

where she was. He did not look at all surprised to see her, and he seated himself on another rock in the most matter-of-fact way.

Ronald drifted into the story of his life, because his listener's kind eyes seemed to invite confidence. He had been an only son, he told her, and his father having died when he was nine, his mother married again. That meant the misery of his life. He and his stepfather never agreed, and at length he left home to make his own way in the world. He had been secretary to a friend of his for two years, and on his friend's death, had gone as tutor to the sons of a wealthy tradesman in South America. The climate there nearly killed him, and the doctors ordered him to Australia or the Cape. He chose the Cape. That was a year ago. He fell across an Englishman who had some influence in educational matters, and he was appointed head master in Vanburensdorp, where he had been rustivating for six long months. The rest she knew.

'Yes, and you are not half-well yet,' she said, looking at him severely. 'And you don't take even reasonable care of yourself. Why do you take boys in the evening? Is not the day long enough to teach them?'

He laughed as if her scolding were enjoyable.

'Poor little beggars!' he said, 'talking so much Dutch makes English difficult to them. They have the courage to face the University exams. on what they can learn from me.'

'The other master did not take them after 3 o'clock. You will never get strong this way.' Ida rose. 'It gets late, and the Mammie will wonder where I am.'

'You are tired of me and my egotism?' He looked up at her doubtfully.

'What use is a friend who can not tolerate egotism?' she said, laughing.

'You are a delightful listener. I feel tempted to ask you to let me continue mine in our next walk. When will that be, by the way?' He tried to speak in a casual tone and failed.

'I came out for a solitary walk, Mr. Gresley,' she said, with mock gravity.

'Yes? I'm glad, for so did I. Do you want to go home solitary?'

'It's getting rather dark,' she said looking doubtfully at the long, lonely way down to the village.

He laughed.

'Say you're not sorry I came, then.'

'Tyrant!' she exclaimed. 'Who would value such an admission at the bayonet's point?'

Mrs. Nelson was waiting for them with news.

'There's a stranger at the hotel,' she said, 'a Mrs. Warner, who is making inquiries about you, Mr. Gresley.'

'Warner! Are you quite sure?'

'Yes, that was the name. An elderly lady.'

He looked at Ida. 'It is my mother,' he said.

'You will excuse me if I go now?'

His eyes lingered on Ida's face; then he said good-night and went.

Next morning Ida was settling the trimmings for a hat when there came a knock at the door.

'You have good news? You are going to England?' she said, when Ronald entered.

'That depends on you. My stepfather is dead, and my mother wants me home to take the old place in Kent. Will you come?'

'What will your mother say to a milliner's assistant?'

'She has nothing to say to my choice. Besides, you are only playing at the thing. Do you think you deceived me for one instant?'

Mrs. Lavinia, entering the shop some time later, stood still in suspense.

'We're going to send you to Paris, Mammie,' said Ida, coming forward laughing.

'But you've got to come to our wedding first,' said Ronald.

'That I will, and dance at it, too. Was it not I,' said Mrs. Lavinia, 'was it not I who made this match?'

GOD OR NO-GOD IN THE SCHOOLS?*

THE DISCUSSION: A CRITICAL SUMMARY

By THE RT. REV. HENRY W. CLEARY, D.D.

PART III.

'THOSE THAT FLY MAY FIGHT AGAIN.'

II.—THE 'EVENING POST'S' 'DEFENCE' OF THE SECULAR SYSTEM

(Continued from last issue.)

There are others a-many, besides French unbelievers, who recognise the practical impossibility of school 'neutrality' in regard to religion. *America* of April 15, 1911 (p. 22), for instance, publishes such an expression of opinion by M. de Brouckere, 'a militant Belgian Socialist.' He had been invited to deliver an address on 'Neutral Schools' to 'a recently organised society of teachers in Brussels, Belgium, composed exclusively of Socialists, and having as chief purpose the propagation of socialistic doctrines.' The speaker set forth (says *America*) to prove 'the flat impossibility of neutrality. . . . The orator affirmed the impossibility on two heads: to defend such a system is a vain dream, and in the supposition that the vain dream could be made a reality, its exponents would find themselves forced to close their schools. Neutral schools (he explained), so far from helping to spread the light of intelligence, must plunge their followers into abysmal darkness of ignorance. "For," he continued, "neutrality in the matter of education must have one of two meanings: Either it supposes that its devotees hold no positive and fixed opinions in all the questions of controversy of the day, or it simply forces them to banish them from their programmes of study, and to ignore such questions and to teach nothing that is in any way subject of discussion." M. de Brouckere, in a very effective analysis of neutrality, then proceeded to show how school training is radically impossible in either of the two suppositions.' The same paper (*America*, vol. II., p. 179) publishes the following opinion expressed in the course of an interview by Judge Grosscup, of the United States Circuit Court: 'The consequence of the ardent desire for neutrality as between the various denominations, is that *the Government is taking a stand against religion, or at least that is how it works out in the end.* The result of the unfortunate situation is that at an age when children are having their character and mentality made up, they are not given any of the benefits of religion. The rising generation is thus losing religious training at the time it is most needed. Some method should be found by which religious instruction will be a part of the school system.'

Many Australian and New Zealand politicians and journalists have, no doubt, merely assimilated this foolish cry of 'neutrality,' partly because it is a good party catchword, partly because (for the unthinking) it is a convenient substitute for argument and proof, partly because they have not seriously adverted to the meaning of the term 'neutrality,' and partly because they have never attempted an analysis of the kind of dogmatism that (as already shown) is necessarily implied and involved in any system of public instruction which legislatively excludes religion from the schools. We may say of their unproven protestations of 'neutrality' what Lord Rosebery said of Tory Democracy: that it is 'an honest and unconscionable imposture.' In Victoria (Australia) and in New Zealand we are passing through the negatively atheistic phase of the secular system, which is based upon the necessarily implied dogmas set forth on page 41, and nowhere set aside. The secular system in France (as a legislative scheme) passed rapidly through this stage in the eighties. Owing to political and social circumstances, it will take Vic-

* Bishop Cleary's latest work, of which the above is an instalment, is procurable at all Catholic booksellers.