

of the co-operative and profit-sharing systems. In our next article we hope to describe the successful work actually done on these lines, under Catholic auspices, in various countries. For the present, we conclude by pointing out that over and above all purely economic and legislative remedies for our social ills stands the paramount need for the application, in our social relations, of the principles of Christianity, and for the moral and spiritual activity of the Christian Church. 'No practical solution of this question,' says the late Holy Father, 'will ever be found without the assistance of religion and of the Church. . . . Since religion alone can destroy evil in its very root let all classes remember that the primary thing needful is a return to real Christianity, without which very little good will be produced by the means which human prudence regards as efficacious.'

Notes

The 'Outlook' and Father Benson

The Editor of the *Outlook*, with the fairness which we confidently expected from him, has, by request of the *Tablet*, published in full Father Benson's repudiation of the views so mistakenly attributed to him on the subject of religious persecution.

A Good Catholic Example

The compiler of the weekly religious column in the *Otago Daily Times* had the following in a recent issue:—The 'house of retreats' for Catholic laymen is now in regular operation on Staten Island, in New York City. Every Friday a group of laymen from the city and its environs gathers in this quiet place to hear lectures and spend Sabbath in devotion. The practice of week-end vacations is growing among business men in all the great cities of the country, but thus far no Protestant laymen have proposed to devote this respite from money-making to the uses of their souls. Certainly here is one Catholic example that the Protestant Church could very wisely adopt.'

Sacramental Wine and Prohibition

Thanks to the prompt action of the Archbishop of Wellington, the *Tablet* interview with the Rev. B. S. Hammond may fairly take rank as the sensation of the week. Immediately after the appearance of the *Tablet* article, his Grace sent the following circular letter to the clergy of the archdiocese:—'A leader of the No-license party has publicly declared that if National Prohibition is carried one of the results will be that, after about 10 years, no wine, even for medicinal or sacramental purposes, will be allowed into the Dominion. As this would render the celebration of the Mass impossible, we feel obliged to warn our people against Prohibition, and to warn them not to vote for it.' Of course there appeared the inevitable disclaimer from Mr. Hammond, which took the form of the following telegram to Archbishop Redwood: 'Respectfully draw your attention to the fact that your Grace has been misinformed. I never said, nor have any Prohibition leaders said, nor will we ever say, one word against the very right and proper exemption clause dealing with wine for sacramental purposes. I hope your Grace will take immediate steps to correct the statement in your circular.'

*

We at once sent the following telegram to his Grace: '*Tablet* statements re Hammond interview scrupulously accurate.' We gather that his Grace must have written to the Wellington papers, for the following paragraph appeared in Tuesday's *Dunedin Evening Star*: 'Archbishop Redwood maintains that the Rev. Mr. Hammond's explanation is in direct contradiction to the latter's interview with the editor of the *Tablet*, which the latter declares to be "scrupulously accurate." After alluding to the use of wine for sacramental purposes, the Archbishop says:—". . . It would be an insult to their reason and their faith to accept it on

precarious tenure and piecruft political promises, or of a clause in an Act of Parliament which might be, and certainly would be, repealed if Prohibition came to prevail in this Dominion.'"

*

We could say a good deal about people who make statements and admissions, and then attempt to go back on them, but we refrain. We content ourselves with simply reiterating that our account of the interview was scrupulously accurate; and we note that in all the disclaimers and lavish promises for the future Mr. Hammond did not once specifically deny having used the words attributed to him.

*

Late Wellington papers are to hand as we go to press, and they all devote a large amount of space to the new position that has arisen. We quote the following from the *Evening Post*, as representative of the general tenor of the press comments:—'A new factor—how potent a one remains to be seen—has been introduced into the battle of License v. No-license. The Roman Catholic Church of New Zealand has spoken, in no uncertain terms, against Prohibition. Its clergy throughout the Dominion yesterday voiced the dictum of the Archbishop of Wellington, as head of the Church, and that dictum, so far as every practical Catholic is concerned, must stand. His Grace does not give his personal views regarding the merits or otherwise of Prohibition—his is an ex-cathedra utterance, bearing on a matter of dogma, that must be respected by the faithful. So much was gathered from what was said by all the preachers in the Catholic churches of this city yesterday.'

*

'In the past the Church, as a religious organisation, was neutral on the No-license subject; its adherents were at perfect liberty to vote as they liked on the liquor question. Never since the Prohibition movement started in New Zealand has any attempt been made to influence the Catholic votes in one direction or the other. Only a week ago last Sunday the clergy, as they have often done in the past, referred to the approaching elections, pointing out that it was the duty of all Catholics who had votes to exercise them on Thursday next, and to cast them for the candidates who, in their judgment, were the best suited to act as legislators. But, as has been the case on the eve of previous elections, no reference was made to the licensing poll. A change has taken place, and the Catholic Church will on Thursday next play a definite part in the License v. Prohibition contest. Yesterday, at all the city churches, and no doubt at all Catholic churches and chapels throughout the Dominion, the announcement was made from the pulpits that Archbishop Redwood, as head of the Church in New Zealand, had issued a circular to the Bishops and clergy of the several dioceses asking them to point out to their flocks that it was the duty of Catholics to vote against Prohibition on Thursday. Not that it would be better for them to do so, but that it was a duty imposed upon them by the Church.' After quoting from the *Tablet* interview and generally explaining the position, the *Post* concludes: 'It has been stated by the clergy that they hold no brief for the Trade, and that had it not been for Mr. Hammond's Ashburton statement, their flocks would have been quite at liberty to vote for Prohibition had they so seen fit. But they cannot do so now, because a dogma has been assailed.'

THIS WEEK'S ISSUE

The Presbyterian Assembly and *Ne Temere*—reply to Rev. R. Wood. Page 2465.

The Church and Socialism—statement of Catholic principles. Page 2477.

Prohibition and Wine for Mass—action by his Grace the Archbishop. Page 2479.

About the *Ne Temere* decree—the conditions on which dispensations for mixed marriages are granted. Page 2466.

Annual Banquet of Christchurch Catholic Club—interesting speeches and impressive gathering. Page 2459.