

manners of its betters, but out contemporary of the Plain lacks the ability of its leaders, and falls into great follies. It would occupy too much space, however, to give here a complete list, with their respective characters, of all those to whom we have to administer reproof every now and then.

The 'Bruce Herald' is, we believe, the last that has made an onslaught on us, and the principles we defend. We do not complain of being attacked, nor are we surprised to find our principles impugned; but we do complain of unfair and shabby treatment. The editor of that journal, in his issue of Friday week, quotes—and incorrectly, too—one sentence from our leader concerning Catholic teaching as to Church and State, and forthwith proceeds to deliver a Philippic on our intolerance and tyranny. The TABLET might say, in reply, *retorqueo argumentum*, but will not do so in so many words. One or two passages, from the article, which the 'Bruce Herald' unfairly suppressed will be more than sufficient for our justification.

The editor of the 'Bruce Herald' begins his leader with the spicey and rather strong words—"Our contemporary, the NEW ZEALAND TABLET, exists for the propagation of intolerance." This is the thesis, and the only proof brought forward is the following, from our issue of the 15th of last month, which, as has been said above, is given incorrectly by our contemporary:—"The Church, the guardian and interpreter of the natural"—not national—"and Divine law, possesses the right to control all the acts of the State, without exception, which necessarily belongs to her under the point of their morality." * * * * *

A little further on the 'Bruce Herald' makes a show to quote other words of ours, but in reality fails to do so, and attributes to us what we have not said. We shall first give the words of the 'Herald,' and then our own:—"The TABLET lays down the doctrine that when a State make laws that the Pope disapproves of, and considers contrary to morality, 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."

We ask such as feel an interest in the subject to be so good as to read our leader from which the above purports to be a quotation. It will be seen at once that we have not written what our contemporary attributes to us. Here are our own words: "If laws emanating from the civil authority, as not unfrequently happens in our day, should be in *flagrant contradiction* to the Natural or Divine Law, not only has the Holy See the right to remonstrate, but in the cases where Governments remain deaf to such remonstrances, 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. As His Eminence says further on: "To obey such laws would not give to CÆSAR what belongs to CÆSAR, but would rob God of what belongs to God." Such, then, is the doctrine, for maintaining which we are charged by the 'Bruce Herald' with intolerance and tyranny. What do we claim, in this passage, for the Head of the Catholic Church, that every man in existence, Turk, Jew, Mahometan, Pagan, and Christian does not claim for himself, and that every Church that exists, or ever existed, does not claim for itself? Absolutely nothing.

In the first place, does not every man and every church claim the right to remonstrate against laws which are in *flagrant contradiction* to the Natural and Divine Law? Does not every man and every church consider it a duty to declare, if called upon to do so, that such iniquitous laws cannot bind any man in conscience, and that it would be a crime to obey them? There can be no doubt whatever that such is the case, the history of religion and mankind proves it beyond a doubt; and even though no history existed, the reason and instincts of humanity establish beyond the possibility of cavil, the justice of such a claim by men, considered both individually and collectively. Does the 'Bruce Herald' mean to say that the civil authority can repeal the laws of God, and that men are bound to obey iniquitous civil laws; and, at the bidding of the civil power, trample on the laws given to men by God? He must either mean this, or all the strong writing of our contemporary is absolutely without meaning,—wild unreason, sheer vulgar abuse. In this article to which the 'Bruce Herald' takes such exception, we have claimed nothing for the Holy Father which every man, even the

Editor of the 'Bruce Herald,' does not claim for himself. But in the claim set up by us there is a great security for civil authority, for which that authority ought to be grateful. According to our doctrine the ultimate appeal lies not to the individual, who may, not unlikely, be a partial judge in his own case, but to a high, learned, responsible authority,—an authority as old as Christianity, and respected, revered, and trusted throughout the world.

Now we may ask which is the tyrant? which is intolerant? The N. Z. TABLET, or the 'Bruce Herald'—the man who denies to all Catholics, individually and collectively,—in their capacity as individual citizens, as well as in that of members of the most numerous, learned, ancient, venerable, and consistent Church in existence,—the rights he claims and exercises for himself; or the writer who claims these rights for all Christians, to be exercised by them under the safe guidance of an everlasting and infallible Church. But the 'Bruce Herald' will not, of course, grant that the Church is infallible. Well, at all events, it is a very numerous and learned body, the most numerous and learned in the world, and, at the lowest, must be as able to form a judgment on reason, law, and religion as the Editor of the 'Bruce Herald.' Again, how can it be intolerant and tyrannical in us to teach the doctrine which in all its essentials is taught and acted on, it may be said daily, by the Editors of all the newspapers in the world? But so it is; the Editor of the 'Bruce Herald' is not the only man who has lost his head at the contemplation of the majestic fabric of the Catholic Church.

HARD UP FOR A MASON.

For some reason, which is not very evident, certain people in Otago have evinced a great anxiety of late to make the world believe that our Most Holy Father PIUS IX. is, or was, a Freemason. The whole affair is absurd. For more than one hundred and fifty years the Church has excommunicated all members and aiders and abettors of that accursed society; and this excommunication has been renewed by PIUS IX. himself, who has besides, on various occasions, denounced this and other secret societies in the strongest terms. What object, then, these people can have in so persistently stating this calumny, we cannot see, unless, indeed, it be for the purpose of deceiving some unwary Catholic into disobedience to his religion.

In our last issue, we laughed at the reasoning of the 'Guardian' on this subject. This week, we have to deal with an extraordinary letter from Dr. BAKEWELL, to that paper, in which he repeats the statement of our contemporary. Dr. BAKEWELL says:—"In corroboration of your statement that His Holiness POPE PIUS THE NINTH is, or was, a Freemason, I may state that, when in Trinidad, I made the acquaintance of an Englishman who had been a Freemason in an Italian lodge. He told me he had visited the lodge in which the POPE was initiated, passed and raised, and had himself seen the signature of the POPE, and the record of the ceremonies in the archives of the lodge." And so, the Doctor thinks the matter proved. Well done, Dr. BAKEWELL! Who proved the authenticity of the signature? who proved that the present POPE was the very identical individual? We are left in the dark as to all this, and the Doctor thinks his cock-and-bull story has clearly proved the POPE to be a Freemason in spite of the laws of the Church, and His own express sentence of excommunication. Wonders will never cease!

But the Doctor is not satisfied with his logical argument as to the POPE's Freemasonry—he must go a step further, and eulogise the principles of the sect. The Doctor says, that the principles of Freemasonry are those of the purest morality and the most exalted charity, and that there is nothing in them opposed to Christianity." Take care, Doctor, you are on slippery ground. We do not know, to be sure, what Dr. BAKEWELL's standard of morality and charity is, and cannot, therefore, say whether he may not be logically consistent in eulogising the principles of Freemasonry as to these; but when he says there is nothing in them opposed to Christianity, we are sorry to be compelled to differ with him. We do know for certain that the principles of Freemasonry are in direct antagonism to Christianity; that, in fact, the real *ratio existendi* of Freemasonry is the destruction of Christianity and Christian society.

In Mgr. DE SEGUR's work on Freemasonry, chap. 28, as practised on the Continent of Europe, the following will be found:—"The moment is the initiation of the Mistress