

provocation, although we admit, he does do without a very happy result, that is, so far as anything more than the temporary misguidance of the mob is concerned. But let us take his word for it: Sir Henry Parkes had never in all his life before heard one syllable concerning the persecution of Catholics in England, or perhaps of the Irish penal laws either. We think it is quite possible after all; there is nothing in his career that need lead us to believe his education to have been anything remarkably brilliant or extensive. However, the fact of Sir Henry Parkes never having heard of this matter proves nothing more than the ignorance of Sir Henry Parkes; it by no means affords any reason to Catholics for regarding without alarm that system rightly denounced by Archbishop Vaughan as "the most ingeniously-devised piece of scientific persecution that has been invented in modern times." His Grace has most happily defined it, and neither flat, idle, scoffing, nor inane laughter can invalidate his description. Sir Henry continues to quote: "Here the plan is to strike at little children—at the helpless little children of the Catholic poor. Do you know that in the days of trial they had a special instrument for squeezing the life and blood out of those Catholics who declined to deny their God? It was a kind of press, with a screw at the top. The Catholic man or woman was shoved into this press, just large enough to hold one; the top was forced down with a screw, until it touched the head and back of the victim. Then the real operation began. By a slow, almost imperceptible process, the top was continually pushed further and further down till the victim first lost breath, then the frame gradually gave way, and the whole body collapsed into a mangled, bleeding mass." On this passage from his Grace's address the comments were as follows: "Well, that was beautifully drawn, that picture, and it was drawn for a purpose. The Archbishop went on to say that this was called the 'Scavenger's Daughter,' and then after a little more he went on to say, 'Well, using my private judgment in the choice of an expression, I would call these schools Scavengers' Daughters.' He had only troubled the House with reading this delightful picture of the 'Scavenger's Daughter' for the sake of a simile—these public schools of theirs were 'Scavengers' Daughters.' And the Archbishop went on to say, 'because they are the most effective instruments invented by man for squeezing very gradually and almost imperceptibly the Catholic faith out of a Catholic people.' Before he went further he must ask where were these circumstances in this country to justify language of this kind?—(Hear, hear.) Where was the slightest evidence of any attempt at persecution—where was the slightest evidence of any attempt to place the Roman Catholics in an exceptional position? What the State had done in the cause of education it had done with an open and a liberal and a wise aim; making no restriction, raising no impediment, creating no obstacle." Nevertheless the "circumstances" are there plain enough; Secularism and Catholicism cannot exist in combination, and to insist on the adoption of Secularism, and the consequent loss of Catholicism by Catholics is to persecute them. "And if it were the case that anyone suffered," continued Sir Henry, "his lot to suffer was deliberately chosen, and made up for himself. It could not for a moment be successfully maintained that the religion of any man or woman, or that of the child of any man or woman could depend upon the teaching which was added to the secular instruction in the primary schools.—(Cheers.) Catholic children must have Catholic mothers and Catholic fathers, they must have Catholic homes, Catholic clergymen; and if all these instrumentalities were futile and idle in preserving this religion, the admission meant too much.—(Cheers.) If this Catholic religion depended—and he was quite sure it did not depend—upon this teaching being added to the secular instruction in the schools, then, he said, that that carried with it an admission which was fatal to the vital admission of the sacred offices of the clergy of the Catholic Church." (Cheers.) Sir Henry, we fear, is but a poor exponent of religious duties. Suffering for conscience' sake must often wear the outward garb of suffering "deliberately chosen and made up for himself" by him who bears it. While the Protestant churches stood open to them in the old penal days, the Catholics who endured all loss rather than make use of them were sufferers of this class. But it will hardly be denied even by Sir Henry Parkes, if ever he does read their history, that they were the victims of a real persecution. The man who is openly fined for not attending Protestant worship, and the man who is virtually fined for not submitting his children to secular teaching suffer alike; their punishment may differ in degree, but it is the same in kind. Again we refuse to accept Sir Henry as a doctor of the Church: he is totally mistaken when he informs us that Catholics may dispense with the Catholic atmosphere with which they are bound at all times to surround their children. Catholic children must indeed have Catholic mothers, Catholic fathers, Catholic homes and Catholic clergymen, but they must also have Catholic schools; in no one respect can neglect of religion be admitted into their education, it is part and parcel of the "sacred offices of the clergy of the Catholic Church" to see that this is observed, how, then, can it be fatal to the vital admission of them? And now we come to a passage of that absurd and worthless argumentation, which seeks to establish the misconduct of certain indivi-

duals as the proper rule for the guidance of the community. We would ask as quite *apropos*, whether Catholics generally would be justified in the adoption of at least habits of polygamy because the late King Victor Emmanuel, for instance, had been the head of several more than questionable establishments? The argument of Sir Henry Parkes is akin to this. He said: "But they were told repeatedly in this pastoral that Catholic parents could not safely send their children to these public schools. Why, they knew that Catholics did send their children, not simply to these schools, but to strictly Protestant schools; and while this movement out of doors was going on now, the most eminent man of the Catholic Church, who took part in the large meeting at St. Mary's the other Sunday night, and advocated as a necessity for Catholicity that poor people should send their children only to Catholic schools, himself sent all his children to a Protestant school (Cheers.) And they knew, the matter could not be concealed—that the late Mr. Richard Kenna—who was always understood to be a most zealous Catholic—was so determined upon sending his children to the best school—whether it was Protestant or Catholic, or non-sectarian—that he resisted all the authority and all the mandates of the Church rather than give up the welfare of his beloved children.—(Cheers.) And when these gentlemen who moved in the most influential circles of the Catholic community could send their children with safety to Protestant or mixed schools, surely the poor—to whom a sound education to their precious children was more precious than all besides—might be permitted to send their children to a school where the teacher was trained to teach, and where the very law of the school was that there should be no attempt to tamper with the child's faith." All we find proved here is that the late Mr. Richard Kenna was not by any means the "zealous Catholic" he was "always understood to be," but quite the reverse; and that some gentleman whose name appears to be unknown, occupied under false pretences a prominent position at a meeting lately held at St. Mary's Cathedral, where he openly stultified himself. The gentleman referred to, more than any others, rich or poor, could not send their children to non-Catholic schools without endangering their children's faith, and themselves incurring a breach of obedience to their Church; and that is all that need be said on the subject. Sir Henry then goes on to inquire how it comes that it is lawful for Catholic teachers to teach in secular schools, when Catholic children are forbidden to attend them. We are no advocates for Catholics teaching in secular schools; but the principles of Catholic teachers are supposed to be fixed; it is not necessary that their calling should be religious, if they honestly perform duties not in themselves sinful, they are blamelessly occupied. And now let us conclude with something relating to the history which Sir Henry Parkes gives us to understand he has been made acquainted with. "But they were continually reminded," said he, "in these pastorals and in the speeches—the very temperate speeches delivered by members of Parliament at these meetings—(laughter)—that Roman Catholics were one-third of the population, he might be pardoned if he reversed the case; and suppose that Protestants were one-third of the population—(cheers)—and suppose the Archbishop and his other Bishops constituted two-thirds; and suppose, by reason of being a majority of the community, they were a majority in the Legislature—in the councils of the country, and they set up a school system—would the poor Protestants receive any more favourable terms than the Roman Catholics were receiving as it was? Would the Roman Catholic Church, with the sanction of Archbishop Vaughan, advise a system of payment by results for the Nonconformist citizens of this country? (Laughter and cheers.) He did not think the teaching of history—he thanked the member for West Sydney for teaching him that word—would answer him in the affirmative." This is mere bombast; the no-Popery cry skilfully adapted to the case. By what right does Sir Henry Parkes assume that Archbishop Vaughan and the other Bishops would act otherwise themselves than as they now demand that in justice Catholics shall be acted by? Where has there ever been an instance of the case Sir Henry Parkes proposes—a settled country, during peace at home and abroad, in which one-third of the people were Protestants, and yet were denied the right to educate their children in their own beliefs? In what country of the world, under any circumstances, has a case of the kind occurred? Protestants have, indeed, in Catholic countries been prohibited from setting up proselytizing schools for Catholic children, but the history that has taught Sir Henry Parkes his belief, if he holds it, has yet to be written. He carries it all about with him in his imagination, for the edification of the bigoted and ignorant. But, in any case, what kind of an argument do we find here in the mouth of a champion of liberty of conscience? "You," says he, "if you had the power, would oppress us, and therefore, since you have not the power, and are not likely to attain it, we will oppress you." Verily this is a strange argument to employ, and act upon too, in an enlightened community of the present day.

AN American paper describes a certain new religion just introduced by a gentleman at Osakona. Its adherents are invited to become as little children, so that they may have a claim to enter the Kingdom of Heaven, and to this end it is proposed to them to re-

AS LITTLE CHILDREN.