

his doing so, it should not deprive him of his means of livelihood without giving him substantial pecuniary compensation. A short time limit is no equivalent for such compensation. Whether the whole amount of the compensation should come from the State, or whether a part should be contributed by the hotels whose business is increased by the closing of others, is a question well worthy of the consideration of statesmen.'

Consumption

Many years ago, while yet a slender student, we explored full many a charming nook of what are, perhaps, the most interesting provinces of France—Normandy and Brittany. We were partly in search of health, and partly (paradoxical as it may seem) upon the track of the many 'maladreries' or 'leproseries' (leper-houses) that were dotted over those two fair provinces in the middle ages. In the neighborhood of Caen alone we, with the friendly aid of a local archaeologist, prowled around the ruins or the bare sites of some thirteen of those leper-homes, and in the famed old library of Bayeux came across some of the quaint regulations of a bygone day for the detection and isolation of the hapless ones that were stricken with this 'most ancient and most human of all diseases.'

Leprosy long lay like a sullen pall of death over both Continental and insular Europe. Great colonies of its specific microbe settled in every country, and their burrowing industry made that 'living death' as familiar, perhaps, as the consumption scourge is in our day. Yet hygiene has banished leprosy so effectually from among Caucasian peoples that to-day it is scarcely known among them except in Norway, and here and there in Iceland, Finland, New Brunswick, the West Indies, and a few of the countries that are washed by the blue waters of the Mediterranean. Leprosy still has the strong and savage grip of a Giant Blunderbore upon the slant-eyed yellow man and the dusky Polynesian of Hawaii. But among white-skinned peoples the disease is well in hand and dying out—chased to the outer fastnesses of habitation by the conquering march of Queen Hygeia. It is no longer the crowned king of terrors that it was once upon a time—in the days of the joust and tourney, and of doctors of the school of old Sangrado. Some day—and there are, perhaps, those already born of woman that may see that day—consumption may be banished in like manner to the wild and woolly places of the world. New Zealand has waked up and is taking a hand in the campaign. Last week Invercargill joined hands with Wellington and Christchurch and Wanganui. And so the good cause, like John Brown's soul, goes marching along. The open-air treatment has extracted the poison of death from the shaft of tuberculosis. The man and woman seized by consumption need no longer order their coffins. But it is of prime importance to the country that the full curative treatment be placed, and in good time, within easy reach of every tubercular patient, and especially of the poor. And let our Health Department organise and continue a relentless campaign against the various modes by which the colonies of bacilli are spread around. Chief and most pestiferous among these is the spitting habit. Aulus Gellius tells of a place in ancient Rome where spitting was unlawful—'ubi spuere non licebat.' The eye of the compound microscope had not then pried out the secrets of minute life. But the law was a good one and deserves the flattery of extended imitation in our bacteriological day.

That 'Conscience Clause'

We have read somewhere of one of Nelson's officers who was so keen and wide awake that he could scent an enemy's dodge ten miles off. One does not need so much penetration—or, indeed, much sharpness of wit—to know that the so-called 'conscience clause' of the Bible-in-schools leaders is merely a dodge to mislead the unwary voter as to the true character of the movement to introduce a Protestant version of an

emasculated Bible, on Protestant lines, into the public school curriculum of New Zealand. We have said full many a time that the proposed 'conscience clause' would afford no protection either to teacher or pupils. In our editorial columns we have already pointed out the open, wholesale, and deliberately pre-intended proselytism of Catholic children that was carried out in the Irish National Schools under the 'safeguards' of a 'conscience clause.' The revolt against using the public schools 'as an instrument of conversion' (these are Archbishop Whateley's words) produced one interesting result: The Irish National system rapidly developed, in practice, into a scheme of separate schools for Catholics and Protestants. That movement has been steadily gaining ground ever since. In 1867, for instance, 39 per cent. of the Irish National Schools were used exclusively by Catholics or exclusively by Protestants. In 1881 the schools of unmixed religion had risen to 44.9 per cent. of the total; in 1887 to 50.6 per cent.; in 1891 to 54.3 per cent.; and so onwards in a regularly progressive increase till, in 1900 (the last date for which we have returns before us) 64.4 per cent. (over 64 in every 100) of the National schools in Ireland were absolutely 'unmixed,' while an overwhelming percentage of the remainder were practically 'unmixed.' The man who runs may read the lesson.

In this connection we may quote the following passage from the first Manifesto of our Bishops on the Bible-in-schools scheme:—

(2) 'At least one State of the Australian Commonwealth—namely, Victoria—furnishes (as the late Royal Commission's report abundantly shows) plentiful evidence of the flagrant manner in which the religious rights of minorities may be violated with impunity in public schools, despite the provisions of Acts of Parliament and the pretended protection of this form of conscience clause. (3) Even the scrupulous observance of an ideal conscience clause by teachers would still leave Catholic children exposed to a serious measure of moral pressure or compulsion to remain for Protestant religious instruction—namely, to the jeers and insults of their companions and to the other forms of social martyrdom which children know so well how to inflict on those whom they deem foreign to their modes of thought and action. Catholic pupils in State schools would, in a word, be placed between these two alternatives—proselytism, or penalties to which no children should be exposed.'

Here is a timely comment on the latter portion of the quotation just given. It is from an article by a Canadian Protestant journalist, Mr. E. W. Thomson, of Ottawa, in the 'New Freeman,' of St. John's, New Brunswick. Mr. Thomson is speaking from personal experience when he refers to 'that "you be d—d" air' with which Catholic children are treated in many of the public schools of Canada. He says:—

'In many a Canadian public school some boys of the creed majority are sure to apply foul taunts to those of the creed minority. No supervision by teachers can prevent this. The vilified boys seldom tell. They may retort in kind, or fight, or keep silence, for fear of worse happening to them later. I well remember Catholic boys at several public schools of my youth being taunted as "Dogans," "Papists," compelled to hear the Mass reviled, insulted in every way conceivable by young savages of the hostile persuasion. The young savages were not irretrievably bad, they were merely boys untrammelled by so much civilisation as some few boys obtain early. Sometimes they were promptly "swatted" by other boys of their own faith, generous spirits who happened to be fond of one or more of the boys or girls assailed. Oftener the evil example was imitated, and wholly unrebuked. This sort of thing breeds some personal and creed hatreds that last as long as life.'

The same evil tendency has manifested itself time and again in these younger lands, and our Bishops were speaking by the book when they told of 'the jeers and insults' and 'the other forms of social martyrdom' to which Catholic children would be subjected in public schools if they were to be turned into sectarian institutions.