

'Ah, just so. I have a wretched memory for names. She musn't allow Percy to hang about the place. Oh, yes, I'll see the woman. And let Adela rouse herself. The engagement should be announced before your three months' tenancy of Wood Hill expires,' Mrs. Butler said.

Next day Mrs. Butler journeyed to the farm where the Department of Agriculture was exhibiting new methods of farming and training young women to make butter and cheese, to wash and cook, and to rear fowls and calves. She was a bit nonplussed when Miss Darragh received her as one lady might another and escorted her to dairy, and kitchen, and laundry room. Mrs. Butler said everything appropriate as she passed along, but refused to visit the poultry and calves.

'Another day, thank you,' she said, and asked for a cup of tea. Miss Darragh, with her well-cut features, refined voice, and well-bred manner, became more difficult to tackle; but over the tea Mrs. Butler attempted her task. She did little more than attempt it.

'Really, aren't you rather—absurd?' Miss Darragh said, and Mrs. Butler thought there was a gleam of amusement in the gray eyes. 'I have no power to forbid Mr. Butler nor any other person from coming here at proper time—nor do I intend to do so.'

Then Mrs. Butler lost her temper and said a few foolish things. She felt they were foolish later. Miss Darragh listened, smiled, and escorted Mrs. Butler to the door; and the lady returned to Glen-Butler feeling that she had not scored in the interview. Then she bethought her of Sir Maurice, and wired to his rooms in Dublin.

The student left his old folios and manuscripts very reluctantly and listened, in evident perplexity, to Mrs. Butler's troubles.

'But what can I do?' he demanded helplessly when Mrs. Butler paused. 'Percy is of age. If this adventuress—'

'She isn't an adventuress,' Mrs. Butler interrupted impatiently. 'You must see her, and tell her you won't allow him to marry her.'

'Oh, well,' Sir Maurice admitted, 'I might do that, but still Percy is his own master.'

'Tell her you won't give him any help, that you'll disinherit him.' Mrs. Butler tried to laugh. Maurice was very dense. She had to say a good deal before Sir Maurice consented to go.

'Well,' Mrs. Butler asked on his return, 'did you see her? What did she say?'

Sir Maurice crimsoned.

'Why, I forgot my errand. It is all so interesting—the dairy, and all. But,' he added, 'I can go to the farm to-morrow.'

Sir Maurice did so, and on many succeeding to-morrows; and Mrs. Butler was satisfied. Percy danced attendance on Adela, and very soon the desired engagement was announced.

'You have managed the boy beautifully,' Mrs. Butler said to Maurice. 'I was at one time in deadly fear that he would marry Miss Darragh.'

'There was never the remotest chance of that,' Sir Maurice said.

'You think not? Perhaps you are right. But it would have been ruinous for Percy.'

'Miss Danton is better suited to him.'

'Why, of course.'

'Yes. By-the-by, I knew Miss Darragh long ago.'

'Knew her!'

'Yes. I—I had been attentive to Shiela; but I was called to the Continent on business. While I was away her father died, and her mother and she were left very poor. Mrs. Darragh went out to a brother in the States and Shiela accompanied her. I heard she was married. She wasn't. She came back to Ireland on her mother's death, and— Oh, well, all misunderstandings were explained at last.'

'You mean—?' Mrs. Butler gasped.

'Exactly,' Maurice looked a half-dozen years younger as he spoke. 'Shiela and I are to be quietly married next week.'—*Benziger's Magazine*.

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.)

III.—MISQUOTATIONS AND MISREPRESENTATIONS.

Three noted Englishmen were quoted by the *Evening Post* (without any reference) as 'authorities,' who (it alleged) stood with it for the utter exclusion of religion from the school processes of education. These 'authorities' were the noted English Protestants, Mr. Gladstone (twice quoted), Archbishop Temple, and Dr. Parker. For its own case, the *Post* could hardly have selected worse allies than these three dead and gone Britons. Its four 'quotations' are, one and all, grave misrepresentations. And the three 'authorities,' whom it called to curse State-aided religious education, remained to bless. A brief exposition of the views of Archbishop Temple, and further and fuller references to the opinions of Mr. Gladstone and Dr. Parker, will, perhaps, be of interest to the reader. In the first place, these additional references will exhibit the real opinions of these men more fully than was possible in a newspaper discussion. And, in the second place, the grave and persistent misrepresentation of their plain words will afford melancholy evidence of the culpable carelessness of assertion and quotation into which otherwise reputable journals may fall under the desperate stress of a discussion on so straightforward a theme as religious education.

I. GLADSTONE MISQUOTED.

Mr. Gladstone was both misquoted and misinterpreted by the *Evening Post*.

1. Mr Gladstone was first misquoted by the *Post* in its issue of March 16. That really serious case of garbling and misrepresentation was amply and clearly exposed in the letter which appears on pages 32-33 of this publication. There it was clearly shown that by supplying the vital words suppressed by the *Post*, Gladstone was really advocating just what Catholics in Australia and New Zealand have been steadily demanding ever since the introduction of the purely secular system. That cogent and damaging exposure has not, as to any one of its details, been met and refuted by the *Evening Post*. There was really no excuse for this literary sin of garbling; for the quotation is properly given by Professor Mackenzie on p. 7 of what the *Post* calls his 'valuable pamphlet' in defence of the 'secular solution.' But, for all his enthusiasm for loose assertion, the Professor had at least the saving grace to refrain from directly making the great Liberal leader appear in the role of a champion of the outright exclusion of religion, by law, from the school-training of the young. That piece of controversial daring was reserved for the *Evening Post*.

2. The second misrepresentation of Mr. Gladstone's words appears on page 38 of the present publication. The light of day was let in upon it on pp. 44-45. The reader will get more speedily to the heart of this matter by a perusal of the quotations hereunder:—

Gladstone's Words.

'Why not adopt frankly the principle that the State or the local community should provide the secular teaching, and either leave the option to the ratepayers to go beyond this *sine qua non*, if they think fit, within the limits of the conscience clause, or else simply leave the parties themselves to find Bible and other religious education from voluntary sources?'

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