

principle of taxation without benefit or representation. (3) He proposes that the New Zealand Government empower the University, by itself or in conjunction with others, to draw up a pandenominational course of theology—to pick and sift and pare and stew till they reduce a hundred contradictory creeds to a jellified residuum that shall be 'acceptable to all Christian denominations'! Sir Maurice and his friends forget (1) that Jews and other non-Christians have some rights in this matter; (2) that dissident Christians have some rights; (3) that 'all Christian denominations' would not unite in a scheme for clapping into one common melting-pot the truths of divine Revelation and the more or less fantastic things that man-made creeds have spun around the faith that was once delivered to the saints.

Moreover, (4) half-a-dozen 'Christian denominations' have signally failed to agree even upon the most elementary scheme of biblical instruction in the public schools. Does the bare majority of the Senate imagine that 'all Christian denominations' in the country will agree when it comes to the vastly more difficult and complicated task of drawing up a scheme of theology that shall be acceptable all around? Let it be borne in mind that it is here a question of theology or divinity, which is a science. That is to say, it deals with divine things on a co-ordinated, systematised, and scientific method. Some of the speakers, with hazy notions upon the subject, seem to fancy that 'Bible literature' is 'divinity'. 'Bible literature' is an ambiguous term. And no matter which of its possible meanings you put upon it, it does not necessarily include divinity. The Bible is, of course, a noble 'fount' or 'source' of divinity. But it is by no means the only one. And it does not follow, nor does it profess to follow, the systematised form and scientific method that is requisite in a treatise on theology. Sir Maurice O'Rorke professes to 'place the faculty of divinity on the same standing for obtaining degrees as law and medicine'. Yet the University demands that law and medicine shall be taught and studied on scientific methods, and not in the form of rudimentary compromises. And in its final resort, Sir Maurice's proposal is (as we showed in 1905) nothing more or less than a scheme for conferring divinity degrees without the divinity.

In 1905, in the columns of a daily paper, we repeatedly pressed the following awkward questions on those of the supporters of the scheme of wooden-nutmeg divinity who stand for secularism in public instruction:

1. On what principle of statecraft could the New Zealand Government claim the right of drawing up, by itself or by others appointed by it for the purpose, a State brand of theology?
2. Who is to determine what brand of theology, and how much and how little thereof, are to be required for the proposed State divinity degrees?
3. If the New Zealand Government has the right to teach divinity indirectly (by drawing up schemata of divinity for degrees examinations), on what principle may it not also directly teach that 'science of divine things'?
4. If the Government may exercise this alleged right in our highest schools, on what ground do Sir Maurice and his supporters oppose the extension of the same principle to the State primary schools?
5. At what numerical percentage—at 5 per cent. or 7 per cent. or 10 per cent. or 20 per cent.—of the population are minorities in New Zealand to begin to enjoy this elementary right of conscience—immunity from compulsory contributions towards the propaganda of the theology of faiths in which they do not believe?

These pertinent questions are still awaiting an answer. The whole burden of detailing, explaining, and justifying the scheme of State divinity degrees falls upon its framers and supporters. They have not taken up the task. If they ever do, they will find it, we ween, like time-killing, 'labor dire and heavy woe'. They must first catch their hare—that is, secure their 'divinity'. Ah, there's the rub! For the rest, our co-religionists

received, during the course of last week's discussion in Christchurch, a sufficient indication of the trend of feeling among some of the supporters of Sir Maurice's scheme. A Calvinist (said the Rev. Mr. Cameron) would 'certainly' and as a matter of course be welcomed on the examining board; but a Catholic—ah! that would depend. 'On Church history', said he, 'I suppose such an appointment would not commend itself.' Church history 'need not necessarily be taught.' But if it is to be, Catholics must be boycotted off the examining board that deals with the subject. And if they are unwelcome in Church history, how much more so in philosophy and theology! It is well that the words were spoken. Now, better than ever, we can realise, with the Chancellor of the University Senate, that the proposed State theology would lead to 'perpetual wrangling' and plunge the country into a fresh 'sea of troubles'.

## Notes

### Two Reminders

A wise man, says the Milwaukee 'Catholic Citizen', 'paid ten cents a week to insure his house against fire, and ten cents a week to insure his children against the loss of their religion. The latter insurance he took out in the form of a Catholic family paper published weekly. Depend upon it—a Catholic family brought up to read, year after year, a good Catholic weekly, will get a thousandfold the value of the subscription paid.' He was a Catholic (in name), says the Los Angeles 'Tidings'. 'He didn't subscribe for a Catholic newspaper (said he didn't need it). After a while he married—and still he didn't subscribe for a Catholic journal. His children grew up—without reading or ever seeing a Catholic newspaper—and now he wonders why he has to spend twenty-four hours a day trying to keep his sons out of the clutches of the law.'

### Another 'Bluggy' Leaflet

Before their departure for the Green Shores of Erin, the Irish Delegates did not, we hope, omit to present a testimonial to the Protestant 'Defence' (? Offence) Association in Auckland and the 'Defenders' yellow brethren in Waihi. We learn that a goodly measure of the success of the Delegates' meetings in these two centres was due to the wholesome disgust aroused in the minds of decent and fair-minded non-Catholics by two anti-Home Rule leaflets distributed by the P.D.A. (which, as stated elsewhere) is merely one of the 'aliases' of the Orange fraternity. In this, as in other cases, the brethren overvaulted their purpose. We have touched elsewhere upon one of these Rawhead-and-Bloody-Bones leaflets. We now have the other one before us. And it is a gem of purest ray serene. It begins with the good old wheeze (dealt with in our last issue) that Mister Michael McCarthy, the special anti-Catholic pet of the Orange press and platform, is 'a Roman Catholic'! We then have some 'history'—in 'extracts.' There is, for instance, a grotesque and scandalous travesty of the facts of an assault on 'souters' who some time ago made a coarse public attack upon the most cherished dogmas and practices of the Catholic faith in the streets of the Catholic village of Clifden, Connemara. Then (among other things) we have a statement—first published, and, in all probability, first coined, by the Orange writer Musgrave—to the effect that during the insurrection of 1798 'the priests' administered to 'the rebels' an oath to 'murder all heretics.' This fabrication is the old attempt to offset the oath which (according to the testimony of Lords Gosford and Holland, Henry Grattan, William Sampson, and other contemporary Protestant writers, as well as of some eye-witnesses) early Orangemen took to exterminate 'the Catholics