

three days" (meaning, I presume, three days' interval between his sending the petition and its actual presentation by Mr Cutten), "and if you wished you might have complied with the request of your constituents, or at all events have asked some other member to present the petition." Bishop Moran admits in the article of the 7th June that the petition was presented by Mr Cutten; and I find from the records that this was on the 22nd of June. I have taken the trouble of examining the Votes and Proceedings of the Council of that year; also my own diary, and the newspaper reports of the period, to see when and how the Catholic petitions were presented, and how I myself was engaged during the same time. I find that on Thursday, June 15, I was in the House and voted. On Friday, June 16, the first batch of Catholic petitions (five) were presented by Messrs. Shepherd, Bastings, Haughton, Hickey and Armstrong, and that a petition from Messrs. Marshall and Copeland, brewers, which had been entrusted to me was presented "by Mr Shepherd pro Mr Barton." I was therefore absent from the Council on that day. In further proof, my own diary shows that I was, on the 16th June, engaged till 12 p.m. (midnight) on the enquiry in Reichelt's case. On Saturday, 17th June, of course, no sitting of Council. On Monday, 19th, two more Catholic petitions were presented by Mr Clark and Mr Haughton. On that evening I was employed in the Reichelt case till 10 30 p.m. On Tuesday, the 20th June, no Catholic petitions were presented. I therefore presume none were sent down. On that day, I believe I was absent from the Council. At any rate, I was absent from the afternoon opportunity of presenting petitions had there been any to present, as I was engaged from 2 p.m. till 3.30 in consultation with Messrs J. McLean, Henry Driver, and James Macansey. I have no reasonable doubt that I was engaged the rest of that evening in preparing to conduct the heavy case of Bathgate v. Bank of Otago, which occupied the Court the two following days. I find on Wednesday the 21st no Catholic petitions were presented, and I again presume none were sent down. On that day I was engaged till after 4 o'clock, and I find no trace of my presence that evening in the Provincial Council. But of this I am certain, that even if I was present, I neither heard nor saw anything of the Dunedin Catholic petition. I find that on the 22nd (Thursday) two Catholic petitions were presented: one from Kyeburn, Oamaru, &c, by Hon. J. McLean; the other, from Dunedin and other places, by Mr Cutten—this latter being the one which it is alleged "had been kicked about the Council Hall for three days." On that day the 22nd, the 'Otago Daily Times' report shows that I was engaged all day from 10 a.m. till 7.15 p.m. in the Supreme Court in the case of Bathgate v. the Bank of Otago.

Thus it appears that Bishop Moran is mistaken in supposing that I was present on any of the days when these petitions were presented, and equally mistaken in believing that I knew he had sent me the Dunedin petition and letter he refers to. As to the delay, if there was any, I find that the Dunedin petition was by no means the last that was presented. One was brought forward on the 28th June by Mr Lumsden, and another so late as the 7th July, by Mr Mackenzie. Were these two petitions left "kicking about the Council Hall?"

Bishop Moran terms me a "quondam blatant Liberal now turned Orangeman," and adds that "the most besotted bigot could not have given expression to a greater spirit of hostility to his Roman Catholic fellow-subjects, and a more lamentable ignorance in reference to the designs of the Catholic Church," than I have displayed. In so far as the principles of Orangism imply opposition to Ultramontaniam, I am content to be ranked as an Orangeman. With "the designs of the Catholic Church," so far as creed is concerned, I claim no right to interfere, but in regard to its political policy I do claim such right: where it ceases to be a creed, it becomes a state-craft. I adhere to my statement that the real object of Ultramontane Catholicism is to keep its own flock unthinking and uneducated, and to retard as much as possible the liberal education of others. From the statements of Irish Catholic bishops I will make a few extracts, and leave the public to judge. Bishop Derry, in a pastoral dated Ash Wednesday, 1865, speaking of the Queen's Colleges in Ireland says:—"It is expressly enjoined on us to keep youth away from Colleges of that description. Parents and guardians of young men are to understand that by accepting education in them for those under their charge, they despite the warnings, entreaties, and decisions of the Head of the Church. Adhering to the discipline in force in the diocese, we once for all declare that they who are guilty of it shall not be admitted to receive the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist or of Penance while they continue their disobedience." In September, 1869, a pastoral by Cardinal Cullen was published in the 'Times,' in which occurs the following passage:—"I am so convinced of the evils of the model School system, that I give notice to any Catholic parents who shall obstinately persevere in keeping their children in the lion's den, in the midst of danger, that I feel bound to deprive them of the advantages of the Sacraments of the Church until they make up their minds to act as parents anxious for the eternal salvation of their children ought to act."

Dr. Keane, Bishop of Cloyne, examined before the Royal Commission on Primary Education, said the only thing the Church did not claim to teach was the multiplication table, and Mr Dorrian, the Bishop of Down and Connor, in answer to the same question said that "even in arithmetic, there might arise points of a metaphysical kind which a teacher might explain injuriously." If these Roman Catholic Bishops are true exponents of the "designs of the Church," then no one can doubt what those designs are.—I am, &c.,

GEORGE ELLIOTT BARTON.

Dunedin, May 11.

To the Editor of the 'Evening Star.'

SIR,—In your issue of this evening there appears a second letter from Mr Barton in reference to the part taken by Catholics in the recent election. This letter gives me the lie direct, and has, consequently, no claim on any attention from me.

But, under the circumstances, I owe it to the public to state the case as between Mr Barton and myself more fully than I have hitherto done. In my former letter, from an unwillingness to trespass too far on your space and to contradict Mr Barton's statements unnecessarily,

I confined myself to what I then considered sufficient for my defence, and passed over a great deal of Mr Barton's letter unnoticed. Mr Barton did not suggest to me, either directly or indirectly, either himself personally at any interview, or through a third party, that "a petition should be drawn up and sent to each of the congregations for signature; and that each of them should be presented to the Council by the members sitting for the respective districts." We had no interview in reference to the drawing up of a petition; nor had we any conversation to that effect. Before our first interview, the Dunedin petition had been drawn up and signed.

Mr Barton had two interviews with me, and only two. I sought the first for the purpose of asking him to present the petition of the Dunedin Catholics, which had been already prepared; and on that occasion the conversation, which Mr Barton denies, did most certainly take place.

The second interview was sought by Mr Barton himself; and on this occasion he asked me to use my influence for him in the Lakes District, for the representation of which he said he intended to be a candidate. The conversation between us during this interview, as given in my former letter, is undoubtedly true in every particular. It need not, therefore, be repeated now. But towards the close of this conversation, I did go over from the fire-place, where we had been sitting, to the wall on which there was a list of members who had voted against our most just claims and absented themselves from the division without cause, and said, "There is a list of our enemies. In every contested election we shall vote against these, no matter who may be their opponents; and though we are not strong enough to put in friends, we are in many or most places strong enough to keep out these—our enemies."

As to the meeting said to have been held in St. Joseph's School-house, I must say I never heard there had been such a meeting. I do not believe there was such a meeting. On the evening of the day of the election, at 8 o'clock, there was a meeting of the Tablet Company in St. Joseph's School-room; and whilst the first comers were waiting for the arrival of a sufficient number of shareholders to constitute a legal meeting, the conversation turned on the event of the day. I was present, and told those who were in the room and called to listen, what I have stated in this and my former letter in reference to the two interviews I had with Mr Barton, and our conversations during these interviews. But this could have had no influence on an election that had been decided several hours previously.—I am, &c.,

† P. MORAN.

Monday, May 11.

## THE LATE REV. FATHER NORRIS.

AUCKLAND, April 28.

You will see from the Auckland daily papers, that on Sunday last, the Catholics of Auckland and the Thames, had a most painful and solemn duty to perform, in following to the grave a young, zealous and much beloved pastor, the Rev James Norris. The rev gentleman, from all accounts has fallen a victim to his unwearied and laborious efforts to promote the spiritual interests of his people. His health gave way, and after a violent and painful illness of a few days, he passed peacefully to his rest, and, as we may piously hope, to his eternal reward. His last moments were passed as became a faithful minister of Christ in such a manner as to show to all around him that his heart was full of faith, hope, and charity, and that he was perfectly resigned to the will of God. He received the Sacrament of Extreme Unction, but on account of a difficulty in swallowing, and the instability of his stomach, the Blessed Sacrament was not administered to him. His remains were removed into the Cathedral, from the friend's house in which he died. The numbers seen kneeling in prayer around his coffin, and the tears which many shed, attested the reverence and affection which were so universally felt for him in life, and their grief at his premature death. When the painful moment at last came in which his remains were to be removed from the Cathedral for interment, the grief of some of those who had known him most intimately, and had shared in his pious labours on behalf of the young, was most intense, and found vent in a flood of tears. The Very Rev. Father Fynes, acting for Bishop Croke, in his absence delivered a funeral oration on the occasion. He evidently spoke from the heart, and to the hearts of his hearers. The funeral was the largest ever seen in this city, and probably in the Colony. When we see a zealous, able, and exemplary priest thus suddenly cut off in the flower of his age, we may well say that God's ways are past finding out. But we know that everything is wisely and well ordered by Heaven. We can no longer see Father Norris's face, nor listen to his counsels; but God has not left us without other faithful pastors, and we would do well to hear and obey their voices while they remain with us. When a good shepherd like Father Norris is thus removed, it must be regarded as a chastisement inflicted upon us, his flock, by the hand of God, and intended for our correction and special warning. "Blessed are the dead who die in the Lord."—R.I.P.

## THE FRANKLIN ELECTION.

### MR STAFFORD AT NELSON.

MR TROUPE has been defeated; but he was supported by 120 electors—a most respectable number, and under all the circumstances much greater than could have been expected. His successful competitor, Mr May, only polled 180. It is believed by many that the Catholics, if they had only united themselves moderately, could have secured Mr Troupe's return, in concert with those Protestants who are advocates for what Mr Disraeli calls "faith and freedom."

The Catholics of Franklin not only made no united effort to support him, but they, it is reported, did what was much worse—some of them at least. They sought to cast suspicion on the purity of his motives in coming forward to advocate their claims to justice in matters educational. This was most ungracious conduct on their part. Surely every man is entitled to have credit for good intentions in his words and acts till the contrary be proved against him.