

Board schools from which the teaching of the Christian religion is excluded. As the Nechells Chairman said, it is calling upon them to violate their consciences, and to set the moral law below threepence a week." But, besides Cardinal Manning's proposal, made last December in one of the *Reviews*, our contemporary quotes the proposal of Mr. Mostyn Pryce, one of Her Majesty's Inspectors of Schools:—"He reported that 'the voluntary schools have suffered much under the existing law, and must suffer so long as a compulsory rate is levied for Board Schools, but subscriptions to denominational schools are not allowed to count in satisfaction of the tax. In Canada voluntary subscriptions are set off against the compulsory rate, and voluntary schools flourish. In Germany, that model country of popular education, contributions in the nature of a tax are levied. But when a sufficient number of householders require the supply of a school of their own denomination, they receive a proportionate share of the universal rate. Were this simple alteration affected, the march of schools where the various distinctive religious tenets may be taught would, I believe, outstrip the march of coming universal School Boards.'" "The German plan," adds our contemporary "appears to be pretty much what Cardinal Manning recommends. The Canadian plan is also a fair and reasonable one. The friends of religious education must insist that the one or the other be adopted in England, and that religious education be freed from the disabilities under which it labours. The stale objection will doubtless be urged that such plans would foster sectarianism. But the religion of a sect is better than no religion, and if children are not to be attached to any one form of Christianity there is little likelihood of their growing up Christians at all."

A SHARP  
OBSERVER.

WE find the following letter in our contemporary the *N.Z. Freeman's Journal*: "Sir,—In the *Dunedin TABLET* I find very often correspondence from Auckland, signed "Dally," in which the most un-

founded and absurd Catholic news is given as plain truths. For instance, I may quote, the *Pontifical High Mass held on Easter Monday*, at St. Patrick's Cathedral and at Parnell; the *abolition of flowers* by the Benedictine Fathers from St. Benedict's, Newton, and many others of the same kind which would be too long to quote here. I think that "Dally" ought to be either correct in his statements, or to refrain from writing, because, with his incoherent assertions, he brings himself and the Catholics of Auckland into contempt. Perhaps he does so without meaning, but we cannot always pass over in silence his wrong statements.—I am, etc., OBSERVER." We should have thought any "Observer" capable of exercising his brains, even in the slightest degree, as well as his eyes, would have seen at once that "Easter Monday," in this instance, was a typographical error.—And surely the character of Auckland Catholics is hardly likely to be affected by that! As for the rest, knowing that our correspondent was himself an educated and respectable Auckland Catholic of long standing, and so situated as to have opportunities of receiving accurate information on Catholic matters, we have not subjected those parts of his letters dealing with Catholic matters to any particular supervision—and therefore have, perhaps, been at fault in omitting to correct, so far as possible, inaccuracies of a trifling kind such as seem, however, to disturb the observation of this "Observer." We acknowledge, moreover, that we are mystified as to why "Observer" has written "Parnell" in Italics.—Is there not a Catholic church there? Or was the mistake made that Monsignore Fynes had celebrated Pontifical High Mass? Nevertheless, for all we knew, or still know, Monsignore Fynes might have been Prothonotary Apostolic Participans, in which case, with the Bishop's permission, he could have celebrated Pontifical High Mass. But how shall our correspondent excuse himself to this "Observer"? He, perhaps, may devise, but, for ourselves, we can only picture him as having recourse to Martine's plea—urged on a somewhat similar occasion, "*Je parlons tout droit comme on parle chez nous.*"

THERE is a rather amusing controversy or DIS-INCONSISTENCY, cussion going on at present as to whether or not it is desirable that Anglican bishops in the colonies should take the title of lord, or be addressed as "your lordship," and, among other things, it has been advanced that their doing so is inconsistent in a country where there are no titles of nobility, and which is determined never to admit of the creation of a territorial aristocracy.—But may it not be urged with equal force that such a state of things as this is also inconsistent with the professions of the colonies, and that the loyal subjects of a monarch who condemn titles and reject an aristocracy are acting somewhat oddly. We have then among us a throne without steps as it were, and standing next to Her Most Gracious Majesty the Queen there are Messrs. Brown, Jones, and Robinson. The Court we have to deal with, moreover, is a notably exclusive and aristocratic one. There, for example, was that retired London tailor whose ambition was made the mockery of the whole English Press a year or two ago, and even celebrated with some *naïveté* by our own newspapers.—He, honest man, it seems

thought his happiness would never be complete or his hands entirely freed from all traditions of the goose, until he had made his bow at one of Her Majesty's levées, and by some means or other he succeeded in doing so, but only to have his presentation cancelled when the Court officials had discovered, with infinite horror, what his antecedents had been. The poor gentleman received a notice on the spot never to presume to show his nose again across the royal threshold. We blush to confess that we are entirely ignorant as to what may be the penalties of a transgression of the *défenſe*, but no doubt they would be calculated to produce a dreadful effect upon the nerves of those receiving or disregarding it.—Children and fools are as easy to frighten as they are to amuse. What is our quandary, then, in these colonies!—Nine-tenths of us can never hope to call upon our Gracious Queen—unless, of course, distance can accomplish what time, it seems, may not, and clear us from the miasma that clings to the tradesman. We are to have neither titles nor territorial aristocracy, and nothing is to make us fit for the royal presence.—There is, therefore, nothing more inconsistent in an Anglican bishop's taking a title here in these colonies than there is in the exclusion of titles by society generally. A monarchy—and we are the gushing and utterly overflowing-with-loyalty subjects of a monarchy, without titles of nobility and an aristocracy is an anomaly. The English monarchy whose Court is all steel and buckram to the backbone, is particularly out of character with such primitive simplicity.

### MR. JUSTIN M'CARTHY ON MR. FORSTER.

AFTER Mr. Justin M'Carthy, in his speech, had related the incident of Mr. Forster's connection with Mazzini, he continued as follows:—That incident was not without its interest and its moral (hear, hear). He wondered that the memory of that time did not make him somewhat more generous, somewhat more honest (cheers), towards men of whom in heart he as little believed in the truth of the charge of sympathy with assassination as honest men believed it of him then (cheers). The hon. member then vindicated his connection with *United Ireland*, and said the right hon. gentleman went over a great many points by which he endeavoured to connect him and others with plots of assassination. For example, the right hon. gentleman spoke of a telegram sent by Mr. Brennan as correspondent to the *Irish World*, "All sorts of theories are afloat concerning this explosion (that was the Salford dynamite explosion) but the truly loyal one is that Fenians did it." He put it to the House whether the plain and evident meaning of that was not while there were many explanations, yet the fashionable and loyal theory, the theory of those who made parade of their loyalty, was, as a matter of course, that the Fenians did it (hear, hear).

Mr. Forster—I would ask the hon. member to read the remainder of the telegram.

Mr. M'Carthy said he had got no more; he had copied that from the papers (hear, hear). The whole theory and purpose of the right hon. gentleman's declamation and defamation (Irish cheers) was to make members of that House responsible for every violent act done, or even every violent word said, by any supposed partisan or hanger-on of their leader and party, either in this country or in America. How would that theory apply to the right hon. gentleman? (Hear, hear.) The right hon. gentleman had not forgotten the riot which led to the breaking down of the Hyde Park railings, and to the maiming and wounding of many persons in the mob and the police force there. The right hon. gentleman and his friends came back into power, he might say, on the smashing of Hyde Park railings (hear, hear, and "Question"). The right hon. gentleman was well acquainted with the leader of the democratic movement, the late Mr. Beales.

Mr. Forster—No; I did not know him.

Mr. M'Carthy—He is dead (laughter). But, living or dead, Mr. Beales was a man of honour and courage. I knew him and I respected him. But he certainly got around him, and could not help getting around him, men of very odd character and very odd pretensions (cheers and laughter). Does the right hon. gentleman remember a certain Mr. Joseph Leicester, a famous glass-blower?

Mr. Forster—I do not remember him.

Mr. M'Carthy—He does not remember him. As a famous actor said on one occasion, "What a candour, but what a memory!" (cheers and laughter). At the time when Mr. Leicester's name used to appear in every London newspaper every morning (hear, hear), this distinguished supporter of the right hon. gentleman's party went to a great meeting one day—a great trades demonstration, held, I think, in Trafalgar Square—and this was part of the speech of Joseph Leicester. There was then, as there has been more lately, much talk of a kind of rush and raid on the House of Commons to force them to pass the right hon. gentleman's Reform Bill, and this was what that demagogic hero said:—

"The question is, were they to suffer those little-minded, decrepit, hump-backed, one-eyed scoundrels, who call themselves the House of Commons (laughter) to defraud them any longer of their rights?"

I was not a member of the House of Commons then, and did not come in for any part of that censure, but I ask the right hon. gentleman if someone as nearly connected with the hon. member for Cork as Mr. Leicester was with the right hon. gentleman, had used words of that description to a meeting of Irishmen what would he have said? (Loud cheers, and cries of "Oh.") Riots took place and people were wounded (cries of "Question"). There was no cry of question when the right hon. gentleman was defaming me and others, and went over land and sea and over years, to find charges against us. It is quite to the question. I want to say to him and the House that it is impossible in any movement to hold the leaders responsible for