

instruction was given in the Catholic schools, was no reason why these should be penalised. Archbishop Kelly has just raised the same issue, and forcefully directed attention to precisely the same aspect of the education question, in New South Wales. In the course of a pointed and powerful address delivered at the opening of the annual conference of the H.A.C.B. Society, on March 29, his Grace remarked: 'We would be wanting in a due sense of liberty, we would be wanting in our duty to ourselves and country, unless we declare these schools of ours, in which children are taught what their parents wish them to be taught, are as much entitled to some recognition for the work done for the State, as the State schools endowed by the Minister of Education. (Loud applause.) Are we not Australian taxpayers bearing burdens? Is religion a nonentity? If it be a reality, must not religion be free? Must there not be religious liberty in every well-governed land? Australia can never say "We have liberty," when schools up to the secular standards are penalised because they are religious as well.'

Of course the Archbishop was taken up in one of the dailies; this time it was the Sydney *Daily Telegraph*, which was incautious enough to challenge the statements made. In the course of an article entitled 'Penalising Religion,' the Sydney paper remarked: "We have no religious liberty," declares Archbishop Kelly, "while schools up to the standard in secular matters are penalised because they are religious as well." If such schools were penalised because they were religious, this would amount to a truism. But when Archbishop Kelly states that anything of the kind is done in New South Wales he quite misleads those who may accept his guidance in this matter.' To which the Archbishop made the following brief but complete and trenchant reply: 'It is a penalty to deprive a citizen or a body of citizens of any civic advantage available by law or administration to the community. Thus, to withhold a full and fair participation in the public funds allotted for the advancement of secular instruction from any school in which the standards of the State in secular subjects is found to be followed is a penalisation of that school. Now, in New South Wales since 1883 the schools preferred by Catholics, especially by parents, although they work up to or beyond the required efficiency in secular matters, are denied the fruits of their absolute and inherent civic right to share justly in the public disbursements of the Department of Public Instruction. Why? Simply and obviously because Catholic parents and all other faithful Catholics hold, have held, and will hold in all times and places—that it is a religious duty of the first importance imposed on conscience by the natural law and by positive Divine command—in the Fourth Commandment—to ensure that influences favorable to religion would permeate the primary schools above all other schools, and that this end requires the teachers, the manuals, and the management to be such as the pastors of the people can sanction. Here, therefore, is a penalty inflicted on account of a religious duty binding on every conscience, and sanctioned by the rewards or punishments of the Divine Tribunal. Here, then, is an infringement upon religious liberty.' We commend the weighty and logical considerations advanced by the Co-adjutor-Archbishop of Sydney to the notice of those of our dailies who are fond of minimising—if not of denying—the utterly unjustifiable disabilities to which the Catholic body is subjected.

The 'Churchman' and the 'Tablet'

The N.Z. *Churchman*—an Auckland Anglican monthly—in its issue for April, makes reference to the criticisms passed by us on a certain reprint article on 'English Church "Saints",' which had appeared in its columns. Our contemporary's comments are so courteous and conciliatory—not to say complimentary—that further criticism is disarmed, and a controversial rejoinder becomes neither necessary nor possible. After saying sundry pleasant things regarding the *Tablet*, our contemporary proceeds: 'We would like, however, to point out to our friend, the *Tablet*, that what we insert in *The Churchman* is for consideration and enlightenment of members of our own Church, and not for the purpose of attacking the Church of Rome or its members. Our conflict, if conflict it be, is not with Rome or its doings. Her position in relation to some of the matters *The Churchman* unfortunately finds it necessary to discuss, is plain and clear. . . . Not being members of that Church, we have no right nor desire to challenge them there, Rome accepts and adopts them in honesty and openness; but we have all right, desire, and determination to resist their introduction into the English Church. Our concern is with the dupes or traitors within our own Communion. . . . With such an attitude we have, of course, no quarrel; and if it is fairly and reasonably carried out we have neither the right nor the desire to interfere in that which in no way concerns us. But when—as in the case under discussion—a formal and bitter attack is made

on the exclusively Catholic saints in the English calendar, and an article is published bristling with such expressions as 'Popish idolatry and superstition,' 'monkish fraud,' 'silly and lying Popish legends,' 'Popish idolatry and false doctrine,' etc., we are fully entitled to have our say.

The Churchman concludes by commending to us a perusal of a portion of Dr. Alexander Robertson's book, entitled *The Roman Catholic Church in Italy*. We know all about the Rev. Dr. Robertson; and should occasion call for it we are quite ready to vindicate the Catholic Church from his coarse calumnies. In the meantime, we have only to express our disappointment and regret that any decent, honest-minded Anglican should feed his mind upon the garbage produced by the Venice mud-slinger. We will mention one fact which may serve to show our Auckland innocent the true character of his hero. There is published in Rome an infamous, anti-Christian, anti-theistic, obscene sheet known as the *Asino*, owned and edited by one Signor Podrecca. It has been banned from the United States, from the Australian Commonwealth, and—only two or three months ago—by the New Zealand Government from the Dominion, as an indecent publication. Yet in his latest work, Dr. Robertson does not scruple to associate himself with this moral cancer-planter. In the preface to *The Papal Conquest: Italy's Warning*, he writes: 'My illustrations are taken from the *Asino* . . . by kind permission of Signor Podrecca.' Referring to this fact, the correspondent of the *Saturday Review* points out that Dr. Robertson was well aware of the character of the *Asino*, for he is minister of the Scotch Church in Venice, and speaks Italian fluently. 'That any Christian minister,' says the *Saturday Review* writer, 'should sully his fingers by even touching this periodical is almost incredible, but how much more so that he should publish a work including illustrations, "by kind permission," from its ignoble pages.' Of the volume of Dr. Robertson's which is especially commended for our delectation, we have only to say, in the words of an exceedingly able English reviewer: 'He has produced a book for bats and owls; who are the only people likely to find light in it. As a history, it is a lie. As a lie, it is poor. Dr. Robertson should take a course of Munchausen and Aristophanes; the first would broaden his mind, the second would sharpen his wit. On only one point can I agree with him: I do honestly believe he is a D.D., though I should not interpret those two capitals, in all probability, as he does.'

SENSATIONAL AUTOBIOGRAPHY

LATE GENERAL BUTLER AND THE BOER WAR

REMARKABLE STATEMENTS

The autobiography of Lieutenant-General Sir William Butler (says an English Press Association message) is a volume admirably produced, and contains four portraits of the general in photogravure—one from a sketch by his wife, Lady Butler, better known as Miss Thompson, the painter of the 'Roll Call.' From its opening to concluding page the book carries one along with its recital of almost countless episodes in the eventful life of a picturesque, and certainly far from conventional, figure. Great soldiers and other men of mark are discussed with outspoken freedom, and the course of events, military and otherwise, in different parts of the Empire during the past half-century are sketched in eloquent and fascinating language. Sir William had a facile pen, and was, as is shown in his autobiography, a close observer of happenings in the many parts of the world which he visited in his military capacity. Though the work in these aspects will be read with pleasure, and for the most part approval, his caustic utterances on the circumstances leading up to, and the preparations for, the South African War, are sure to provoke a storm of hostile criticism. In this matter each reader will be as a law unto himself, but however unpalatable his comments may be to those responsible for entering upon that campaign, few possibly will be inclined to question the sincerity which prompted the attitude he adopted.

The 'Crowbar Brigade.'

Sir William, who was an Irishman and a Catholic, was born at Ballyslateen, County Tipperary, in 1838, and entered the army twenty years later. His native land first comes under a brief review, and he discourses sympathetically of the horrors of the Irish famine. Of an eviction scene which he saw in his boyhood he speaks of the miserable inmates of the cabin being dragged out upon the road, designates the 'crowbar brigade' as the 'lowest and most debauched ruffians,' and adds: 'I was twelve years old at the time, but I think if a loaded gun had been put into my hands I would have fired at that crowd of villains as they plied their horrible trade.'

Sir William had not long been in the service before he was drafted to India. Returning to Ireland again,

"Drunken at e'en, drouthy in the mornin'."—the best substitute for Glenlivet is Hondai-Lanka Tea.

"If ye brew weel, ye'll drink the better." Hondai-Lanka Tea well brewed is fit drink for princes.