

beautifully less. It is said that the Premier is in favour of the principle of Mr. PYKE'S Bill, and we dare say there is some truth in this report. But does this imply that he is favourable in his official capacity, and that he is disposed to make it a Cabinet question? If so would it not be wise to wait till next session? Probably, then Government would have maturely considered the question, and would come down to the House with a well-digested Bill, calculated to settle the question finally for many years. Mr. PYKE'S Bill proposes to give Catholics a very small instalment of justice, which, if granted, we shall, of course, accept, and do the best we can with it, on the understanding, however, that we shall ask more in due time. At the present moment we get nothing for all the money we pay for public education, but we maintain our independence. Under Mr. PYKE'S Bill, however, we should be placed in the humiliating position of receiving only two-thirds of the capitation allowance granted to godless schools, and no building allowance, nor any share in scholarships. We fail to see that two-thirds of the usual capitation allowance would be much compensation for the loss of that amount of independence which the Bill now before Parliament demands of us. Were our advice to be followed, we should say it would be much better, and under every point of view wiser for Catholics to continue in the course they are now following; and on the school question maintain a lofty independence of all Governments. We feel assured that in the long run this would prove to be the better course. But the times are dull, and Catholics claim a right to have their due share for their own schools of the monies they are forced to contribute for the support of education. Their claim is most just, and the policy that pursues an opposite course is most impolitic and iniquitous; but the question is, shall we not be called upon to sacrifice too much of our independence in the education of our children in order to obtain even an instalment of justice. According to Mr. PYKE'S Bill, as we understand it, we shall be called upon to use in our schools the books approved of by the Minister of Education. He may be anything or nothing in religion; and may refuse us aid unless we discontinue to use our own excellent school books. This is a serious consideration. It will be seen from this that we are not very enthusiastic as regards Mr. PYKE'S Bill. Nevertheless, we are anxious it should pass, inasmuch as its enactment would affirm the principle that our schools should not be ignored by Government, and that we are entitled to our own money for our own schools. If Parliament really wishes to be just, let it establish the Canadian system which will give us all we want and all that we are entitled to, or establish a system of payment by results. We do not ask from Parliament anything that we shall not fairly and honestly earn. Let our school children be annually examined by Government inspectors, and then let us have the full capitation allowance for all who pass in their respective standards. This will satisfy us, although we should get no building allowance, provided always that children attending Catholic schools shall be enabled to hold scholarships while doing so. It will be seen from the above that in deference to the views of Catholics generally we abstain from pressing on them our private views as to the policy of having anything whatever to do with Government in the education of our children. Our private view is that it would be better and wiser to maintain our own schools ourselves, independently of Government aid and maintain our independence under every point of view. It would be safer to do so.

A WORD FOR OUR CATHOLIC FELLOW JOURNALISTS.

WE write the following with considerable hesitation, and influenced solely by solicitude for the honour of Catholic journalism. For a considerable time we have noticed that, with the exception of the NEW ZEALAND TABLET, all the Catholic newspapers of Australasia have been in the habit of calling the sees of the Archbishops, archdioceses. This practice, we are advised, is incorrect. We have the highest authority for saying that such a title as archdiocese is not known to Catholic theology, or Canon law. The word archdiocese, indeed, is to be found in English dictionaries, but these are not authorities to be relied upon by Catholic publicists in reference to the usages of the Catholic Church. So far as the word itself is concerned we have no objection to archdiocese, and should the Holy See, or approved Canonists use it, so shall we. But at present, as we are advised, neither the Holy See nor Canonists use it,

Nowhere in Canon law, we are told, is the word to be found; and certainly we can say that from our own observation of the practice of their Eminences Cardinals CULLEN and MANNING, we have been correctly advised. We have been in the habit of reading the pastorals addressed to their people by these eminent and learned ecclesiastics, and when our attention was drawn to this subject we went to the trouble to look up these pastorals, and our former reading and recent investigation enable us to say that never, not even once, have these great ecclesiastics used the word archdiocese. It will be seen by all who care to make investigation for themselves that both these Cardinals have invariably addressed their pastorals to their respective dioceses, not archdioceses. Both always head their pastorals "to the clergy and faithful of the diocese" of Dublin or Westminster respectively. The last number of the *London Tablet* which has come to hand, viz., October 1, says in page 526:—"In a Pastoral Letter, read in the churches of the diocese of Dublin, the Archbishop of Dublin says," etc. We know it will be said that we have some unworthy motive in writing thus, but we are conscious of the contrary, and the only blame we can take to ourselves is the cowardice that prevented us from saying all this long ago, through fear of the imputation of unworthy motives. We have now, however, assumed courage enough to do what we think is a public duty. As journalists, we are naturally solicitous for the honour of our craft, and we write thus to call the attention of our brother journalists to this subject, in order that they may be induced to look into the matter, and if they find we are correct in our views, that they may amend their practice. We feel humbled at the thought that our learned fellow publicists in Catholic countries should have reason to laugh at the want of knowledge of their fellows in Australasia.

MISLEADING.

In the first page of the periodical called *The Illustrated Catholic Missions* there is a review of the Apostolate of the Marist missionaries in New Zealand. This review is misleading, as will be seen from the words which we quote:—"In 1837 Mgr. Pompallier and Father Servant left Wallis Island already known to our readers, and set sail to bear the Cross to New Zealand. In this new mission-field they found the Natives as warlike as those they had left in the Pacific, and yet within a short period after their arrival they had converted as many as 5,000 Maories and established numerous Christian communities. Fourteen years later, or 1850, the Marist missionaries were called away from their successful work in the north of the island and placed in possession of the diocese of Wellington. In 1887 this territory was elevated into an Archbishopric and divided into the diocese of Wellington and that of Christchurch. So rapid has been the growth of Catholicity that these dioceses at present contain 40,000 Catholics, 28 parishes or stations, 100 churches or chapels, under 38 missionaries, and two bishops of the Society of Mary." People in New Zealand will laugh at the above paragraph and shrug their shoulders in amazement at the travesty of history it contains. One not aware of the facts would certainly come to the conclusion that the position of the Catholic Church in these two dioceses was entirely due to the Marist missionaries and their Maori converts. We in New Zealand know that such is not the case; but people in England, for whose instruction and edification *The Illustrated Catholic Missions* is published, will be surprised to hear that there are not one thousand Maori Catholics in these two dioceses, and only one Maori mission. They will be also astonished to learn that were it not for Irish Catholics and their children there would not be more than perhaps one Catholic parish or mission in all New Zealand, and that the position of the Catholic Church in New Zealand is mainly due to the faith, zeal, and generosity of Irish Catholics, whose presence in this country *The Illustrated Catholic Missions* entirely ignores. The Marist missionaries have their merits, and it is just and proper to recognise them, but it is simply monstrous in any public writer to give to them and their Maori converts the entire honour and credit which is for the most part due to Irish Catholics.

THE Most Rev. Dr. Moran, who spent last week in examining the school of the Dominican nuns at South Dunedin, leaves for Queenstown this morning, where during the ensuing week he will also examine the schools, and will administer the Sacrament of Confirmation on Sunday next. His Lordship will then proceed to Invercargill, where likewise, the schools will be examined by him