

gological (training) action of home and church and school—each acting and reacting on the child in its own proper measure and way, and all on uniform principles. In other words, religion and religious training should enter into all the processes of education.’

Mr. Balfour is still, as he has always been, a champion of the rights of parents; and his vindication of their claim to a say on the subject of the religious instruction of their children is certainly not the least effective portion of his address. We quote from the report in the *Daily News* of March 24. ‘I have always looked forward,’ he said, ‘to the time when it would be found possible to give in our public elementary schools that teaching to every child or to the great majority of the children—for no system can be quite perfect—the religious teaching which the parents of that child desire. It is to that goal I look forward. That is the only solution which seems to me perfectly consistent both with our own ideas of religious liberty, with our ideas of parental responsibility, and with that fundamental doctrine in which all in this room are agreed—namely, that it is a misfortune for any child to be brought up without any religious knowledge whatever. If the individual parent unhappily chooses to say of his own child that he thinks religion a corrupting influence, that he would rather not have his child taught religion—well, then, we must acquiesce. But do not let us frame our system so as to make religious teaching difficult; do not let us frame our system so as to produce the fantastic illusion that there is such a thing as undogmatic religion. Let us frankly face the situation; let us frankly face the fact that Christians, though the things on which they agree are far more important than the things on which they disagree, yet they disagree—and parents desire their children to be brought up in accordance with one or other of the denominations. Let us frame our system in such a manner that these legitimate wishes of the parent can be effectively carried out in the case of the vast majority of the children of this country.’ What is this vindication of parental rights and parental responsibility but an echo of the traditional Catholic teaching as set forth, for example, in a manifesto issued by the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand some seven years ago. ‘The duty of the physical, intellectual, moral, and religious growth and development of the child,’ says the manifesto, ‘falls primarily and by right upon those who were the immediate cause of its existence—namely, upon its parents. This is a dictate of the Natural Law, of which God is the Author. It is, moreover, to parents, and not to the Civil Power or to School Boards, that God’s positive command was also given to train up their children to “fulfil all that is written in the Law.” (Deuteronomy xxxii., 46; see also Eph. vi., 4). These rights of parents and the Christian Church are not a civil grant. They are rights of the Creator, against which no man and no human organisation has any rights. . . . They can neither be surrendered nor taken away, and every Government is bound to respect them by the very law which justifies its own existence.’ And the political bearing and practical application of these principles were thus outlined by Mr. Balfour in a speech in the House of Commons when introducing his Education Bill of 1902: ‘Whatever may be the origin of the present state of things, we have as a community repudiated responsibility for teaching a particular form of religion; we equally assume responsibility for teaching secular learning. As we have thus left to the parent the responsibility in this matter surely we ought, in so far as we can consistently with the inevitable limitations which the practical necessities of the case put upon us, make our system as elastic as we can in order to meet the wishes of the parent. I do not stand here to plead for any particular form of denominational religion. I do stand here to say that we ought as much as we can to see that every parent gets for his child the kind of religious education he desires.’ That is the principle which found expression in Mr. Balfour’s Act, and which is in operation in the Mother Land to-day—why, and oh why, should it be impossible of application in tiny New Zealand?

Tercentenary Utterances

The members of the L.O.L. who—in response to an official summons by advertisement—attended the Protestant Bible tercentenary celebrations in Knox Church on Tuesday

of last week must have been sadly disappointed. To the credit of all concerned, the ‘anti-Rome’ note was not in the least in evidence, there being only one speaker who came within even remote distance of reflecting on the Catholic Church. The Rev. P. W. Fairclough, whose lot it was to speak on the precursors of the ‘Authorised Version,’ implied, though he by no means stated, that in pre-Reformation times knowledge of the Bible was almost a minus quantity, and that the Church on the whole was opposed to the translation of the Scriptures into the vernacular. Incidentally Mr. Fairclough made the remarkable statement that ‘in such times *The Conformities of St. Francis* made the saint equal with Christ, and preachers declared that St. Thomas A’Becket was more merciful than the Saviour.’ This may be taken as a fair illustration of that historical fable which, as Newman showed half a century ago, is the basis of the general Protestant view of the Catholic Church. Readers of the *Lectures on the Present Position of Catholics in England* will remember the parallel instance cited by Newman, and how completely the historical misstatement was exploded and exposed when original authorities were consulted. Such reputable historians as Mosheim, Jortin, Maclaine, Robertson, White, and Hallam, had all stated that in the seventh century Catholics were taught that true Christianity consisted in merely coming to church, paying tithes, burning candles, and praying to the saints; and in support of the statement they quoted a sentence from a sermon by Eligius, an obscure saint of the day. Mosheim had been the first to make the allegation and quotation, and each of the others had simply passed the tradition on without ever troubling to verify the statement. It was not till 1833 that it occurred to the Protestant Dean of Durham, Dr. Waddington, who was engaged in publishing an Ecclesiastical History at the time, to consult St. Eligius himself. The result came with something of a shock to the man who had pinned his faith to the great name of Mosheim. ‘It was with great sorrow and some shame,’ he wrote, ‘that I ascertained the treachery of my historical conductor,’ that is, Mosheim. ‘The expressions cited by Mosheim,’ he continues, ‘and cited, too, with a direct reference to the *Spicilegium* in which the sermon is contained, were forcibly brought together by a very unpardonable mutilation of his authority. They are to be found, indeed, in a Sermon preached by the Bishop, but found in the society of so many good and Christian maxims, that it had been charitable entirely to overlook them, as it was certainly unfair to weed them out and heap them together, without notice of the rich harvest that surrounds them.’ Amongst the maxims thus referred to are the following:—‘Wherefore, my brethren, love your friends in God, and love your enemies for God, for he who loveth his neighbor hath fulfilled the law. He is a good Christian who believes not in charms or inventions of the devil, but places the whole of his hope in Christ alone . . . who has no deceitful balances or deceitful measures, . . . who both lives chastely himself, and teaches his neighbors and his children to live chastely and in the fear of God.’ After citing a large number of similar passages, Dr. Waddington adds: ‘The impression which Mosheim, by stringing together certain sentences without any notice of the context, conveys to his readers, is wholly false; and the calumny is not the less reprehensible, because it falls on one of the obscurest saints in the Roman calendar.’ The Rev. Mr. Fairclough has evidently trusted to similarly unreliable historical conductors; and if he will take the trouble to look up original authorities, he will find how egregiously his guides have blundered.

As to the other notion—that the Reformation restored the Bible to the people—it is little wonder that Mr. Fairclough only ventured to hint, and not to assert; for never was there a fable more utterly groundless nor more easily exposed. Before Luther’s pretended discovery of the Bible, the Catholic Church had printed over 100 editions of the Latin Bible, which means many thousands of copies; and it is to be remembered that in those days all who could read, read Latin, and even preferred to read a Latin Bible than one in their own language. In German there were 27 editions before Luther’s Bible appeared. In Italian there were over 40 editions of the Bible before the first Protestant edition appeared. There were two in Spain by 1515. In French there were 18 editions by 1547; the first Protes-

“Drunken at e’en, drouthy in the mornin’.”—the best substitute for Glenlivet is Hondai-Lanka Tea.

“If ye brew weel, ye’ll drink the better.” Hondai-Lanka Tea well brewed is fit drink for princes.