

apply, but the motive was to confer honor, and bestow an adequate token of national gratitude. The magnitude of it should be measured by what the recipient has done, and not by what he may do in the future. In fact, Parliament has been committed to a pledge to give Lord Kitchener more by and by, when he shall have performed some further signal services, and in effect he has been paid only an instalment of what is due to him. Some such reasoning as this might possibly have occasioned opposition to the grant, though we hardly suppose it did. We put it forward merely for the purpose of showing that the proposal was susceptible of more than the one interpretation, and that in point of fact, when analysed, it amounted to the very common but illogical action of a parent who says to his offspring: 'There, you have been a very good child, and here is sixpence for you; if you are also very good to-morrow, I may give you another sixpence.' It would seem that thus taking a mortgage on future good behaviour is not confined to doting parents, but may be found also among eminent politicians.

*

It may be interesting at this stage to compare the grant to Lord Kitchener with some previously given as rewards for military achievements. The victories of Blenheim and Ramillies cost the country subsequently nearly a million sterling. The Duke of Marlborough received in 1707 a pension of £4000 a year, and it was paid until about 17 years ago, when it was commuted by a single payment of £107,800. Besides this the Government purchased Blenheim, and the present Duke of Marlborough lives in it at this day. Admiral Rodney sank seven Spanish ships and relieved Gibraltar less than 120 years ago, and was given £2000 a year for life. But on his death, nine years afterwards, the pension was made perpetual. Lord Raglan, who distinguished himself in the Crimea, received a pension which has been paid to his successors, but is terminable on the death of the present peer. The total sum so paid is not less than £100,000. After Nelson won the battle of Trafalgar, a grateful nation awarded £5000 a year to all the Lord Nelsons for ever; so that about £500,000 has been the cost to date of the great naval victory. The Duke of Wellington received a large grant and an annuity which was to terminate with the death of the third holder of the title. Lord Napier of Magdala, for the almost bloodless and short, though nevertheless extremely arduous, campaign in Abyssinia, received a pension of £2000 a year, which was to continue to his heir. Nor must mention be omitted of the large aggregate sums paid in pensions to officers and men who completed their term of service. Too often the rank and file, who are not less necessary than the commander, are left to pine in neglect in their old age. A gratuity is to be made to every man who was engaged in South Africa, but whether this will be the sole expression of the nation's gratitude remains to be seen.

DIOCESE OF DUNEDIN.

His Lordship Bishop Verdon has appointed the Rev. Father Delaney, of Oamaru, to Holy Cross College, Mosgiel. The Rev. Father O'Reilly, of South Dunedin, has taken Father Delaney's place at Oamaru.

On Tuesday evening the members of St. Joseph's Club (26 ladies and 26 gentlemen) met a similar number from St. Patrick's Club in a tournament at St. Joseph's Hall, when a very pleasant time was spent. The home club were declared the winners after a very keen contest. It is intended to give the losers an opportunity of regaining their laurels later on in the season. A special programme, consisting of various games and musical items, is being prepared for the meeting of July 11 of the St. Joseph's Club. The matter is in the hands of a committee consisting of Messrs J. McKennah, J. H. Brown, and A. J. Sullivan.

The devotion of the Forty Hours' Adoration was begun in the Church of the Sacred Heart, North-East Valley, on Friday morning, when the Rev. Father Murphy, Adm., celebrated the Mass of Exposition. On Saturday morning Father Murphy was also the celebrant of the Mass. Short instructions were given at both Masses, and also at the devotions in the evenings. His Lordship Bishop Verdon presided at the Mass of Exposition on Sunday, of which Father Murphy was the celebrant. His Lordship, who preached on devotion to the Blessed Sacrament, made appropriate reference to the proclamation of peace, and spoke feelingly with regard to those of the faith who had died in South Africa. His Lordship spoke in similar terms at the half-past seven o'clock Mass at St. Joseph's Cathedral.

An 'Evening with Authors' was the subject of a lecture given by Mr J. F. M. Fraser at the weekly meeting of the South Dunedin Catholic Literary and Social Club on Monday last. The president (Rev. Father Coffey) occupied the chair, and there was a large attendance of members and lady friends. The lecturer entertained his audience for over an hour, introducing a number of extracts from books of a very humorous character. Mr Fraser was loudly applauded at the conclusion of his interesting address, and a hearty vote of thanks was accorded him on the motion of Messrs F. W. Petre and D. McCurdy. The Rev. Father Coffey, in conveying the vote of thanks, expressed his pleasure at Mr Fraser's presence that evening, and also for the kindly interest taken by that gentleman in the club since its institution. Songs were nicely rendered by Messrs Fetterell and Foster.

At Vespers at St. Joseph's Cathedral on Sunday the Rev. Father Murphy, Adm., preached the sermon, taking for his text 'Peace be to you' (St. John, xx, 19). The rev. preacher, after speaking of the blessings which peace brought to the world, and the horrors which followed in the train of war, referred to those of the Catholic faith who had fallen on the battlefield, and exhorted the congregation not to forget to pray for them during the Holy Sacrifice of the Mass. They should return thanks to God for the cessation of hostilities, and pray for the welfare of the King. Although they were far away from the heart of the Empire, still it was not difficult to see that the influence of his Majesty was on the side of peace. They should pray that God would prolong the King's reign and give him long years so that he might live to see all his subjects around his throne, and, if the necessity arose, ready to defend it. Father Murphy then went on to say that sin was the cause of war, showed the necessity of doing penance, and exhorted the congregation to give thanks to God for the blessings conferred upon them, and to offer their Holy Communion with that intention. It was a fallacy to suppose that victory was the result of courage or bravery, as it came from God, and to Him they should give thanks for it. After the 'O Salutaris,' his Lordship the Bishop intoned the 'Te Deum,' which was then taken up by choir, who rendered it in a finished manner. There was a crowded congregation present.

THE MORAL ASPECT OF CRANIOTOMY.

THE following letter by 'A Catholic Priest,' which appeared in Monday's issue of the *Otago Daily Times*, on the above subject, is well worth careful perusal by our readers:—

'With your permission I should like to reply to your sub-leader of Saturday on the subject of craniotomy on a living child. At the outset, I thank you for the acknowledgment, 'that the subject, though delicate, has been treated with marked good taste.' This is as it should be, as the object is not to overcome an adversary in controversy: it is of higher nature—it is to arrive at an understanding of what the moral law teaches and expects us to follow in such a case.

Your statement, 'that the teaching of the Catholic Church on this matter is repugnant and shocking to a large number—probably an overwhelming majority of the people in this district' is no argument for or against the lawfulness of the act. Truth is not unfrequently shocking and repugnant to a large number of people. Especially is this so when there is question of moral and divine truth. Yet the fact that it shocks a large number makes it no less true. We have an infinite number of examples of how the multitude were shocked at.

Christ's Teaching,

yet His teaching was no less true. But does the teaching of the Church in this respect shock a good many—the overwhelming majority? Your writer says it does. I am inclined to the opinion that the great majority of the thinking public feel quite the contrary, and are glad to find that the Church has the moral courage to uphold the moral and divine law in this respect. I respectfully differ with your writer in the case, and state at the same time that I am in a fair position to know how the general public feel on the matter. Your statement or suggestion 'that craniotomy on a living child is lawful' because the Criminal Code does not punish a doctor when he performs it in good faith is altogether beside the question. The Criminal Code is surely not the standard of our moral actions. The Criminal Code is not one and the same thing as the Divine moral code. Were this so an act which is considered lawful at one time would be unlawful at another time; also, an act which is permitted by the Criminal Code, or not punished by it in one country, is not permitted but severely punished in a different country at the same time. We could not have a better example of this than the case we are discussing. I am informed that at the present time, according to the American Criminal Code, at least three doctors must pronounce in favor of craniotomy before the doctor who performs it is safe from prosecution, whereas in this country one doctor can perform it even without consultation. I myself have known of more than one case in which this happened, therefore we see that what is criminal in America is not criminal here, and were the Criminal Code set up as the guide to the morality of an act we would be reduced to the absurdity of having to believe

That the Great Lawgiver

laid down one moral standard for New Zealanders, and another, and as we have seen, an altogether more strict, moral standard for Americans. I may point out that the Criminal Code of this country creates its own 'human being,' and then lays down the law regarding that 'human being.' According to it 'the child is a human being' only when it has completely proceeded in a living state from the body of its mother. According to our law, then, a child only becomes and is to be regarded as a 'human being' when it is born, but not before. It is evident that this definition of a 'human being' (as many other definitions in the Criminal Code) is made for the occasion with little or no relation to the intrinsic truth. However, I may argue that did the Legislature admit, what is certainly a fact admitted by all Christian scientists, that the child is a human being, not merely when it proceeds in a living state from its mother's body, but long before there is any question of birth, it would have acknowledged its rights as a human being—first amongst which is the right to live, and therefore would have made it equally criminal to interfere with its life before as after its birth. The Criminal Code, therefore, instead of being against me in reality with me in my contention that it is unlawful to destroy by any means or for any reason the life of an unborn human being. It is the union of the soul and body that makes