

schools such a modicum of religious teaching as contents them, the grievance of the Roman Catholics will be greatly intensified. They will say, "Things were bad enough for us before; you have now made them much worse. You should not attempt to force us to accept a system to which on conscientious grounds we are strongly opposed; so, since you have made a change that drives us further away from your schools, you should, in justice, give us a separate grant, so that we may educate our children according to the demands of our own faith." The refusal to do this would give the Roman Catholics a cry which in time would become irresistible. They would assert that they were oppressed for conscience's sake, and, ultimately, the people as a whole would be compelled to yield their point.

No community living under free political institutions could absolutely shut its ears to the plea of those who consider themselves downtrodden. Ultimately, therefore, a fundamental reorganisation of the educational system would have to be made, and the Roman Catholic claims would have to be conceded. So long as no change is made in the secular principle, no demand for a separate grant will be listened to by Parliament, and properly so, too; but once break down the Act, and a great stride will have been taken towards reintroducing denominationalism. Probably the leaders of the Protestant Churches who desire the introduction of Scripture teaching do not see the full effect of their proposal from this point of view. If, however, the Roman Catholics obtained a separate grant, the State would be found to be subsidising the teaching of doctrines of their Church in their schools, but—their Church and their Church only would be so favored. No other denomination would have religious teaching in such full measure at the State expense. In the State schools generally the religious instruction would be of a non-descript character—neither Church of England, Presbyterian, Wesleyan, or Baptist—since, in order to agree upon some form of lessons, those denominations would have to give up the specific doctrines in which they differ from each other. The outlook, therefore, is very unpromising, and it is not merely to be feared—indeed, it seems certain—that we shall be forced back to denominationalism (from which we thought we had escaped in the early seventies), with this difference, that the Roman Catholics will be stronger than ever.

Home Economics

A very ambitious scheme to cope with the perennial problem of women's housework has recently been broached in Christchurch, and is now in a fair way to be carried into effect. Mr. John Studholme, a Canterbury philanthropist, having been impressed with the great value of the established course of Home Economics in the American Universities, offered to the Board of Governors of Canterbury College to pay £200 a year if the authorities would find the remaining £400 required to pay the salary of a Lady Professor of Domestic Science. The authorities accepted the offer, Miss Gilchrist of the University of Tennessee is to be communicated with, and the new chair of Home Economics will be a reality within the year. The course of study will comprise all that pertains to the home, such as: "The proper feeding of infants, the proper kinds and quantities of foods for different ages and seasons, and the composition and cost of foods, the durability, making, cutting, sewing, mending and washing of clothes, the bandaging of wounds, and first-aid, the warmth, ventilation, lighting, plumbing, and everything connected with the health, beauty and cleanliness of the house."

We have not much sympathy with the modern craze for rushing all our girls, without discrimination, through secondary schools and university, holding that it is the almost certain prelude to overwork and nervous break-down and that, as they afterwards usually

settle down to married life, it is at best very largely a waste of time. We think that there was a vast amount of hard common sense in the American humorist's idea when he said: "If Billings understands human nature, and he thinks he does, there ain't nothing that a true woman loves more than the hole of a man's harte; and, in order to git this, she haz got to know less than he does, or make him think so. I haven't enny doubt that you could educate wummin so muchly that they wouldn't know enny more about getting dinner than sum ministers ov the Gospil know about preaching, and while they might translate one ov Virgil's ecklogues tu a spot, they couldn't translate a baby out ov a kradle, without letting it cum apart." If, however, the higher education of women must come it is at least desirable that it should come, as the new scheme proposes, on practical lines and in a direction that will be of some service to them in after life.

CORRESPONDENCE

[We do not hold ourselves responsible for the views expressed by correspondents.]

A SUGGESTED FORWARD MOVEMENT ON THE EDUCATION QUESTION

To the Editor.

Sir,—At the end of the able and interesting reply which Mr. Scott has done me the honor of writing in answer to my "discordant note," three questions are asked, which fairness to my esteemed opponent and to the subject commands me to answer. Such is my apology for trespassing once more on your kind forbearance.

(a) "Is it or is it not desirable that our Catholic schools should receive payment from the State for the hard work that is done for the State?" It is undoubtedly desirable, as a matter of justice, that payment should be made to our schools, on a basis not only of results but also of attendance, as the work of teaching dull children is harder than obtaining results from bright pupils. No Christian State would hesitate in this matter. But modern States are so infected with that kind of liberalism, which is practical atheism, that they view with disfavor any measure of fair play or just remuneration to the Catholic Church, no matter how well earned. Hence it is that so many onerous and sometimes insulting conditions are laid down by the State before a grant may be obtained by the Church. Should the liberty of teaching, belonging to the Catholic Church by every right, be impaired in any way, for instance by onerous conditions affecting the appointment of teachers, the choice of books, the imparting of religious instruction, etc., a noble refusal on the part of the Church would be preferable. Poverty with freedom would win my favor sooner than slavery with golden lace.

(b) "If it is desirable, has "Tuba" any scheme to suggest whereby this desired result can be brought about?" No new scheme, but the continuation of the work going on so well, and this at the risk of a part of our earnings going to support the Catholic schools—a perfectly safe investment from every point of view, at the risk also of beating the streets regularly to worry our heroes whose help is in the wrong direction. A good long time before the elections, our people and their friends might be pressingly invited and instructed to withdraw their support from candidates opposed to the Catholic claims—in other words to vote like Christians.

(c) "If he has not, why throw obstacles in the way of an experiment being tried, which is not in conflict with any Catholic principle, which must do some good, and which may do a great deal?" Here the conference or mutual understanding with other religious bodies on the education question is meant, and on this point, the note which is going to be blown will be more outrageously discordant than ever.

First, allow me to say that I am not throwing new obstacles in the way of an agreement. I am only noticing the obstacles already existing. Such obstacles are not of our own making, and to remove them is not in our power. The experiment suggested is not in conformity with Catholic practice, and practice is always founded on some fixed principle formulated or under-

WHENEVER you see a Smiling Woman, think of Hondai-Lanka Tea! It always gives pleasure.

"HONDÉE LANKA" is see so-much used tea of see family. Madam, she praise it—so eet is "tres bon"!