hour of difficulty, he was acting most tyrannically against the majority of the assembly, siding with Gambetta, facilitating the election of Communists for the sake of his republic or rather for the sake of a power of which in his old age he was most tenacious. M. Thiers belonged to that class of liberal politicians who, under the mask of liberty, hide monstrous despotism. In 1830 he encouraged by his presence the sack of the palace of the Archbishop of Paris, and when national guards were marched to protect the palace, Thiers was there, Thiers the little despotic deputy was there to keep away military force, and feast his eyes on the spectacle of the destruction of church property. That is the way Thiers attacked unprotected property and paved the road for the wild socialists. Thiers was an unrelenting enemy of the Jesuits; they have no right, he said in parliament, except the right of exclusion. That is a sample of Thiers' love for religious liberty. Thiers was still a great opponent of liberty of education, against parents, against the Church, against all who differed from him. He would have all the youth of France cast in the mould of an infidel or nearly infidel university, to his own mould. Thiers is a Deist. Such is Thiers, let him be known by his acts. We do not deny the services he has rendered to his country, but they are the services of a man who, with others, having kindled a destroying conflagration, and being appalled at its progress, throws on the fire some buckets of water or directs the fire brigade more or less skillfully to put out the fire. Thiers fell. Good people were persuaded that France was saved at least for a while. The financial world gave its verdict; the French funds rose immediately. Let no man who loves France regret the fall of Thiers.—I am, &c.,
A READER OF THE TABLET.

EMIGRATION.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—It is a matter of surprise to many to see you recommending the Irish people to direct their course to some other country rather than to seek a home in this land of our adoption.

You must have very strong reasons impelling you to such a course. 1st. You ought to know that the climate here is better than that of Ireland; and that Irish people could seek a home no where south of the line, where they would be more likely to possess good health than in this Province of Otago. 2nd. The labor market here is ever asking for fresh hands; and in no part of the Southern Hemisphere are wages better. To me it is evident, (but of course, I will not ask you, Mr Editor, to change views), that if men be careful and industrious, they will be sure to be respected, to realize competency, and before many years to see themselves the owners of happy homesteads, even though they may have arrived here penniless. There are many, who came here without a farthing to spare just a few years since, now the owners of broad acres, contented and independent, and in such positions, as they could not dream of in early youth. How did they accomplish that? By industry and sobriety, exercised on a fruitful soil. The land is good, the climate is good, and in most cases—owing to the salubrity of the climate—the general health of the community is excellent. I admit we have many wet and cold days, even weeks here in Otago; yet it ought to be remembered that all was not sunshine at home. The green fields of Ireland are loved by the Irish, and may their love of their native land ever grow stronger; but I doubt not, if many at home got the opportunity of experiencing the advantages of living in this fair land of ours, they would not love the less ardently. It is an excellent trait in the character of any people to love the land of their birth, and their forefathers, yet with all that devotion, I think it is the duty of every colonist to love more ardently the land of his adoption. I must admit, I do not like to hear one word uttered to discountenance immigration to this, my adopted home.

Mr Editor, you seem to feel keenly the apparent reluctance of the promoters of the immigration scheme to seek for Irish emigrants. Perhaps those concerned fancy they are right. It appears that now the Minister of Immigration seems desirous of getting the Irish out here. Would it not be well to help him, instead of thwarting him? If, as your leader of last Saturday would imply, it is not good for the Irish to come here, owing to the peculiar circumstances of the case, and the antipathy of those in power, then, I fancy, you ought to be thankful to the Agent-General for not getting them to come. You seem at first sight to admit that it would be well they came only for the intolerance and dislikes of those in power; and that because of that intolerance you recommend the Irish to stay away. With great respect, Mr Editor, for your sounder judgment, I am of opinion that since the prejudiced wish to keep the Irish out, they ought to make the greater efforts to come here. No stronger proof could be offered to any people to induce them to come to this country than the desire of those who dislike them to prevent their coming. If it be a fact, then, that the Agent-General was opposed to Irish immigration, or that the Government only want to get a few, or a *pro rata* number, intending immigrants ought to know that this is the very place for them. If it were not excellent, others would not be making an effort to keep it for those of their own native land. You say better for the Irish to stay at home. I say so too, but emigrate they will, and, therefore, I would say to them come here. No doubt for Irish Catholics there are many difficulties—many obstacles in the way of educating their children, and rearing them in accordance with Catholic doctrines; many dangers to which the youth of this young community are exposed, from which there would be an escape at home; but it must be remembered that, if these Irish Catholics go to the United States of America or to Canada, they and their children will have a great deal with which to contend there, similar to the many obstacles with which those of their race and faith have to battle here. In Otago, as well as in the other provinces of the colony, there are secular, Godless, and sectarian schools—principally here, in Otago, these sectarian schools are Presbyterian—in fact, as those professing Presbyterianism were the first to come into this district, they have seized the government and management of the province; and they tax all other portions of the community to support Presbyterian schools. Of these schools Catholics cannot avail themselves, without running the imminent danger of having the faith of their children tampered with; and the books in the schools are still Presbyterian in tone and teaching, and are full of virulence against the Catholic faith. No doubt there is a promise on the part of the Board of Education to remove these books, but they are to be replaced by books purely secular and Godless, scarcely ever mentioning the name of God, and that only at times in some scraps of poetry. Then all the teachers must be Protestant, and for the most part they are of the Presbyterian denomination; and one of their principles appears to be to enlighten their benighted Catholic neighbours. Hence many of them fancy it a duty to instruct Catholic children in Presbyterian notions, and to show them what they call "the errors of popery." The difficulties to be met with here, in Otago, on account of this state of things, are discouraging to those whose greatest treasure is their faith. But to my mind the way to meet the difficulty is not by leaving those at present suffering under the Otago system unaided, but by bringing larger numbers to aid in bearing the double burden of educating the Presbyterians, for which the Government unjustly taxes the Catholics, and to join together to help in educating their own children in accordance with their principles and the Catholic doctrine. As they can have plenty of work and pay, they can struggle to accomplish both these tasks, until a more liberal spirit shall seize the Otago Government, and make them cease doing the Catholics a gross injustice.—You s, &c.,
A.

August 21, 1873.

[Our correspondent gives us the following extract from the London 'Times' regarding a field for emigration to New Zealand, which has been studiously ignored by Dr Featherston:—"Irish Emigration Statistics.—From a return sent in by the General Register Office, Dublin, it appears that 29,577 males and 20,005 females emigrated from Ireland during the first six months of 1872, and 35,150 males