

## Pointers for Catholics On the "Free Education" Fad.

Under the caption "The Cost of State Education," the New Zealand "Tablet" says:—

In glancing through the election speeches which are being poured forth on the electors at the present time, we notice that one subject crops up very frequently. The question to which we refer is 'Free education from the primary schools to the University.' The aspirants for Parliamentary honors either state their views on this subject in the course of their speeches, or are asked to state them by a question from the audience, and answer almost invariably that they are in favor of 'Free education from the primary schools to the University.' This is a most important proposition, which if adopted would materially increase the cost of education in the Colony and proportionately affect the working man, out of whose pockets through taxation must come most of the money required. We propose in the course of this article to give some pertinent facts and figures which will show that even at present the working man has to bear an educational burden out of all proportion to the advantages he receives, and if, as is proposed, the vote for 'free education' be increased by some tens of thousands of pounds, his burden will become almost unbearable, while his advantages will remain much as they are at present.

From the statistics of New Zealand, we learn that in December, 1900, a total of 130,724 children were attending the public primary schools of the Colony. The expenditure on their education in the same year was £490,378 2s. 2d., or something like £3 15s. for each pupil; or, if we reckon on the average attendance, which was 110,092, on which payment was made, we find that it cost the Colony £4 9s. 10d. to educate each child in the State schools. From the same source we learn that there are close on 75,000 children attending the primary State schools of the ages of eight, nine, ten, eleven, and twelve years. After twelve the attendance shows a very remarkable and significant falling-off, so that only 10,641 remain at school to the age of fourteen, only 5,558 to fifteen, and only 2,665 pass their fifteenth year at school. This table proves decidedly that the vast majority of the children do not remain at school to take advantage of the education given, the reason being that the great majority of parents are not in a position to allow that they can find employment, and thereby help to earn their own living. We may also state that the more advanced the class the greater the expense in providing instruction, as teachers of advanced classes receive large salaries and the accommodation for such classes is on a proportionately more elaborate scale. We take it, therefore, that it costs the Colony more to provide instruction for the 2,665 children whose parents can afford to leave them at school up to and after the age of fifteen than it does to provide instruction for 15,000 children of twelve years of age. Yet the parents of the latter, whose circumstances do not allow them to leave their children at school, are compelled by our system to pay for them at school, and are also presumably better able to pay for extra tuition. Here we see that even in our primary schools an absolute injustice is done to the working classes in compelling them to pay for a system of education of which their circumstances will not allow them to take advantage.

The injustice of our educational system to our poorer citizens may be seen still more clearly by a look at our High Schools, the class of students who attend them, and the expense to the Colony of their upkeep. The returns show that at the end of the year 1900, there were 2,792 pupils at the State High Schools of the Colony. There was expended during that year on the education of these pupils £76,561 7s. a fraction over £27 15s 7d per pupil. The direct fees received during the same year from the pupils amounted to £31,067 4s 9d, which left £45,494 2s 3d to be made up by the State or about £16 5s per pupil. Here we have the State paying about four pounds for the education of the child of the average working man, while it pays over £16 a year, or four times as much, for the education of the child of its richer citizen, and the working man is compelled to pay more than his

due proportion to this educational tax. This is 'Free Education' with a vengeance, which costs twenty-seven pounds per pupil—sixteen of it borne by the State. And our would-be law-makers are not yet satisfied, they are very anxious that the working men should present their richer neighbors with this £16, or in other words that the Colony bear the further burden of £31,067 4s 9d, so that its richest citizens should have their children educated at the expense of the poorer classes.

We know it will be argued that this sum which goes to the support of the high schools does not come out of the taxpayers' pockets, that it comes from educational endowments. It does not matter from what source it comes, what is the property of the people is the property of the poorest as much as the richest citizen, and the educational endowments are the property of the people, therefore it is only a question of which pocket the money is taken out of—the right or the left. Yes, it is more, it is here a question of taking money out of the pocket of the poor man and putting it in the pocket of the rich. We contend that the word 'Free' is a misnomer when applied to our educational system, where education costs as much—probably more—than in any other part of the world. We have also shown how unjust is this tax on the poor man, who is compelled to pay dearly for the education of his own children, and when no longer in a position to keep them at school, is still forced to pay yet more dearly for the education of the children of his well-to-do neighbors. Yet such is the effect of the fine-sounding phrase 'Free education' that the workers of the Colony continue willingly to bear their unjust burden, and seem only anxious to have it increased. They say, 'We are not only willing to have the Sixth and Seventh Standards free, to which a few of our children may go, but we are willing to present to our richer neighbors a free secondary course, through which one or two of the more favored ones from our own ranks may pass. This does not even exhaust our generosity, as we are willing to present you with a free university practically for the use of your children alone.' In other words, the workers of the Colony are willing to tax themselves to the extent of many thousands sterling per annum that they may help to educate the children of the wealthy classes. But if the system is unjust to those who can take some advantage of it, what shall we say in regard to those who cannot conscientiously make use of it. We refer to the Catholics of the Colony. The Government statistics for 1900 tell us that at the end of that year there were 10,687 children attending the Catholic schools of New Zealand, for whose education the Colony was not paying one penny. This means that according to the scale of charges in the public schools the Catholic body was being robbed (we cannot use a milder expression) of £48,000 annually, which amount, large though it is, does not represent our whole loss, as many of our children are receiving a secondary education, which in the State schools costs about £16 for each pupil. We feel we are within the limit when we say that the present system of education robs the Catholic body of £60,000 a year. And our legislators are not yet satisfied; they are keenly desirous to increase the burden, and, like Roboam, they answer our petitions to lighten it: 'My father put a heavy yoke upon you, but I will add to your yoke; my father beat you with whips, but I will beat you with scorpions.'

The people of the Colony, as far as this question of education is concerned, may be compared to a vast co-operative association. This association has to obtain an article—namely, a certain standard of education—for which it has to pay a certain price. Two subordinate firms, the one the public schools, the other the private schools, have undertaken to supply that article; the members of these supplying firms are also members of the purchasing association, therefore equally interested in the article supplied and the price paid. In justice, then, it should make no difference which firm supplied the article. The buyers should be paid for equal value. What would be said of a similar association where the majority of its members used their power to crush the firm represented by the minority, even when they knew that this minority

had conscientious objections to deal with the firm represented by the majority, but were supplying and were willing to continue supplying equally as good an article. Such action could only be described as tyrannical and unjust, yet this is how the State treats its Catholic members. It compels them to pay for an article which it knows they cannot use, and in addition it places on them the burden of providing themselves with the similar article obtained from a different source. Such is our present educational system. It is unjust to the poor man, who cannot take advantage of it to the extent that he is compelled to contribute to it. It is unjust and tyrannical on the Catholics, as it compels them to pay for an article which they cannot use, and, in addition, places on them the burden of supplying an article of equal value to the State, which they can use.

## Conversion of Coppee.

Some few years ago the world was surprised, and the Catholic world was delighted, to read of the complete conversion of Francis Coppee, the eminent author and member of the French Academy. Since the day of his return to the Faith, Coppee has penned some of his most enchanting pages—and they are as bright with the rays of religious fervor, as were those of his earlier years dark with the clouds of infidelity. In one of his recent contributions to French periodical literature he gives a sketch, in which he represents a man, on the first Sunday of Advent (himself of course), coming out of a meeting of politicians, wending his way homeward in the grey mist of a December evening, and turning into a little low church in a suburb of Paris. The account of what happened well deserves to be translated and we do so.

"The man entered, and at once perceived that there were not very many at the Vespers. About thirty women, and a few white caps of nuns, were about all; in the nave the three-fourths of the seats were vacant. But yonder, behind the altar, a choir of solemn voices, accompanied by the organ, chanted the beautiful Advent canticle:

"*Rorate coeli, de super  
Et nubes pluant justum.*"

Then the visitor of that humble church dropped into a deep reverie. That canticle recalled to his mind the period of penance and prayer during which the Church prepares to celebrate the mystery of Christmas and the birth of a Savior-God who besprinkled the world with such a fruitful dew of justice and of goodness. He also recalled the expression of ardent desire and of feverish waiting that he had seen an hour before upon the faces of all the crowd which he had left.

"Alas," he thought, "what those madmen desire and expect with such impatience, what the political preachers cause them to anticipate for their grand-nephews only, and beyond the fogs of the future, is simply perfect happiness; and, in order to attain it, not for themselves, but always for the generations yet unborn, they are incited to fearful struggles and to fratricidal wars. Now perfect happiness is eternal—for it can only be perfect on that condition—and for over nineteen centuries it has been promised them for the day after their death, and even immediately, in this world, since they can have the joy of meriting it by loving their neighbors as themselves, as well as the delicious joy of being very good while awaiting a state in which they will be perfectly happy. Why turn they away from that school of human happiness and love, the sublimest that this world has ever known? Why do they close by, crowd into that den where they drink deep of folly and falsehood; and why is this humble house of God so empty—house of the God who became man merely to bring to earth the gifts of hope and consolation?"

"While this passer-by gave way to such melancholy reflections, the organ and the choir continued the 'Rorate,' that Latin prayer, centuries old, as if to assert that the Christian's faith is certain to survive all persecutions, to conquer all indifference, and also to proclaim in presence of triumphant error and iniquity, that in the mysterious skies, the organ of Eternal Justice rolls its volumes. The visitor went out a changed man! That man was Francois Coppee."

Conduct ever must get its impulse from the highest purpose in which we live. We must manage present concerns in consistency with the better things we hope to attain.

## American Christianity.

(By a Regular Contributor.)

"La Revue Bleue," of Paris, publishes a criticism of a recently issued French work entitled "Religion in American Society." The author of this book appears to have been making a special study of religious conditions on the American continent, and especially in the United States. He has discovered that Christianity in the American Republic is a "social religion;" meaning that it concerns itself more with society than with individuals—a strange conception of religion, just as if its purpose was not the saving of individual souls, but the reconstruction of the social organization. He also finds that it is a "positive religion;" meaning that its interest is in what is human rather than in what is supernatural—a queer conception, again, of religion, just as if it were not with the spiritual, but with the temporal that it has to do. He declares the "religion of the Americans to differ from the theologies of Europe as the Greek philosophy stood out in contrast to the theologies of the Orient." He says that it stands chiefly for the idea of morality; and that "above the diversity of sects, apart from the theories of theologians and scholars, has grown up a feeling of Christian unity." He claims that it is not Protestantism, and that the title of Christianity is the only one broad enough to designate the American religion.

In support of his peculiar arguments the author quotes Mr. John Fiske, whom he reports as saying:—

"The United States does not offer so much the lesson of Protestantism as the lesson of colonization. American liberalism has its causes in American history rather than in the reform of Luther; it has flourished in Catholic Maryland or English Virginia as well as in the Puritan States; it is as inseparable from the Jewish churches or the Roman Catholic Church as from the reformed churches; it is a product of the soil. The American religion is living and fruitful because it is national. It is born of three centuries of effort to organize a society and create a civilization in an unpeopled land. Its aim is human progress, because its origin is human work. It is a religion of humanity grafted upon Christianity."

Now here is a long rig-marole about something that bears an intelligible title, but, in the bottom, means absolutely nothing else than a chaotic mass of confused ideas. Imagine a religion whose aim is human progress, that deals with the temporal affairs of this world and ignores the supernatural affairs of the next, that is based upon an idea of morality, without any dogma—that is principles of faith. Conceive a religion that has for its aim the construction of a social organization and that has naught to do with the individual. In a word, this French savant, has found out a new religion that he characterizes as "American" and which he wishes to dignify with the title of Christianity, while divesting it of every Christian religious attribute. We have no intention to enter into the details of this peculiar contribution, but we cannot avoid indicating it as one of the most striking evidences possible of the dechristianizing of religion by the men who seek to wear the cloak of Christianity as a cover to hide the deformities of their principles.

It is quite evident that the writer in question does not possess even the most elementary idea of what religion is, or of what is an essential characteristic of religion. Without going into any minute examination of the claims set forth by different sections of Christianity as to the possession of the truth, it is sufficient to point out that a religion must deal with the supernatural, the spiritual, and the individual, that it must have its dogma, or teachings, and that it must have its moral principles. Lacking any of these it cannot be called a religion. It may be a social organism, a national, or political, or humanitarian polity; it may be anything else—but not a religion. Consequently to call that something, that condition, or that state of development, which the writer describes, the American religion, or the religion of America, is mere nonsense. In fact, this is the real anti-religionist propaganda of the materialist. It is the work of

men anxious to blind the public to the interests of the soul, by flinging the dust of a false reasoning in their eyes. Taking that which is the very opposite of religion and holding it up as "a religion," means the abolition of the idea of God and the satisfying of man's innate craving for a Divinity, by substituting therefor the idea of demi-gods, or idols. It is the work of iconoclasm carried on with the refinement of the expert in the trade of infidel propaganda.

## A Lesson On Peace.

(By an Occasional Contributor.)

Sometime ago Mrs. Hannah J. Bailey wrote a lengthy article for the New York "American" upon the subject of "The Evils of Warrior Worship." In the course of her remarks upon the manner in which history is written, as if it were only a long list of campaigns and battles, the writer says:—

"It would greatly promote a true internationalism if the influence for militarism and the so-called glory of war should be obliterated from the school books of the nations.

"If school histories should give accounts of the achievements of governments, nations and prominent individuals, of scientists, politicians, educators and philanthropists in times of peace, or independent of warfare, omitting the mention of war, except as an event, the cruel practice of settling international difficulties by force of arms would soon be relegated to the past and men would 'learn war no more.'"

"If the honor and glory now bestowed upon warriors who have done the most harm to the losing side were given to worthy poets and other authors, to inventors, discoverers, leaders in righteous causes, in moral reforms and in genuine religious teaching and the promulgation of the Gospel of the Prince of Peace, there soon would be 'no need of arsenals and forts.' The song of the angels on the first Christmas morning would be the victory song of the world, and all nations would join in the march of peace."

We have no hesitation in saying that there is much truth in these remarks and that this lady sets before us a very important issue. It is quite possible that she looks at the question from an extreme standpoint, but it is equally true that she is seeking to convince those who have long regarded it from the very opposite extreme. It is absolutely true that many of our most universally adopted school histories are nothing other than a series of enumerations of wars and of lists of great conquerors. Ask the average pupil to tell you something about France—for example—in the seventeenth, or eighteenth, or nineteenth century, and he will start off with the story of all the warriors from the great Conde to Napoleon. He is under the impression that having learned the story of all their battles he knows all about the history of their country. Were you to tell him that Napoleon's greatest achievement was the codification of the French laws, and that the Code Napoleon will perpetuate his name and fame, long after the perishable trophies under the dome of the Invalides shall have been reduced, by the hand of time, to dust, he would very probably consider that you did not know about what you were talking. This short passage, which we take from that article, would furnish subject-matter for many a page of useful comment. It is not possible to efface from the black board of history the dates and other details of the great feats of mighty leaders; but it would be a boon if some person would write a school history that might serve to instruct pupils in the customs, the habits, the literature, the creeds of the various peoples that have passed across the stage of this world during the long centuries that are dead. Certainly Christianity would be the gainer by such a history.

**WALTER G. KENNEDY,**  
DENTIST,  
768 Lagardere (Palace St.)  
Two Doors West of Beaver Hall,  
MONTREAL.

## The Dean Of Ripon.

(By a Regular Contributor.)

Last week we had occasion to dwell upon the troubles that are affecting Presbyterianism, and now we find that the great Anglican communion is threatened with something like a general split. The attitude of the Hon. and Rev. W. H. Freemantle, Dean of Ripon, at the Churchman's Union in London is one that is too significant to be absolutely ignored. As a rule, we do not occupy space with the discussion of any of the million and one differences that Protestantism and its divers sects present, nor even the differences between adherents of any particular sect. They are all characteristic of Protestantism, are of its very essence, and must go on multiplying as long as the cause, of which they are the logical results exists. But one is forced to pause in presence of the spectacle of a leading minister in a great and powerful religious denomination continuing to preach the fundamental dogmas of Christianity while openly proclaiming his disbelief in the same. There must be something very wrong some place; either with the Church to which the Dean belongs, or with the Dean himself, or with both.

The Dean of Ripon proclaims his doubts in regard to the miracles of the New Testament, and even the central miracle of all Christianity—the Resurrection. The Bishop of Ripon wrote to Dean Freemantle, expressing the hope that the contradiction could find some explanation. In the letter to the Dean the Bishop said: "Knowing you as I do, remembering how earnestly you have preached Christ to men, and recalling your triumphant voice in reciting the creed, I am confident you would not retain your position for an hour, if the declaration of your faith made in public worship were contradicted by your own convictions."

In his reply the Dean says that it is remarkable that he should "be supposed to be doubtful about the truths on which I live from day to day, and without which the world would be unmeaning to me." He says that he repeats the creeds because they enable him "to express Christ as God manifest in the flesh" and he adds that his sole object is "to preach Him as the Savior of mankind and to make Him supreme over every part of human life."

All this is delightfully bewildering and vague. The Dean must be very innocent if he is surprised that the world should suppose him to be in doubt about the truths of the Gospel, when he takes the trouble to expressly inform the world that he does not believe in them except in a figurative manner. It is not our business to inquire into the Dean's belief or disbelief; but we cannot help remarking the peculiar condition of faith in any Church that is manifested in such striking contradictions. However, we have a great degree of respect for the Dean, even while we feel pity for his illogical position, because he has the courage to openly state his doubts. He is not alone, far from it, in his estimate of Christian "creeds," but the thousands who have glided into infidelity, as a consequence of the free and easy principles, of the Protestantism that they profess, and who, for one reason or another, make an outward show of believing that which they actually disbelieve, to be found in every denomination outside the Catholic Church. It is evident that the Dean has stood at the cross-roads of life, and has found himself hesitating between that which leads to confirmed Faith and Rome, and the other which conducts to religious doubt and agnosticism. He had not the courage to take the former; he felt impelled to follow the latter; and he still could not break with the Church of his childhood, his education, his ministry, and his lengthy years of preaching. Hence the peculiar position that the poor Dean finds himself in. Manning, Newman and others have stood at the cross-roads; but they solved the difficulty of choice in a determined manner. It is not probable that the Dean of Ripon will ever reach a like solution; the more the pity, for the tortured stage of life through which he is passing would deserve some greater result and reward than is likely to come to him as matters now stand.

Pleasure is very seldom found where it is sought. Our brightest blazes of gladness are commonly kindled by unexpected sparks.

## The "S"

S I am not special line I expect the to break in with a wholly foreign to subject. Recently I learned gentleman, versed in Irish lore, if I could to ing, or the ori Burst." It is the ever heard the qu I must admit that with any direct sta the origin of that. Moreover, it never to make any inqui Now that the may brought to my atte sacked the authori sal, and I will give benefit of my inves

Firstly, in a note "Tis Gone, and the fourth line of Moore says: 'The the fanciful name of the King's daughter, to the Now, to my mind, vague. It neither a banner was adop rising sun came to folds, nor yet why "fanciful." I am i that there was no it was a reality; a was not a banner.

In "O'Hart's Pe that Milesius, in hi to Scythia and the King's daughter, a eral commander. T Egypt, where Ph the King, made hi his forces in the w of Ethiopia. He t the trades and art teach them to his return to Spain. In obedience to a his, the eight brot sail from Spain fo met with untold d attempts to land, ceries and enchan Tuatha-de-Danaus them. That part c manded by Heber, ergin (the three su landed in safety, fo the natives, and selves in the land. non divided the c themselves, allottir ergin, who was th Druid, or magician hand. Moore com event in his "Song the third stanza he

"Then turned they wave, Where now their A look of such sun As lighted up sea

Thus we see that to the rising sun of the Milesian inv land. Now if we notes to his poems, lowing under his g Celts." Referring to

"Cromah, their da thunderer."

McGee says:—

"Crom, or Crom-name given by the gan Irish to their—the dispenser of the author of fecund ity. He was the Maximus, from wh ties descended. The from the Egyptian Ignis, fire—which w ble object of devo and that only as the Supreme. Consiste with this view, the powers of nature. Cruith-God the Cr same as that ador and the Persians fo hundred years before evident, and I base on the best and mo thorities, that the were fire-worshipper their day-god, an from Egypt that fo Persians were es ships; and in Per imbibed the precept quently brought ho we study Moore's we will find that, u its Orientalism, it is poem. This is a su like very much to v this is not the time. When the Milesian struggling in vain