

## DUPLICITY OF THE EDUCATION DEPARTMENT.

ANYONE acquainted with the history of what is called the "Reformation" cannot be surprised at the astounding duplicity or hypocrisy of the education authorities in this Colony. Catholics, all along, have been persuaded that the New Zealand Government schools were Protestant schools. Dr. Croke, when Bishop of Auckland, showed this clearly enough in a communication to the Press here, by quotations from history books used in State schools. Protestant principles may be taught through books of history as well as by catechism. I always maintain that New Zealand Government schools are practically just as Protestant in their spirit and teaching as our *Evening Star* and *Herald* are Protestant, or as your *TABLET*, or the Auckland *Freeman*, or Catholic schools are Catholic. On looking into Collier's history, one of the class-books in the Government schools, I see that he holds up the Catholic Church as an object of public hatred and execration, she having, as he maintains, poured out a stream of poison upon the world. When Government puts, or allows to be put, such books as these into the hands of the pupils in State schools, one cannot but feel astonished as well as disgusted at the duplicity, the brazen deceit, and shameless impudence of men like Mr. Rolleston and others when they pretend that these schools are "non-sectarian." I have used strong expressions, as you see, in denouncing such dissimulation, but if I could find any stronger I would use them. All men of all creeds, except, perhaps, staunch Scotch Presbyterians and English Puritans, despise hypocrisy and deceit whenever they see them, especially in matters regarding education and religion, for both these go together and cannot be separated. Everybody knows that what is called the "Reformation of religion" in England and Scotland was based on robbery, brute force, and fraud; Roman Catholics being the victims. The "Reformation" of religion was a mere pretext. Plunder, plunder, plunder was the object from the beginning to the end of the so-called "Reformation"—the plunder of the poor and defenceless by the rich and strong, by the ancestors of those men who now hold the spoil in their possession. No wonder the descendants of these royal and aristocratic robbers and their sympathisers are to this day "staunch Protestants" and anxious to keep down "Popery" by fair means or foul, by pretended non-sectarian Education Bills or otherwise. The Minister of Education has now more fully revealed the cloven foot and showed the sham New Zealand so-called secular and non-sectarian system of education, in its real character, as a Protestant system. Bible-reading in the mouth of a Presbyterian means rank Presbyterian doctrine—no mistake about that, though he may not have the honesty to avow it. The same term, in the mouth of a Protestant generally means Protestantism. No question of that either. To talk of non-sectarian Christianity is a mere delusion, a play or juggle upon words. Non-sectarian Christianity, if it mean anything, means Christianity without dogma. Where is such Christianity as that to be found? Not in the Bible certainly. Why, every sentence of the New Testament almost from end to end, asserts or implies some dogma which, to be understood aright, requires to be explained by those having lawful authority to do so. God knows the Bible has been abused already quite enough by those men who have cast off the authority of the Catholic Church. It has been times innumerable made by them a text book to teach endless religious errors and extravagances and even downright rebellion itself and crimes of the darkest dye, to the great injury of good morals and the public peace. We have seen a melancholy illustration of this in New Zealand. The Maori chief Wi Thomson, like another Oliver Cromwell, took the Bible in one hand and the rifle in the other while he went forward to destroy the power of his Sovereign. In this Colony the Protestant missionaries had taught him to read the Bible and interpret it on Protestant principles, by his "own private judgement." He and his followers did so with a vengeance. In vain Bishop Selwyn sought to convince them that their interpretation was not sound. Their to him reply was virtually this:—Sound or not sound, it is our interpretation, and, according to your teaching as Protestants, every man has a right to understand the Bible as his own private judgement leads him." It took ten thousand British soldiers to try to convince Thomson of his error as a Bible interpreter, and they did not succeed after all, though they took the best part of their land from him and his followers—a good deal of which a certain staunch, pious "Bible reader" in Auckland now holds, legally, of course. Thomson's open Bible has been a dear Bible to the Colony. It has imposed a war debt of seven million pounds upon us all, which we have yet to pay off or pay interest so long as it is unpaid.

Properly speaking, the great Maori war was the direct fruit of Protestant teaching. It profited the rich, the capitalist, the usurers, but not the poor tax-payer.—Grossly as the Bible has been misused in the past under Protestant influence, it bids fair to be more grossly misused yet if taught by authority of Government in State schools, upon non-sectarian principles—or pretended non-sectarian principles, rather. The "Reformation" was born, and cradled, and reared in injustice, robbery, duplicity and fraud, and for the overthrow of the Catholic Church. The same thing may be said of the present New Zealand system of education. There is little use in saying that to the education authorities, however. They will only laugh to your face. So long as they retain power they care not what you say of them. Like the authors and original defenders of the so-called "Reformation," they are insensible to feelings of justice, honour or shame when the interests of Roman Catholics are in question,—and they have the Catholics under their thumb. The Protestant Press are even worse than the Government in this respect. Those on whom the mantle of John Knox and the "good" Queen Bess has fallen are not likely to pay much, if any, respect to the claims of justice set forth by Roman Catholics in such a matter as education. I may be singular and extreme in my views, but I believe you might as well try to subvert the "Reformation" in New Zealand as break in upon the present Government education system. They both stand on one and the same footing—inveterate hostility to the Roman Catholic Church and her principles. The "Reformation" must run to the end of its tether, or nearly so, ere Catholics can hope for justice from a Government like this. The vices to which the "Reformation"

is leading, however, will in the end destroy it. In the mean time let Catholics "to themselves be true," while fighting for God and justice to all.

The Commons of New Zealand and of the United Kingdom do not see now what their ancestors saw a hundred years ago, and up to the time of the so-called "Reformation," that the Roman Catholic Church is the best friend of the weak and defenceless and their best protector against the avarice and tyranny and selfishness of the rich and powerful. Do not tell us that the avarice and tyranny and selfishness of the rich and powerful no longer exist now, either in New Zealand or the United Kingdom. A man must be blind, or deaf, or unable to read who will believe that. The sacrilegious spoilers of the Church, royal and aristocratic, their creatures and sympathisers, in the 16th century, got the people to believe that the Church was the enemy of the Commons. Under that delusion they have remained to this hour. Untruthful historians and fanatical self-seeking preachers have helped to keep up that delusion by their misrepresentations, and sometimes by enormous lies against the Church. The Press has worked hard in the same unblest vocation. Indeed, so long as that generation lived which had seen and known what the Catholic Church in the day of her power was, and what she had done for the Commons, they never lost their respect for her, and never ceased to regret her overthrow. It was only after that generation had passed away that the present anti-Catholic spirit arose among the Commons of England, such as we now witness it. The English commons would have defended the Catholic Church by force of arms against the infamous Henry and his co-robbers if they only had been able. They did make a feeble effort to do so, but failed, as they naturally would do with the thieving king and nobles, and their illgotten wealth against them. Misrepresentation and falsehood, however, are not immortal; truth is. The day will come, and is even now visibly approaching, when the Commons of England will know the true history of the Catholic Church—the true history of the so-called Reformation. Then their eyes will be opened to see how they have been misled and deceived regarding the Church, her principles, and her action in the past, and her present aims both in New Zealand and elsewhere. Within the last ten years there has been issued from the Edinburgh Press two interesting historical works, written by able and impartial Protestants, and which are well calculated to remove from the Protestant mind long-established misrepresentations and prejudices respecting the Catholic Church, her policy, and some of her most distinguished members in past ages. This seems to me to indicate something like a "reaction" among Scotchmen of culture in favour of the Catholic Church. Strange that Edinburgh, of all other cities, so long the head centre of the most rabid form of heretical error and tyranny, should now, by her Press, be leading the way to a Catholic reaction. Dunedin must follow suit. The two books I allude to are "The Warrior, the Priest, and Statesman," by Davenport Adams, and "Queen Mary and her Accusers," by John Hosack, barrister at law. In the first-named work, Mr. Adams has given a sketch of the life and character of the noble and saintly Thomas à Becket, of the patriot statesman Cardinal Archbishop Langton, the patriot warrior Simon de Montford—the three founders of the British Constitution, the most glorious temple of liberty the world has ever seen. He has done simple justice to the memory of these great men, and English-Catholic worthies. With a few trifling exceptions, the most enthusiastic Catholic might have written the book. Mr. Adams ought "to go over to Rome" to be consistent. The work of Mr. Hosack is primarily a vindication of the character of Mary Stuart against her false accusers—her Protestant accusers or slanderers. He does this in a cool, impartial, and masterly style. But the work is also a history of the "Reformation" in Scotland. He shows that the men who brought that event about were a confederacy of base traitor knaves, assassins, robbers, forgers, and perjured liars.—Elizabeth Tudor and John Knox being the worst of the lot and at the bottom of all the villainy then done, in the sacred name of religion. He shows that Mary was innocent of any share in her husband's assassination, or of any knowledge of it; that she was deeply grieved at its occurrence; that though Darnley was a bad husband, a rake, and a fool, who had plotted against her, she had been reconciled to him ere his assassination. It was not in her nature to harbour ill-will against anyone, far less the husband of her youthful choice—though not her first love. She earned the forgiveness of injuries even to a fault; heaped favours and honours on her base bastard brother, the "Reformer," the Lord James Stewart; even after he had been in arms against her and tried to kill her and her unborn babe. She never entertained a guilty passion for Rizzio or Bothwell;—there is no evidence to show that: much to prove the contrary. That her marriage with Bothwell was forced upon her. She loathed the man as well she might. He a Scotch brute, she a refined and sensitive, pious Catholic woman, brought up among refined people. What community of feeling could exist between them? The day after marriage with Bothwell she said she wished she were dead. The murder of Darnley was not a domestic, but a political tragedy; Almost every one of the Scotch "Reforming" nobles had a hand in it, or a guilty knowledge of it. Morton, the Regent, Knox's crony, was hanged for his share in the job. Every Scotchman should blush for shame up to the eyes at the very name of Knox, or the "Reformation." It has often struck me as singular that some of the most able defenders of the Catholic Church in her political character have been Protestants. They were so because of their full and intimate knowledge of the principles and the past history of the Church. Among these Protestant writers we may notice M. Guizot, author of a series of lectures on the "History of Modern Civilisation"; and William Cobbett, author of a "History of the Protestant Reformation," in England. The French said that M. Guizot, though Protestant, was more Catholic than the Catholics themselves. It would hardly be going too far to say the same of W. Cobbett. His little "History of the Protestant Reformation in England" is, perhaps, the most able and manly defence of the Catholic Church in her political character that ever was written. Yet William Cobbett somewhat inconsistently lived and died a member of the Protestant Church of England. The book was written about the time of the