

## TO OUR SUBSCRIBERS AND ADVERTISERS.

Mr WHEELER, Stafford street, and Mr MACEDO, Princes street south, are empowered to receive monies and orders for papers on account of the NEW ZEALAND TABLET.

## NOTICE TO OUR AGENTS.

IT is respectfully requested that Agents for the TABLET would advise the Secretary when any change—either of increase or decrease—occurs in the number to be forwarded. Those agents who may be receiving copies in excess of the demand, will kindly notify same.

## New Zealand Tablet.

FIAT JUSTITIA.

SATURDAY, OCTOBER 31, 1874.

## CAN THE 'BRUCE HERALD' SPEAK TRUTH?

WE ask this question for the following reason. Some time ago, in our leader on Catholic teaching on Church and State, we made the following statement, "If laws emanating from the civil Authority, as not unfrequently happens in our days, should be in flagrant contradiction to the Natural or the Divine law, not only has the Holy See the right to remonstrate, but in cases where Governments remain deaf to such remonstrance, it becomes a duty for the HOLY FATHER to declare that such iniquitous laws can not only not bind the children of the Church in conscience, but that it would be a crime on their part to obey them." The 'Bruce Herald' after having mis-quoted another sentence from this leader grossly misrepresented the above extract, and without giving its readers an opportunity of forming a correct judgment on the matter, by placing our own words before them, represented us as saying what we did not say.

We naturally complained of this twofold injustice, but without redress, as will be seen by the following quotation from the 'Bruce Herald' of the 16th October—which, by the way, did not come to our office. "The TABLET, in its most recent issue shirks the question at issue—as, of course, it would be compelled to do unless it admitted the soundness of our case—and treats itself to a syllogism in which it starts—as we said it would—by a premises that does not justify the conclusion. It begins by asserting that we admitted having mis-quoted it. We did nothing of the kind. We pointed out to the TABLET that, owing to the slipshod nature of its orthography, no one—not even itself—could fix upon quotations from it with accuracy. That is all we said; and upon that the TABLET founds a conclusion that it did not assert the right of the Pope to forbid obedience to temporal laws of which it disapproved. That is the point upon which the TABLET should argue, but it cannot, because it dare not."

Now for barefaced misrepresentation and falsehood of statement, the above extract from the 'Bruce Herald' stands almost unrivalled. In the first place we never asserted anywhere, either in words or in effect, *the right of the Pope to forbid obedience to temporal laws of which he disapproved*, and consequently we had no question to shirk. We stated that the Pope has the right to remonstrate against laws in *flagrant contradiction to Natural or Divine law*, and to declare that such iniquitous laws cannot bind in conscience; and more, "that it would be a sin to obey them." Now there is no sane man, who understands the meaning of the words *Natural and Divine law*, that would controvert this proposition: why, every man has the right to do what we here claim for the POPE. But the 'Bruce Herald,' if not thoroughly dishonest in its dealings with us, is, it appears from the quotation given above from its issue of the 16th October, incapable of comprehending the difference between our proposition and the proposition which asserts the *right of the Pope to forbid obedience to temporal laws of which he disapproves*. With one so stupid or so untruthful it is idle to argue.

But this is not the only untruth charged upon us. Referring to the TABLET, the 'Bruce Herald' says, "It begins by asserting that we—'Bruce Herald'—admitted having mis-quoted it." Our answer is that we never made nor even thought of making such an assertion. Indeed, the thought of the 'Bruce Herald' being capable of doing such a graceful thing as to acknowledge its errors, is about the last thought that would be likely to enter our mind. But that our readers may be enabled to form a judgment as to the accuracy of our contemporary, we here subjoin the very words we used. "In answer to these grave charges the 'Bruce Herald' says in effect that it should be held excused

for misquotation from our leader on Church and State, because in a subsequent number of the TABLET—that of the 26th of September—there is to be found a typographical error." This is the sentence which our contemporary translates for its readers' information and edification into the following—"It, the TABLET, begins by asserting that we—'Bruce Herald'—admitted having misquoted it." The two statements, as any one can see, are not at all identical.

In reference to this point we shall quote another sentence from the 'Bruce Herald' of the 16th October, viz., "We pointed out to the TABLET that owing to the slipshod nature of its orthography, no one—not even itself—could fix upon quotations from it with accuracy." We shall leave it to the public to judge as to the nature and amount of admission implied in these words. We may, however, be permitted to point out that even though there were an error of orthography, this is a paltry excuse for substituting the word *Natural* for *Natural*—law; for making a substitution which entirely changed the meaning of the TABLET. But in the sentence misquoted by the 'Bruce Herald,' there was no mistake of any kind, and consequently there is not the shadow of an excuse for the misquotation of our contemporary.

But after all there are times when our contemporary is amusing. Even its leader of the 16th October is not altogether destitute of matter capable of causing a laugh. Our contemporary says in reference to a syllogism given in the TABLET of the 10th inst., that "the TABLET could not—as we predicted it could not—construct a syllogism that would stand test." Precisely; nor could any one who would endeavor to embody the arguments of the 'Bruce Herald' in syllogistic form. This is what we did in order to make the *non sequitur* of the reasoning of our contemporary more striking. True, the syllogism cannot stand the test; why? because the argument of the 'Bruce Herald' is faulty. The impossibility of putting it into logical form is the strongest proof that it is erroneous. The fault, therefore, must be laid at the door of our contemporary. The 'Bruce Herald' had better not tangle with syllogisms.

### THE 'OTAGO DAILY TIMES' AND PRINCE BISMARCK.

At last there is one word—a little word—uttered as it were in an undertone, to be found in the 'Daily Times,' not altogether laudatory of Prince BISMARCK's policy in reference to the Catholic Church. Our contemporary calls this powerful Minister "the champion of despotism," but, as it appears to us, in a deprecatory tone. Were, however, the picture reversed; were BISMARCK a German Catholic Chancellor, persecuting the Protestants of the new Empire, expelling their ministers, compelling their ecclesiastical students to attend the lectures of Catholic professors of theology, placing Catholic masters over the Protestant schools, immuring their superintendents in loathsome prisons as so many felons for refusing to abandon Protestantism, and confiscating their Church property, what would be the nature of the language of the 'Daily Times'? How loud would not be our contemporary's denunciation of Popery? How strong its language? But as we have learned to be thankful for small mercies, we shall say no more on this head.

Our object in calling attention to the subject is not to deliver a Jeremiad on the one-sidedness of the 'Daily Times,' and its tender treatment of the greatest, though not the bloodiest, persecutor of the Catholic religion that Europe has seen for centuries; but to correct a mistake as to a matter of fact into which our contemporary has fallen. What we mean will be made apparent by the following quotation from the 'Daily Times' of last Saturday:—"This shows plainly, that the Chancellor"—BISMARCK—"is taking very strong radical measures to establish his authority, and to strangle the Roman Church in the new Empire. That he will succeed we do not for a moment doubt, having regard to the relative strength and enlightenment of the hostile communions." BISMARCK may succeed; we doubt it, however. But should he succeed it will not be in consequence of the superior enlightenment of Protestantism in Germany. The 'Daily Times' is clearly of opinion that this superior enlightenment of Protestantism, together with its superior strength will enable Prince BISMARCK to strangle the Roman Church. But our contemporary, we regret to say, is laboring under a delusion. Protestantism has no superiority of enlightenment over Catholicity in Germany; and had the writer in the 'Daily Times' from