

ST. PATRICK'S SCHOOL, NASEBY.

**WANTED, CATHOLIC TEACHER** for the above School. Applications, with testimonials, &c., to be forwarded immediately to the Rev. President, E. Royer.

### NOTICE TO AGENTS.

As in future papers cannot be returned to the office, if four weeks after date, it is necessary that agents promptly advise the Secretary of any change either of increase or decrease.

### CANVASSER FOR THE TABLET.

**M<sup>R</sup>. W. MURRAY** has been appointed **COLLECTOR** and **CANVASSER** to the **NEW ZEALAND TABLET**, and is authorised to receive monies and give receipts on behalf of this journal.  
By order,  
**JOHN DUNGAN,**  
Secretary.

### SUBSCRIPTIONS TO TABLET.

**THE** following **SUMS** have been received since our last issue as Subscriptions to the **TABLET** :—

|                                            |     |    |    |   |
|--------------------------------------------|-----|----|----|---|
| Mr. Willis, Wanganui, to December 26, 1874 | ... | £4 | 6  | 0 |
| Boyne, Queenstown, to December 26, 1874    | ... | 1  | 14 | 8 |
| P. J. Duncan, Timaru, to January 2, 1875   | ... | 0  | 12 | 6 |
| O'Driscoll, Timaru                         | ... | 7  | 1  | 6 |
| Quin, Temuka, to January 13, 1875          | ... | 0  | 19 | 0 |
| Geran, to October 26, 1874                 | ... | 1  | 5  | 0 |
| McLeod, Shotover                           | ... | 0  | 8  | 6 |

## New Zealand Tablet.

FIAT JUSTITIA.

SATURDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 1875.

### THE 'SOUTHERN MERCURY' IN A RAGE.

THE 'Southern Mercury' is found out, and in its anger at being detected in its underhand calumny of honest and honorable men, forgets itself, and gives vent to its feelings in an article of abuse and falsehood in reference to the **NEW ZEALAND TABLET**. As is usual with our assailants, the 'Southern Mercury,' whilst saying all manner of untrue and disparaging things of us, and laboring hard to prejudice its readers against us, has not the justice nor the manliness to quote even one sentence, by way of proof, from our article which has occasioned its towering passion. It is manifestly afraid to let its readers see what flimsy grounds there are for its invective.

The 'Southern Mercury' begins its Philippic with the words—"The **NEW ZEALAND TABLET** is rapidly acquiring the reputation of being the most aggressive and intolerant periodical in the Colony. Not content with the defence of its own position, it invites attacks, and commits the impolitic mistake of forcing neutrals into the ranks of its opponents." Our answer is—(1). No doubt the opinion is gaining ground amongst the readers of certain newspapers that the **TABLET** is everything the 'Mercury' says it is, because these newspapers, in defiance of facts, have persistently repeated calumnies of us, and as persistently withheld our own words from their readers. But a falsehood repeated, even for ever, cannot change a lie into a truth; and those who know the **TABLET** best, who have read it from the beginning, are well aware that it is neither aggressive nor intolerant. (2). We give the most emphatic contradiction to the statement of the 'Mercury' that we have not been content with the defence of our own position, and that we have invited attack. From the first our position has been one of defence. We have defended our faith and our Church from assaults upon them made in the public and High Schools, and in the Press; but when or where have we attacked any man's faith, assailed any man's right, or in any way endeavored to impede the legitimate expression of opinion? This is a matter easily tested. If it can, and if it dare, let the 'Mercury' give the passages from the columns of the **TABLET** which sustain its assertions. To do this would be an honest, straightforward proceeding; but this is precisely what the 'Mercury' shirks.

The 'Southern Mercury' continues:—"An illustration of the pugnacious disposition of our contemporary is furnished by a most disingenuous article, which appeared in its last issue. We lately published in our columns an extract

from the 'Independent,' respecting Freemasonry. It was inserted without comment, and consequently would not, by any honest or competent journalists, have been treated as an expression of opinion by ourselves. But the Editor of the **TABLET** is ignorant of the functions of a journalist, or which is worse, he wilfully misinterprets those functions. If he is fit to be entrusted with the control of type at all, he should know that the mere insertion of anything copied from another paper, without comment, and with an acknowledgement of the source wherever it is derived, in no way binds the copyist to the sentiments or statements therein contained." Softly, Mr Editor of the 'Southern Mercury.' But we must, before proceeding further, apologise for the length of this extract. Our excuse, however, is, our anxiety to let our readers see our contemporary's doctrine as to editorial responsibility, expressed in his own words. The principle here announced by the 'Mercury' is true to a certain extent, but by no means universally. It has its limitations. If, for example, an Editor republishes a libel or a slander, is he not responsible for it, even to the law of the land? And, again, may there not be circumstances which go to prove that the publication of matter copied from another journal, is another way of giving expression to the copyer's own opinion. And will any dispassionate man deny that such is the case in the present instance, when he bears in mind the controversy that has taken place on the subject of Freemasonry in the **TABLET** and certain other newspapers lately? And this view is confirmed by the consideration, that the charge against the Jesuits, to which the 'Mercury' gave circulation, and which has originated this controversy, is the most atrocious that could be made against any body of men. The 'Mercury' published, without note or comment, the following fearful calumny, taken from the 'Independent': "It is exactly a hundred and one years since the Bull for the suppression of the Jesuits was put by Pope CLEMENT XIV., Ganganelli, who died so mysteriously a year after—poisoned by the Jesuits, as every Italian believes." Now we maintain that the man who publishes such a charge as that without note or comment makes himself an active agent in the propagation of the slander. No honest, honorable man, who disbelieved the charge—who, in fact, did not endorse it, would publish it to the world, even as an extract without comment. It is a charge of too terrible a nature, too injurious to the good name of a learned, virtuous, and useful body of ecclesiastics,—too hurtful to the most sacred feelings of upright men, to be flung abroad before the eyes of the public, without a deep conviction of its truth, and of the absolute necessity of making it public, or of repeating it. The 'Mercury' is on the horns of a dilemma: either its Editor endorses the 'Independent,' or, in sheer recklessness, and with no object, except to wound and outrage the feelings of his Catholic fellow citizens, he launches this lie on the wings of the New Zealand Press. We here repeat what we said in our issue of the 23rd ult.: The 'Southern Mercury' contains an article from the 'Independent,' which a respectable journal ought not to insert.

Again, the 'Mercury' misrepresents our use of the word "endorse" in our article of the 23rd January. It is no where said in that leader that the 'Mercury' endorsed the article of the 'Independent,' and this affords another proof of how unfair it is to omit quoting the passages to which reference is made in such controversies as this. These are our own words,—“According to the 'Independent,' endorsed of course by the 'Mercury,' for which the 'Guardian' is sponsor—the Holy See does nothing except at the suggestion of the Jesuits. Poor simpletons all three are.” We applied the word "endorsed," and in a playful way, to one particular sentence, and to that only. Had the 'Mercury' attended to this obvious fact, its columns should not have been burdened with a great deal of irrelevant matter, and the expression of a great deal of unnecessary indignation and untrue charges of ignorance, &c., in reference to the 'TABLET.' The only remark we made which is at all applicable to the entire article of the 'Independent,' was, that a respectable journal ought not to insert it, and that it is at once silly and shocking. But what we did not say then, we say now, viz., that it is clear to us the 'Mercury' did endorse that article from the 'Independent.'

The 'Mercury' says, "Yet persistently we have been attacked, vilified and misrepresented, by that peculiar paper" the 'TABLET.' The 'Mercury' is dreaming. Until the 23rd of last month, the 'TABLET' has never, so far as