

two gentlemen for relief, and they, quarrelling whether they should give him beef or mutton, decided not to give him anything at all.' The so-called 'secular solution' of the religious difficulty in education is not a solution, but an evasion, of it. Experts have widely conflicting views on arithmetic. Does the Government 'solve' these differences by banishing arithmetic, as it does religion, from the schools? There is 'educational peace' in at least some countries that support the denominational system. When, for even one year, was there 'educational peace' in any State or country that has adopted the 'secular solution'?

3. The secular system is (it is claimed) undenominational, unsectarian, and neutral.—(a) Even if it were, it would not follow that it is a true and proper system of education, a true and proper preparation of the child for its duties in life and for the noble destiny that awaits him after death. (b) In the sixth article of this series it has been abundantly shown, by reference to its underlying principles and to the methods by which it is pressed upon the consciences of dissidents, that the secular system is oppressive to objectors, and that it is sectarian and denominational in the only sense in which these terms have any relevancy here. It creates a monopoly of State-aided free instruction; it takes advantage of the poverty or comparative poverty of large bodies of parents by compelling them (in the absence of other free educational systems) to send their children to these schools; and then it deprives these parents of the power to determine what view of religion shall there be placed before their little ones.

4. The plea of political and social expediency has been dealt with in the second article of this series. Let it be added, (a) that it can never be expedient to inflict a wrong upon the soul of a nation or to violate 'the Crown rights of Christ'; and (b) that education is a matter of sacred principle—the training of the Christian youth of a Christian land to live as good and true men and women here, in preparation for the wider and greater life hereafter. And so high a principle, so sacred a duty, can never be justifiably made subservient to mere worldly expediency, or to the passing interests of political factions, or to the clamors of a biased or uninstructed local feeling.

II. THE QUESTION OF RESULTS.—Before you can determine the respective merits or demerits of the results of two systems of education, you must (a) first clearly ascertain the guiding principles and aims and processes by which each produces its results. In no other way can you with any degree of certainty trace educational results back to their educational causes. Here again we are forced back upon the philosophy of life that lies at the root of each system. (b) Next you must ascertain what are the results which, in point of fact, the system or systems under review have produced; and (c) by what criteria these results, when ascertained, are adjudged to be good or evil. (2) Here again we get back, and ever more back, to the fundamental consideration dealt with in the first section of this article. And here again the secular system has upon its shoulders the burden of proof, and against it well-grounded a-priori suspicion, as has been pointed out at length in the fourth article of this series. (3) No attempt has been made to grapple with this subject of comparative results upon the only lines on which it can be reasonably and logically discussed—namely, upon those set forth in the fourth and fifth articles of this series. (4) A fallacy does not become sound reasoning, nor an error a fact, by merely passing through the mind of Chief Justice Sir Robert Stout. His personal deductions from the misleading returns of crime by denominations in New Zealand do not add to their statistical value so much as the weight of a speck of grey fluff from a hawk-moth's wing. In every part of Australasia malefactors are permitted, with complete impunity, to misdescribe (partly for purposes of statistical comparison) their denominational allegiance, while non-criminals are made to feel 'the butt end iv the law' if they give misleading information in the census-paper or in the income-tax returns. As already intimated, there is ample evidence, ready at any moment for the inspection of the statistical authorities, to show that the returns of 'Roman Catholics' in our prison-cells are seriously misleading for purposes of accurate and scientific information and comparison. I fully agree with the *Otago Daily Times* that this 'allegation is one which the authorities cannot disregard.'

III. THE CATHOLIC CLAIM.—The facts and principles of the Catholic claim were set forth in the last previous articles of this series. That claim is based upon the ground-work principles of Christian education referred to in the first section of this article. It is unnecessary to repeat these here. They are in possession. And the Catholic claim can be hit only through them. We are thus ever and evermore getting back to the bedrock of fundamental principles in this discussion. Here again the burden of proof falls upon the critic of the Catholic claim. To upset it, he must demonstrate one or other of the following proposi-

tions: (1) That the principles upon which the Catholic claim is based are false or untenable; or (2) that the Catholic claim does not follow from these principles; or (3) that the Catholic claim is inconsistent with these principles. Not one of these lines of demonstration has been even attempted. The only pleas advanced against it were based upon considerations quite apart from the justice of the claim or the merits of the principles upon which it is grounded. The principal adverse contentions usually advanced are summarised hereunder:

1. The granting of the Catholic claim would, we are told, result in educational chaos. (a) This plea carefully avoids criticism of the facts and principles upon which the Catholic claim is based. And it is from these, rather than upon more or less scared guesswork, that the merits of the claim itself are to be determined. (b) The plea of 'chaos' is, moreover, merely a prophecy. And prophecy of this kind is, proverbially, poor argument. George Eliot describes it as 'one of the most gratuitous forms of human error.' This prediction would merit serious attention if some country could be pointed out as a melancholy example of educational chaos resulting from handing over to Catholic schools an equivalent of the taxes contributed by Catholics to public education. But this has not been done. On the contrary, we find that among State-aided denominational-school countries are the only ones in which educational peace prevails; moreover, that among them are nations which (like Germany and the Scandinavian lands) lead the van of educational progress. And must not justice be done, even if the heavens should fail?

2. The majority, we are reminded, are opposed to the Catholic claim—it is outside the range of practical politics.—(a) This is the argument of the Big Stick. It has been dealt with in the third article of this series. (b) This plea, too, avoids contact with the facts and principles upon which the Catholic claim is based. (c) It makes a count of noses and an uninstructed local feeling the final arbiter in a matter of the deepest and most tremendous import to the individual, the family, and the nation. And, finally, this plea by no means impresses those who have read history and know how people are given to dance and sing around their golden calves to-day and to crush them beneath their heels to-morrow.

3. 'Minorities must suffer.'—So we are sometimes told. But (a) what has this plea to do with the merits of the Catholic claim as disclosed by the facts and principles on which it is based? (b) Let me quote from an English educationist: "'Minorities must suffer' is the old, discarded cry of utilitarianism. It is hopelessly out of date. Democracy, and especially Liberalism, raises the counter cry: "Minorities must be safeguarded!" Politics is fast learning from commerce and from science the human, necessary art of specialisation. There are now several hundred processes in the making of a shoe. Secularists would decree that there shall be but one process for the making of a citizen. There are ten thousand ways of building up the kingdom of science, but secularists decree that there shall be one way—the way of suppression—for building up the kingdom of politics.' Educational methods are rapidly becoming specialised—even in the interests of minorities, such as deaf-and-dumb and defective children. Our legislation is packed with provision for minorities, from the old-age pensioners to the habitual drunkards on Pakatoa Island, for whose education in habits of self-control the Salvation Army receives a well-merited capitation grant—the thing which Catholics request for the training of children of a smaller growth in secular knowledge. And why should minorities suffer, or conscientious convictions be disregarded in education, more in Australia and New Zealand than in less democratic countries, such as Germany, Holland, Canada, and the rest?

4. 'No return to denominationalism!'—(a) 'Great is Diana of the Ephesians!' This is the Big Stick again, with a fresh knob. (b) But are serious questions to be settled by clamor? And what has this war-cry to do with the merits of the Catholic claim, as disclosed by the facts and principles on which it is grounded? Unfortunately, Berrier's words are to an extent true—that shibboleths and catch-words too often serve where arguments fail, and that many people are swayed more by question-begging epithets and sounding fallacies than by fact and reason. Some Rabelaisians tickled themselves in order to laugh. A great many more build scarecrows to scare themselves withal. One of the shibboleth-scarecrows is the term 'denominationalism.' Mr. Knatchbull Hugessen 'pinked' it with gentle raillery in a pamphlet published in London in 1872. 'Now,' said he, 'do not let us be frightened at that word. I have often noticed that when people in this country want to get up a cry against something or other they give it a long name. It is astonishing how far a long name goes with some people. I have known measures condemned before they were half understood, because grandiloquent orators had declared that they were akin to "centralisa-