

religious symbol from some position occupied by it in the household of her Majesty the good Queen Bees, the difficulty was solved by calling in the aid of Patch, her Majesty's fool, who removed it at once, and also, as we may suppose, with a very airy grace indeed. Our contemporary afterwards gives us another specimen of our sage's wit and wisdom. "He recognises education," says he, "as the sole differentiating force between mobs such as mi rule the fourth American Republics and our own orderly and law-loving population."—But we ask our readers' indulgence for a little foolish recollection. Once, then, we were acquainted with a family wherein a foreign nursery-maid vainly attempted to teach her native tongue to the children. With one accord, however, the other servants were agreed that this unhappy girl could not herself understand a single word that was uttered by her. Does Mr. Reeves really believe that people who are educated through the medium of the Spanish or Portuguese language do not, therefore, know one word of anything learned by them? What is certain is that the men who make the South American revolutions are Spanish and Portuguese partisans of secularism, fully as well educated in fact, though always by means of the Spanish or Portuguese tongue, as is even Mr. Reeves by means of the English tongue, and feeling quite as supreme a contempt for religion as he himself can. The South American revolutionists, in short, are in the van of the democratic enlightenment of the day, as Mr. Reeves must very well know. The colonist of Anglo-Saxon origin, perhaps may be somewhat less hot-headed and lively than the colonist of more Southern races. Godless education, however, must relatively affect him quite as badly as it does the other—and in due time, though too late, perhaps, for remedy, the proofs will be forthcoming. We do not know how far the *Lyttelton Times* now represents Mr. Reeves, but if it does so to any great extent, the manner in which that ingenuous youth blows his own trumpet is, indeed, something portentous.

THE letter written by Cardinal Manning to the *XXme. Siècle*, although clear enough in its meaning and distinguishing perfectly between the revolutionary system known as Socialism, and from which

A TRUE SOCIALIST.

nothing but evil could be excepted, and a system of amendment for the salvation of society, and which might more justly take the name of Socialism, was falsely interpreted. Various motives, no doubt, were accountable for this. Some people, differing widely from Cardinal Manning, might have been glad to misrepresent his views for their own ends; others might have found it to their profit to claim his Eminence as to all intents and purposes in agreement with them. The Cardinal, however, has removed all possibility of doubt or of plausible misrepresentation. Impudent misrepresentation, of course, will still remain, as, for example, we see from a paragraph in the London correspondence of the *Otago Daily Times*, when he speaks of his Eminence as seemingly climbing down under the influence of the Pope's frown. But in an interview with a representative of the *Figaro*, to which, indeed, the correspondent of the *Daily Times* alludes, and in a letter to the Comte de Mun, himself also accused of Socialism, the Cardinal perfectly explains his position. The principal portion of the interview in question is the following:—"All that is social is good," says his Eminence, "but there is between social organisation and Socialism as great a difference as there is between reason and rationalism. If society is as beneficent as reason, Socialism is as malevolent as rationalism. Civil and political society is nothing else than human society, and for that reason all legislation should be essentially social and the preserver of society. On the contrary the Socialism which begins by overthrowing existing society is subversive and destructive. There are, therefore, two things—social organisation and Socialism. The former comprises every social phenomenon, and is dominated by two factors—one moral, the other economic. The moral factor consists in the sentiment of reciprocal duties, of the unity of the human race, and of the blessings of social union. The economic factor consists in the practical execution of these sentiments. That Socialism is a socialism of organisation and legislation. On the contrary, Socialism has scarcely anything in common with organic social phenomena. It is purely political, and is composed of two factors—the one immoral, the other disturbing. The immoral factor consists in the progress of the individualism of this proud century, which destroys families and separates naturally common interests. The second factor consists in the disturbances produced by that individualism productive of a want of agreement between laws and needs. That Socialism is a socialism of disorganisation and revolution. It is that which is generally designated by the name of Socialism, but it is that which is the complete negation of Socialism, for by Socialism we should mean society, legislation, evolution, transformation, but not destruction. I am then anxious to declare I am not a Socialist. I do not, indeed, believe that the means to make men happy is to destroy them. Social organisation is thoroughly English. Socialism is, on the contrary, Continental. There must then be no misunderstanding. And when people on the Continent talk of my Socialism they are mistaken, for being an Englishman I cannot be a Socialist." The important passage in the letter to Comte de Mun is:—"The coming age will belong

neither to the capitalists nor to the commercial classes, but to the People. The People are yielding to the guidance of reason, even to the guidance of religion. If we can gain their confidence we can counsel them; if we show them a blind opposition they will have power to destroy all that is good. But I hope much from the action of the Church all Governments are despoiling and rejecting. Her true home is with the People; they will hear her voice. My letter to the *XXme Siècle* caused some irritation in England; and I am accused, as you are, of Socialism. Here, however, Socialism is little studied; it is a kind of party cry. France is a long way ahead of us in such studies. Nevertheless, our legislation for the protection of labour is already considerably advanced." Neither the advocates of revolutionary Socialism, then, nor the detractors of Cardinal Manning, have made much capital out of his letter to the French newspaper. No one can be more completely out of agreement with these Socialists or more truly the Catholic prelate representing the doctrine of the Church. Yet the Cardinal has not in the slightest degree compromised the position assumed by him from the first, but still remains the wise protector, and leader of the people.

A SHAM.

THE Minister of Education has just told us how the Spanish and Portuguese languages fail as educational mediums. The report of a Royal Commission recently published, and as quoted by the *Quarterly Review* for January, gives us to understand that the English tongue can hardly claim a superiority in the regard referred to. We find, in fact, that secularism, as carried out in the English Board schools, is something of a sham. The Commissioners report as follows:—"We have also felt bound to consider, as bearing upon our recommendations, the important evidence to which we have before alluded, which, coming from various quarters, testifies to the disappointing fact that under our present system, though the result of inspection of schools by examination of scholars may appear satisfactory, many of the children lose with extraordinary rapidity, after leaving school, the knowledge which has been so laboriously and expensively imparted to them. We are thus led to believe that a system of " cram " with a view to immediate results, which tends to check the great advance made of late years in all our education amongst all ranks, and threatens to destroy the love of knowledge for its own sake, is prevailing more and more, though under different conditions, in our public elementary schools, and that unless a large change is now made, as the system must become in working more rigid, so its evils will increase rather than diminish." Unless our democracy therefore, is educated under some different system from that whose effects are thus described, it is to be feared then superiority to the democrats of South America, if it exists, must be based upon something besides secular education. There is every reason, moreover, for us to believe that English Board Schools are in no way inferior to primary schools in this colony. The reviewer goes on to examine into the moral nuts of the education in question, which on his showing are quite as much a sham as the instruction received. He proposes to his readers to examine the children so educated—"They will probably find," he says, "that the motives instilled into their minds for conducting themselves honestly, soberly, and purely is, that such a course will most advance their temporal interests, whilst of the religious sanction for a moral life they will know nothing, and of Christianity itself, if their experience resembles ours, they will find that the children know little or nothing. A few of them may be able to recite at the Lord's Prayer, some may have heard of the Creed, and know that there are ten Commandments. Of course we speak of those who have not been to a Church Sunday school, and there is, unhappily, good reason for knowing that a large proportion of the children who are being educated in Board schools attend no Sunday school." But English Board schools still make some little pretence of religious teaching—in which they differ from the unblushing godlessness of our own system—not, however, as it would seem, with much effect. As to the appearance of an improvement in the morals of the people, the Reviewer proves it, as follows, to be also a complete sham. "It may be thought," he writes, "that a sufficient answer to what has been just advanced is furnished by the statistics of crime that are annually issued by the Home Office. These returns clearly show that the number of criminal offences tried at the Assizes has diminished, that the number of persons on whom severe punishments have been inflicted is materially less than it was; but they do not show the changes in the criminal law by which much of this advantage has been gained. They do, however, show that there has been a most serious addition to the number of juvenile offenders who are compulsorily detained for a term of years in Reformatories and Industrial Schools, and are thus happily preserved from the possibility of a continuous repetition of crimes, by which the number of criminal offences was formerly swelled. In 1862 there were 8863 children thus compulsorily detained; in 1879 the number had grown to 15,079; in 1889 it amounted to 28,033. These returns likewise show the enormously increased amount of money expended in the prevention and detection of crime, which should certainly account for a considerable diminution in the number of crimes committed, and we also regret to say that they tell of the serious growth of those lesser