

ting advantages. 'Earthquakes,' says he, 'dreadful as they are as local and temporary visitations, are, in fact, unavoidable—I had almost said necessary—incidents in a vast system of action to which we owe the very ground we stand upon—the very land we inhabit, without which neither man, beast, nor bird would have a place for their existence, and the world would be a habitation for nothing but fishes.' Which may be a comfort—if only a cold comfort—to those who look upon their rent and battered walls and broken crockery in Wellington.

A Great Boycott of Catholics

'He who serves queens,' says Darkush in Disraeli's 'Tancred,' 'may expect backsheesh.' The ascendancy party in Ireland went somewhat farther—they demanded backsheesh (gifts). Their loyalty was, in express terms, conditional, and the price they put upon it was distinctly high—namely, a complete and perpetual monopoly of all places of honor, power, and emolument under the Crown. 'And,' said they, in the course of a historical pronouncement made in 1792, 'that no doubt may remain of what we understand by the words "Protestant ascendancy," we have further resolved that we consider the Protestant ascendancy to consist in: A Protestant King of Ireland; a Protestant Parliament; a Protestant Hierarchy; Protestant electors and Government; the benches of justice, the army and the revenue, through all their branches and details, Protestant.' It is—outside of Ireland—a common superstition that this monopoly of place and pelf was broken by the passing of the Emancipation Act, and that Catholics in the Green Isle now enjoy equal rights with their Protestant fellow-countrymen in the matter of State appointments. Nothing could be farther from the truth. But the full extent, the searching character, of the State boycott of Irish Catholics has never before been brought out in such a startling way as was done by Dr. Hogan at the recent meetings of the Maynooth Union. We will publish the article in its entirety as soon as the demands upon our space permit. It will come with the shock of a great surprise to many of our non-Catholic and Colonial-born readers to discover the flagrant extent to which that institution of evil repute—Dublin Caw's'le—has (to use the words of Edmund Burke) succeeded to this day in enabling 'one set of people in Ireland to consider themselves as the sole citizens of the Commonwealth, and to keep dominion over the rest by reducing them to servitude, and, thus fortified in their power, to divide the public estate, which is the result of a general contribution, as a military booty solely amongst themselves.'

A Tale from Far Bolivia

The following letter was sent for publication to the 'Outlook' (Dunedin), which is described as 'the official organ of the Presbyterian and Methodist Churches of New Zealand.' The letter sufficiently explains itself:—

'Sir,—In your issue of August 6 (p. 13) there appears a selected article from the pen of Mr. C. T. W. Wilson, "of Bolivia." The writer makes two statements to which I ask space for a reply.

'1. He declares that "there is not a single school for Indians throughout Bolivia." Official returns for many years back—those before me go back to the early nineties—tell quite a different tale. Here, for instance, is a quotation in point from "The Statesman's Year Book" for 1904 (pp. 485-6), which gives the figures for 1901: "The primary schools include 70 schools for the rural Indian population, taught by the parish priests, besides 160 schools at mission stations receiving subventions from Tarija, La Paz, and Potosi, and 10,000 bolivianos from the Government." In other words, the Bolivian Government, from whose official statistics these figures are taken, declares that there are 230 schools for Indians "throughout Bolivia," while Mr. Wilson—a recent arrival in the country—says, in the course of an article soliciting funds for missionary work, that there

is not a single one. It is scarcely necessary to say which of these two incompatible statements is the more worthy of credence.

'2. Mr. Wilson also states that "he has, amongst other things, a translation of a letter published by a bishop in a Spanish paper," which furnishes "startling evidence" of the laxity of living which (he says) prevails among the clergy of "the corrupt and corrupting Church of Rome" in Bolivia. And you publish some extracts from the alleged "translation" as samples of what he holds in reserve.

'But (a), unfortunately for Mr. Wilson, he has given "startling evidence" of his unreliability in at least one matter of which he ought to have direct cognisance. On what grounds can he claim credence in another which is supposed to have taken place at a distance of 10,000 miles from him? (b) Writing of Bolivia, he asserts that "a bishop" wrote to "a Spanish paper" accusing his clergy of all manner of crimes and misdemeanors. But even "a bishop" has a local habitation and a name; "a Spanish paper" has a title and an address; and a particular issue of it has a date of publication. Why were all these facts withheld? Why this studied reticence about a document which—assuming it to have been published, as alleged—had become public property? If Mr. Wilson wants to aid, and not to baffle, investigation he will state which of the four Bolivian bishops published the alleged letter, and in what "Spanish paper," and at what date. How can he in conscience advance as "evidence"—whether "startling" or otherwise—against the moral character of any man or of any body of men an alleged translation of an alleged document on which—as appears by the context of the article published by you—he has apparently never set his eye? (c) Again: will he kindly explain how a Spanish-speaking bishop, writing a letter in Spanish to "a Spanish paper," contrives to use a particular expression which is altogether unknown in the Spanish tongue, and which, as employed in English-speaking countries, could only be translated into Spanish by a very roundabout circumlocution? I write with a knowledge of Spanish as it is spoken and written both in Spain and South America. Since 1897 so extensive a use has been made in missionary letters—no doubt in good faith—of a bogus papal "encyclical" to South American bishops, and of a bogus letter attributed to the Bishops of Brazil, that Catholics are naturally somewhat critical about alleged episcopal documents coming from the same quarter of the earth. In the present instance I think you will hardly set me down as hypercritical.

'Mr. Wilson—who, to judge by his remarks, seems to have been a former resident of Dunedin—is described as a missionary to the Quichua Indians in Bolivia. These descendants of the Inca tribes represent about 50 per cent. of the pure Indian population of Bolivia, and with their kinsfolk, the Aymara people, have been for centuries civilised and Christianised. They are described in "Chambers' Encyclopaedia" (ed. 1891) as "devout Catholics." This is what I should expect from the testimony of Protestant and Catholic writers before me as to the zeal and self-sacrifice of the clergy who labor among the Indians in these countries. Mr. Wilson should explain how the Quichuas blossomed into "devout Catholics" with a horde of demons as their spiritual guides. However much he may dislike the Catholic clergy and people of Bolivia, he should at least give the Spaniards and the Portuguese the credit of being the only colonising nations that have systematically civilised and Christianised the aboriginal races with which they came in contact, and saved them from destruction.

'I ask you, as a matter of justice, to publish this communication, or at least a fair and sufficient summary of its contents. I ask you, furthermore, to do