

THE VOICE OF NEW ZEALAND.

Father Gilbert, S.M. (Rector of St. Patrick's College, Wellington, New Zealand), who met with a great ovation, said that in New Zealand not only the Irish and Irish descendants, but people of all nationalities supported Ireland's right of self-determination. Last St. Patrick's Day, in Wellington, he had the pleasure of submitting a resolution almost in identical terms to the one moved that day, and it was forwarded to Mr. Massey, the Premier. That resolution was in Mr. Massey's pocket now, and he was asked to bring it before the Imperial Conference at present sitting in London. "I shall be anxious to see," said Father Gilbert, "if he acts up to his word."

Other speakers were Mr. Purcell (Tyneside), Ald. Scurr (Poplar), Mr. J. McManus (Leeds), Mr. H. Benson (Bradford), Mr. J. Harte (Liverpool), and Mr. P. D. O'Hart (London), etc.

The singing of "The Soldier's Song" brought the demonstration to a close.

Another Scourging for Elliott

Last week we referred in our "Topics" to Professor Pringle's condemnation of an unnamed parson whose bigotry called for special castigation. The Professor mentioned nobody by name, but the P.P.A. organiser took the remarks to himself and had the temerity to write to the press accusing Professor Pringle of misrepresenting him, and challenging a criticism based on the report of his (Elliott's) remarks in the P.P.A. organ, *The Sentinel*. It was another verification of the old adage, Whom the gods wish to destroy they first make mad. Elliott might have kept silence and escaped, but in his inconceivable ignorance he had the audacity to defy the Professor and to assert that he stood by his words as reported in the Auckland No-Popery weekly. His friend, Rev. Knowles Kempston, tried to excuse the defamer of the dead nun by saying the poor man must have been tired and it was not fair to attack him after a No-Popery campaign that had exhausted him. But Elliott scorned such a defence and gave Professor Pringle an opportunity to serve the public of New Zealand by administering to the itinerant disciple of Chiniquy and Maria Monk a castigation quite in keeping with any of the others that have been bestowed on this wretched bigot, whether by the returned soldier, Clements, by the magistrates, Messrs. Bishop and Frazer, or by the various Members of Parliament who went out of their way to brand as a low cad the parson whom Professor Pringle now exposes as a blatant and untruthful nuisance. The Professor's reply to the challenge is as follows:

Sir,—I gladly accept Mr. Howard Elliott's challenge to produce evidence of the numerous errors and misstatements of historical fact contained in his sermon on the League of Nations. It is certainly courageous of him to say that he is prepared to stand by the facts as he stated them on that occasion. Unfortunately, the facts will not stand by him.

First, Mr. Howard Elliott says—I quote from the *Sentinel* article—that "after the Napoleonic wars had devastated Europe, the Powers combined in what was called the Holy Alliance, to enforce a permanent peace." Rarely have so many errors been packed into one brief sentence. In the first place, does Mr. Elliott really mean the Holy Alliance or is he thinking of the Quadruple Alliance? The Holy Alliance was formed in the autumn of 1815; the Quadruple Alliance was formed at Chaumont in 1814. I do not care which alternative he selects. The former alliance included only the three autocratic States of Central and Eastern Europe—Prussia, Austria, and Russia. The latter, in addition to these Powers, included Great Britain. Neither alliance consisted of all the Powers of Europe. For this reason, among many others, neither of them is comparable to the League of Nations, which at present includes the vast majority of States, not only of Europe, but of the world, and which, in the intention of its framers, will ultimately include all the States of the world. Further, Great Britain was never a member of the Holy Alliance, as Mr. Elliott led his readers

(and hearers) to believe. Curiously enough, neither was the Papacy. The Pope at that time, Pius VII., "refused his adhesion to a league founded by a heretic and a Liberal." (Allison Phillips: *Modern Europe*, p. 18)—that is, by Alexander I., the Tsar of Russia. The Tsars of Russia, as Mr. Elliott apparently does not know, have never from the time of Vladimir I. been Roman Catholics. Nor was the Holy Alliance a league to enforce a permanent peace. In form it was a declaration of three absolutist monarchs of their intention to govern their kingdoms on Christian principles. In effect, it "had no real existence except as a noble ideal in the mind of Alexander I."

Secondly, Mr. Howard Elliott in the next sentence goes on to say "the conditions then were almost identical with those surrounding the formation of the present League." This sentence is delightfully obscure. If it is intended to compare the international situation in 1815 with the international situation in 1918, every observant man knows that, so far from being almost identical, they were radically different. If Mr. Howard Elliott's meaning is that the birth of the League has been attended with the same secrecy that surrounded the inception of the Holy Alliance, the statement is equally untrue. That the inevitable result of the war, if the Allies were successful, would be the formation of a League of Nations was clearly stated by responsible leaders of public opinion in every year from 1914 to 1918. For instance, to take only the authoritative utterances of British and American statesmen, such a policy was declared in set terms by the British Prime Minister in 1914, by Mr. Balfour in 1916, by Mr. Lloyd George in 1917, by President Wilson and by Mr. C. E. Hughes, the Republican candidate at the American Presidential election, in 1917. Again and again the formation of the League was put in the forefront of the Allied war aims. It was preceded by the fullest discussion in Parliament and in the press. There was no such secrecy about it as attended the launching of the Holy Alliance in 1815.

Again, Mr. Howard Elliott says that "the Holy Alliance under the dominance of the Vatican, wrought the greatest mischief for all time in international politics; occasioning, as it did the announcement of the Monroe policy by President Monroe, a policy which today accounts for the strange attitude of the American leaders in regard to international affairs." Again, we have an example of Mr. Howard Elliott's controversial methods. What was the "greatest mischief for all time in international politics?" Was it the Monroe Doctrine or was it the present strange attitude of American leaders? Mr. Elliott has cunningly framed this sentence so that it is capable of both interpretations. But I can scarcely believe that he is referring to the present attitude of America. For America has refused to join the League of Nations, and in Mr. Elliott's opinion the League of Nations is a curse and not a blessing. He must, therefore, mean that the Monroe Doctrine is the greatest mischief for all time. But the Monroe Doctrine kept the Catholic powers from having their own way in South America. Therefore, Mr. Elliott apparently believes that it was the greatest mischief for all time that the Catholic powers were kept from having their own way in South America which, as Euclid would say, is absurd. Whichever alternative he selects, he stands convicted of using words without any clear idea of what they mean.

And so I could go on. The whole article teems with absurdities, with false suggestions, and tricky innuendoes. For example, Mr. Elliott says that the Pope gave President Wilson a present valued at £8000. He would lead his readers to imply that this was a personal gift from the Pope to President Wilson. I ask, is it possible to treat a man seriously who would make such a suggestion? I have no references beside me to enable me to give your readers the exact facts regarding this transaction. Probably, the Pope gave Mr. Wilson a gift for Mr. Hoover's fund for the relief of destitution in Belgium or in Central Europe. I do not know. As I say, I have not the facts beside me. But I should as soon believe that the Pope gave Sir Robert Stout £8000 for university education in New Zealand or that he was subsidising Mr. Elliott's own

A. Newlan Hancock

Chemist, Optician,
Photographic Dealer.

Temuka

Winter winds make rough skins.
Use NYAL'S FACE CREAM.