

Schoolmasters' (pp. 91-108). Hereunder I give, in summary form, an enumeration of the grievances alleged by Bishop Moran and his fellow-petitioners against the Otago provincial system:

(1) **FIRST GRIEVANCE.**—No objection was made by the petitioners against Christ or religion in the schools. (a) The grievance was this: That in a system for which Catholics as well as non-Catholics were taxed, provision was made for the religious training of Protestant children only, and none for Catholic children. The only religious instruction provided was Protestant 'mixed' and 'Protestant denominational.' The version of the Scriptures used was the Protestant one (*Appendix*, p. 90); it was interpreted by (almost exclusively) Protestant teachers in a Protestant sense. Said Bishop Moran (*Appendix*, p. 87): 'Distinct sectarian teaching, never Catholic, can take place, and does take place, in the Government schools. . . . Whilst it [the system] pretends to be unsectarian, it is intensely anti-Catholic, practically Presbyterian, and therefore denominational; in favor of one denomination, to the exclusion of others.' The Presbyterian *Shorter Catechism* was used in a number of the schools, and (*Appendix*, p. 89) Catholic children were not 'afforded the opportunity of religious instruction in consonance with their religious tenets.' (b) So far from making 'war' upon Christ and Christianity in the schools, Bishop Moran pleaded for a system of religious training therein which would 'do equal justice to all denominations' (*Appendix*, p. 85). 'I find,' said he (p. 85), 'in reference to this province in particular, from the public prints, that leading members of the several Protestant denominations are either satisfied with the present [system] or would be satisfied with the purely secular one; this being the case, the community practically resolves itself into two denominations—the Roman Catholic on the one side, and all the other denominations on the other. What I would propose, therefore, is, shortly, this: Recognise the claim of Catholic schools to aid wherever there is a sufficient number of scholars, and the character of the secular education satisfactory to the inspector, and that there be an honest conscience clause obligatory in all schools' (*Appendix*, p. 85). Here we have Bishop Moran making 'war' upon Christ and religion in the public schools by offering to hand them over, on two easy conditions, to the Protestant denominations to teach therein whatsoever religion or non-religion that might seem good in their sight. There is not a word about all this either in the articles of 'R.W.' or in the 'fully and fairly-told' tale of the Rev. C. S. Ross.

(c) The Select Committee admits in its report (*Appendix*, p. 80) that in some of the schools the law was violated in regard to Scripture instruction. It furthermore grants (p. 80) that 'in several of the schools catechisms are taught' (this was also illegal). The evidence of the teachers (*Appendix*, pp. 91-108) showed that the *Shorter Catechism* and other denominational catechisms were taught during school hours in at least twenty-five of the schools. Mr. John Hislop (secretary of the Education Board) testified (*Appendix*, p. 84) that this had been even more common in previous years. 'The Education Board,' added he, 'has neither enjoined nor prohibited the use of any catechism in the schools. This is a matter which has been left to the committees and the teachers' (*Appendix*, p. 84). The power thus left in their hands was abundantly, though illegally, used to make the Otago system as denominational as they pleased. On the evidence, the Select Committee found it necessary to recommend 'that the schoolmasters throughout the province be enjoined to adhere strictly to the terms of the Ordinance in regard to the reading of the Scriptures and religious instruction.' There is nothing about all this justification of Bishop Moran either in the articles of 'R.W.' or in the 'fully and fairly-told' tale of the Rev. C. S. Ross.

(2) **SECOND GRIEVANCE.**—Clause 40 of the Education Ordinance (said Bishop Moran, *Appendix*, p. 87), 'not only permits, but obliges, teachers, in opposition to the faith and discipline of the Catholic Church, to impart religious instruction to Catholic children, unless their parents object.' This was described as 'a wily and insidious attempt at proselytising,' as 'few parents can be expected to be aware of this provision of the law, and few are, consequently, in a position to object.' As a matter of fact, the teachers' evidence (*Appendix*, pp. 91-108) showed that, in connection with a large number of schools, neither the children nor their parents were made aware of their rights under this tricky conscience clause. The Catholic grievance in this respect was admitted by the Select Committee to this extent: It recommended 'that the schoolmasters throughout the province should be enjoined to 'take care that the parents and children be informed that attendance at such reading and instruction is optional' (*Appendix*, p. 80). Note well: The committee was restricted to 'such redress' for Catholics 'as may be practicable under

the existing Ordinances' (*Votes and Proceedings*, July 19, 1871, p. 124). There is not a word about these justifications of Bishop Moran in 'R.W.' nor in the 'fully and fairly-told' tale of the Rev. C. S. Ross.

(3) **THIRD GRIEVANCE.**—Bishop Moran and the other petitioners objected as follows, in the interests of Catholic children: That (apart from the sectarian instruction provided for at the opening and closing of the schools) the instruction given was, legally, purely secular (*Appendix*, pp. 85, 86; cf. p. 84). It was therefore opposed to the well-known principle of the union of religion and education which Catholics have ever held sacred. In the view of the petitioners, therefore, the system did not offer sufficient religion for Catholic children. Verily, that was a rather curious way of making 'war' upon Christ in the schools of Otago. Here again 'R.W.' and the Rev. C. S. Ross are dumb.

(4) **FOURTH GRIEVANCE.**—The petitioners complained (*Appendix*, p. 86) that not alone was the Catholic religion 'ignored' under the Otago provincial system, but that it was 'contemned or misrepresented'; that the class books used 'contain matter which is most offensive to Roman Catholics and, as they are persuaded, untrue and injurious to their religion and its ministers' (*Appendix*, p. 81). These statements were backed up by a great mass of detailed evidence and references. Again and again the reading books placed in the hands of little Catholics scoured their faith with such offensive epithets as 'Romish,' 'Popish,' 'Papist,' 'Popery,' 'superstition,' 'superstitious doctrine,' 'false religion' (cf. *Appendix*, p. 87). There were besides the unhistorical bitterness of Collier and others; and teachers and other witnesses described some of the lessons as 'not only objectionable, but repulsive to Catholic people' (p. 87); 'unfit for Catholic children to read' (p. 87); 'the bitter feeling expressed in these books' (p. 89); 'most objectionable lessons. . . . with the numerous train of offensive epithets which permeate throughout the studiously prepared series. . . . a most glaring insult to the feelings of every Catholic' (p. 89); 'passages' 'calculated to throw disrepute upon the Catholic religion and its supporters.' And so on. In consequence of these offensive text-books, Catholics (said the petition) 'have been obliged to withdraw their children from the public schools,' and establish, without State aid, schools of their own (*Appendix*, p. 81). Was this protest a 'war' against Christ in the school?

The Select Committee reported (*Appendix*, p. 80) that most of the offensive statements in the text books placed in the hands of Catholic and Protestant children were 'accepted as historical by other Christian denominations!' As if this were a denominational question and not one of history, and, to a real extent in the circumstances, also of justice and mutual charity and forbearance! The Select Committee admitted that 'there are, however, a few expressions in some of the books which, in the opinion of your committee, are fairly objectionable' (p. 80). And (p. 80) they recommended 'that schoolmasters throughout the Province should be enjoined' to 'avoid the use of any lessons containing words or expressions offensive to Roman Catholics or other denominations of Christians.' There is not a word about these admissions and recommendations in the articles of 'R.W.' nor in the 'fully and fairly-told' tale of the Rev. C. S. Ross.

(5) **FIFTH GRIEVANCE.**—The petitioners pleaded (*Appendix*, p. 81) that 'Roman Catholics consider it a hardship and an injustice to bear the entire expense of their own schools, whilst very large sums are voted out of the public revenue, to which they contribute in common with their fellow-colonists, for the maintenance of public schools, to which they conscientiously object; that Roman Catholics bear their share of the public burdens, and take their part of public duties, and are therefore entitled to a share, in proportion to their number of the moneys voted for education.'

These demands were opposed by the Select Committee on the plea of alleged increased cost, possibly lowered efficiency, and—fear of denominationalism! (See first paragraph under 'First Grievance,' above, in which it is shown that the Otago Provincial system was already largely denominational). Besides (said the committee, p. 80), Catholics 'cannot be satisfied with any system of education which is not under their own exclusive control.' But there is nothing in the evidence to suggest such a claim. On the contrary (a) Bishop Moran, in a passage already quoted, stipulated for State control of the secular instruction in Catholic schools, and of another matter; (b) he never even suggested 'exclusive control' in the matter of finance; but (c) he did rightly claim ecclesiastical control in the matter of the faith and morals taught to the children in our schools. There is, of course, nothing about this in 'R.W.' nor in the 'fully and fairly-told' tale of the Rev. C. S. Ross.

Start the day right! Delicious Hondai Lanka Tea for breakfast will put you in good humor!

'The finest tea I ever drank.'—That's what people say who use Hondai Lanka 'Cock o' the North'!