

WANTED.—Superior Male **TEACHER**, for Catholic School.
Apply to Father Cummins, Reefton.

NOTICE.

NOW READY.

**SPLENDID LITHOGRAPHIC PORTRAIT
OF
IRELAND'S LIBERATOR.
By a Leading Artist.**

Pronounced by competent judges to be the best likeness extant.

PERSONS desirous of ordering Copies should communicate with the undersigned without delay, as only a limited number can be supplied.

Price, - - - 5s. Single Copy.

On Wholesale Orders a Liberal Discount will be allowed.

J. A. MACEDO,

**PRINCES STREET SOUTH,
DUNEDIN.**

New Zealand Tablet.

FIAT JUSTITIA.

FRIDAY, JULY 23, 1875.

IS MR MACANDREW IN EARNEST?

MR MACANDREW is Superintendent of the Province of Otago; and in the General Assembly of New Zealand, member for Port Chalmers. In the latter capacity, this hon. gentleman lately addressed his constituents at the Port, and with his usual ability discussed before them several very important topics. On the subject, Provincialism *versus* Centralism, and his views regarding it, we do not care to dwell to-day; it will be time enough to expend ink and paper on this question when the details of the proposed Government measure are before the people. All that need be said now is that the ideas of the member for Port Chalmers have, in our opinion, much to recommend them to the very serious consideration of colonists.

We are very much pleased, too, with his words on the subject of Education; but after reading them we asked ourselves:—Is Mr **MACANDREW** in earnest? He is of opinion that education "is best managed by the people themselves." He objects altogether to the idea of "the people of Auckland," for example, "being taxed to educate his children in Otago, and *vice versa*;" and when the time comes for direct special taxation to support schools, "he will object to the people of Port Chalmers being taxed to educate children in Dunedin, in Invercargill, or elsewhere." All this is admirable; and after having read these words, and the following from the same speech, viz., "I think that in this, as in all other matters, it is far better to act on the golden rule, 'to do unto others as you would be done by'"—we almost involuntarily exclaimed, bravo! well done member for the Port, this inspires us with hopes that justice may yet be done to Catholics; but after a moments consideration we were forced to ask ourselves: "Is Mr **MACANDREW** in earnest, or is all this merely *ad captandum*. Is it all merely an oratorical flourish, such as one often finds in *post-prandial* orations?"

Alas, we fear it is so. Mr **MACANDREW** would not tax people in Auckland to educate his children. The virtue of this is not very heroic, and such as it is, the Aucklanders are not likely to give him a chance of displaying it. But, judging from our experience of Mr **MACANDREW**'s policy in Otago in reference to the subject of education, the probabilities appear to us that if it were really in his power to tax the people of any place to educate his children, he would not have the least scruple to do so. It may be, indeed, that he has repented of his past unjust policy, and resolved to turn over a new leaf for the future, and do unto others as he would have others do to him; this may be, for everything is possible to grace, but at present the only grounds for thinking it may be so, are so far merely empty words, whereas his acts, up to this hour, are all against the supposition.

We cannot forget that Mr **MACANDREW** was the most determined and powerful opponent of the last Education Bill, introduced into the General Assembly by Mr **VOGET**, now Sir **JULIUS**, although this Bill was little else than a transcript of the Otago Ordinance, because it proposed to make it merely possible for the Government to give a little aid to Denominational Schools. Neither can we forget

that Mr **MACANDREW** is not only the strenuous upholder, but one of the authors of the Otago system of Education, which refuses to recognise in any way Denominational Schools, enables teachers, in the only schools it maintains, to insult the faith of Catholics, and renders all competition, if not absolutely impossible, extremely difficult. This hon. gentleman objects to taxing the people of Auckland to educate his children, and to the people of Port Chalmers, being compelled to pay for the education of the people of Dunedin. Very good indeed, this is very liberal, is it not? But he has no objection at all, not in the least, to compel the Catholics and Anglicans of Dunedin to contribute towards the education of Presbyterians and Secularists.

Here, in Dunedin, Catholics and Church of England people have schools of their own. Mr **MACANDREW**, so liberal as to Auckland, Port Chalmers, &c. &c., ignores the schools at his own door; and whilst in reference to those distant places, he proclaims the great principle of justice—"do unto others as you would that others should do unto you," he evidently holds the doctrine to be inapplicable to his next neighbours. Here, for example in Dunedin, the Catholics have established Catholic Schools, at great expense, and are actually giving an excellent education to five hundred children, and yet the Government of which the member for Port Chalmers is head, refuses to give one shilling out of the revenue of the Province towards either the building or maintenance of these schools. And so it is also throughout the entire Province. In all the centres of population there are Catholic schools, but Catholics are obliged out of their limited resources to bear the entire expense of them, whilst the revenue of the Province—the common property of all—supplies all the funds requisite for the erection of the University, Dunedin High Schools, the Grammar Schools, and common schools in Otago, and at the same time contributes the chief part of the funds required for repairs, and pays the salaries of professors and teachers. This is the way in which Mr **MACANDREW**'s objects to other people paying for the education of his children! People far away "have long horns," and he is consequently afraid of being impaled should he come in contact with them, but his next door neighbors, particularly if they should happen to be Catholics, may be, and ought to be, treated quite differently.

The principle "do unto others as you would have others do unto you" does not apply in the case of Catholics, according to Mr **MACANDREW**. They may have excellent schools of their own, provided by themselves independently of the Government; these schools may have cost them many thousand pounds; the annual cost to them may amount to several thousands of pounds also; they may refuse to send their children to Government schools, as they object to have their minds either blanks, so far as God and their duties to Him are concerned; or filled with detestable falsehoods in reference to the religion and Church of the fathers, and their nationality. What of that? These Catholics must be compelled notwithstanding to contribute to educate Mr **MACANDREW**'s children in godless or sectarian Government schools.

It was not without reason, then, we asked ourselves—"Is Mr **MACANDREW** in earnest? Does he mean what he says, or is he only playing with a gullable public, and making a sport and a mockery of Catholics?" Of course he knows best himself, but we cannot believe him to be in earnest, unless, indeed, we suppose him to be laboring under a hallucination, to which, if report may be relied on, he is not likely to be liable.

GERMAN PERSECUTION.

In another column will be found an extract from the 'Sydney Freeman's Journal' in reference to this subject. It appears that the wail of starving men in Germany reached England, and that many persons, both Protestant and Catholic, contributed funds to relieve the dire distress of the excellent priests whom the German Government plundered of their property. But **BISMARCK** interposed and would not allow this money to reach the hands of his victims. The Government of their country has cruelly robbed them, because they are faithful Catholic priests, and then uses its power to prevent all others, whether natives or foreigners, from giving them bread. This is worse than cruel, worse than brutal; there is no word in our language capable of designating such outrageous conduct. And this is not persecution, not it! says one of our contemporaries. In Germany, men are compelled to starve or abandon