

this is mere childish caprice. When we rise in our passing anger and flay opponents, we should, on our own part, remember to put on sackcloth and ashes and mend our political ways.

*

What have we, the great Catholic body of New Zealand, been doing to advance our educational claims? The question is a remorseful one. Bits of gallant outpost work here and there over the matter of school inspection; a rare question put timidly—almost apologetically—at election times; some lone voice in the pulpit once in a while; and the N.Z. TABLET speaking in season and out of season, but, to some extent, we fear, to the wilderness. Mostly words, words, words. And yet there is no loss of faith in the inherent justice of our claims, nor, we believe, of hope in the ultimate triumph of our cause. Our faith is right. But where are our works? Religious bigotry is the great barrier that stands in the way. What have we done to enlighten it? Little or nothing. And it requires teaching year in, year out, in season and out of season; and the best propaganda against it is conducted, not amidst the discordant din and evil clang of an electioneering campaign, but in 'the stilly hours when storms are gone.' The principle, *non in tempestate Deus*, has, in altered terms, its application here.

*

And at election times, what have Catholics been doing? Giving their votes, from one end of the Colony to the other, alike to non-Catholic and to Catholic candidates who are opposed to our views and rights and interests in connection with the education problem. Such candidates are supported merely or chiefly for their political or party leanings, or for their proved or anticipated power to 'benefit the district.' It is a question of prospective railway sidings, workshops, 'billets,' engine-cleaning sheds, roads, turn-tables—mere henroost politics. There is an accursed venality or spirit of implied barter over it all, that, to a sensitive man, must be like contact with Asiatic leprosy. And Catholic voters have learned to overlook the hostility of candidates and members to our just educational rights. They coddle and stroke the hand that strikes them, just because it can dispense Government crumbs. They hunt—with less avidity, it is true, than others—for backsheesh—and get very little of it, as we have shown; and many of the short-sighted wights are content to receive as the reward of their support the ghastly political 'favor' which drops a son into the position of an underpaid hack clerkship or condemns him for life to the pick and shovel of the navy or the surfaceman—like a galley-slave chained to the oar. That is what we have been doing. We have fine principles on our lips and fine, if distant, hopes in our souls, and we make, with light and happy hearts, a thousand splendid sacrifices to teach our children that there is more in life and beyond it than the multiplication table and dollar-worship. But we have taught members and candidates that they can count on our support almost irrespective of their views on the one question of questions for us. We greet a string of twelve opponents—Catholics and non-Catholics—with a smile, and aid them with our votes. But when the thirteenth steps forward and follows in the footsteps of all the others, we suddenly recall our 'principles' and smite him with a dire *anathema maranatha* and make him a scapegoat to bear the sins of all. Would that we were either consistently hot or consistently cold, so that friend and foe alike should know where to find us on election day! But this shilly-shallying is a trap for candidates, and it is unfair to ourselves. In the Caversham electorate, however, the great body of the Catholic voters are staunch upon this subject. We are convinced that, in ordinary circumstances, they would not support one whose views thereupon do not meet with their approval. Numbers of them, however, have been stung and lashed out of apathy or opposition to a candidate of their own creed by an utterly reckless and disgraceful no-Popery campaign carried on with indecent clamor in the interests of a nominee of the Orange lodge. And if, under all the circumstances, they select what seems to them to be the least evil and support an otherwise blameworthy candidate, we believe that—however we may ourselves regard the matter—the Catholic body at least, considering its own past action, is not entitled to upbraid them.

We, Catholics, are, in connection with this general subject of our educational claims, acting the part of the rustic who sat down upon the river-bank and waited for the waters to flow by so that he could cross over. Or, like helpless MICAEBERS, we are waiting for something to 'turn up'—hoping that, by some miracle or other, our opponents may one day be suddenly converted, as SAUL of Tarsus was, to accept a point of view and espouse a cause that to-day they hate and persecute. No. Such success as we achieve in this matter of the recognition of our educational rights, will be measured by our own effort. In Victoria, thirteen years ago, few men outside the Catholic constituencies, would dare to stand upon a public platform and advocate the Catholic educational claims. To-day a number of its representatives are committed to their support, and within the past two weeks Protestant newspapers and Anglican and Presbyterian clergymen have warmly espoused our cause. But in Victoria Catholics have had the grace to keep 'pegging away' upon the subject. And, in DISABELI'S words, 'the secret of success is constancy of purpose.' Right here is our highest lesson and our brightest hope. But it means organised and united effort; it means a known policy towards individual politicians and cabinets, towards friends and foes. At present we have none. We have dealt with all this before, and there is no need that we should thresh the same old straw over again. Let us be frank and state that if our claims are slighted at election times, if candidates fear to voice them, if electors are impatient at hearing of them, Catholics have, in a great measure, themselves to blame. Let us but once get our forces together and in hand, from North Cape to the Bluff, and the aspect of things will in due course change. The grievance that marches into an electioneering campaign with a phalanx of 50,000 voters at its back will be listened to with respect.

Notes

Electioneering Tactics.

The *Lyttelton Times* has been hitting out with refreshing straightness and vigor at the attempts being made by two candidates in the Caversham electorate to score politically by raising the denominational spectre and exhibiting it, with its horns and tail and cloven hoof, to the accompaniment of a storm of shrieking rhodomontade. 'The religious issue,' says our Christchurch contemporary, 'must not be wantonly and recklessly obtruded, for the mere purpose of electioneering. Mr. Earnshaw may be sincere in his belief regarding the preference which he alleges; but his mere belief does not justify him in making positive assertions and in assuming that to be fact what may only be his own vain imagining. The onus is upon him of proving his case. If he fail to do so, he must stand condemned.' In another issue the same paper remarks: "'At the proper time and place," he (Mr. Earnshaw) is prepared to substantiate his charges, he says; but the proper time is now, and the proper place is the Caversham electorate. If he is convinced that the Departments are being stuffed with Roman Catholics, it should be easy enough for him to state the specific instances on which he bases his conclusions, and give the Ministers an opportunity of replying before polling day.'

*

'As things are,' says another issue of the same paper, 'dispassionate people can only conclude that he has raised the cry of "Rome rule" because he thinks it will gain him votes from the "true blues" of Caversham electorate. In no other part of the Colony would a political candidate dare to raise such an issue; his candidature would be damned at the outset by tactics such as those of Mr. Earnshaw. . . . Mr. Earnshaw, even if he be actuated by zeal for efficiency, has gone the wrong way to work. His first duty is to prove that the public service is suffering from malpractice; next, he must prove the existence of the specific malpractice alleged; then, and only then, would he be justified in making public accusations. Until he puts himself right, he cannot be acquitted of attempting to work upon the basest prejudices of mankind, and of trying to stir up animosities akin to those which, in other lands, have led to Jew-baiting and other forms of persecution. No man should be allowed to enter public life in this country whose actions place him in that category.'

How Appointments are Made.

'As a matter of fact,' says the *Lyttelton Times*, 'the members of the Ministry, and especially the Minister of Railways, have taken