

an audacious kind was openly professed. The priesthood was denied; Masses and purgatory were ignored; the Sacraments were described as nothing but outward signs; and the Eucharist as a memorial supper, without sacrificial character, figurative or real.' How could any Catholic Bishop endure this? Henry VIII. was even compelled to forbid under penalties the original annotated editions of Tyndale in 1543. 'The Bible, as edited by Cranmer,' says Froude on this event, 'was left untampered with; but a temporary limitation was imposed, perhaps wisely, on its indiscriminate use.' We have all read Henry's words to his Parliament in 1539: 'I am very sorry to know and hear how unreverently that most precious jewel, the Word of God, is disputed, rhymed, sung, and jangled in every alehouse and tavern.' He had 'intended his loving subjects to use the commodity of the reading of the Bible humbly, meekly, reverently, and obediently'; but quite other consequences speedily became visible, and private judgment started on its career towards the goal of unbelief which we now see it is attaining. These are considerations that throw light upon the decrees of the Council of Trent and the discipline long prevalent in face of a religious anarchy. But history shows that the Catholic Church first preserved Holy Scripture, has always protected it, and was willing to have it rendered into all languages, on condition that it should be devoutly handled and rightly interpreted. Any other reading of her action is false, ungrateful, and I hesitate not to say malicious. I leave, however, to abler pens the explanation and defence of Catholic policy after the great Revolt. It is enough for me, if I have proved that until Protestants by abusing the reading of the Bible had made it a pretext for heresies and divisions beyond counting, the first thought of ecclesiastics was to sanctify the printing-press, and to employ it in the multiplication not only of the Latin Vulgate, but of translations from it in the spoken languages of Christendom.

HOME RULE CONTROVERSY

AN EMPHATIC PROTEST

The following letter from the Very Rev. Father Price, Adm., Christchurch, appeared in the Christchurch Press of May 9:—

SIR,—As a constant reader of and subscriber to *The Press* for the past twelve years, I feel constrained to make an emphatic protest against your action in permitting from time to time anonymous writers to give expression in your columns to grossly unfair insinuations, and sometimes lying statements against our faith and the nationality of the vast majority of your Catholic readers. The latest insult you have given us is by inserting this morning in the most prominent page of your issue an article entitled 'Home Rule,' and signed by 'History,' which for its display of ignorance of the case he discusses, and fanatical prejudice against those differing from him, might almost be regarded in this particular branch of literature as a classic.

I must honestly confess that I have never come across anything in the New Zealand papers to equal in its offensiveness this particular diatribe. I do not propose to argue with 'History,' although I feel obliged by reason of the publicity that you have given his statements to traverse a few of the more glaring errors. My quarrel is with you, Sir, for having given his views the notoriety he craved for. An editor, you will say, does not hold himself responsible for the opinions expressed by correspondents. That is a proposition that I would 'distinguish,' as we say in school; opinions, even differing from our own, but held honestly and put forth in good taste, granted: opinions of the nature of 'History's,' grossly unfair in matter and objectionable in form, most emphatically, no! I do object to all this cant about Home Rule being a question relating to English politics only. Who says it is so? Who is to determine what questions have a local and what an Imperial interest? Are only Russians to pass judgment on the State of Finland, Prussians on that of Poland, and Belgians on the Congo atrocities (sic)? Millions of Irishmen throughout the world do claim to be heard on this subject. If I remember rightly, Sir, you are accustomed to express a like view on the occasion of every visit of Irish delegates to this Dominion. Colonial Statesmen and Parliaments have never hesitated to express an opinion on Home Rule—their opinion being generally an unanimous vote in its favour, transmitted through the proper channel to the Home Government. It seems to me one of the questions on which citizens in the oversea dominions are entitled and qualified to express an opinion.

Again, to take at random, another of 'History's' grievances, when is the Mayor of a city justified in pre-empting over a public meeting? Is he to wait until all sections of the community are in agreement on a particular measure? A late mayor welcomed to the city the delegates to the Conference of the Loyal Orange Society. Would 'History,' in view of the numerous propositions having for their aim the cementing of the ties of brotherhood between Catholics and Protestants, carried at the meeting at the Opera House on that Sunday afternoon, say that his late Worship, in welcoming the Orange delegates to

the city acted as 'the impartial representative of all citizens?'; I don't remember reading any letters of protest: even 'History' was silent. If the anti-Home Rulers of Christchurch were to engage the Theatre Royal and hold a meeting there in an orderly and decent manner, as we propose to do, we would not find fault with them.

'History,' with all modesty, would initiate Mr. Taylor into the real nature of the Home Rule movement. 'Home Rule means Rome Rule' has long since been regarded as an exploded canard. The Catholic Association exists only in the fertile imagination of your correspondent. I am well acquainted with a Society bearing that name in England, but it is non-political, its object being to organise pilgrimages and promote social reunions amongst its members. Of course the Catholic Church has a 'vast organisation'; it may have a 'larger service' than the Imperial or our own Government. *Quid inde?* One expects everything big in the Catholic Church. It is not true that the Bishops 'wink' at Catholic Secret Societies, if there be any such. The Scotch and Irish Bishops, and the Pope himself, have fearlessly condemned Catholic Societies whenever there was anything deserving of censure in their aims or methods. I have heard of A.P.A.'s and other alliances that would appeal to your correspondent, but I know of no such in the Catholic Church.

'Catholic ascendancy means the triumph of the Irish liquor traffic.' An impudent lie! Michael McCarthy is as much a Catholic as 'History,' Hocking, or any other distorter of everything Catholic. He is a renegade who makes his living by vilifying the Catholic Church in Ireland, and secures a wide circulation for his works by representing himself as a Catholic. 'Michael' and 'McCarthy' are names that have served him well in pushing the sale of his books. What does it matter to us in New Zealand, anyhow, who drinks more, the Irish Catholic or his Presbyterian brother? Isn't it largely a question of liver?

As regards 'Catholic intolerance,' Viceroys, past and present, statesmen, Anglican and Presbyterian clergymen, regard it as a bogey whether existing in the North or the South. If Catholics are in a majority on local boards, as the correspondent says, it only shows that they outnumber the non-Catholics in those particular districts. The Irish delegates, when they come, will tell us how many Irish Protestants represent Catholic constituencies, and how many Catholics represent Protestant constituencies. Everybody knows that all the leaders of the Irish movement in the past, excepting O'Connell, were Protestants.

Mr. Lloyd George's much-debated Budget met with opposition, as a financial statement might be expected to, on purely economic grounds. 'Saul among the Prophets!' I remember reading some time ago, with great pleasure, a letter in your columns, showing how our language was permeated with Biblical allusions and imagery. Would you consider 'History's' letter as exemplifying your remarks?—Yours, etc.,

THOS. W. PRICE, Administrator.

Catholic Cathedral, Christchurch, May 8.

Diocesan News

ARCHDIOCESE OF WELLINGTON

(From our own correspondent.)

May 13.

The Very Rev. Father O'Shea, S.M., V.G., is at present on a visit to Hawke's Bay.

The Rev. Father Barra, of Wanganui, who has been appointed assistant at St. Joseph's Church, Buckle street, arrived here last Tuesday.

The Rev. Father Quealy, of Palmerston North, who has been in indifferent health of late, left by the Warrimoo for Sydney yesterday.

About eighty children made their First Communion at St. Joseph's Church, Buckle street, on last Sunday, at the 7.30 o'clock Mass.

The new church-schoolroom at Brooklyn will be opened by his Grace Archbishop Redwood on the second Sunday in June.

The monthly meeting of the Newman Society took place in the Sussex Square Convent Schoolroom on last Sunday, there being a good attendance of members. A very interesting and able paper on Newman was read by the Rev. Father Bartley, S.M., M.A. The next meeting is to take place at St. Patrick's College on the first Sunday of June.

It is with regret that I record the death of Mr. Frank Minogue, a nephew of Mr. M. Kennedy, K.S.G., which occurred at Island Bay on last Sunday morning. The late Mr. Minogue was a resident of Napier, and came to Wellington for medical treatment some months ago. The funeral took place on Monday, and was attended by the members of the H.A.C.B. Society, the deceased being a member of the Napier branch. The Rev. Father G. Mahony, S.M., officiated at the church (St. Anne's) and at the graveside in the Mount Street Cemetery. A widow and one child are left to mourn their loss.—R.I.P.