

members of the Imperial House. The position of the Archduchess, when her husband is called upon to take up the reins of Government, will be a delicate and difficult one. She will still be inferior in rank to every archduchess of the Imperial family, all of whom will take precedence of her. This may give rise to unpleasant incidents, and will probably prevent her from taking part in State functions. A Vienna correspondent points out other anomalies that will arise out of this marriage. 'Of course,' he says, 'the Countess will live in the Archduke's house. If she accompanies him to the station when he starts for some journey she can ride with him in his Imperial carriage, but she cannot come back from the station in it, as she must not ride alone in a carriage with golden spokes to the wheels, or with a coachman in full livery. She must not sit in the opera-box with him, nor attend the races in the Imperial stand. And so forth *ad infinitum*.'

The term 'morganatic marriage' dates from the promulgation of the Salic Law in the fifth century, to regulate the succession to the throne of the Salii, a tribe of Franks. The Salic Law, the main object of which was to exclude females from the succession, also provided that in the event of the monarch contracting a marriage with a lady of inferior birth, neither she nor her children should share his rank. Every reigning monarch and his family are equal in rank to every other reigning monarch and his family, without reference to their respective origin. Thus the Bonapartes and the Abrenoviches are considered to be of equal birth with the Hapsburgers and Hohenzollerns. King Alexander of Servia, whose great-grandfather was a peasant, could marry into any royal family, whereas the marriage of the Archduchess Stefanie to Count Lonyay, whose ancestors were valiant knights and warriors 1000 years ago, was considered a mésalliance.

OLD AGE PENSIONS.

THE British Government are evidently afraid to tackle the question of old age pensions. The matter was recently referred to a Departmental Committee to inquire into the financial aspects of the proposals made by the Select Committee of the House of Commons on the subject. The conclusions which the Departmental Committee arrived at were that the carrying out of the scheme recommended by the Select Committee would, if the pension age were fixed at 65, involve a progressive annual expenditure commencing at £10,300,000, and rising in 1911 to £12,650,000, in 1921 to £15,650,000, and so on. These estimates, it is admitted, are founded mainly on hypothesis, or rather on a series of hypotheses, there being no definite data upon which to work. In view of the composition of the committee, however, it may be taken that the figures are as near an approach to the probable actual cost as it is possible to make. And while there are, of course, many objections to the pension scheme propounded by the Select Committee other than financial, this exposition of its great cost will be (remarks a well known financial paper) sufficient to discredit it in the eyes of the British taxpayer. It may, however, be possible to reform the pension system of Great Britain so that the worker and the soldier may be included. When a pension scheme that runs into millions is propounded, people are apt to consider the proposal too great a burden even for the British Empire. Now if we compare that proposed for Great Britain and Ireland with that in actual force in this Colony, the results are nearly the same as far as population is considered. The amount required in New Zealand for old age pensions this year will be about £200,000, with a population, roughly speaking, of 800,000. The population of the United Kingdom is, say, 40,000,000—fifty times that of this Colony, so that at the same rate an old age pension scheme for the former country would be about £10,000,000, very close on what the Departmental Committee calculated on. Therefore, taking per head of the population as the basis of comparison, we find that our responsibility is just as great in proportion as that which apparently frightens the British Cabinet from dealing with a pressing subject. The amount spent in war during the past twelve months would provide sufficient money to pay an old age pension in the United Kingdom for the next five years. The average British taxpayer is never appalled by expenditure in the latter direction.

A VINDICATION. THE appointment of Sir William Butler to the command at Aldershot reminds us that it is now somewhat over a year since he resigned that of the South African forces in consequence of a difference of opinion with the High Commissioner and the Colonial Secretary. War was then imminent and the High Commissioner directed that certain positions should be occupied, but Sir William Butler, who had by that time formed a pretty accurate estimate of the fighting capabilities of the two republics and had furthermore a thorough knowledge of the difficult nature of the country which he was called upon to defend, pointed out to the Home authorities the impossibility of the task with the small force at his command. He warned the High Commissioner and Mr. Chamberlain that he would

require five times the number of troops that he had then under him to withstand the united forces of the republics. He spoke as an expert who had been practically studying the situation for some time, but his advice was practically laughed to scorn by the Colonial Secretary, who, backed up by a section of the press, entered on the contest with a light heart, and a conviction born of vanity that three months would see the end of the war. General Butler was looked upon as a pessimist; the Jingo press went so far as to hint that he was a pro-Boer. Although he got the command of the Western District he was for months under a cloud, and for a considerable time he was the object of vile attacks in the press. In consequence of his position his mouth was shut; military etiquette prevented him from defending himself, and the Colonial Secretary and the War Office did not seem at all anxious that he should be given an opportunity of so doing. They had ignored his advice, but every week during the early part of the campaign brought fresh proof of the wisdom of his counsels. The Boer farmers, who were held in such contempt by London editors, showed that they could fight, and their commanders displayed a knowledge of military tactics which, if not brilliant, was at least unexpected. The march to Pretoria was not the picnic it was expected to be, and by degrees the British public and the saner of the British newspapers woke up to the fact that Sir William Butler had been right, and that if his advice had been taken at first the nation would not have to mourn the loss of so many brave lives, nor hear of those periodical 'reverses' which were of such constant occurrence during the first six months of the campaign. Instead of the 130,000 men which General Butler said would be required—an estimate which was then considered ridiculously excessive—200,000 have been found necessary, and the casualty list alone has exceeded the force at his disposal prior to the outbreak of war. General Butler's appointment to Aldershot is practically a vindication of his opinions, but it is to be hoped the despatches which passed between him and the High Commissioner will see the light of day, for then the British public will be in a position to apportion the blame for a great deal of inexplicable blundering that has taken place in connection with this war.

NO SALVATION OUTSIDE THE CHURCH; OR THE DOCTRINE OF EXCLUSIVE SALVATION.

POSITIVE AND NEGATIVE INFIDELS.

THE following is the third of a series of articles on the above subject contributed to the *Austral Light* by his Grace the Archbishop of Melbourne—

There is, in regard to the salvation of positive and negative infidels (writes his Grace), an element of difficulty which is not found in the case of formal or material heretics. That element arises from their want of such an amount of supernatural faith as is absolutely and certainly necessary for salvation. Many theologians would include faith in the Incarnation amongst the necessary articles of belief. Some would include the Trinity. But it is certain that the very least required includes supernatural faith in God as a Remunerator. Hence it is that St. Paul says in the Epistle to the Hebrews: 'But without faith it is impossible to please God. For he that cometh to God must believe that He is, and is a rewarder to them that seek Him' (xi., 6).

No one, therefore, who does not believe that God exists, and that He will reward the good and punish the wicked, is in the way of salvation. But by infidels we understand those who receive neither the Old nor the New Testament—who are wanting in all supernatural faith.

These, again may be either culpable or inculpable in their infidelity. They are culpable, as is evident, if the Gospel has been sufficiently preached to them to induce the obligation of believing the necessary truths of faith, or at least of making further enquiry in cases where the manifestation of Gospel truths has not been clear or distinct. These are called *positive* infidels. If no manifestation of the Gospel has been made to them or if it has not been made so clearly as to bind them to make further enquiry, they are inculpable in their infidelity, and are classed by theological writers as *negative* infidels.

We can easily imagine some of the aboriginals of this country who are in contact with white men receiving a sufficient manifestation of the existence of God as a Remunerator, to make them culpable if they reject this necessary truth, while others who are separated from all intercourse with the white population may, at least for a time, be inculpably ignorant of this fundamental and necessary truth. The former should be set down as positive, the latter as negative infidels.

POSITIVE INFIDELS.

It is obvious that what has been said of *formal* heretics must also be said of *positive* infidels—namely, that as such they cannot be saved. Their exclusion from salvation arises not from the fact of their living and dying outside the true Church, but because they are living in the violation of a divine precept which has been sufficiently manifested to them, and the violation of which involves the guilt of grievous sin. They are amongst those of whom Our Lord spoke in His last commission to His Apostles, saying: 'Go ye into the whole world and preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not