

the Bible-in-schools clergy in New Zealand. And the upshot of the 'plan' would be this: that Catholic teachers would have no chance of employment by Committees who would permit the proposed scheme of religious instruction within working hours in the schools under their control. In other words, the common adoption of 'the Nelson plan' would inevitably lead to the general imposition of a religious test in the matter of appointments to schools. As for the conscience clause, all the talk about it is so much gammon and spinach.

(2) Neither is it any comfort to Catholic parents to be told that they would be under no obligation to send their children to the public schools except during the legal hours. All this supposes that (as in Balclutha and elsewhere) Catholic children would stand up at the beginning or in the middle of the extra hour and leave the school as naturally and with as little interference as at the mid-day recess. 'It takes but little experience with, or knowledge of, children to be certain that this cannot be done. There are two broad forms of compulsion, physical and moral. In Victoria, under such a scheme as is proposed for use in New Zealand, the religious rights of minorities have been violated with impunity and in an altogether flagrant way, and the 'May remain' of the Act of Parliament was over and over again interpreted 'Must remain.' We commend to the School Committees concerned the following warning words of our Hierarchy:—

'Even a 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.'

We Catholics have before our eyes the melancholy experience of the wholesale, shameless, and predetermined proselytism that was so long carried out, under the sham 'protection' of a 'conscience clause,' by visiting clergy in the National Schools of Ireland. We have before us the still later warning example of the State and Industrial Schools of Massachusetts. In view of the new menace to the faith of our little ones, the voice of the Catholic clergy and Catholic parents should be raised, and raised loud enough to be heard, wherever 'the Nelson plan' or any similar arrangement is mooted. Let the Committees formally and properly dismiss the schools under their control at any point they wish in the fifth hour; let the Catholic children 'be permitted to retire without taunt or interference'; then let the Bible-in-schools clergy have their innings. And we will wish them God-speed in the good work which they have so long and flagrantly neglected. But against such instruction in schools of mixed religion, during school hours—whether legal or non-legal—the voice of the Catholic body will ever be raised.

Notes

'Gambling'

The Rev. Dr. Gibb has sent to the 'N.Z. Times' (Wellington) one of his characteristic communications—that is to say, one that betrays not even a nodding acquaintance with the amenities of the 'Polite Letter-Writer.' The subject was 'Church and Charity Lotteries.' It is not a theme that in itself, or in the circumstances in which the pugnacious Doctor wrote, was calculated to provoke high controversial temperatures. But the good man's letter glows with the heat of an electric furnace, with which he endeavors to toast both the editor of the 'N.Z. Times' and the Catholic Church. Instead, he himself gets 'done brown' in an editorial comment which charges him with distortion,

misstatement, studious all-round offensiveness, and an epistolary style which sorely needs amendment. 'We could,' says the editor, 'probably teach the Rev. Dr. Gibb a good deal, including the arts of polite letter-writing and honest discussion.'

The emphatic Doctor has, apparently, not improved in his knowledge of, or manner towards, our co-religionists, since the days when we publicly convicted him, in the columns of the Dunedin secular press, of wholesale misrepresentation of the doctrines and practices of our Faith, of garbled and bogus 'quotations' from Catholic authors and divines, and of silly credulity in publishing a Munchausen story of diabolical papal duplicity, which he 'had' from somebody who knew somebody that had met somebody who thought that he had read something about it in the London 'Times' 'some fifteen years ago.' Dr. Gibb may be an authority of the first rank on the cut of a Moderator's frill. But we decline to accept him as a witness in regard to anything affecting Catholic faith or practice. As regards church and charitable lotteries, we Catholics have clear-cut and definitely stated principles. We claim the right to be judged by them. The Rev. Dr. Gibb and his ministerial confreres have no fixed principles on the subject which they call 'gambling.' They are marvelously shy about even defining their terms. 'Playing for a stake' and 'playing for money' are very protean terms. We have more than once pointed out that they cover actions which are almost as different in intent and effect as a friendly dig in the seventh rib and an angry stroke of a twelve-inch bowie-knife; as ha'penny euchre and the staking of fortunes on one's 'fancy' in horse-flesh or on the trembling chances of rouge-et-noir. A gulf separates the injury done to God's honor, to the individual, to the family, to society, by the different forms of what is loosely termed 'gambling.' And it can serve no good to the crusade against a growing evil to pin the same label to them indiscriminately and damn them all to the bottom of the same deep pit of Tophet. Catholic teaching on the subject is, on the other hand, clear and unmistakable, and in full accordance with both Scripture and right reason. It has already been set forth more than once in our columns.

Official returns (see, for instance, those presented to Parliament on July 12, 1898) show that Dr. Gibb's own co-religionists in New Zealand are by no means all averse to church and charitable lotteries. Moreover, we would lay Lombard Street to a China orange that Dr. Gibb and many of his confreres have substantial 'gamblers' in life and fire insurances—nay, it is even within the bounds of blushing possibility that they may now and then in a quiet way 'do' a little on the Stock Exchange. The late Dr. Salmon, Provost of Trinity College, Dublin, was, we ween, a nobler Roman (we mean Protestant) than them all. A few years ago his praises were sounded in Dunedin by Dr. Gibb, through a fog-horn letter to the press. Now if our Wellington friend turns to MacDonnell's 'Life of Archbishop Magee' (Anglican) he will find there a letter by the late Provost of Trinity, in which the writer says: 'One form of betting is recognised as a prudential duty. I mean life assurance. You bet with an assurance company that you will die; they bet you will live—and you are well pleased to lose your bet. Betting is, you say, buying a chance; but suppose that each 'would rather have the chance than the price to be paid for it, why not? Two boys want to see a show. Each has only half the price of admission. If they toss up, one of them has his wish; if they don't, neither. If people take tickets at a bazaar, no one feels the loss of a shilling for a ticket, but if the object to be raffled for is pretty, the winner may feel the gain as much. A clergyman once at a bazaar, when I professed to be shocked at his having a raffle, declared that he did it

J. TAIT, Monumental Sculptor

273 Cashel Street West, CHRISTCHURCH.

{ just over Bridge
and opposite ...
Drill Shed
..... }

Manufacturer and Importer of Every Description of Headstones, Cross Monuments, &c. ... in Granite, Marble, and other stones.