

impossible by the sheer butchery done by the blood-letting machinery in use on modern battlefields? The experts may, however, find some consolation for their blighted prophecy in the proverb that 'wise men are oftener wrong than fools are right.' Some years ago one of these 'wise men' calculated that 'a regiment of 700 infantry, armed with the Krag-Jorgensen rifle, a six-gun battery of small breech-loading cannon, and a couple of Gatling guns,' would within two minutes turn 1500 assailants into sundry roods of tangled dead meat. The five-millimetre rifle of to-day is computed by Professor Gebler to be 1337 times more effective than the needle-gun of 1870. Langlois has calculated that the French field-gun of 1891 is 20 times more destructive than that of 1870. Later improvements in artillery have left the older guns—French, Boer, and British—still farther in the rear. In a few years they will be thrown aside to rust along with the Armstrong smooth-bores of 1862, or to fill odd corners of military museums side by side with the culverins, demi-culverins, serpentines, and falcons of the middle ages. General Müller (according to Bloch) computed that with 136 to 140 rounds, the artillery of the Triple and Dual Alliances could kill and wound over 11,000,000 men; with 267 rounds per gun, 22,000,000; and with 500 rounds, 41,000,000!

Very pretty figures, i' faith! But they call up impertinent reminders of some of the martial calculations of Bobadil in Ben Jonson's *Every Man in His Humor*. Bobadil's method of wiping out a hostile army of 40,000 men was very simple—and so was Bobadil. He would join with himself nineteen gentlemen 'of a good spirit and able constitution,' challenge twenty of the enemy, kill them, challenge twenty more, kill them, twenty more, kill them too . . . every man his ten a day, that's ten score—200 a day; five days, a thousand; 40,000, forty times five, 200 days—kill them all.' It is a wholesome fact—sometimes ignored in such 'expert' calculations—that potential destructiveness and actual destruction are two very different things. Lyddite, for instance, ought, by calculation, to have been as an active volcano harnessed into the service of the artillerist. But 'Banjo' Patterson declared it, in irreverent phrase, 'a howling fraud.' Attack in open order, the art of 'taking cover,' the greater use of trenches and earthworks, and the wider distance that now separates combatants, have all combined to reduce the mortality from the use of improved weapons of war. In view of the relatively meagre death-rate from wounds in the Chilian, Spanish-American, and Anglo-Boer wars—all of which were fought under what are termed 'the new conditions'—we can afford to smile at the spectacle of colossal carnage figured out on paper for our benefit by Müller, Langlois, and others. As a hard matter of fact, the old-time results of war have not been radically altered by the newer modes of blood-letting. In his *Modern Weapons and Modern War*, Bloch says:—'The losses from wounds constitute but a small part of the total number of sacrifices.' So it has been in the Boer war. And so it has been in practically all campaigns of which history bears a record. 'Bad and insufficient food,' says the same authority, 'in consequence of the difficulty of provisioning immense masses, will mean increase of sickness, and the over-crowding of the sick at certain points will complicate the danger both from sickness and from wounds, and thereby increase the mortality.' In South Africa only 19 per 1000 of the rank and file had the partnership between soul and body dissolved by weapons of war. As many as 31·8 per 1000 died of disease. This is the old, old story of war. From one point of view, at least, there is a foundation of truth in the saying of good old Homer, of which Samuel Butler gave the following metrical version:—

'A skilful leech is better far
Than half a hundred men of war.'

THE following cable message appeared in
CARDINAL MORAN AND THE
COMMONWEALTH.

The Catholic papers explain that Cardinal Moran refused to attend the Commonwealth procession and banquet because he was not allowed precedence of the Primate. They state the Premier informed the Cardinal's private secretary on Monday night that the Committee of Management had awarded precedence to the Primate, and that the Government did not see their way to upset the arrangement. Under the circumstances, Cardinal Moran decided to take no part in any social functions till his due position was recognised. Other Catholic bishops visiting Sydney refuse to participate, considering an insult was offered to the Catholic body.

The incident afforded, of course, a fair subject for editorial remark. Most or all of the daily papers, however, were content to publish it without note or comment. But it afforded an opportunity for a special display to the individual who is permitted to trick out the cable news of the *Dunedin Evening Star* with bran-brained pseudo-American headings which have for some time past been the subject of much sarcastic comment and of many a twelve-inch grin at the expense of their composer. This poor parodist of the smart American caption 'got off' the following remarks in triple tier regarding the incident of the Commonwealth celebrations to which reference has been

made above:—'A Remarkable Demand'; 'Catholic Officials in a Protestant Commonwealth'; 'Cardinal Moran's "due" position.' Briefly, he informs the public that (1) the Australian Commonwealth is a Protestant one, and (2) that the alleged 'demand' of Cardinal Moran was 'extraordinary,' and, by inference, preposterous, just because it was made by a Catholic 'official' to the rulers of a 'Protestant Commonwealth.'

We pass by the bad taste displayed in dubbing the distinguished body of the Australian Catholic hierarchy as merely 'officials'—a title which in ordinary language is limited to civil functionaries of various kinds, from departmental officers to railway porters and lamp-trimmers, borough turncocks, billiard-markers in clubs, and weighers-in at race-meetings. We know of no sense in which the fresh young Federation beyond the Tasman Sea could be fairly called 'a Protestant Commonwealth.' We can, of course, understand the applicability of the term Protestant to countries like Denmark, Sweden and Norway, etc., where members of other than the Reformed creeds count for as little numerically and in the industrial and political life of the nation as Protestants do in Belgium, France, Spain, Mexico, or Russia. But nobody calls the German States Protestant, even though the parti-colored Reformed denominations within their borders numbered jointly in 1890 62·8 per cent. of its total population as against 35·8 per cent. of Catholics. The same remark applies to the Swiss Confederation, with its 59 per cent. of Protestants and its 40 per cent. of Catholics. Catholics are the most numerous religious body in the United States. Yet they are probably not more than one-fourth of the total adherents distributed among the several hundred Reformed denominations scattered through the United States, nor above a sixth of the total population of the country. But who would describe the United States—apart even from its recent conquests in the West Indies and the East—as a Protestant country? In Australia the percentage of Catholics to total population is much greater. At the census of 1891 the Catholics of the six colonies now federated numbered 713,846 in a total population of 3,175,392, or nearly one-fourth of the whole. The only denomination that outnumbered them was the Anglican, with a membership of 1,234,121. The great variety of assorted creeds comprised by Mr. Coghlan under the designation of 'Wesleyans and other Methodists' numbered collectively 372,009. The various Presbyterian bodies counted altogether 351,892. The other Reformed denominations were, in sporting phrase simply nowhere. The comparison is greatly enhanced in favor of our co-religionists in the Australian Commonwealth if we consider the number and eminence of their prelates; the long roll of persons whose lives are devoted, without fee or reward, to the service of God and the good of their neighbor; the splendor of the Catholic places of worship; the attendance of Catholics at religious services; the beauty, extent, variety, and enervating activity of Catholic institutes of learning and charity, etc.

The headline commentaries of our Dunedin contemporary were, however, apparently written under the extraordinary delusion that some or other form of Protestantism is the recognised official or State religion of the new Australian Commonwealth. Else, wherein lies the 'extraordinary' folly that a prelate who is at the same time a cardinal and archbishop should claim that it is due to his position to have precedence over one who, although a primate, is nevertheless merely a bishop? In the British official 'Order of Precedence among Men' the Archbishop of Canterbury ranks next after the nephews of the Sovereign. Next comes the Lord High Chancellor; then the three remaining archbishops (of York, Armagh, and Dublin). The bishops follow far off in the dim perspective, after the younger sons of marquises. In England, the prelates of the Establishment or State Church naturally take precedence of the members of the Catholic or any other hierarchy. But in the Australian colonies there is not, nor has there ever been—despite repeated efforts in that direction—an established or State religion. 'Statute law,' wrote Dr. Ullathorne in 1840, 'limits the Anglican Establishment to England, Ireland, Wales, and Berwick. All the Acts contain and speak their own expressed limitations. The statute law is so far from giving the Anglican clergy of the colonies the rights and privileges of belonging to the Establishment of the Church of England, that it expressly and by special enactment excludes them from the rights and privileges of that Establishment.' It was 'good old Governor Bourke'—nephew of the great Irish orator and statesman, Edmund Burke—who gave to Australia the charter of her religious liberty. 'I have done my duty,' said he on that memorable day, 'in conferring upon Australia the charter of her liberties; let Australia now do her duty by preserving that charter inviolate.' Religious equality was guaranteed, and the Act applied to the whole of the Australian mainland, which was then under the jurisdiction of New South Wales. By an Act of the Legislative Council of Tasmania, passed in 1837, the Churches of England, Rome, and Scotland were declared to be on an equality. This measure was confirmed and its provisions further emphasised by an Act passed in 1862. In every case these Acts received