

essential circumstances of your accusation. Where is your evidence? There is not so much as a scrap of it! You even grant that I 'hold an impregnable position' in demanding it, for you neither have any evidence in hand nor can you procure so much of it as would be visible under a compound microscope.

Instead of attempting to establish your specific indictment against the bishops, you fall back upon the mossgrown old fallacy of 'proving the wrong conclusion.' You quote at second hand—and, incidentally, gravely misrepresent—some allegedly 'dictatorial' snippets from articles in a Melbourne Catholic paper (the 'Tribune') on the drawing up of the questions that were put to electors at the recent Bible-in-schools plebiscite in Victoria. And then—apparently in perfect seriousness—you ask me to admit that these second-hand and unofficial texts 'fully sustain a charge of "political bargaining" so far as the Roman Catholic Church in Victoria is concerned, and that it is fair to assume that, with a similar issue before the Roman Catholic Church in New Zealand, the same tactics will be adopted!' You seem to forget that in the very same article you were good enough to give me credit for a measure of common-sense and even for considerable skill in the art of reasoning!

Now (1) your specific charge against the Catholic Bishops of New Zealand is retrospective, not prospective. You have made a positive statement that they are in the habit of striking bargains with political parties for the sale of the Catholic vote. (2). Realising that you are quite unable to sustain this accusation, you now make another of a different kind. You ask me to discuss the academic question: Is it fair to assume that, in conditions which do not exist, have not existed, and are not likely to exist, our prelates will, some time or other in the future, offer 'the adult Catholic vote' to the highest bidder among 'political parties?' In the new issue which you place before me you fall into another fallacy—that of undue assumption. But this must stand over till your previous indictment has been determined. (3). 'Initium doctrinae definitio nominis,' says Epictetus. Right definition is the first condition of right discussion. It is of the essence of a bargain that it is an agreement or stipulation or contract between two parties. No number of journalistic solos, however boisterous or 'dictatorial,' can constitute a bargain, much less a bargain for the disposal of votes. (4). I have before me all the 'Tribune' articles from which your second-hand quotations are taken. There is not in even one of them anything that would even remotely suggest a bargaining for votes. Your 'authority' holds that there are 'dictatorial' expressions in the 'Tribune' articles. That is a matter of opinion. But the highest note in them is as the silver speech of the Fair Damocel by comparison with the intimidating Bible-in-schools official documents quoted in the 'Melbourne Age' of August 8. And the 'Tribune' articles are not, of course, official pronouncements. (5). Even if you were to prove up to the hilt your accusation of 'political bargaining' against the 'Tribune,' it obviously would not follow that 'the Roman Catholic Church in Victoria,' and much less 'Archbishop Redwood and his creatures,' gave 'the adult Catholic vote,' for a consideration, to a political party. I append an illuminating extract in point from a letter just received from the Archbishop of Melbourne.

Again, you said: 'From every district we learn that appointments in the public service fall to Roman Catholics in a ratio far in excess of their proportion of the population.' I have twice asked you, but in vain, to submit those returns to me for inspection. Where are they? And why, on this subject, is your mouth sewed up? Surely this tell-tale reticence is not the attitude of a man who trusts his evidence and dares to submit it to the test of criticism and investigation.—I am, etc.,

EDITOR 'N.Z. TABLET.'

August 23, 1905.

The following is the extract from the letter of the Archbishop of Melbourne referred to above:—

'The form of the questions' (for the Victorian Bible-in-schools Referendum) 'was really suggested to the Government of Victoria (1) by the form adopted in South Australia, but (2) still more by the form submitted to, and passed by the Legislative Assembly of Victoria a few years previously. You may remember that when a Referendum was demanded some years ago, it was proposed and carried in the Legislative Assembly, couched with these three questions. Subsequently the whole scheme was thrown out by the

Legislative Council, not on account of the form of the questions, but because the Referendum in any form was not acceptable to the Upper House. Mr. Bent stated expressly that he was, in the form of the questions, following these two precedents.

'Now, in regard to my action and the action of the Catholic representatives, we simply had no part in determining the questions. . . . Beyond the ecclesiastical news which appears in the "Advocate," I have no part in shaping its contents or policy. In regard to the "Tribune," I have no part in regard to either contents or policy.'

#### A Parting Word.

The letter quoted above appeared in last week's 'Outlook.' It was followed by the following editorial footnote: 'This correspondence is now closed.' No editorial comments on our communication have appeared in either last week's or this week's issue of our local religious contemporary. We have to thank the editor of the 'Outlook' for the ample opportunities allowed us for the treatment of these subjects in his columns, and for the many courtesies extended by him to us during the discussion.

## PEACE NEGOTIATIONS

### HOW THEY ARE CONDUCTED

The end of the war between Russia and Japan and the arrangement of the terms of peace have been the chief items of public interest during the past fortnight. In view of the unexpected settlement arrived at between these two nations, a few notes on the methods and procedure followed by the representatives of belligerent Powers at a peace conference will be of special interest at the present time:—Some people seem to imagine that when the representatives of the belligerent nations come together as the 'high contracting parties,' as they are called, to a treaty of peace, they can make what terms they like as between themselves, but this is not entirely the case. Here, as in the case of the war, they have to pay strict respect to the canons and traditions of international law.

One of the most delicate points for settlement in cases of this sort, where the theatre of war is so vast and when no armistice is concluded beforehand, is to determine the exact time at which the treaty of peace shall become operative at certain places to which the news may be difficult to convey. Careful calculations are made and these various times are settled, and until the official news arrives the belligerents at these places are justified in waging war, even though they know that at headquarters peace has been proclaimed. The reason for this principle of

#### International Law

is that if a combatant officer were to be expected to accept information of this kind from any one except his own Government he would lay himself open to be deceived in the most serious manner, and in some extraordinary cases his conduct in continuing warlike acts, even though certain that peace had been agreed upon, has been justified by international tribunals, who have only made the reservation that his country shall reap no advantage from these acts, and that any land or spoils that he may gain by them shall be given up afterwards.

#### The Leading Case in The Matter,

and that which is always quoted when disputes arise, is that which is known as the case of the 'Swineherd.' This was an English ship which was provided with letters of marque, and which sailed from Calcutta for England before the end of the period of five months fixed by the Treaty of Amiens for the termination of hostilities in the Indian seas, but after the news of peace had arrived at Calcutta and after a proclamation of George III. requiring his subjects to abstain from hostilities from the time fixed and mentioned in this proclamation had been published in a Calcutta paper. The 'Swineherd' had a copy of this proclamation on board, but soon after she had left port she was captured by a French privateer, the 'Bellona.' She could offer no resistance, as, taking peace for granted, she had only enough powder on board for signalling purposes.

Now, the captain of the 'Bellona' had been informed by other vessels that peace had been concluded, he was shown the proclamation, and he had no room to doubt that the intentions of the 'Swineherd' were