

education.' The three great agencies in education are the home, the school, the church. In the vital matter of educating in religion and virtue, the Catholic Church has ever stood for the now scientifically accepted principle of unity and concentration; she has ever required harmony in the pedagogical (training) action of home and church and school—each acting and reacting on the child in its own proper measure and way, and all on uniform principles. In other words, religion and religious training should enter into all the processes of education. In this materialising age, more than ever, should the child be taught to find God in the school as well as in the church and the home and the boundless universe—and in Him to live, and move, and have his being.

These principles of education are not Catholic alone. They have been in possession from ages immemorial. They are, in varying degrees, and with many differences in detailed application, accepted by educators over the greater part of the Christian world. They must be deemed to be rightly in possession until the contrary is shown. All rival and hostile systems are recent, experimental, localised, and no one of them has thus far established its claim to acceptance on the basis of Christian philosophy and the principles of pedagogy (child-training)—the only grounds on which they can claim a hearing from a Christian people.

II. CATHOLIC PRINCIPLES APPLIED.—In their practical application the Catholic principles of education summarily stated above would, in the present writer's view, work out, for Catholic children, along the following general lines (at one stage, to be duly indicated, another Catholic principle would likewise come into operation):—

1. There must not alone be instruction of the intellect of Catholic children in religious truths in the schools; there must also be instruction and training of the moral conscience and the will.

2. The instruction and the training mentioned above must, moreover—according to the opportunities of the schools and the several capacities of the children—be effective; that is, they must be of their nature such as really to aid the child in attaining the great object of his existence. In other words, it must be a serious and genuine religious training. Hence—

(a) The religious instruction and training of Catholic children must have a known and clear-cut object in view—namely, adequate training in virtue and character; they must be based on definite religious truths and principles, after the manner of any art or science that is seriously taught—again, of course, according to the children's ages and relative capacities and the opportunities of school life. In connection with this deepest concern in life, this first and most important part of true education, Catholics cannot knowingly tolerate make-believe methods, or make-shift compromises, or ineffective principles of instruction or training, such as they would be unwilling to employ in home or church or Sunday school, or such as a skilled and conscientious teacher would be ashamed to follow in the case of (say) arithmetic or of any physical science.

(b) Catholics insist upon giving to religion and character-formation their rightful place of first importance in education. They demand for Catholic children in the school the 'religious atmosphere' in the sense explained above. They will therefore not accept for their children any system that subordinates religious training to secular instruction. They will not accept as satisfactory for their children any system which provides some or any form of religion, no matter what it may be, at the opening or closing of the school only, or at some other set hour only, while God and religion and the play of religious principles and religious influences are excluded from the remainder of the working hours of the school. In this connection Pope Leo XIII. merely expressed the immemorial feeling of the Catholic world when he said in his Encyclical on the centenary of Peter Canisius in 1897: 'It is not enough for youths to be taught religion at fixed hours, but all their training must be permeated by religious principles.' Hence Catholics could never accept, for their children, any compromise effected between religion and secularism, such as took place under the old Otago provincial system. For the same reason Catholics have steadily declined to accept, as suitable for Catholic children, the New South Wales system of pure secularism tempered by brief stated periods of religious instruction—even though that instruction may (where it can be given) be really Catholic for Catholic pupils. We will have no act or part in excluding God and religion and religious principles and influences from any vital process—least of all from that of education. On the contrary, we would widen the scope and influence of religion till it embraces the whole life of man.

3. On grounds of conscience which are well known, and from which they can never recede, Catholics cannot formally participate in the religious instruction, religious training, or religious worship of other creeds. Hence the religious education of Catholic children must be wholly

along Catholic lines. To ensure this, the proper authorities of the Church claim the right of control of the education of Catholic children in all matters pertaining to faith and morals. In all civil and secular matters (as will be explained more fully in the course of this article) they, of course, admit State control. The right of control in matters of faith and morals implies (a) the supervision of the text-books dealing with religion, and (b) the right of insisting that the faith and moral character of the teacher of Catholic children shall be satisfactory. The Catholic Church does not recognise in the civil authority any right or competency to teach religion to Catholic children. Neither does it recognise any such right or competency in non-Catholic teachers—well knowing, by reason and experience, that none can teach or train in a religious faith except those that know and love it. Apart from this knowledge and love, such teaching, if attempted, would be erroneous, unreal, a mere mechanical drill, and the acting of a part. Hence, too, Catholics cannot accept, for Catholic children, any non-Catholic school compromises or arrangements on religious matters that may be entered into by the adherents of other faiths. Catholics have ever desired, and cordially desire, to see non-Catholic children in the public schools brought up in Biblical and religious knowledge. Such compromises as those referred to are conscientiously possible among the more or less allied creeds which accept as their rule of faith the reformed principle of the Bible and the Bible only, interpreted according to the individual private judgment. Catholics, like Jews, have a different rule of faith and practice. Catholics must, as a matter of religious teaching and of conscience, stand outside and apart from any such compromises, so far as the religious instruction and training of their own children are concerned. Subject to State control in civil and secular matters—as indicated and to be further indicated—Catholics desire Catholic schools and Catholic teachers for Catholic children. The extent to which this ideal may be limited as a working compromise, and yet fairly meet the Catholic demand, will be broadly indicated later on.

4. Catholics would gladly co-operate in any just and reasonable scheme having for its object the instruction or training of non-Catholic children in the public schools, during school hours, in Biblical and religious knowledge. But, whether as Catholics, or as citizens and taxpayers, we could not accept as just and reasonable any such scheme running on the following lines:—(a) Any such non-Catholic scheme without a conscience clause. (b) Any scheme (as above) with a conscience clause making it legally compulsory for Catholic children to attend such Biblical reading or instruction, unless their parents or guardians enter formal protests, written or verbal, against it. The only conscience clause that would be deemed satisfactory for Catholic children would be one empowering the giving of Biblical or religious instruction, etc., to those children whose parents or guardians by express word or act desire it. (c) Catholics could not accept as just and reasonable any non-Catholic scheme of Biblical reading and religious instruction as part of the State curriculum, if, as now, it would compel us to pay a double tax for education—namely, contributions for the Catholic education which Catholic children receive, and another (a Government impost) for a system of public instruction of which we could not in conscience avail ourselves.

5. Finally, Catholics will never accept, for Catholic children, any system of public instruction divorced from religion, such as that of Victoria (Act of 1872, section 12) and of the New Zealand Act of 1877, which declares (section 84, sub-section 2) that 'the teaching shall be entirely of a secular character.' The grounds of the Catholic objection to the hard legalised secularism of these systems have been indirectly indicated in the preceding paragraphs, and in fuller detail in the course of previous articles of the present series.

I ask the patient and thoughtful reader to bear well in mind that the position taken up by Catholics in regard to education is not dictated by caprice or perversity or chuckle-headedness. It is purely a matter of religious belief and conscience. There is no more use in scolding us about it than in quarrelling with us about the color of our hair or eyes. On other matters we can compromise. On those matters, connected with our stand on education, which depend upon religious truths or principles, we can never yield in one iota. There we are, and there we remain. And the earnest seeker of a way out of the religious difficulty may as well, frankly and in a reasonable and statesmanlike way, accept a position which he cannot hope to alter. We ask that our conscientious inability to compromise beyond a certain point be treated with as much consideration as the conscientious ability of many of our Protestant friends to carry compromise somewhat further.

Only two further matters remain to be dealt with. One of these—the sectarian character of the secular system—will occupy a few brief paragraphs; the other is a state-

Dinna drink tea that disna satisfy! Hondai Lanka has the rich, full-bodied flavor and satisfying taste.

'Nae doot, if ye drank "Cock o' the North" Tea ye wadna be sae fashed wi' indigestion.'