

## DEATH

O'CONNELL.—Of your charity pray for the repose of the Soul of Letitia, the beloved wife of Edward O'Connell, who died at Ngapuna, Central Otago, on Good Friday, April 14; aged 63 years.—R.I.P.

WANTED TO LET, in South Canterbury, New Shop, suitable for Drapery, Millinery, or Tailoring, with Workrooms attached; apply 'Clontarf,' Tablet Office.

## Dannevirke Grand Fancy Carnival

## WINNING NUMBERS

W. Webb, 9364; Vallance, care of E. E. Prior, 49; Miss Fraser, Craven School, Palmerston North, 3; H. W. Giesen, 6620; H. Muhliesen, 61; D. Hage, 8213; M. Hedderman, 6073; H. Prior, 6685; J. Boyle, 8673; Beatrice Ardell, 8555; Mrs. Joines, 257; Mrs. Dr. Dawson, 2041; Molly Joines, 2746; Lyldia Somerville, 7663; Mrs. D. Barry, 7748; R. C. Robb, 2550; R. Tilson, 7688; E. Grenside, 9677; W. Crump, 9704; M. Smith, 6700; Miss Monteith, 7222; J. S. Smith, 7335; J. Alding, 6860; T. J. Cullinane, 6915; F. D. McLean, 630; R. Hendy, 4401; N. Hemanson, 7245; Miss J. Evans, 230; Mrs. G. Gray, 378; M. Shears, 592; Dott Barry, 7646; M. K. Bennett, 92; M. E. Fuller, 726; Lyldia Somerville, 930; Gavan, 725; J. McDermott, 9789; J. Asher Johnstone, 4842; Mr. Magnes, 5; T. McMaster, 293; L. Pettit, 233; D. Smith, 2404; J. Bridson, 57; N. W. Simpson, 9538; Day Smith, 7560; H. Prior, 2581; Mollie Power, 6498; Mrs. Quaid, 6989; Mrs. Dunnage, 4502; A. Gilmour, 3596; J. Neagle, 552; H. Douglas, 7629; P. Sydow, 3010; L. Harker, 3121; F. J. Knight, 18; H. Morgan, 7442; Mr. Beban, 5308; J. Olsen, 9181; Mrs. Rinch, 4779; E. Neagle, 726; T. Hurley, 450; H. Chisholm, 5183; Mrs. W. Gilmour, 3897; A. M. Harmer, 3567; Mr. Simpson, 4252; Mr. J. Bice, 548; Taihape, 694; Irene Holder, 3271; W. Dew, 6689.

## MAYORAL ELECTION

COUNCILLOR WILSON respectfully solicits your Vote and Interest on Wednesday, April 26, 1911.

Polling from 9 a.m. to 7 p.m.

Councillor Wilson has been continuously serving the Public Municipally since April, 1897. Mayor of Caversham for three years—1902, 1903, and 1904,—and is now serving his fourth year as Chairman of Public Works Committee, besides being a member of the Dunedin Fire Board.

## CITY OF DUNEDIN MAYORAL ELECTION.

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 1911.

## CR. WILLIAM BURNETT

(Senior Councillor on the Dunedin City Council),

Solicits your VOTE AND INTEREST at the forthcoming Mayoral Election.

COUNCILLOR BURNETT has been a member of the Dunedin City Council continuously since 1904, and has filled the offices of Chairman of the General Committee (1907-1909), and Chairman of the Reserves Committee (1906-1911). Besides representing you upon various Public Bodies, he has been a member of the Dunedin Drainage and Sewerage Board since 1903, and has been Chairman of that body since 1905. He was also for many years a member and for some time Chairman of the Maniototo County Council.

## THE LATEST 'TABLET' PUBLICATION

'Secular versus Religious Education: A Discussion.' Edited (and, as to its greatest part, written) by Rev. H. W. Cleary, D.D. 212 pages, stiff paper wrapper. Price 1/-, posted 1s 3d. Cardinal Moran writes of it: 'I have received the brilliant pamphlet, *Secular versus Religious Education*. It is a most useful and instructive contribution to the educational controversy, and cannot fail to do a deal of good.'

Apply MANAGER, TABLET, Dunedin.

## MESSAGE OF POPE LEO XIII. TO THE N.Z. TABLET.

*Pergant Directores et Scriptores New Zealand Tablet, Apostolica Benedictione confortati, Religionis et Justitiae causam promovere per vias Veritatis et Pacis.*

*Die 4 Aprilis, 1900.*

LEO XIII., P.M.

TRANSLATION.—Fortified by the Apostolic Blessing, let the Directors and Writers of the New Zealand Tablet continue to promote the cause of Religion and Justice by the ways of Truth and Peace.

*April 4, 1900.*

LEO XIII., Pope.



THURSDAY, APRIL 20, 1911.

## THE 'POST' CRIES OFF



THE *Evening Post*, finding that things were getting too hot to be comfortable, has declared the controversy closed which has been proceeding in its columns for the past two or three weeks between the Right Rev. Dr. Cleary on the one hand, and the Wellington paper itself on the other. As things were going, it was time for the *Post* to shut down. Unless and until the *Post* pen-driver fairly faced and straightforwardly answered the issues originally raised by Dr. Cleary, the discussion could necessarily get no further. That the *Post* could not, and would not, face the music has long been evident; and having sufficiently emphasised the paper's failure, and at the same time pressed home upon *Post* and public alike the true view-point from which the consideration of this great question must be approached, Dr. Cleary himself had no particular object in—for the present—pursuing the matter further. His main purpose—that of putting the question in its true perspective and of getting the discussion right side up—has been amply achieved; and the considerations he has advanced may easily be elaborated and strengthened from time to time.

\*

The outstanding feature of the recent controversy has been the *Post's* persistent evasion—from start to finish of the argument—of the simple, clear-cut points that were in issue in the discussion. These have been stated and restated, repeated and reiterated, by Dr. Cleary in such a way as to leave the *Post* without the semblance of a pretext for not fairly facing them. Reduced to their simplest terms, the issues raised and pressed by Dr. Cleary may be thus expressed: (1) Do you, or do you not, admit—with Spencer, and educationists generally—that education is 'a preparation for life.' (2) Do you, or do you not, admit that, by consequence, the character of the education given must, necessarily and logically, be based on the view of life adopted. (3) On what view of life—or principle of child-training based on a specific view of life—do you justify the exclusion of religion from the formative process of school work? These queries are not merely pertinent—they are essential and fundamental. To attempt to discuss what forms of religion are to be taught in the schools, and under what conditions, before having settled the previous question, is to reverse the proper logical process. The question of religion versus no-religion (irreligion) in the schools comes first—and must be threshed out and settled before a consistent and coherent system can be built up. Recognising this, Dr. Cleary has stuck, from first to last, to the root-principle involved; and has refused to allow himself to be drawn from the fundamental issue. There were two ways in which the *Post* might honorably have met the situation in which it found itself in face of Dr. Cleary's pointed queries. (a) It might have acknowledged the weakness of its position; and frankly admitted that, on going more deeply into the question, it found itself unable, on any Christian principle or view of life, to justify the exclusion of religion from the schools. Or (b), if it knew of any such principles, it might have set them forth, and put up the best fight it could in their defence. The *Post* has adopted neither of these courses. In our issue of March 23, we printed from two of its leaders the exact words in which the paper summed up its 'reply' to Dr. Cleary's queries. In neither of these was there the faintest hint or trace—not so much as a breath or whisper—of a 'view of life' or of those principles of child-training