

according as their fortunes grow we can well understand. Scotland grows wealthier every day, we are told, and with wealth come luxury and softer ways, but it is impossible for any except a people of considerable powers of endurance, and some roughness, to suffer the Presbyterian service or even to entertain the stern Presbyterian doctrines, and, by all others, as a matter of course, a more refined and less trying method of worship, as well as a looser code of doctrine will be sought for. The Church of England seems for the time to answer all the need, and, under the circumstances, it is but natural she should increase. To hear her called the Church of the Scotch peoples' fathers, nevertheless, must prove a surprise to many, and to none more than those fathers themselves. They knew nothing of her, and, as we have seen, resisted her even to death and torture when it was sought to impose her upon them. She herself, when she first arose had made common cause with the Presbyterian Church, and acknowledged her as a sister, and it was rather the Presbyterians that manifested mistrust and dislike of her. McCrie, for example, in his *Life of Knox*, tells us that the fathers of the English Reformation were very far from holding ordination by a bishop to be necessary; they welcomed Knox gladly as a fellow-minister, when he went to England; Archbishop Grindal authoritatively acknowledged the validity of the orders conferred by the Synod of Lothian, "according," as he wrote, "to the laudable form and rite of the church of Scotland" on one Mr. John Morrison, and Whittingham, Dean of Durham, was ordained at Geneva in the church of which Knox was pastor. At the present day, again, the august lady who has succeeded Queen Elizabeth as the head of the Church of England constantly gives us the practical example that she is of the same opinion with the founders and first ministers of the Church over which she presides, for when she visits Balmoral she attends the service of the Kirk. That her Majesty, moreover, is quite as ready as Queen Elizabeth was to vindicate her position as head of the Church, we were given reason to believe a little time ago when the late Duke of Albany, in addressing a public meeting in presence of the Bishop of London and some other prelates, spoke of the Archbishop of Canterbury as standing next to his royal mother in the primacy. It would seem, however, that Bishop Nevill claims also for Scotland some antediluvian church, whose representatives the present Episcopalian clergy there are. And there are quite as good grounds for his doing so as there are for the extraordinary notions he and his party entertain with regard to their Church in England—that is, there are no grounds for such a belief at all. But, as we have said, the opinions men are capable of sincerely entertaining are of great extravagance, and, so far as we have had an opportunity of judging, Dr. Nevill may be taken as an advanced example of the men in question. Let us give him all the credit he deserves—that is, for sincerity in foolishness at the very best.

ACCORDING to *Hansard*, two debates took place last month in the House of Representatives give Catholics some information as to those members upon whom they may reasonably look as friends and foes. The first was that on the Education vote, in which—notwithstanding the fact that, as certain of our contemporaries have reminded us now and then, there are Catholic members in the House—the only friend we had to speak a word in defence of our interests was Mr. Turnbull, the member for Timaru. And verily it would appear that Catholics need to be reminded in some way by strangers that members of their Church are in Parliament, for unless by the means taken by the said members to convince the Colony generally, and in which they are for the most part eminently successful, that they have no sympathy whatever for their Church, and are in no degree concerned about the interests of their fellow Catholics, it would be impossible to distinguish them as Catholics. Mr. Turnbull spoke as follows, referring to Sir Julius Vogel's statement that Government had resolved to withdraw their proposal for a reduction in the education vote:—"I protest against this action, on behalf of the Catholic population of this country, who are suffering under a great hardship. You not only inflict on them bodily hardship, but you also inflict the greatest possible injury upon them in another way; and when I take into consideration that one-seventh of the population of New Zealand are compelled to withdraw their children from the schools, and to go to great expense and to make great sacrifices in order to educate their children themselves, I think that this proposal is one of the most illiberal acts that could be brought forward. I regret that such a selfish step is to be taken as to refuse to make this small reduction in the education vote. I feel deeply grieved at what, I think, shows a want of firmness on the part of the Government. The proposition having been defended by the Premier last evening with such great ability, why should they now come down and say they will withdraw the proposition? If such is to be the conduct of the Government, I do not know how we are to depend upon them in respect to other measures which they may bring down. I protest, on behalf of the Catholic population, against such action, brought about by what I cannot but consider to be selfish motives." Mr. Ross, the member for Roslyn, who is understood to be a leading advocate for the application of the "starve'em-out" policy to the

Catholic schools, congratulated the Government on their determination, and speaking, as he did, immediately after Mr. Turnbull, we may lawfully draw the conclusion that his approbation was accorded principally because he saw that the danger of yielding some slight relief to the plundered Catholics had been avoided. The Catholic schools can hardly be starved out effectually unless the people who support them are thoroughly impoverished, and Mr. Ross will not be to blame if any failure occurs in that respect. In the debate on the School Committees Election Bill, Mr. Turnbull spoke again, in answer to the argument of Mr. Shrimiski that the abolition of cumulative voting would give Catholics "more ground for complaint, as they would then be deprived of power to elect any member for themselves to a School Committee." And the admission on Mr. Shrimiski's part that Catholics have already any ground for complaint rather surprises us. Mr. Shrimiski, as we all know, is a member of the Jewish Church, and as such takes a very ardent part in the promotion of the system by means of which the Jews and atheistical Freemasons hope to destroy the Christianity of the world and to blot out the name of the common object of their hatred—the infame of the atheist, the Nazarene of the Jew. We are not surprised to find that he is aware that Catholics have grounds for complaint, for that anyone must see, but rather at his making any acknowledgment of the fact, and we can only attribute his having done so to a slip of the memory or tongue. Catholics will have much weightier grounds to complain than they even now have if Mr. Shrimiski and the men he in truth represents ever obtain the full exercise of their sweet will. Mr. Fergus was more cautious, and thought the bill should be opposed as it would give Catholics "a tangible reason on which to hang up a grievance." And we may add in passing that Mr. W. J. Hurst had been foolish enough to call the present Education Act a "sacred thing." But to quote *Hansard* "Mr. Turnbull would not have risen but for the remarks that had fallen from the honourable member for Oamaru, who said that so long as the cumulative vote was retained the Catholics had no real ground of complaint in this matter. He could tell the honourable gentleman, as far as that was concerned, that the Catholics did not interest themselves or interfere in these elections at all. Besides, it would be simply a mere sham if they did so. The Catholics were one-seventh of the population, and for them to put one member on the Committee by cumulative voting would be doing what was simply useless. He wished to point out that they desired to have nothing to do with the schools. They, the Catholics, thought it indispensable and necessary that religion should form a part of school education, and he believed every Christian man should do so. It was simply a sham, and an excuse to persecute the Catholics, to keep this in. He was surprised that any men calling themselves Liberals could exercise such a cruel tyranny on a body of people. They were made to pay the taxes and erect their own schools. In a few years such treatment would be looked on with astonishment. If this bill were passed they would remove a sham from the education system." This honest, outspoken protestation requires no comment, and it was followed up in a manner equally praiseworthy by Mr. Dodson. "Mr. Dodson said that anyone who had listened to the debates in the House on the education question would arrive at this conclusion that there was a feeling on the part of the majority of honourable members that the education system should not be interfered with. They heard that repeatedly, when this question came up. To his mind, that was the very reason why it should be discussed. These honourable gentlemen had no confidence in the justice of the present system, or they would not be afraid to trust it to the good feeling and judgment of the House. They knew that it was not perfect, or in accordance with the wishes of the country or of the majority of the House. He knew no Act so sacred that it must not be interfered with; and this Act of all Acts had blemishes and faults that called aloud for interference and redress. While they plumed themselves on having an Act that would educate their children, they should extend it to all their children, and not leave one-seventh of the population out, as was done under the provisions of this Act. They knew there was a section of the community who would not come under the operation of the Act as it stood. If they were in earnest in the continuance of the present system, it was their duty to see that it was based on justice and fairness. If they did so they would look on the present system with feelings very different from those they had now. He, for one, would never be satisfied with the Act. They had heard that evening that the cumulative vote was a concession to the Catholics. It was a concession which had been rejected. In very few instances had the Catholics endeavoured to put members on the Committees, nor did they wish to do so. (Oh!) He was speaking generally. There might be isolated cases. He distinctly denied that this was any concession to the Catholics. They did not want it. He would not rest satisfied with the education system until it gave justice to that large body of people, and removed the disabilities which they now laboured under." Where, meanwhile, were those Catholic members of whom our contemporaries have spoken? Echo, perhaps, at least if it were like that far-famed and sensible one we had at home, might reply—Just wherever they could best make it plain to their Protestant supporters that they were Catholics only