

the assent of the Crown. And the Catholic bishops in the Australian colonies were thus placed in a position similar to that of bishops of the Church of England. This religious equality is guaranteed for all time by one of the fundamental articles of the Commonwealth Constitution, which forbids the establishment of any State or official Church within the limits of its jurisdiction.

Differences as to precedence cropped up in 1864, 1868 (during the visit of the Duke of Edinburgh), and on a few subsequent occasions. These arose for the most part out of a desire on the part of some to extend to Australia the traditions of religious ascendancy which had grown up around the State Church in England. These difficulties were, however, arranged by the Colonial Office with due regard to the equal rights of those concerned. By virtue of this arrangement Cardinal Moran was entitled to precedence of the Anglican Primate not alone by reason of his higher dignity, but by priority of appointment—he having been translated to Sydney from the See of Ossory in 1884, while Dr. Saumarez Smith was not elected and consecrated Bishop of Sydney till 1890. (We may here incidentally remark that Cardinal Moran is the successor of Dr. Polding, the first bishop of any Church that was ever appointed to a see in Australasia.) The cable messages in Saturday's and Monday's daily papers show that Sir W. J. Lyne was aware that the Committee of Management of the Commonwealth celebrations had blundered; that the well-known rules of precedence laid down by the Colonial Office were set at defiance; and that the Government of New South Wales, when acquainted with the mistake, had not the good sense or moral courage to rectify it, and, in plain terms, deliberately deprived Cardinal Moran of the honor which the Home authorities long ago decided was 'due to his position.' Monday's cable messages add the following significant bit of information:—'Cardinal Moran claims that the Home Government had communicated to Lord Hopetoun the order of precedence, in which the Cardinal was allotted a place of honor above the Primate.'

Had Cardinal Moran stood alone and merely to himself in this affair, it would probably have mattered little to him what place he occupied at the Commonwealth celebrations. But his position was that of chief representative of a great and ancient religious denomination, the members of which have done so much to build up the Commonwealth. Moreover, a serious question of principle was involved in this matter of precedence—nothing less, in fact, than the principle of religious equality. This—together with certain rights attaching to it that have long been recognised by the Colonial Office—has been deliberately violated by the Lyne Government. Had Cardinal Moran and the other Australian Catholic prelates acquiesced in the intentional slight thus cast upon their faith, their action would be used as a precedent to justify the unequal social treatment of their Church in the Commonwealth for all future time. They, therefore, deserve the thanks of the Catholic body everywhere for their firmness in thus maintaining, on the very inaugural day of the new Commonwealth, that principle of religious equality which is set in in the corner-stone of its foundation. This principle cannot be too strongly emphasised in a country in which the Catholic Church was for so long a period the object of such a bitter and relentless persecution. But on the Lyne Government lies the heavy disgrace of having marked the inauguration of the Australian Commonwealth with a display of petty religious partisanship which is no good omen for its future harmony and peace.

## THE STOKE CASES.

### FACTS TO BEAR IN MIND.

BY 'WATCHFUL.'

I HAVE read with great pleasure the able résumé of the Stoke 'man-hunt' in the TABLET of the 20th ult. Accurate as it is as far as it goes, there are still some facts which the Catholics of New Zealand should know, and I propose to place these before your readers.

The great outcry which has been raised about the affair—despite all the protestations to the contrary—is due, not so much to solicitude for the orphan children, as to religious bigotry and political malevolence. If the Nelson Charitable Aid Board did not desire to introduce the religious element, it is not a little remarkable that Messrs. Harley and Rout specially invited Mr. Jessie Piper to accompany them on their philanthropic raid. Mr. Piper is an Orangeman whose animus against the Stoke institution—indeed against everything Catholic—is notorious in Nelson. Again, it is not a little curious that a batch of the boy-witnesses against the Brothers were provided with special accommodation at a Wesleyan conventicle, while a local parson delivered himself of a vile diatribe against the Catholic Church. If any doubt exists as to the part played by the

NO-POPERY ELEMENT.

in this wretched business, it should be dispelled by the fact that at a public meeting in Nelson—addressed by pious parsons and by

freethought oracles who hate the parsons, but unite with them in hating their common enemy, the 'Scarlet Woman'—an individual calling himself 'a minister of the Church of Christ' got off an attack on Catholic convents and religious Orders worthy of the drunken adventurer Slattery himself. As a matter of fact Slattery—unfortunately for his purse and fame—came among us too soon. Had he come to Nelson since the Stoke affair he would be lionised in such a manner as to put our returning troopers in the background, and he would probably be requisitioned to contest the Parliamentary representation of Nelson city.

### THE ANTI STOKE PRESS.

Allusion is made in your article to the conduct of the Nelson *Evening Mail*, whose efforts to stir up feeling have been worthy of the vilest specimens of the gutter and garbage Press. But while, generally speaking, the Press of the Colony has treated the affair with becoming moderation, there are one or two papers whose attitude has been equally as reprehensible as that of the *Evening Mail*. I allude particularly to the *Wellington Post*. This paper professes Liberalism, like many of the Continental sectaries, and, while it pats its Catholic readers on the back now and then—chiefly by some flattering reference to Ireland—it more frequently displays the cloven hoof of rabid sectarianism. Now we have a veiled reference to the pernicious influence of religious orders in France; to-morrow we shall probably read a labored editorial on Spanish decadence and the evil influence of ecclesiasticism in Spain. The Stoke affair was a veritable godsend to this journalistic pillar of anti-Catholic intolerance, chiefly because the *Post* hoped to injure the Premier thereby. One leading article contained a most insulting reference to the Church, and the writer dared to say that members of Parliament were afraid of offending 'a great and powerful Church' by probing the Stoke affair to the bottom. Later on, when the little coterie of political 'yellow pups' thought they had succeeded in withdrawing all monetary aid from Catholic industrial schools, the *Post* gleefully whooped that 'the fate of private industrial schools was sealed.' I have seen a journalistic bigot brought to his knees before to-day, and if the Catholics of Wellington were of my way of thinking, they would teach the *Evening Post* a lesson which would compel it to refrain from gratuitously insulting them in the future.

Even if all the attacks made on the Stoke school were borne out by fact,

### NO FAIR-MINDED MAN

would condemn the Catholic community therefor. Scandals there have ever been, and will be again, and if isolated instances of human frailty are to be accepted as conclusive evidence against institutions, then what shall we say of the public schools of the Colony? I have known within recent years two cases of schoolmasters being dismissed for immoral conduct with girl-pupils. I have known three instances of a shameful disease breaking out among the children attending public schools. I have known a teacher, an elderly married man, to be dismissed for impropriety with a female pupil-teacher. What would those who never tire of boasting about 'our national system of education' say if Catholics were always dinning these scandals in their ears? The very reasonable reply would be that such instances did not necessarily condemn the system itself. Yet we have during the late session of Parliament seen professing Liberals anxious not merely to condemn beforehand the Brothers who have since been triumphantly acquitted, but leaving no effort untried to injure all Catholic institutions in New Zealand.

The specious story which these

### POLITICAL PANDERERS

will no doubt tell their Catholic constituents will be what the 'oute Mr. 'Tam' Mackenzie has since been careful to promulgate—that the State should found orphanages for the exclusive use of the several denominations. Granting, however, for argument's sake only, that such a school is practicable, what would its adoption at the present juncture amount to? It would be tantamount to a vote of censure on every Catholic orphanage in the Colony; it would practically mean that the good nuns and Brothers who, without even the poor reward of popular approbation, are devoting themselves to the care of the homeless and fatherless, are not doing their duty; it would be giving a coloring to the vile slanders of such depraved wretches as Slattery and some of his New Zealand prototypes. Yet this is precisely what an organised nest of bigots have attempted, and in which they were aided by some so-called Liberals who have time and again been glad to receive Catholic support.

In your article only one division list is published. Permit me to supply a few more, as showing who attempted last session to aggravate the grievances of the Catholic population, and who stood up for common fair-play. Let your readers turn to *Hansard* No. 28 of last session (page 172), and they will there find that

MR JOHN HUTCHESON,

one of the members for Wellington City, complained that children attending private schools were allowed free travel on the railways, although they passed State schools *en route*; and he moved to reduce the item 'Railway fares for school-children £3,300' by £1 as an indication that the House disapproved of this. There voted for his motion seven members: Messrs. Atkinson, A. L. D. Fraser, W. Fraser, Herries, Meredith, J. Hutcheson, and Pirani, while the following members—31 in all—voted against it: Messrs. E. G. Allen, Arnold, Barclay, Bennet, Buddo, Carroll, Collins, Duncan, Ell, Field, Graham, Hall, Hall-Jones, Laurensen, Lawry, McGowan, R. McKenzie, McLachlan, Mills, Morrison, Palmer, Parata, Rhodes, Seddon, Smith, Symes, Tanner, Ward, Witheford, Stevens, and Flatman. On the following page will be found

### ANOTHER INTERESTING DIVISION.

Mr. Meredith—political arch-priest of King Billy—moved to reduce the vote for private industrial schools: 'St. Mary's, Auckland; St. Joseph's, Wellington; St. Mary's Nelson; St. Vincent de Paul's,