

In a moment, as once already in the Council of Florence, if it would but renounce its national pride, its schism, and the contentious, if not heretical errors it has elaborated, it might be restored as a whole to Catholic unity. It has valid Orders, and the presence of Jesus, and the whole order of divine facts and truths, less only by its schisms and its errors. But it is recoverable, and one day may rise again as from the dead.'

EDUCATION SYSTEM

CATHOLICS' POSITION.

The following letter from the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary, Bishop of Auckland, appeared in the *Wellington Evening Post* of March 29:—

Sir,—From the first, this has been a discussion between the advocates of religious education and the Christian supporters of the legalised banishment of religion from the school-preparation of children for the duties and responsibilities of life. The expulsion of religion from its immemorial place in the schools is the most revolutionary change that has taken place in education in the whole course of Christian history. The burden of justification of this revolt falls upon its authors and supporters. Such justification involves the demonstration of the following (among other) pertinent points: (1) By what precise moral right did our legislators banish religion from the school-training of children? No answer, no justification, has here been attempted, simply because, on Christian principles, none is possible. (2) If it could be shown that the civil Government has a moral right to exclude religion, penalty, from the school, how or why would it not equally follow that it has also a moral right to exclude religion, under penalties—if it so choose—from any and every phase of public and private life in which it has the physical power of interference? Here, again, the 'answer' is—the silence of the tomb. (3) On what Christian or educational principle do the Christian supporters of the secular school demand the exclusion of religion from the school-training of the child for the duties of life, and at the same time retain religion in the home-training of the child for the duties of life? Here, again, no answer, no justification has been attempted, just because, on Christian principles, such justification is impossible. (4) By what moral right does a professedly 'neutral' and 'impartial' State at least implicitly teach the following (among other) sectarian dogmas: (a) that religion has no necessary or rightful place in school-training; (b) that all Christian history, teaching, and tradition demanding the essential union of religion with education, are a huge blunder, a scholastic heresy; (c) that a majority of legislators have the moral right to 'fire' religion from the schools and keep it out by legal penalties? No justification of these (at least implied) State-school dogmas has been attempted, just because, for believing Christians, no such justification is possible. (5) What moral right has a professedly 'neutral' and 'impartial' Government to force these (and other) State dogmas upon the consciences of dissidents, and to compel them to pay tithes for the endowment and propaganda of this sectarian State-school creed? Here, again, no justification is possible on Christian and 'impartial' lines; therefore no justification has been attempted. (6) Can the Christian supporters of the secular system show that the fundamental principles and ideals necessarily involved in that system, are such that believing Christians can accept them? Once more, we have no answer, no justification, because none is possible.

In my letter of March 16, I showed, by the facts of the secular system, and by clear, cogent, and unanswered deductions therefrom, that it necessarily involves doctrines and principles and ideals which constitute a genuine form of negative atheism. It was open to you to refute this demonstration, if you could, by proving (a) that I misrepresented the facts of the system, or (b) that I drew wrong inferences therefrom, or (c) that I erred both in fact and in argument. This you have not attempted to do, and my position stands unassailed because it is, I believe, unassailable. Here, as in the other issues, I claim judgment by default. Had you made even a show of justifying, on Christian lines, the banishment of religion from its olden place in education, my letters would have been short indeed, my task light and easy—it would have been simply a question of sitting still and smilingly seeing you prove, up to the hilt, the case against the Godless school. I am entitled to claim judgment by default on all the issues which you ought to have faced and did not face. In regard to other matters, a journalist of your eminence and standing should not need to be reminded that unsupported assertion and denial do not constitute proof. And the burden of proof is all along upon you. I no more like, than do you, the term 'negative atheism' as applied to a system which banishes religion from the school. But the truth, justice, and necessity of the designation makes it wholesome. And it is high time that well-meaning Christian supporters of that system should begin to realise what is involved and contained in it.

"I have learned again" what I often learned before—that the best is cheapest. Hondai-Lanka Unblended Tea beats all blends.

You contend (and I agree) that it is not the function of the State to teach religion; and you draw the conclusion that the State is, therefore, entitled or bound to banish religion from the school. You represent me as accepting this conclusion and 'approving' the secular system! Yet the only references I made to this curious contention were in your issues of March 16 (last paragraph) and March 22 (paragraph 2); and there, in the most express terms, I protest against your conclusion, and challenge you over and over again to make it good! Amazing as is this misrepresentation of my plain words, I am convinced that it is, like your grave misquotation of Gladstone, the result of inadvertence. I therefore take it that the honorable man's honorable amende will be made by you in due course.

—Yours, etc.,

* HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.

Bishop of Auckland.

March 25.

THE DUTIES OF A BISHOP

ELOQUENT ADDRESS BY THE BISHOP OF GOULBURN

One of the distinctive features of the consecration of the Right Rev. Dr. Clune as Bishop of Perth (says the *West Australian*) was the sermon delivered by the Right Rev. Dr. Gallagher, Bishop of Goulburn. This added appreciably to the impressiveness of the occasion, and by it Dr. Gallagher's reputation as one of the finest orators among the Catholic clergy of Australia was abundantly maintained. Bishop Gallagher took for his text, 'Take heed to yourselves and to the whole flock wherein the Holy Ghost hath placed you bishops to rule the Church of God, which He hath purchased with His own blood. I know that after my departure ravening wolves will enter in among you, not sparing the flock' (Acts xx., 28). The sacred ceremony in which they were engaged, he said, was not merely an occasion of religious joy, but of instruction also. A Bishop had just been consecrated; a fresh sentinel had been placed on the watch towers of Israel; a new successor of the Apostles had been given to the Christian Church. A new link had been added to that golden chain which bound them to the hill of Calvary, to the upper room of Jerusalem, to the Rock of Peter, to the venerable hierarchies of the ancient Catholic world. The important and progressive See of Perth having become vacant by the voluntary resignation of its laborious, self-sacrificing, and venerated Bishop, Dr. Gibney, those priests of the diocese to whom the Supreme Pontiff had granted a consultative voice in the nomination of their chief pastor, had commended their future prelate to the Bishops of the province as the one whom in their opinion the Lord had chosen—as the one whom, after deep reflection and prayer, they considered for his learning and piety and zeal, his prudence and good works, most worthy to rule over them. Bishop! What name was there that could justly claim the esteem and gratitude of mankind? What order was there amongst men that had done so much for the enlightenment, the elevation, the true progress of their fellow-creatures. What region in the world that was not full of their beneficent and unselfish labors? To the bishops had been given in their corporate capacity in union with their Supreme Head the authoritative voice in defining doctrines of faith and prescribing laws of universal discipline. Invested with the plenitude of sacerdotal power, it was the bishop alone who perpetuated the ministry of Jesus Christ by the ordaining of priests and consecration of other bishops. It was the bishop who in the solemn dedication of churches gave as it were a living soul to the house of stone and

The Blessing of Heaven

to the works of the hands of man. To him, as representative of Christ, was committed the care of the consecrated Virgins and the reception of those vows by which they bound themselves with the triple bond of poverty, chastity, and obedience to the service of their eternal spouse; to moulding on His Divine model the character of infancy and childhood; to relieving the miseries and praying for the temporal and eternal wants of their fellow-creatures. Shepherd of the flock, he must nourish his sheep with the food of sound doctrine, and warn them off from poisonous pasturage; he must not, like the hireling, flee, but grasp firmly his pastoral staff when the wolf of error or corruption came to seize or scatter his sheep. Sentinel on the watch tower of Israel, he should always be ready to cry out and give the alarm when the enemy was openly attacking the gates or covertly undermining the walls. Laboring incessantly as a good soldier of the Divine Lord, attending to reading, exhortation, to doctrine, he must strive to be an example to the faithful in word, in conversation, in sobriety, in charity, in chastity, and in faith—meditating on those things and wholly occupied with them, he must save himself and those sheep and lambs whom God had committed to his spiritual care. But not to the sanctuary alone had the cares of the bishop in any age or country been exclusively confined. 'Salt of the earth,' they took possession of the empire of the Caesars, when falling into

"A Call to Supper" is quickly responded to when Hondai-Lanka Tea is the beverage served. "Beware of substitutes."