

In this battle for Faith and Morality, for Truth and Justice, the Victorian Catholics are ably led by their Bishops. In his Lenten Pastoral, Archbishop GOULD writes as follows: "They meet our opposition to the intolerance and unscrupulousness with which they endeavour to degrade public education, with abuse, vituperation, and misrepresentation. This, however, is characteristic of the opponents of religion. The course of public instruction carried out in our schools could only be objected to on one ground—namely, that the young were taught to believe in God, and to love and serve Him. This is the only objection made in public by the Secularists against the system of Denominational Education as carried out in Catholic schools. The Secular instruction therein imparted more than satisfied all reasonable expectations. It stood successfully the severe test of Governmental inspection and examination. This is evident from the reports of Inspectors not favorable to Denominational education, and from absence of all complaint on the part of parents. . . Religion and Secular instruction ought not be separated. . . Man must know more than how to make money and intrigue for power. To be a loyal and good citizen, he needs a knowledge of God—of right and wrong."

The new Bishop of Ballarat, the Most Rev. Dr. O'CONNOR, in a letter in answer to a leader in the 'Courier' of that city, very ably defends parental rights against the encroachment and tyranny of the State, and refutes the arguments of Secularists in reference to their fundamental principles. The first claim made for the State by Secularists is that the duty of educating children belongs inherently to the State. This Doctor O'CONNOR denies. "I affirm," he says, "that the duty of the educating of children does not belong inherently to the State; but that it primarily and directly falls on the parent. Here, then, he continues, we are fundamentally at issue. I assign the duty of education to the parent as his undoubted obligation, and his alone." This is true doctrine, for both by the Natural and Divine law, the duty of providing for the corporal, moral, and religious wants of the child belongs to the parent alone, and he alone is responsible for the discharge of the duty confided to him. Having stated this principle, which is undoubted, the Bishop of Ballarat argues thus, "The superstructure of legislation on this point should be based on *parental commission* and delegation. If the State commission proceed on any other basis, it assumes an authority which it does not rightfully possess, and by the violence it inflicts on the *parents' rights*, it loses all binding force in conscience.

His reasoning is logically unassailable, and it is also, as Dr. O'CONNOR clearly shows from the authority of BLACKSTONE, in accordance with the primary principles of English law. "BLACKSTONE," in his 'Commentary,' speaking of Municipal law, says, "that if it be opposed to Natural and Divine law it is so far invalid." We cannot do better than give the conclusion of the Bishop's reasoning on this point in his own words. "The relations of parent to child, and of child to parent, come directly from the Natural and Divine law, and, as such, directly are the object of these laws; and, therefore, to avoid collision and contradiction, cannot be referred to the category of the 'things which are Caesar's,' and that directly and properly belong to his domain. Since, then, as we say, the responsibility of education devolves, as of right, upon the parent, if the State legislate on the subject at all, it should do so from the presumed consent of the parents who are unable to provide by themselves, out of their scanty means, that education which their conscience tells them their children should receive. Hence, it follows that only *incidentally*, that is in cases of defect or inability of parents, the State can rightfully come in with a scheme of education at the public expense. Hence, also, the State should not open and equip schools at the public expense, meeting the educational requirements of all classes of society, rich as well as poor, and giving to all education *gratuitously*. Such arrangements would press unfairly on the poor who would justly complain that by taxation they had to pay for what the rich man was well able himself to pay for. The poor equitably depend, in legislation, upon the richer members of the community, but not *vice versa*. Hence, too, it follows that when the State takes up the duty of education for parents who are badly able to discharge the duty themselves, it shall provide such an education as the parents *conscientiously* approve of."

To the answer of Secularists who reply that the State legislates for temporal interests, and leaves to representatives of religion the task of providing for the spiritual interest, the Bishop says, "To this argument I answer that it fails to justify the action of the State, because it assumes that it is

quite practicable to separate the two elements without either suffering by the process. As well (I shall just now show) might SHYLOCK expect to extract the pound of flesh from the body of the debtor, without further injury to his person, as the State could separate in education the temporal from the religious interests without the latter being injured by the operation."

Secularists never tire of repeating a stock argument to this effect—that if the Governments aid Denominational schools, they are, *ipso facto*, endowing religion. This argument the Bishop of Ballarat designates as foolish, and indeed it is so. It hardly deserves a serious answer. But we may be permitted to set down here His Lordship's words: "If the Government acted as you wish, it would be endowing the Catholic religion again. This is a foolish observation. The Government would be only endowing and paying for the fruits of *Secular* knowledge, that would be produced in our schools. It might as well be argued that the State is endowing the Catholic Church because it pays some Catholic civil servants, whose money goes in part to the support of that church."

From the above it will be seen that the agitation for justice in the matter of education, is vigorously carried on in Victoria. Catholics are providing schools for themselves as rapidly as possible. Public writers and speakers of position and great ability, are contributing to enlighten and inform public opinion. Catholics are steadily holding aloof from Secular schools—will have none of them—and a burning sense of injustice and of the affront put upon them by a rampant majority, insolent in the mere superiority of numbers, is sinking deep into the souls of tens of thousands of intelligent, brave, and determined men. Everything promises well for the success of the agitation. Even the opponents of the Catholics must soon come to see that it is sheer persecution to force them to pay for what they will not have, and for what they not only abhor because it is the fruit of injustice and tyranny, but also because they believe it to be most injurious to the well-being of the community. We, here in New Zealand, whilst taking courage from beholding the attitude of Victorian Catholics, may learn a lesson as to tactics, which will be useful.

REGISTER! REGISTER! REGISTER!

We would remind our readers that the time within which they can register their claims to be placed upon the electoral rolls of the colony is fast drawing to a close. The 31st of the present month is the last day on which claims can be received. The vital importance to Catholics of being able to vote for the representatives of the people in Parliament must be felt by everyone, and we sincerely trust that those among our readers who have not yet sent in their claims will lose no more time in doing so. A general election must of necessity take place after the next session of the Assembly, and as many most important questions—chief among them the great question of education—are sure to occupy the attention of the new Parliament, any Catholic would be culpable in the highest degree if through laziness or carelessness he rendered himself incapable of influencing the decisions of the Legislature upon matters affecting so seriously the interests of himself, his children, and his fellow-colonists.

NEWS OF THE WEEK.

HIS HONOR MR. JUSTICE CHAPMAN will retire at the end of the present month from the Supreme Court Bench to enjoy a well-earned pension and dignified repose. Towards the end of last week His Honor stated in Court that he had some time ago intimated to the Government that he was desirous of retiring from the Bench, and had sent in his official resignation on the 22nd February last. He had just received a reply from the Government, the following portion of which he would read:—"Colonial Secretary's Office, Wellington, March 6th, 1875.—Sir,—I have the honor to inform you that your Honor's letter of the 22nd February, intimating your desire to resign your office as a puisne Judge of the Supreme Court of New Zealand as from the 31st of March inst., has been laid before His Excellency the Governor, and that His Excellency will be prepared to accept your resignation at the date indicated by yourself."

MESSES W. J. M. LARNACH, J. Scoular, and G. F. Reid were elected local directors of the New Zealand Shipping Company at a meeting of the Otago shareholders held on Monday last.

THE Committee formed in Auckland for the purpose of raising a testimonial to the late Mr. Williamson, Superintendent of the Province, has issued lists inviting subscriptions to be invested as follows:—1. To provide an income for Mrs. Williamson for life, and after her decease for Miss Williamson, if she should survive. 2. After the de-