

for legislative protection. The State should have the power of rescuing its future citizens from such surroundings, and the law which protects young children from physical hurt should also be so framed as to shield them from moral destruction." But not only does the law refrain from protecting the children that are so miserably situated but, by means of its compulsory education in common schools, it forces into association with them, and as a necessary consequence into a participation more or less in their corruption, children whose homes are respectable and pure.—These facts are sufficient without any further comment.

AT a meeting of the Timaru School Committee held the other day, one, Mr. Gibson, in opposing a motion for Bible-reading in the school, predicted that "the free, secular, and compulsory system of

education would stand the test of time." Now, we do not know upon what the prediction of this Mr. Gibson was based, nor do we know what the gentleman's claims to a clear prevision may be. It is said, we are indeed aware, that there are, or have been, people endowed with a power known as that of second sight, and to whose possessors the future lies revealed. But whether Mr. Gibson is so endowed or not it has not been revealed to us. If, without the power of second sight the gentleman in question ventured to foretell the enduring nature of the secular system he relied on his opinion only, and from that it may be possible, perchance, for a man to differ without egregious presumption. Nor could experience have guided Mr. Gibson in his decision, for, wherever a system of secular education has prevailed for a sufficient time, it has been found sadly deficient. At this moment, for example, we have before us the testimony of competent judges to the result of the system alluded to in America, and there it has proved a remarkable failure. The *New York World*, then, in a couple of its recent issues has dealt with the system, and shown certain important points in which it has failed. The common complaint among parents is, as this newspaper tells us, that their children are learning nothing, and all the pretence of teaching made in the costly schools, is so much vain show. But Mr. Donn Piatt in his *Commercial Gazette*, makes a still more serious arraignment of the system. "There never was such a fraud and delusion as the common-school system," he writes, "Based on a proposition that is communism in its simplest and most direct form, which says that the property of the rich shall be taken to educate the children of the poor, it is really the reverse in its effect. Labour pays all, and instead of the wealthy being taxed to educate the children of labourers, labour is taxed to educate the children of the rich. They are hotbeds of iniquity.

My honoured father was the first, he being then a member of the Ohio Legislature, to introduce a bill inaugurating this monstrous fraud. He lived to regret his work. It is communism in its worst form. It seeks to rob the rich for the benefit of the poor, and ends in burdening labour for the uses of wealth. Instead of the rich being taxed to educate the children of labour—labour, that pays all, is taxed for the benefit of the rich. Its practical outcome is an infamous outrage. What child of a day labourer carrying his pick and shovel can graduate in your High School? We are a nation of phrase eaters, and because this system of irreligious teaching is hid under a few choice phrases, no man dares even to investigate its senseless extravagance." Mr. Gibson, also, in his turn, seems to be somewhat of a "phrase eater," and because to him apparently the system is one displaying what he calls the "Christianity of Christ," and what we should judge from the manner of his argument to be no Christianity at all—or, verily, to be a "sham"—notwithstanding Mr. Gibson's asserted detestation of such—for what greater sham is there on earth than the pretended benevolence and justice of those men whose firm determination it is to force upon their unwilling neighbours any system that it may please them from various motives to support?—And it is this true "sham" and utter imposture that we often hear them blasphemously identify with the Christianity of Christ.—What right, again, has any man to pronounce his neighbour's religion a sham, and to insist that his neighbour shall not teach his religion to his children? But Mr. Gibson, as we said, is possibly possessed of second sight, and, knowing much more than his neighbours, is admirably qualified to lay down the law for them. Without the gift of second sight the gentleman in question might be accredited with self-sufficiency and rashness, and even, perhaps, with no small degree of presumption.

A GREAT PROTESTANT MONUMENT.

THE London *Times* in an article on the Jesuits, not only repeats all the time-worn calumnies made against the Order, and takes an opportunity of assailing the Catholic Church generally, but also makes a boast or two intended to reflect honour on Protestantism, but which may, perhaps, be otherwise understood without much difficulty. "The Jesuits," he says, "used the *New World* to restore the balance of the Old, and the most illustrious of Loyola's disciples all but achieved the impossible feat of bringing Japan, China, and even Hindostan into obedience to the See of Rome. But that the Protestant Powers pursued them even to the ends of the

world, it is conceivable that they might have succeeded in making all the races of the earth Christian after their fashion, involving the most astonishing compromises between the new creed and the ancient superstitions." How honourable, then, it is to the Protestant Powers that they should have preserved to Vishnu and Buddha, and all the gods of the heathen, their ancient empire—that they should have been the means of saving from destruction every abominable heathen rite, and every vile heathen observance. What a monument to the Protestant Powers are, for example, human sacrifices, the degradation of women, and the innumerable infamous things that are attendant on the different forms of heathenism. Truly they are to be congratulated on the marks they have left of their empire in all the quarters of the world, and who shall henceforward deny that the glorious Reformation has been suitably upheld by them. But let us note for our warning and admonition the spirit that the great organ of English opinion displays in the passage we have quoted. We have frequently been told of late that in no countries of all the earth does the Catholic Church enjoy greater consideration or more liberty than she enjoys within the limits of the British Empire. Yet the *Times* prefers to the obedience to the See of Rome into which, he says the Jesuits might have brought the whole heathen world, the continued reign of heathen abominations.—Can a more bitter hatred, a deeper contempt than this be shown towards the Church, and is it not manifest that the toleration displayed towards her by those who entertain such feelings is one on which no Catholic can reckon, and one for which he need feel no gratitude—knowing that it is but the fruits of accidental circumstances, and which may any day be withdrawn? The boast that the Protestant powers by their persecution of the Jesuits, have baffled the Holy See, and renewed the strength of heathenism is an ominous one for Catholics, and proves to them that the hatred of their religion is in the very blood of Protestantism—and if in that of Protestantism, how much more in the blood of its advanced and more rancorous children, Freethought and Atheism? so that the position of Catholics is at all times precarious. Meantime, it is consistent with the boasting of the *Times* to find that what the Jesuits have been prevented, as he says, from doing, is not likely to be accomplished by Protestant missions. The monument that the Protestant Powers have raised up for themselves is one that is likely to last in all its beauty, and honour them, perhaps, till the end of time, or, at least, until the final triumph of the Church on earth has brought about an acknowledgement of what Protestantism has really been, and the Protestant Powers have discovered the true nature of all their anti-Catholic undertakings and successes. But the *Times*, indeed, might have boasted still more loudly—he might have claimed for England not only that she had had her share in persecuting the Jesuit missionaries, and so re-establishing heathenism in all its strength, but he might have proudly reminded his readers that in the heathenism of India England has an exclusive monument belonging to herself alone, and that bears ample testimony to her anti-Catholic spirit, since it is anti-Christian.—Marshall, in his *Christian Missions*, for example, maintains that the English Government in India very fervently restored and supported the native worship. He gives many instances of cases in which this was done, and supports his statements by competent English testimony. Let us take, for example, the following passages:—"The disgusting and gory worship of Juggernaut," says Mr. Howitt, 'was not merely practised, but was actually licensed and patronised by the English Government. It imposed a tax on all pilgrims going to the temples in Orissa and Bengal, appointed British officers, British gentlemen, to superintend the management of this hideous worship and the receipt of its proceeds.' They even became ingenious, it seems, in multiplying such sources of revenue; for a Protestant missionary informs us that they also imposed a tax on those 'who desire the privilege of drowning in the Ganges,' and that this scheme was 'calculated to yield two hundred and fifty thousand rupees.' . . . And as late as 1857, we find the Protestant Bishop of Carlisle declaring in a public address, that the same proceedings still continue. In one of the presidencies for the support of idolatry and Mahometan superstition, upwards of fifty thousand pounds are regularly expended every year by this country for the maintenance of that idolatrous and superstitious worship. This is no negative work. It is not a question whether we should have discountenanced it or not; but here is a positive and downright encouragement of it. Again he writes, "One more witness to these singular facts shall be quoted, because he is supposed to represent, more accurately than any other writer, the opinions of the majority of Englishmen. 'The company,' says this great authority, —beginning with a skilful limitation,—'seem to have thought that they held their possessions in India upon much the same terms as the Dutch held their footing in Japan,—by tenure of trampling on the Cross. Practically, they worshipped those ugly Indian deities more servilely than their own votaries did. Their only anxiety was to show them what they should salute, what they should respect; and they honoured, saluted, and respected accordingly. This idolatry of other men's superstitious prevalent among the officers of the East Indian service is a mania by no means yet extinct.' (*The Times*, March 16, 1859) this, indeed, is the most wonderful fact of all,—that such things were still possible in the year 1859. 'Some time ago,