

controversy was conducted in the coarsest and most acrimonious spirit. 'Tuba's' suggestion that because an attempt to bring about an agreement failed then 'a fortiori' it will fail now, is therefore entirely wrong. The 'a fortiori' is quite the other way about. (c) Although the European movement was not directly successful, it rendered substantial service to the Church—precisely the kind of service which I maintain the proposed conference would render here, even though it failed in its direct object. In the first place the movement had a very important educative effect. On this point I quote Alzog, who is universally recognised as a standard authority on the subject. On p. 47, vol. iv. of his 'Church History', referring to this movement he says: 'If the efforts of these great men were unsuccessful, they at least made clear to both parties the only possible basis of a union, brought both to understand each other better, and to entertain more kindly feelings; and in this way relieved the Church of many of the charges falsely brought against her. A like effect was produced by the compendious but masterly Exposition of the Catholic Doctrine by Bossuet, in which, while clearly setting forth the Catholic teaching, he did full justice to the objections and prejudices of the Protestants, proving to them by irrefragable arguments that in separating themselves from the Catholic Church the great bulk of them took the step in ignorance, rather than with a full knowledge of what they were doing.'

Then, besides helping to dispel Protestant prejudice the movement resulted in certain more tangible gains to the Church. 'In consequence,' continues Alzog, 'many of the German princes, seeing and acknowledging their mistake, to the great joy of Holy Mother Church, returned to the unity of faith. Among these were Ernest, Landgrave of Hesse; John Frederick of Brunswick, then reigning Duke of Hanover; Fredric Augustus I., Elector of Saxony; and Charles Alexander, Duke of Wurtemberg. Others, again, like Christian Augustus, Duke of Holstein, and the scholarly Anthony Ulric had the great joy of bringing their entire households with them.'

The moral of all this is obvious, and 'Tuba's' appeal to history only gives added point to my contention that the proposed conference, even if it failed in its immediate object, would be certain indirectly to do substantial good.

4. 'Tuba' considers that 'this embassy sent to our opponents would be a sorry admission of weakness.' We live in a country where one adult one vote is the ruling principle, and in which the question of State aid to Catholic schools will be decided by mere count of heads either in the House or in the constituencies. Catholics form one-seventh of the population, and this 'embassy sent to our opponents' would be an admission of the simple arithmetical fact that one vote is not equal to six, and that one of the simplest ways of getting equal in voting power would be to transfer some of the six to our side. 'Tuba' may call this, if he will, a 'sorry admission of weakness'—most people, I am satisfied, will regard it as mere elementary common sense. To lie down and let ourselves be walked over is surely a much sorer admission of weakness.

5. 'Tuba' supposes the suggested conference to have been successfully held and the Protestant clergymen to be engaged in preaching State aid to private schools, and then asks: 'Do you really believe that New Zealanders will be guided by their clergymen in politics? Is there any parson in New Zealand capable of commanding two votes on any question?' This sounds suspiciously like playing to the gallery. Unless 'Tuba's' district is different from every other district in the Colony, he must know well that there is many a parson who is capable of commanding many more than two votes. Are there not many parsons capable of commanding not only two but many hundreds of votes on, say, the prohibition question? Suppose there had been not a single parson in the Colony during the past ten years would the Prohibition movement have reached anything like the dimensions it has now attained? Would the anti-gambling and anti-totalisator movement have been able to influence legislation in the way it has recently done if New Zealand had been without parsons for the last few years? I do not say that the parsons have the same degree of influence on the education question. In the Presbyterian Church, of which I have personal knowledge, I know that there are a great many people who do not care a snap of their fingers for their minister; but I know, too, that there is a substantial proportion who are really concerned at the secularism of the present system and would certainly follow their ministers if the latter

gave a clear and united lead. I have no desire to magnify the parsons' influence. I only say that they have some influence, and that, whether it be little or great, it is better that it should be with us than against us.

6. 'New Zealanders,' 'Tuba' continues, 'will vote at the next election as they have always voted, for telephones, roads, railways, and bridges. . . The results of this famous conference will be annulled by the rank secularism pervading the politics of the country.' So, then, already it has come to this, that 'rank secularism pervades our politics,' and that we are producing a type of being who is at bottom (to use the expressive phrase of a writer in the 'Dublin Review') only 'a digesting tube open at both ends.' Does not 'Tuba' see that this furnishes the strongest possible reason why we should at once be up and doing? If his statement is correct, our chance of redress is receding farther and farther from us, and unless we move quickly it will soon be useless for us to move at all.

7. It is not necessary for me to interpose in defence of Dean Burke's assertion that at present political agitation on the education question is dead. Had 'Tuba' appended his name to his communication, the Dean would doubtless have dealt with it himself and 'Tuba' would have met the fate which rash critics of Dean Burke usually meet with. Tuba contends that agitation is not dead, because we are still building Catholic schools. I only desire to point out—what indeed is self-evident—that building schools is not political agitation. 'Building schools' is, of course, strong evidence of the earnestness and sincerity of our convictions; but it is quite obvious that our only chance of securing State aid is by influencing Parliament—in other words, by political agitation. It is quite true, as 'Tuba' says, that we are building schools, and—we are paying for them. The lion is lying down with the lamb, but the lamb is inside, and unless he gets a move on and does something to disturb the lion's digestion there is not the slightest prospect of any improvement. We may build Catholic schools till they are as plentiful as blackberries and Government after Government will look placidly on without ever feeling the slightest qualm of conscience in regard to the way they are treating us. The one and only thing which will influence a N.Z. Government is the pressure of votes at election time and in the House.

8. Assuming that the State is willing to subsidise private schools, 'Tuba' asks on what conditions would the subsidy be granted. The only condition which I have ever heard suggested from any authoritative source is that payment should be made on the basis of the standard passes obtained—in other words, that a capitation grant be made for all our children who satisfy the State Inspector's requirements in respect to secular education. I have myself suggested that, if it were the only means by which we could obtain the grant, it might be worth considering whether we could make some slight concessions—concessions, in name rather than in fact—on the lines of Mr. Balfour's Act of 1902. That was a purely personal opinion, and it is one which at the present time it is altogether premature to discuss. Only let us advance the question to the stage at which the State expresses its willingness to help us, and the authorities of our Church can be very safely left to look after the 'conditions.'

9. I fear 'Tuba' has a very inadequate idea of the heavy strain which the double tax imposes upon our people. As I go round amongst the people, I am lost in admiration at the heroism of many Catholic mothers—at the way in which, in the middle of an almost life and death struggle to make ends meet, they manage to keep the flag flying and pay their school fees regularly, even when the quiver is very full. But there is another side to the picture. There are the heroes who 'don't' pay, and there are the heroes who, flouting priest and bishop and all the laws of the Church, coolly send their children to the State school. I am told by priests that in the large city parishes there are scores of Catholic children being sent to the State schools. If 'Tuba' had to pay a portion of his salary—as many priests have to do—to keep a Catholic school going, and had to ramble round after the parents who send their children to the Government schools, he would not view the situation quite so calmly. 'Tuba' thinks that my proposal is like some motoring appointments which suppose a phenomenal combination of favorable conditions. I may say that I have never for a moment supposed that all the details of my scheme would ever be given effect to, precisely as they are set out on paper. They were suggested merely as a possible method of procedure to