

less a sum than £1,100. The orphanage is now fast approaching completion, and its lofty walls can be seen looming in the distance from most parts of the Flat. One wing only has as yet been proceeded with, and the cost entailed will be about £2,000.

GORE.

In this district a new church has been erected at Riversdale, and the church at Waikaia enlarged.

INVERCARGILL.

A branch of the Order of Marist Brothers has been established and charge of the boys' school has been handed over to them. A new church has also been erected at the Bluff.

LAWRENCE.

The sum of £150 has been raised for a new church at Miller's Flat, and £30 for general improvements.

MILTON.

A new church has been opened at Owaka.

OAMARU.

The basilica at Oamaru has also been fitted with metal ceilings, and the effect of the improvement has evoked general admiration. A new church has been built at Kurow, and the sum of £300 has already been raised for it.

PORT CHALMERS.

The parochial church of this busy little seaport is being completed, while a convent has also been provided for the Sisters of St Joseph. Other churches in the parish have also been repaired, and some debts have been paid off, while £393 has been raised for various improvements.

RIVERTON.

Property at Wrey's Bush has been purchased for a Convent of the Sisters of Mercy.

WINTON.

The Winton Church has been enlarged and furnished at an expenditure of £650, which amount was successfully raised by the late lamented Rev. Father Vereker.

QUEENSTOWN.

The work of building a new church has been commenced, and the sum of £590 has been collected towards this object.

Correspondence.

[We are not responsible for the opinions expressed by our correspondents.]

THE CENTENARY OF 1798.

TO THE EDITOR N.Z. TABLET.

SIR,—That my views on this subject should evoke criticism is scarcely a matter for surprise, nor is it perhaps to be wondered at that I should be made the object of personal attack because of them. There are, doubtless, many who differ from them. But it is doubtful if many will sympathise with the abuse of your correspondent. Rev. J. J. Lynch. I shall not accord him the flattery of imitation. His personal abuse certainly is not argument, and, consequently, calls for no reply.

Your correspondent has evidently allowed his impulsiveness to obscure his intelligence—at least temporarily. He accuses me of drawing "a comparison between the Church of the living God and the ravings of rank socialists." This is the reverse of fact. Your correspondent significantly contents himself with a mere assertion, not caring evidently to analyse what I really did contend for. I stated plainly that socialism is an error, but that, like all errors, it contains an element of truth. In this opinion I am supported by more than one eminent theologian. Brownson, for instance, states the same thing in his essay on "Liberalism and Socialism." "The chief danger of socialism," says he, "lies in the truth it contains."

Error is never unalloyed with truth." I have always understood that there is a radical difference between error and sin, the one being partially truth, while the other is not. This is just my contention regarding socialism. No one can disprove, nor do any of your correspondents attempt to disprove, that the "brotherhood of man and the fatherhood of God" is a Catholic principle. But to concede this is not to compare all the principles of socialism with the principles of the Catholic Church. To insinuate that I did so is a mere quibble.

Probably I could have gone further and stated that the Church has no quarrel with socialism when based on religion. At any rate the Jesuit Republic of Paraguay—the most successful socialistic state that ever existed—appears to show that when human nature is subjected to the influence of religion, there is nothing in socialism at variance with Catholicity. But in saying this or in contending that modern socialism contains an element of truth, I cannot in fairness be accused of drawing an analogy between the teachings of Fourier and Proudhon and the teachings of the Church. At the parliament of religions at Chicago, Archbishop Redwood said "there is an element of truth in all religions." It would be as logical to accuse his Grace of stating that all religions were true as it is to state that I "draw a comparison between the Church of the living God and the teachings of rank socialists." So much, then, for the clumsy attempt to distort one of my contentions.

Briefly put, if your correspondent's contention appears to be that, in deprecating the celebration of the centennial of 1798, I advocate a policy of cowardice, and he apparently deduces from this assumption that I am prepared to placate the prejudices of the ignorant by distorting the teachings of the Church. Here, again, he wisely refrains from any attempt to prove anything. Evidently he has

read little of the history of the Church, or if he has done so, he has learned little of it. The Church must necessarily maintain and defend the principles entrusted to her keeping. But her history does not show that she is wedded to any particular race, nor indeed do her title or principles, which are essentially universal. All that I said about the conflict between Nationalism and the Church, and, in fact, a great deal more, has been said by more than one Catholic historian and controversialist. Brownson (I quote him because his works have been specially recommended to me by a priest) says that the enemies of the Church in the middle ages were chiefly monarchy and Nationalism; and Austin, in his treatise on Canon Law, says "the Church, being essentially Catholic, cannot be fettered by Nationalism." History shows that, while the Church has always rigidly maintained her essential principles, she has ever made as much concession to the customs and even to the prejudices of the people as was compatible with the maintenance of these principles. In a letter to the clergy and laity of his diocese, Dr. Nulty referred to the attitude of the Church towards public abuses; and instancing slavery as a case in point, he characterised it as "the most odious injustice." Nevertheless, he added, it continued to exist long after the introduction of Christianity. The Church, had she openly attacked it, would not have been listened to. She, therefore, "prudently tolerated this great and crying evil." But she ameliorated the condition of the slaves, and gradually paved the way for their emancipation. Again, the Maronite Catholics of Syria are to this day permitted by the Pope to say Mass and sing Vespers in the Syriac tongue. Your correspondent would perhaps call this cowardice, but, nevertheless, it is prudence—a very different quality. The fierce Indians of Paraguay were passionately fond of music, and the Jesuit missionaries made this passion the vehicle for conveying the faith to them. Some years since, Bishop Raimondi, of Hong-Kong, visited Sydney, and told his hearers there that in China many of the missionaries wore the orthodox tails and sandals in order to win the sympathies of the natives. But we need not go beyond New Zealand for examples. Zealous missionaries have gone among the Maoris, eating food prepared according to Maori custom, living in rude whares, and even wearing flax mats. Was all this cowardice or prudence? Did it involve a single sacrifice of Catholic principle? Or were not the foregoing wise and charitable concessions to the customs of the different peoples?

In the present instance, I have argued that, in a mixed community like ours—I said nothing against it in regard to Ireland—it would be inadvisable from a Catholic point of view to revive the memories of 1798, partly because it would not help to remove the evils at present afflicting Ireland, partly because it would afford an excuse for Orangemen to sharpen the poisoned arrows of religious bigotry, but chiefly because it would have a tendency to hinder the progress of Catholic ideas in the minds of those who are not Irish people, and whose feelings, in charity, should be considered. All this, I admit, is fairly debatable, and honest men might well differ upon it. Instead of my views, however, indicating cowardice, I believe them to be eminently prudent, and in accordance with the policy of the Church and the dictates of charity. It is undeniable that what is really cowardice may sometimes be mistaken for prudence, and *vice versa*. Nevertheless, they are necessarily opposing principles, and I leave any unprejudiced person to decide which I have endeavoured to defend. Prudence and charity it has been my desire to follow.

Your correspondent is correct in arguing that the rising of 1798 was not, properly speaking, a rebellion. Rebellion can only be against lawful authority, or, at any rate, against authority administered with justice. But this is not the point at issue. Though not a native of Ireland, I claim to be as much in sympathy with her cause as any of your correspondents. But I would say, with Thomas Bracken:—

"Confusion to those bad old times
That happened long ago."

Heartless indeed would be the man who could read unmoved the sad, sad story of Ireland's sufferings, sufferings which, alas! are not at an end. Well may they feel proud who are of the race that has enriched the annals of mankind with the Grattan's, the Curran's, the Sheridans, the Burkes, the Moores, the O'Connell's and the Parnells. But I would much prefer to see the people united in a common crusade against their common enemy than to see them divided about the bad times that have been and are gone—I am, etc.,
Raefton, February 2. P. J. O'REGAN.

Civilisation depends on morality.

Politeness is the ritual of society.

Outside of the Church there may be views of truth—theories, opinions; but she holds and teaches the truth itself.—Dr. Brownson.

A remarkable vagary of modern criticism is the serious dispute concerning morality in art. That is not an open question. We must require that same morality in art that we require in a woman, and this entirely for aesthetic reasons. Immorality is not beauty, and art has nothing to do with anything not beautiful. This is not a limitation of art, because beauty is everywhere, from the light of a child's forehead up to its source in God.

While every care should be taken to teach a child how to decide wisely he should be taught with equal assiduity that when the time arrives he must make up his mind with promptness and resolution, and abide by the consequences. It is very poor training that allows him to change his mind with every fancy, to take what he has refused, and to give up what he has chosen. It cannot be so in manhood, and he will enter upon it quite unprepared for its stern decrees. Equally bad is that authority which forbids all choice on the child's part, that decides every detail and orders all the minutiae of his life. If he is brought up in absolute dependence on the will of another, and never allowed to decide anything for himself, it is not strange that the task should prove too much for him in after life. No freedom in youth often means no decision in manhood.

"BLUE BELL" OATMEAL Is again in the Market, and may be obtained from all Grocers

WHOLESALE FROM

J. H. HANCOCK & CO'S (Late Hood & Davidson) CALEDONIAN MILLS DUNEDIN