attempt to train the child according to moral laws unless religion was made the basis of those laws. On parents devolves the duty of having the children educated according to their conscientious views, and no State should interfere with them in pursuit of that duty. The State is bound to help them, andto make it possible for them to have such schools as their consciences demand. To claim a monopoly in favor of its own system would be tyranny on the part of the State. The Dean concluded by expressing the wish that in the future the Government might find a means of doing its duty to all classes in this respect, as progressive Governments such as those of Great Britain, Germany, Canada, Belgium, and Holland have done.

Mr. Dickinson paid a tribute to the tact and ability with which the Dean had treated this contentious problem, and expressed his own personal conviction that the State ought to devise some scheme of assisting all schools no matter what their denomination. Mr. Broadhead said he believed that if we were to live our lives rationally we must have some definite faith to build upon. Professor Salmond agreed that a religious basis was absolutely necessary in education.

The foregoing summary of the proceedings is an other illustration of the fact that men who are best qualified to judge on the subject are recognizing that the day of the secular system is drawing in, and that if we want to build up a nation of just, honest, clean men and women we must sooner or later face the fact that apart from definite religious training there is no education worth talking about. Great Britain, Canada, Holland, and Belgium are quoted by the Dean as progressive countries wherein men are not so blinded by prejudice that they cannot see for themselves the real evils of godless schools. He also mentioned Germany, and it is significant that the change was made there only when it was realised that the harm had been done. Let us hope that it may not be too late for New Zealand when the intelligence and good sense of the people compel politicians to grasp the fundamentals of the problem. Recently there has been no little pother in the press about Dr. Averill's remarks concerning cer-tain State schools. With these remarks we have no immediate concern, but it is apropos to comment on the fact that one of the Bishop's critics, referring to the moral lessons which teachers in such schools are desired to inculcate into pupils, asks what more could anyone want. The answer is that we want a foundation for these moral lessons, and a sanction to make the children put them into practice. Pagan ideals of duty, poetic rhapsodies about the loveliness of virtue and the degradation of vice are all well enough in their way; but as a sanction that will help the young people in the hour of temptation they are worth precisely nothing. We are very pleased to see that the other speakers at the conference were in substantial agreement with the Dean's contention that in order to give such lessons their proper force and to make them a real help religious education of a definite kind is the primary essential. This is what Germany found out too late. Will it be too late when the vast numbers who know it now in this country make the Government do its duty ?

Prohibition

Ε.

Mr. Todd's letter published in our last issue calls for a few remarks. We will deal with it as briefly as possible. First let us say that we are not prophets, and we did not say that after reform is carried fermented wine will not be admitted for sacramental purposes. We said that behind Prohibition there was a strong party who hate Catholics and who would leave no stone unturned to prevent us from having altar wine in New Zealand. We do not say that the whole party is of this kidney: we know very well that men like Mr. Todd would never join in such an attempt; but of such it is not too much to say that they are in very bad company. As for other Churches, we have had much evidenco lately that many of their ministers are quite ready to cease using fermented wine; and considering the Catholic doctrine of the Mass we make bold to say that it is a question that affects Catholics chiefly. The great majority of people do not lend themselves to persecuting others; but the great majority of the people will not go far out of their way to prevent others from being persecuted.

We now come to Mr. Todd's comments on our articles---

(1) Mr. Todd begs to differ from Archbishop Redwood. No more need be said on that matter. We leave it to our readers to select which authority they will follow.

(2) Mr. Todd quotes a few Catholic Temperance advocates as being Prohibitionists. Even if they were they are in a small minority on a question which is not theological except as far as the danger to the valid celebration of Holy Mass is concerned. Beyond that it is an ethical question about which opinions may be freely held. Archbishop Redwood is our guide here; Cardinal Manning was the highest authority in England: the Archbishop of Sydney is the occupant of the most important. See in Australia; Cardinal Gibbons is the Head of the Church in America. They are all opposed to National Prohibition, and the names quoted by Mr. Todd carry little weight compared with theirs. As for Dr. Cleary's words they inculcate Total Abstinence, which is a very different thing from Prohibition.

(3) Mr. Todd says that nobody asserts differently from Cardinal Manning's words in condemnation of alcohol as an evil thing in itself. Mr. Todd is wrong. And when he says that "it is an evil practice to use alcohol as a beverage" he is accusing Christ and the Apostles of evil practice.

(4) We have quoted Father Lockington and Father McNamara on the morals of "Dry Districts." They have studied the question on the spot and they do not by any means find that statistics are against us.

(5) Mr. Todd says that it is misleading Catholics to say that on principle they ought to vote against Prohibition. Archbishop Messner lately found it necessary to pass a law to prevent Catholics from being misled into voting for Prohibition. The danger to the Mass is real enough to make it the duty of every Catholic to oppose any legislation that might possibly become a weapon against us in that respect; and it is very conceivable that the Catholic who supports Prohibition is helping to do an injury to the Church. Mount the water waggon by all means; but keep clear of the Prohibitionists. Mr. Todd has not had the opportunity of feeling the strength and the intensity of the hatred of all things Catholic which would infallibly urge many of his most ardent supporters to make Prohibition au instrument for attacking the Church. We know what has happened in the United States, and we shall have the same experience here some day if Prohibition is carried. The following statement made by the Methodist Episcopal Church of the United States represents the feeling of many of their brothren here : "Intelligent people had long ago given up the SUPERSTITION that intoxicating wine is necessary to the proper observ-ance of the sacramental duty." Mr. Todd writes in good faith; but he does not realise as we do, and as Archbishop Redwood did when he issued his warning, that Prohibition is a danger to the Catholic Church. We here quote a passage on the subject from St. John Chrysostom, who was certainly an authority on Catholic matters, and who was not likely to mislead his heavers: "I hear men say when these excesses happen, Would there were no wine! O folly! O madness! When other men sin do you find fault with God's gifts? Did the wine, O man, produce this evil? Not the wine, but the intemperance of such as take an evil delight in it. Say then, Would there was no drunkenness, no luxury ! But if you say. Would there was no wine! you will go on by degrees, Would there was no steel, because of the murderer; no nights, because of the thieves; no light, because of the informers: no women, because of the adultries ; and in a word you would destroy everything. But do not so, for this is a sign of a saturical mind. And when you have found this same may sober, show him his unscouliness and say to him. Wine was given

L. RICHARDS BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER, 146 VIVIAN STREET, WELLINGTON. Stocks of Catholic Prayer Books, Resary Beads, and all School Requisites.