

wrote: "Secular schools would not be irreligious. I am by no means sure that on the whole they would not be more religious." Here, again, the *Post* gave no reference. But, like so much more of its argumentative material, this quotation seems to have been dug out of the 'valuable pamphlet' of Professor Mackenzie, entitled 'Defence of the Secular Solution.'

In those brief references to 'Archbishop Temple' (thirty-one words only), the *Evening Post* contrives to convey no fewer than three distinct errors in matters of fact.

1. First error: The *Post* distinctly suggests to its readers that I somehow stated or implied that Archbishop Temple was an atheist. This is a persistent and entirely regrettable resort of the *Post*—setting me wrong in order to set me right; denying, as my statements or suggestions, ideas that never even knocked for admission at the ante-chamber of my brain.

2. Second error: The *Post's* remarks (quoted above) clearly imply that it is citing in favor of its own view the words of a noted Archbishop of the Anglican Church. Such an implication is distinctly misleading. 'Archbishop' Temple never used the words with which the *Post* credits him. Neither did 'Bishop' Temple. The words in question were employed by the Rev. Mr. Temple in 1856, when he was an employee of the Education Office, long decades before he rose to the rank of Archbishop of Canterbury. To the 'plain man' who reads the *Evening Post* it is one thing to quote a young, unknown Education Office official, of fifty-five years ago, as an 'authority' on this religious question; it is a very different thing to quote as an 'authority' thereon a great Protestant Archbishop of Canterbury, whose name was for long years tolerably familiar to newspaper readers of our time, even on this outer rim of the English-speaking world. The distinction is one of some controversial importance. And, in any case, it was the duty of the *Post* to refrain from creating a palpably false impression, in this matter, among its readers. We shall presently see that Dr. Temple, both as Bishop and Archbishop, was a strenuous upholder of the intimate and essential union of religion with education.

3. Third error: The *Post* distinctly conveys to its readers the following impression in regard to 'Archbishop' Temple: That the term 'secular schools,' as used by him, means the same thing that the term 'secular schools' mean in New Zealand—namely, schools from which religious teaching and religious worship and religious influences are absolutely and rigorously excluded. Such, indeed, is the whole trend and purpose of the *Post's* argument in this connection. It appeals to its three 'authorities' in 'support of the State school system,' which has been in operation in New Zealand 'for more than thirty years.' And, more specifically, the *Post* adduces these three 'authorities' to 'prove' that the utter exclusion of all religion from our State schools does not represent 'the negative form' of atheism. It makes 'Archbishop' Temple its ally and backer in the de-Christianising of the public schools.

Let us see. The *Post's* quotation from 'Archbishop' Temple runneth thus: 'Secular schools would not be irreligious. I am by no means sure that on the whole they would not be more religious.' I find that these words (as well as the fuller quotation in Professor Mackenzie's pamphlet) form part of a long letter written by Dr. Temple to his sister Netta on April 15, 1856. This letter is published in *Memoirs of Archbishop Temple*, by Seven Friends; edited by E. G. Sandford, Archdeacon of Exeter (London, 1906, 2 vols.), vol. II., pp. 642-643. The greater part of the letter is reproduced hereunder, including so much of the context as is required to bring clearly before the reader the meaning attached by the Rev. Mr. Temple to the term 'secular schools.'

(To be continued.)

THE JAPANESE PARLIAMENT

THE EMPEROR AND THE CONSTITUTION

Everyone knows of the astonishing progress that Japan has made in the last forty years. This progress, however (says the Rev. A. M. Roussell, S.J., writing in *America*), has not been equally rapid in all the branches of civilisation. Nor would it be proper to compare this country with those of the West, but only with what Japan was forty years ago, at the time when the old régime came to an end. However, in the material order Japan might to-day stand comparison with the other nations in its army, navy, commerce, postal and police services. But in the material order itself and, of course, in the domain of the intellect and in the social and moral order there are many gaps and shortcomings. The poverty of Japan explains to some degree, at least, its failure in material civilisation, and, naturally, where there is question of ideas or customs, progress cannot take place mechanically. A people which has such a long past as that of Japan cannot make the progress of fifty or one hundred years in a week.

Some of the debates of the last session of the Parliament may give the outside world a gleam of light on the actual state of the Japanese mind, and will reveal some peculiarities of the conditions in which we live. A review of the discussions on the Universal Suffrage Bill may be helpful in that respect, for since the promulgation of the Japanese Constitution on February 11, 1889, Japan has been under a constitutional government, but by no means a parliamentary one. Still less can it be called democratic. For as this constitution was granted by the spontaneous and benevolent generosity of the emperor, a change in the constitution is reserved to his Imperial Highness, the chambers have nothing to say in the matter. The emperor is not only the chief executive, but is the source of all power. He is not compelled to consult Parliament either to declare war, or to conclude peace or to make treaties with any foreign State, or to determine the organisation of the army, or the number of troops of which it may be composed. The ministers of state are responsible only to the emperor, and in no way whatever to the representatives; they are not obliged to submit to the majority of the Parliament, and may remain in office as long as they have the emperor's confidence. Parliament has the right to interpellate the Ministry; to place facts before it, to present addresses to the emperor; but the government is not obliged to pay any attention to votes of censure. From 1891 to 1903, that is to say within a space of twelve years, the government dissolved the lower chamber seven times, and since 1904 it has shown itself very docile, and has carried out whatever it has been told to do.

The Regular Annual Session of Parliament lasts three months. The members are convoked for the 20th of December, and immediately begin by taking a month's vacation on account of the festival of the New Year. Thus they are in session only two months. Nearly all of the work is done in committee, so that during the session which has just finished the lower house held only twenty-six sessions. A single session was enough to vote the budget, while in the upper house this important proceeding required only an hour. In brief, both houses are merely, as you would say in America, rubber stamps to carry out the wishes of the government. The House of Peers is so arranged as to avoid both the inconvenience of a purely hereditary body, like the English Lords, and that of an elective upper chamber. It is composed as follows: (1) Princes of imperial blood, 14; (2) nobles who are hereditary members, 43; (3) nobles elected by the peers, 143; (4) members named by the emperor, 121; (5) members elected by the highest taxpayers, 43; total, 364.

(1) All princes of the blood are members by right as soon as they have reached their majority, which they reach at the age of twenty. All the dukes, who are also called princes, to the number of thirteen, and all

Portraits Are Our Forte

Sittings a pleasure, not an ordeal at the "Tesla" Studios, opposite Post Office, Wanganui, so the hackneyed phrase no longer required—sooner have a tooth out.

Enlargements made from any photo. in black and white, sepia, or water colours.