

T E M U K A .

(From an occasional Correspondent.)

July 14, 1890.

I AM sorry to have to state that the health of our much-beloved pastor still remains in an unsatisfactory state. On Sunday, the 29th ult., his reverence celebrated the holy sacrifice of the Mass, on which occasion the "Te Deum" was rendered by the choir in thanksgiving for Father Fauvel's recovery from danger. The pallor worn on his countenance was, however, a source of considerable uneasiness to many, as it was evident that he was far from being in a fit state to resume his duties. In the evening Father Fauvel was unable to attend church. On Sunday last Father Binsfield (Timaru) officiated at St. Joseph's both morning and evening, preaching a practical sermon at the former service. Father Fauvel's health continues in a somewhat weak state, and by what I have learned from the rev. gentleman's medical adviser, it will be necessary for him to obtain the services of a curate, as he will not, without serious injury to his health, again be able to fast until after the last Mass. It is really wonderful how the rev. gentleman has for so long been able to carry out his many arduous duties without assistance, the more so as he is now considerably advanced in age. The parish is a very large one, taking in Pleasant Point, Waitohi, Milford, and Winchester. By procuring a curate Father Fauvel will be able to labour amongst those to whom he could not possibly be replaced for many years to come, and it is very much to be hoped some step will be taken to make things easier for our good pastor.

On Friday evening Father Fauvel had what was at first thought a serious relapse. By Sunday, however, he was slightly better, and was able to be present in church. The Rev. Father Goggan, S.M., Professor of Mathematics, from St. Patrick's College (who had a short time ago completed giving a mission at Ashburton, and was on a visit to Timaru), having heard of Father Fauvel's indisposition, came to Temuka by Friday morning, and officiated on Sunday morning and evening, and also on Monday morning, giving facilities to those who wished to go to confession. Father Foley (Timaru) was to have officiated on Sunday, but as the rev. gentleman himself had been ill for several days he could not possibly have attended. Father Goggan in the morning preached a long and eloquent, as well as impressive and instructive sermon. The matter of his discourse was "Christian Teaching." The rev. gentleman forcibly placed before his hearers the duties of children—first, to God; secondly, to parents, and, thirdly, to society, explaining to the parents the manner of bringing up their children in order to fulfil these duties. In the evening Father Goggan preached on the "Humanity and Divinity of Christ." The space at my disposal does not justify my reporting the sermons. Suffice it to say that they were among the best I have ever heard. The rev. gentleman left this morning *en route* for Wellington, to resume his duties at the College.

I N F A N T I C I D E .

(Melbourne Advocate, July 5.)

SOME startling evidence was given at the sitting of the Charities' Commission on the 27th June. Drs. Fitzgerald, Neild, and J. P. Ryan were amongst the witnesses, and these gentlemen expressed themselves strongly in favour of the establishment of a foundling hospital as the means of checking the alarming growth of infanticide which now so painfully shocks the moral sense of the community—Dr. Neild said he himself had held *post-mortem* examination on 500 children, nearly all of whom had been murdered. Most of them had been killed immediately after birth, and others by the slower process of starvation. This number only formed, he said, a moiety of the infanticides which actually took place. In the murder of these children probably there were at least two persons besides the mother implicated, and there must be at least 1,500 persons walking about with the stain of murder on their souls. This estimate, we should think, much exaggerated; but, even so, Dr. Neild's evidence is entitled to great weight, though it only confirms the impression produced by publicly recorded facts. To check the great evil the only remedy these medical gentlemen had to propose was the founding hospital, and that would only be consequential, and therefore wholly inadequate to the circumstances of the case. It only deals with the existing state of things and does not look to its cause with the object of effecting a reform there. It was most clearly proved that a frightful laxity of juvenile morals resulted from the secular system of education in America. To that effect we have so often given the testimony of Dr. Muller, and of other respected citizens of the United States—both Protestant and Catholic—that we deem it needless to take up our space with it once more. The evidence exists, and that it is reliable is unquestionable from the character of the witnesses. More than that, its applicability to our circumstances in this colony needs no tedious demonstration. We have also a secular system in this colony, and, as we foretold, it is producing the results traced so clearly to it elsewhere. From the absence of religious teaching in the State school, a vast majority of our youth grow into adolescence untrained to resist the promptings to which infanticide is to be traced. A founding hospital may or may not be desirable. On that point we offer no opinion; but we have no hesitation in saying that so long as Christianity remains divorced from our system of public instruction, the care of abandoned infants by the State will produce no good effect on the morals of the people by whom the children are deserted. If our Government and our public men are only concerned to deal with the consequences of profligacy, then a founding hospital of large dimensions and capable of extension at short intervals might meet the case; but if they acknowledge any higher responsibility, then they must look to the source of the evil and grapple with it there by restoring to the children attending the State schools that Christian inheritance of which they were robbed by secularists in Parliament.

"AMERICAN HATRED OF ENGLAND."

(From the Pilot.)

SELDOM has an advocate answered his own questions with such unintentional fullness as Professor Goldwin Smith does in his paper on "The Hatred of England," in the *North American Review* for May.

The mystery, why Americans hate England, is explained in almost every paragraph of Mr. Smith's querulous inquiry. It is because Englishmen, even when trying to be conciliatory, can so seldom refrain from being insulting. Let us see how Mr. Smith essays to persuade his American readers that they ought to love and admire his countrymen.

In his opening paragraph he forestalls any denial of the charge by doubting in advance the honesty of the denier. If you attempt to deprecate dislike, he says, "you will probably get at most a hollow disclaimer."

In the next paragraph he impudently accuses American Legislators and Presidents of pandering to the Irish vote whenever they have expressed sympathy with a people struggling for justice.

In the next he accuses American politicians of dishonesty and cowardice, and instances, without mentioning his name, Abram Hewitt, who once "explained his vote to the British Ambassador."

In the next he accuses the Protectionists of insincerity in making demagogic appeals to anti-English prejudice to strengthen their cause.

In the next he quotes a nameless ignoramus, as if he were a representative American, who asked him once "if it were true that the British Government had counterfeited the greenbacks for the purpose of ruining the credit of the United States."

In the next he contrasts favourably the advantages of Australian democracy in its comparative freedom from "the dominion of Tom Paine, Elijah Pogram, Tammany, and people-worship," delicately intimating that these latter represent American institutions.

In the next he condemns the Revolutionary War and justifies the Government of George III., saying: "No Government, if it had any sense of dignity or of duty, will allow a constitutional question to be settled by mobs—even Boston mobs," and casts a slur on the honesty of the Revolutionary leaders by saying that all of them, "including Samuel Adams and Washington, found it necessary, in order to carry the people with them, to protest that they did not mean separation."

In the next he condones the insolence of England after the Revolutionary War by saying: "It is surely possible that victorious Republicans visiting England may not always have borne themselves meekly;" and, "moreover, if the bitterness was prolonged, the fault lay partly in the Americans themselves, who, instead of closing the war with an amnesty, drove the vanquished by thousands into exile, and sent them to tell the tale of their wrongs and stir generous hearts to pity and indignation wherever the English tongue was spoken"—referring doubtless to the traitorous Tories, abettors of Tarleton and his Indian allies, who found no congenial home in the country which they had laboured to destroy. Benedict Arnold was one of those injured exiles.

In the next he denies that the war of 1812 was caused by the infamous imprisonment of American seamen and ascribes it partly to the ambition of Henry Clay and partly to an American desire to help Napoleon against the "nations of Europe then struggling for their independence."

In the next and following paragraphs he denies that the secession was rebellion. "The south was not an insurgent party, nor did it seek to overthrow or change the Federal Government. . . . The seceding group became at once a *de facto* nation, with a distinct territory of its own. And, after all, was it the best policy to defeat their aspirations? Is it yet proved beyond doubt that the re-incorporation of the black States was a gain?"

In the next, forgetting that he had previously denied English responsibility for the Alabama, he says that "ample atonement has been made for that wrong," which, of course, should be considered equivalent to proving its non-existence.

But we cannot follow the amblings of this British cow over the corns of American readers. It is scarcely necessary to answer Mr. Smith's absurd insinuation, that "jealousy waits upon success," as an explanation of American hatred of England.

The simple fact is that Mr. Smith is totally unable to comprehend the American attitude towards England, because he is unable to see himself or his country as others see them. "Hatred" is not the word to describe the American feeling. Distrust, strongly dashed with contempt, is the real feeling. We might hate England if we had any cause to fear her; happily, we have not. We do not like, and we do despise, the power which has always been our enemy and rival, and never more so than at the present time when she uses gold instead of steel to assail our welfare, and sends whining advocates, like Mr. Smith, to plead consanguinity, instead of supercilious tourists and bagmen to tell us of our inferiority.

Mrs. Loft, Royal Arcade, Dunedin, is now holding a great clearing sale both of her large and excellent stock of boots and shoes and of drapery. In both departments unprecedented bargains are to be had, such as are not likely soon again to be offered to the public.

Captain Dawson, "formerly of the 3rd Dragoon Guards, now of the local Militia," deserves the thanks of his countrymen for having told a few plain truths about the Army at a public dinner at Norwich last week. Here are one or two of these truths:—"Recruits for the Army were merely boys instead of healthy men capable of facing all climates and meeting the best of all foes in all climates. The Army was 20,000 short of the establishment. . . . He had been on parade that day with some recruits, and, if they could have seen their physique, they would have said that they were sickly youths, the scum of the nation, who could not get employment in any other way. It is a pity that officers a few degrees higher in authority had not the courage to speak as plainly