

still leading, thoughtful Anglicans day by day into the one, true, and undivided Fold of Christ. The sudden change of title adopted by the Anglican Bishop of Dunedin to that of 'Catholic Bishop of Dunedin,' which raised such an expansive smile upon the faces of readers of the 'Otago Daily Times,' represents a phase of Anglican Protestantism to which the 'Lamp' (an extremely 'High' Anglican organ) for June made the following reference, to which we cordially direct his Lordship's attention: 'To call ourself a Catholic and ignore the Pope is like the play of "Hamlet" with the character of Hamlet left out.' And then it goes on to say: 'The opponents of reunion with Rome call it enslavement. Has the Church of England ever ceased to be enslaved since the Tudor tyrants, father, son, and daughter, first made her so? Submission to the Vicar of Christ in reality means emancipation from enslavement. God hasten the day when Anglicans will think lovingly of the successor of St. Peter as our Holy Father, and gladly render him filial obedience.'

### Non-sectarian Schools Impossible

Like that blessed word 'Mesopotamia,' the term 'non-sectarian' is honey in the mouths of many clergymen and politicians in New Zealand who talk, from divers standpoints, more or less stormy nonsense in connection with the National Idol, our godless system of State instruction. To the clergymen referred to, what is Catholic is 'sectarian'; what is Protestant is 'non-sectarian.' To the politician who grovels before the Idol as the last and highest expression of glorified wisdom, what is Christian is 'sectarian', what is Secularist or Agnostic or Atheistic, is 'non-sectarian.' We have many a time and oft pointed out in our editorial columns that there is not, nor can there be, either in or out of New Zealand any such thing as a non-sectarian school system. Our contention has found ample expression by an educationist writer in a recent issue of the 'New York Times.'

'Is a non-sectarian school possible?' he asks. 'Let us see. Either the school admits in its teaching that God exists or that He does not exist, or that it does not know whether He exists or not. If it admits that He exists, then it is theistic; if it supposes that He does not exist, then it is atheistic; if it professes not to know whether He exists or not, then it is agnostic. We will go a step further. The ideas directing the school admit either that God has made a revelation, or deny a revelation, or hold that they do not know or that they do not care whether there is a revelation, or that they will have nothing to say on the question, and leave the pupils to think as they please of it. In every one of these cases the school is still "sectarian," and the principles advocated determine the school and put it in accord with a particular set or sect which advocates those principles. There may be no name yet invented for the sect of men who advocate the particular principle involved, but since there must be a principle at the root of every school system that system becomes allied to the sect advocating that principle. Now, are our public schools influenced by the principles of any sect? Most certainly they are. They are influenced by the principles of the sect which wishes to have schools without any religious instruction. You may remember that our great statesman, Daniel Webster, gave his opinion of such schools in his famous speech in the Girard case. He said: "It is a mockery and an insult to common sense to maintain that a school for the instruction of youth from which Christian instruction by Christian teachers is sedulously and religiously shut out is not delictic and infidel both in its purpose and in its tendency." And Mr. J. G. Spencer, superintendent of public instruction in the State of New York about the beginning of the present school system, writing to Governor Seward in regard to sectarianism in education said: "It is an error to suppose that the ab-

sense of all religious instruction, if it were practicable, is a mode of avoiding sectarianism. On the contrary, it would be in itself sectarian, because it would be consonant to the views of a particular class, and opposed to the opinions of other classes. Those who reject creeds and resist all efforts to infuse them into the minds of the young would be gratified by a system which so fully accomplishes their purpose." Why should any of our citizens who wish to have children educated according to their own particular views not have a right to their own share of the money appropriated for education.'

## ST. PETER'S ROMAN EPISCOPATE

### DEAN BURKE AND BISHOP NEVILL

The two letters of the Very Rev. Dean Burke, in reply to the Anglican Bishop of Dunedin (to which reference was recently made in our editorial columns) covered practically the same ground as our articles at the same time on the same subject in the columns of the 'N.Z. Tablet.' They appeared in the 'Otago Daily Times' and elicited a rejoinder from Dr. Nevill in which he disclaimed any idea of discussion merely with a view to a controversial victory, and raised minor objections, based on negative contentions only, and chiefly from St. Irenaeus, Eusebius, and St. Cyprian, against the Roman episcopate of St. Peter. To this Dean Burke replied as follows in the 'Otago Daily Times' of last Thursday:—

'Sir,—I must express my surprise at the contents of Bishop Nevill's defence. I looked for a vast mass of evidence newly derived from the deep study of ancient literature and monuments, upsetting the Early-Christian belief that St. Peter had been Bishop of Rome—a belief so strong that no one questioned the fact of Peter's episcopate—a question which in the primitive Church," says the learned Anglican Bishop Pearson, "was never looked upon as a question but as a real indubitable truth." This fact, then, was in possession through all the Christian centuries; but possession is nine points of the law. The dispossessor must show reasons, positive, clear, overwhelming, before he can dare to attempt to drive out the old owner. It was Bishop Nevill's duty in logic and common sense to produce such expulsive evidence. Did he do so in his sermon published in your paper? I should think not. Has he done so in his long letter? Again, I should think not. It is hardly necessary for me to say that I was not bound according to the requirements of logic to give the summary of evidence advanced in my letter against Bishop Nevill's thesis—"the figment of St. Peter . . . having been the first Bishop of Rome." My place was to ask his Lordship for his proofs—clear, strong, overwhelming. However, ex abundantiā, I gave my short summary to show your readers that there was something to be said on the other side, and to give the Bishop a chance to be more explicit than he had been in his sermon. I must say that, in common with many of your readers, I am disappointed. The letter has not improved much upon his sermon.

'Here I may be permitted to call attention to an introductory remark of Bishop Nevill's. He hinted that he does not care much about controversy; but still truth, above all things, is dear to him. I claim to be on a level with his Lordship in these respects; at any rate, I have not written a controversial letter for 19 years. Though a few Anglican Archbishops of Canterbury have died in my time, and have been spoken of highly in the references to their deaths in the papers, yet I have never felt my anti-Anglican zeal so roused as to preach a controversial sermon on the "figment" of the Anglican claims and then to run with it to the public press for a wider circulation.

'But now to come to his Lordship's letter. He was bound in logic and common sense to produce from the ancient Fathers, councils, synods, monuments, etc., evidence strong, positive, calculated to overturn the time-honored "indubitable" belief. Instead of doing so he has contented himself with

### Attempted Pinpricks

at portions of my summary, adding a little cobweb spinning to finish up with. He is, however, satisfied with himself, for he assures us that he has written "with exhaustive effect" and that he is one of "those who have had the opportunity of learning all that is to be known on the subject." I like to be logical and to keep to the point. Hence I shall pass over all he says about the "rock" and St. Augustine, etc., and shall come to the pinpricks and cobwebs.

'1. Irenaeus:—Lo! what is this we find at the outset? I referred to Irenaeus, Book i, c. 27 and Book