

than Christchurch for the evidence which repeated public challenges have failed to induce them to produce. We hope after a short delay to be able to publish final figures and a general summing-up of the position of Catholics in the public service in and around Christchurch.

THE JUSTICE DEPARTMENT, OTAGO AND SOUTHLAND.

The more we pursue this subject the more we are struck with the small number of Catholics in the various branches of the Civil Service and at the recklessness and utter disregard for truth displayed by those who state or insinuate that the public service is 'stuffed' with Catholics. So far as we have gone we have been able to show that in many departments our co-religionists are practically unrepresented except by a minor official or cadet, and that in none of them are they in proportion to their numbers in the population.

In connection with the Department of Justice in Otago and Southland, there are 6 Stipendiary Magistrates—1 at £550 a year, 2 at £475 each, 1 at £450, 2 at £425 each. The clerks of court number 14, the salaries per annum being as follows:—1 at £325, 1 at £275, 1 at £265, 3 at £240 each, 1 at £220, 1 at £210, 1 at £190, 2 at £170 each, 1 at £160, 2 at £120 each. There are 8 cadets—1 at £105 per annum, 1 at £100, 3 at £85 each, 2 at £75 each, and 1 at £50. In the same districts there are 6 bailiffs and assistant bailiffs, 2 receiving yearly salaries of £160 each, another £155, one £140, one £120, and one £60. The total amount of these salaries is £7200, and of this the magistrates draw £2800, or more than one third. These are all non-Catholics. Of the 32 positions referred to only two are filled by officers who are known to be Catholics; that is, 1 in 16, although we are 1 in 7 of the general population. The combined salaries of these two officers amount to £380 per annum. For every £19 drawn by the total number of officers of the Justice Department in the provincial districts of Otago and Southland the Catholics draw £1. This is an example of 'stuffing,' but our co-religionists do not seem to have benefited by it.

REV. MR. GIBB 'QUOTES' AGAIN.

THE 'MANNING' EXTRACT ONCE MORE.

The following letter from the Rev. Mr. Gibb, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, appeared in the *Dunedin Evening Star* of last Friday. It refers to one of the long series of misquotations of which the Rev. Mr. Gibb was convicted by Rev. Father Cleary, editor of the N.Z. TABLET, in July and August of last year. By a curious coincidence, the publication of Rev. Mr. Lilley's letter, which has been in the hands of Rev. Mr. Gibb for some time, was delayed till almost the eve of Father Cleary's departure for Europe. The Rev. Mr. Gibb's communication runs as follows:—

Sir,—It will be within the recollection of your readers that when the editor of the local TABLET challenged the accuracy of a quotation from Cardinal Manning which I made on the authority of the Rev. J. P. Lilley, of Arbroath ("the Principles of Protestantism"), I promised to write that gentleman as to the alleged inaccuracy of the words in question. Father Cleary asserted two things—first, that no issue of the *London Tablet* existed of the date assigned by Mr. Lilley; second that the quotation was 'an impudent fabrication, and contrary to Catholic doctrine.' Will you kindly publish the accompanying note which I have received from Mr. Lilley in reply to my letter of inquiry. It reached Dunedin some time ago, but came into my hands only after my return from Canada. I am sorry that two weeks have passed before I have found an opportunity of forwarding it to you, because, as I hear, the editor of the *Tablet* has either left or is about to leave Dunedin for a time. I wish it, however, to be distinctly understood that, even if you were willing (which is very unlikely) to reopen your columns for further correspondence on this matter, I shall not on any account be drawn into the writing of any other letter than this. I owe it to myself and to your readers to seek the publication of Mr. Lilley's letter, and with that I shall for my part be content.—I am, etc.,

JAMES GIBB.

March 5.

Knox Church Manse,
Arbroath (Scotland), October 10, 1901.

My Dear Sir,—I have just received your letter of August 19, 1901, regarding the quotation I HAVE made on page 235 of my hand-book on *The Principles of Protestantism*, from Cardinal Manning's sermon. I received the precise date of the sermon from a ministerial friend in Scotland. He gave it to me as I have stated it in my book. I have since discovered that he made an error in the last figure of the year. The sermon was delivered on October 3, 1869, and was reported in the *Tablet* of October 9, 1869. The statement was also slightly condensed, but not a single word was added or altered. In order that Father Cleary will have all the comfort of seeing and comparing with his own eye every word that the Cardinal uttered I transcribe the whole passage. Speaking in the name of the Pope, Dr. Manning said:—"I say I am liberated from all civil subjection; that my Lord made me the subject of no one on earth, King or otherwise; that in His right I am sovereign. I acknowledge no civil superior; I am the subject of no Prince; and

I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge on earth and director of the conscience of men—of the peasant that tills the field and the Prince that sits on the throne, of the household that lives in the shade of privacy and the legislators that make laws for kingdoms. I am the sole last supreme judge of what is right and wrong." I need scarcely say that this utterance is in harmony with the whole spirit of Manning's teaching; and no one knew better what was believed and held in Rome itself. I could give a score of similar quotations from his writings. I am sorry that a mistake in a single figure should have caused you so much persistent annoyance. Father Cleary must be a very Protestant priest indeed if he can call Manning's statement 'an impudent fabrication and contrary to Catholic doctrine.'

Pray make what use you can of this letter, and believe me, in the bonds of Christian brotherhood—Your faithfully,

J. P. LILLEY.

THE REPLY.

These communications from the Rev. Mr. Gibb appeared in Friday's *Evening Star*. On the following evening the following reply from the Rev. Father Cleary appeared in the same paper:—

Sir,—The friends and well-wishers of the Rev. Mr. Gibb will, I think, join with me in regretting that he has reopened, on even the narrowest issue, a discussion which cannot by any possibility add to his credit as a controversialist. This time he has a further word to say regarding one of the two irreconcilable versions which he gave some time ago of the now notorious 'Manning extract.' But, strangely enough, he makes not the slightest reference to the shockingly garbled version which he quoted in the Choral Hall, out of which the whole controversy arose, and around which (as declared by him to be 'Catholic doctrine') it centred to the end. Here are the words of the Rev. Mr. Gibb as given in the verbatim report in your issue of July 13, 1901: 'In the *Tablet* of the 9th October, 1864, the late Cardinal Manning, speaking in the name of the Pope, is reported thus: "I acknowledge no civil power; I am the subject of no Prince; and I claim more than this: I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men—of the peasants that till the field and of the prince that sits upon the throne, of the household that lives in privacy and the legislator that makes laws for the kingdoms. I am sole last supreme judge of what is right and wrong. Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary for salvation to every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." This alleged 'quotation' was the cause of all the trouble. Yet the Rev. Mr. Gibb, in his letter of yesterday, has not made the remotest reference to it.

I ask your readers to bear the following points in mind:—

1. The Rev. Mr. Gibb, in his Choral Hall speech, professed to quote from the *Tablet* of the 9th October, 1864. The *London Tablet* is, of course, meant throughout.

2. I had the *Tablet* for the whole of 1864 in my possession; and showed that there was no issue on October 9 of that year, and that it was not to be found in any issue for some months before and after. All this is now admitted. In his next letter (July 27) the Rev. Mr. Gibb admitted that he had not taken this alleged 'quotation' from the *Tablet*, but from a statement made in an Orange newspaper and by an Orange clergyman who is noted for the violence of his utterances against the Catholic Church and body.

3. I denied the Rev. Mr. Gibb's statement (made in his letter of July 27) that the version of the 'Manning' extract given by him in the Choral Hall and quoted above, is 'Catholic doctrine.'

'Some time after the close of the controversy I discovered the report of Manning's discourse in the *Tablet*, volume 30, No. 1539 (October 9, 1869), pp. 601-602, and found, as I had anticipated, that it was

Garbled and Altered

by the Rev. Mr. Gibb's 'authorities' in an altogether disgraceful fashion. I published the full facts of the case in the NEW ZEALAND TABLET of October 10, 1901, a marked copy of which was sent to the Rev. Mr. Gibb. It is not necessary to enter here into the full details of this most discreditable piece of controversial trickery, but the following salient points may be laid before your readers:—

(a) In the Rev. Mr. Gibb's Choral Hall 'extract' quoted above the Pope is made by Manning to say: 'I acknowledge no civil power.' Such a statement is nowhere to be found in the *Tablet* report (which, by the way, I am not quoting at second-hand). On the contrary, Manning, in the very same discourse (p. 601), said that 'the civil society or civil power was a thing sacred in itself. It came from God. It had God as its author and must be treated with great veneration.' And he completes a long and eloquent exposition of its rights and functions by declaring, on the authority of St. Paul, that those who resist the ordinances of even a 'persecuting and pagan' civil power do so at the peril of their souls. The report merely credits Manning with putting into the Pope's mouth the words: 'I acknowledge no civil superior, I am the subject of no prince.' The 'prince' referred to here was none other than Victor Emmanuel. 'You ask me,' Manning makes the Pope say, 'to abdicate, to renounce my supreme authority. You tell me I ought to submit to the civil power, that I am the subject of the King of Italy, and from him I am to receive instructions as to the way I should exercise my supreme power.' And this is twisted by a singularly discreditable piece of manipulative trickery, into a statement that the Pope, in Manning's idea, does not recognise the 'civil power.'

(b) Again, in the Choral Hall extract Manning is said to make the Pope claim to be absolutely and without any qualification the supreme judge of conscience, of right and wrong—even the Almighty Himself is not excepted, for there is no limiting or qualifying word or phrase. This is another Artful Dodger quotation. The report (which I am quoting at first hand) attributes no such sweeping statement to Manning. It only makes the Pope the highest judge in these matters, not absolutely, but 'on earth.' The suppression of the two vital words 'on earth' is made all the more