

slang words complained of). (2) The 'Outlook' also quoted three extracts from the 'Tablet' in which the calumnies of Mr. Michael McCarthy and Dr. Robertson are spoken of as 'fairy tales,' 'misinformation,' etc.; and an imitative description of the Rev. Pierce Carey's fee-fow-fum No-Popery shriek on a Melbourne Orange platform during the last dog-days. (3) Our contemporary concluded by quoting, at third-hand, some alleged extracts from the Melbourne 'Tribune,' in reference to the terms of reference for the late Bill-in-schools plebiscite in Victoria. 'In Victoria,' says the 'Outlook,' 'we believe, the "Tribune" occupies the same position as does the "Tablet" in New Zealand, and in both cases their articles may be regarded as official and authoritative.' The 'Outlook' regards the articles as 'dictatorial' towards Premier Bent, and concludes that they accurately indicate the policy of the Catholic Church there. It assumes that the 'Tablet' believes in its heart in the same line of action—only that its editor is rather more cautious and wary than the editor of the Victorian 'Tribune.' (This is, we believe, the first occasion on which the 'Tablet' was accused of lack of the courage of its convictions. But in the same articles the 'Outlook,' by way of compensation, no doubt, makes it a grievance against us that we are too outspoken).

The 'Tablet's Rejoinder.

Sir,—(1) In your issue of July 22, after having made the altogether incorrect statement that 'the adult Catholic vote' in New Zealand 'is in the hand of the Archbishop and his creatures,' you add, as a sheer matter of fact, 'With this vote the prelates bargain with political parties.' I replied, 'This statement I know and declare to be in every part contrary to fact.' You, Sir, must be well aware that in all discussion a gratuitous assertion is logically met with a gratuitous denial. On the face of it, my denial is at least as good as your assertion. In point of fact, it is a good deal better. For, in the first place, I speak from knowledge, and, in the second place, it is a principle of British law and of common fair play that even the men whom you contemptuously refer to as 'the Archbishop and his creatures' shall not, until adequate proof is forthcoming, be deemed guilty of selling that which is neither legally nor morally theirs, as if they were a gang of thieves disposing of ill-gotten goods to a professional 'fence.' The evidence for your accusation should be clear and cogent. Thus far not so much as a scrap of it has been advanced by you. Instead of sustaining your specific accusation, you pile on a fresh agony of unproven charges and unworthy innuendoes. I shall, at the proper time, claim the right of being heard on these fresh accusations. For the present I await your evidence as to the time, place, and nature of the alleged bargain and the 'political parties' with whom it was carried on. Surely you were jesting when you said of the 'Tablet' and the 'Tribune' (the latter the youngest of the Catholic journals of Victoria) that 'their articles' may be taken as 'official' pronouncements! Are the 'Outlook's' articles to be regarded in this light?

(2) You also said in your issue of July 22: 'From every district we learn that appointments in the Public Service fall to Roman Catholics in a ratio far in excess of their proportion of the population.' I have already indicated in general terms the widely different lessons of the searching investigations conducted during twelve months by the 'Tablet' and its local committees in nearly 'every district' of New Zealand. Their detailed evidence regarding 'appointments in the public service' was published week by week for all the world to see and test it. I have called for the wholly incompatible evidence which you have received 'from every district' in the Colony. Where is it? You have not so much as mentioned the subject in your last issue! Both your assertions, as they stand, are sufficiently met by the old legal maxim, 'De non apparentibus, et de non existentibus, eadem est ratio,' which may be translated: 'The evidence that is not forthcoming must be treated as if it did not exist.'

A glance at the 'Tablet' of August 17, or at any good English dictionary (the Encyclopaedic, for instance vols. 9, 10, and 11), should satisfy you as to the offensiveness of the terms 'Papist,' 'Popery,' and 'Romish,' to which I have specifically taken exception. It is one thing to fling at a Christian creed old-time theological nicknames that were coined as terms of mere offence. It is obviously quite a different thing to apply such all too mild terms as 'extravagant enthusiasm,' 'oft-exposed,' 'fairy tale,' etc., to aggressors who have been repeatedly convicted of recklessly making false and injurious statements against people who differ from them in religious belief. I have made this charge against Dr. Robertson; also against No-Popery McCarthy, whose

fierce denunciations of Catholic doctrine and worship were, no doubt, learned in the strongly Protestant institutions in which he was trained. I am prepared to substantiate my case against both, either in or out of your columns. For the rest, if I advance an accusation against any man, or any body of men, you may rest assured of my readiness either to substantiate it with adequate proof or to frankly withdraw it. I claim no credit for this. It is only what even a self-respecting pagan would do.—I am, etc.,

EDITOR 'N.Z. TABLET.'

August 10.

The 'Outlook'

comment opened with a kindly but quite unmerited compliment to the 'Tablet' editor for 'that skill in controversy for which,' it says, 'he is so deservedly renowned.' It then goes on to say: 'We can scarcely pay the "Tablet" editor a higher compliment than to declare that were we in the unfortunate position of being charged with any offence when the evidence was strongly against us, we should count ourselves happy in having him as our advocate. The letter to which we call attention is a masterpiece of its kind, and may well serve as a model of polite letter-writing upon polemical subjects. We envy the "Tablet" editor his suaviter-in-modo and fortiter-in-re style of penmanship.' The 'Outlook' then goes on to say: 'The "Tablet" editor holds an impregnable position in demanding what he knows cannot be furnished by anyone outside Roman Catholic official circles.' It holds, however, that 'a weak point in our tactics is disclosed in our statement that our articles are not the "official pronouncements" of our Bishops. (We may here state that only those items in our columns are the "official pronouncements" of our Bishops, or of any one of them, which are on the face of them official, or which are expressly stated to be official. The articles of the "Tablet" cover wider ground,) from household economy—on which our Bishops are not likely to make "official pronouncements"—and

'Down from mythology,
Into thyology,

Troth! and conchology'—

and other subjects that happen to crop up week by week). The 'Outlook' rather rashly concludes that, as we disclaim an official character for our articles universally taken, our information, as to the alleged sale of 'the adult Catholic vote' may not be first-hand and trustworthy. But it declares that it 'gladly accepts' the 'Tablet' editor's assurance that, to the best of his knowledge, the Catholic prelates of New Zealand have never indulged in political bargaining.' (The expression, 'to the best of our knowledge,' was not, of course, used by us. Our denial was absolute). It quotes at second-hand from some articles in the Melbourne 'Tribune' on the plebiscite questions, which the Rev. Mr. Nicholson finds 'sufficiently dictatorial.' 'We submit,' says the 'Outlook,' 'the following proposition, which the "Tablet" editor's trained legal mind cannot fail to grasp: The "quotations" from Mr. Nicholson's letter fully sustain the charge of "political bargaining," in so far as the Roman Catholic Church in Victoria is concerned, and that it is fair to assume that with a similar issue before the Roman Catholic Church in New Zealand the same tactics will be adopted.'

Our Last Shot.

Sir,—Absence from Dunedin has prevented an earlier reply to certain editorial matter in your issue of August 19. I thank you for your kindly references to my last communication. They are, however, undeserved. I merely urged you to extend to 'Archbishop Redwood and his creatures' (as you call our prelates) the elementary principles of fair play that every court of justice in Christendom, and even in civilised pagandom, extends to the thief or footpad that is placed upon his trial. You have haled our Bishops before your court on a charge that is about tantamount to one of political corruption—namely, striking bargains with 'political parties' for the disposal of 'the adult Catholic vote' of New Zealand. A plea of not guilty has been entered for them by me. I know, moreover, with complete certainty, and have twice declared in your columns, that your accusation is in every detail devoid of truth. And on such matters you must admit that my knowledge, even at its worst, is better than yours, even at its best. It was your duty to furnish, on demand, not alone information as to the nature of the crime alleged by you against the Catholic bishops, but likewise to tender evidence as to the date or dates on which it was perpetrated, the names of the persons with whom the alleged corrupt 'bargaining' was carried on, and all the other