

on his high horse, denounces the priest as subtle or ' Jesuitical '—the much-enduring Jesuit is bound to be dragged in at some stage—and repeats, only more loudly and more confidently, the very same thing he had said before. Finally, if the priest happens to be able to put his case in a way that is perfectly crushing and conclusive that only makes the aggressor still more violent. ' Everybody,' he then says, ' knows the thing to be true, and it is mere evasion or special pleading for the priest to make so much fuss about its not having the necessary evidence. Besides, even if this particular story cannot be proved a dozen others as bad or even worse are certainly true, and it is mere impertinence to ask for evidence when the whole thing is so notorious.' Thus there is no finality in the argument, and not even a passing glimpse of Christian good-will or fair-mindedness from the prejudiced party who began the controversy. At the end of the argument he is not one hair's breadth nearer taking a more reasonable view of ' Popery ' or of the particular question under discussion than he was when it began.

*

We are led to make these remarks apropos of the conclusion last week of a certain controversy begun some time ago between the Rev. Mr. GIBB, Moderator of the Presbyterian Church of New Zealand, and the Rev. Father CLEARY. Our readers will probably remember the origin of the controversy. It began in a violent attack on the Church made by Mr. GIBB at what was practically an Orange meeting in the Choral Hall, in the course of which the rev. gentleman made the following statement :

' In the *Tablet* of the 9th October, 1864, the late Cardinal MANNING, speaking in the name of the Pope, is reported thus : " I acknowledge no civil power ; I am the subject of no Prince ; and I claim more than this : I claim to be the supreme judge and director of the consciences of men—of the peasants that till the field and of the prince that sits upon the throne, of the household that lives in privacy, and the legislator that makes laws for the kingdoms. I am sole last supreme judge of what is right and wrong. Moreover, we declare, affirm, define, and pronounce it to be necessary for salvation to every human creature to be subject to the Roman Pontiff." '

Father CLEARY at once took the matter up in the Press, pointing out that there was no issue of the *London Tablet* of the date mentioned, and declaring the quotation, as given, to be a fabrication and contrary to Catholic doctrine. After further correspondence Mr GIBB (who had at first professed to be quoting from the *London Tablet* at first hand) undertook to write to the author of the Protestant hand-book from which the *Tablet* reference and alleged quotation had really been taken, and a fortnight ago he published the reply which he had received in which the correct *Tablet* date was now supplied, and a very much modified version of the MANNING ' quotation ' was given. To this letter Father CLEARY replied at length, showing how very materially the new version differed from the one first flaunted by Mr. GIBB, and pointing out that even as now correctly given the words were not and did not profess to be statements of ' Catholic doctrine.' Throughout all the correspondence Father CLEARY was careful, as he always is, to make the point at issue perfectly clear and to stick strictly to it from first to last.

*

And what was the Presbyterian reply to the clear issue raised and to the explicit statements made by Father CLEARY? Did the representatives of that body express their satisfaction at receiving Father CLEARY's denial and frankly accept it, or did they—as in the other alternative they were bound to do—bring forward proofs from recognised Catholic theologians to show that the quotation fairly expressed the authoritative teaching of the Church? They did neither the one nor the other. Mr. GIBB, with commendable prudence and good sense, had announced his intention of retiring from the contest, but the *Outlook*—the official organ of the Church of which Mr. GIBB is at present the official head—elected to take the matter up, and we give below in full a leaderette on the subject which appears in the issue just to hand. After reviewing the origin of the controversy and quoting the revised version of Cardinal MANNING's words, the *Outlook* continues thus, under the heading of ' Father CLEARY's Rejoinder ' :—

' So spoke Cardinal MANNING, and in speaking much more than justified Mr. GIBB's contention. Does the Catholic apologist admit this? Oh, dear no! As a sample of begging the question, and Jesuitical reasoning of the purest order, there is nothing to surpass the column and more in which Father CLEARY tries to take the sting out of Mr. LILLEY's letter, and to hide his own defeat. Round and round the point at issue he travels in labyrinthine twists and turnings intricate. " The punctuation is wrong. What Mr. LILLEY now says is not exactly what Mr. GIBB originally said. The ' t's ' are not properly crossed in the quotation, the ' i's ' are not properly dotted." And so on and so on. It is an amazing spectacle. It fills one with wonder akin to awe at the character of the Romanist mind. Plain to demonstration is it now that the Papal claim is as arrogant and inimical to human liberty as Mr. GIBB contended. But if not the Protestant mind, then the Catholic mind may be deluded by a multitude of words and so the words come whirling fast and furious. There is something, however, deeply suggestive in the *TABLET* editor's rejoinder as indeed there was in the letters he wrote several months ago. Rome is one thing in countries where she has it all her own way ; quite another thing in Protestant lands. Here the effort is to hide the sting, to keep the claws well within the velvet. As Mr. LILLEY says, " Father CLEARY must be a very Protestant priest indeed." It is the policy of Rome in Protestant lands to pose as a friend of freedom and equal rights for all. But no man is really deceived thereby. Give Rome the power she once possessed, and our liberties, both civil and religious, would not be worth an hour's purchase.'

*

We reproduce the *Outlook* observations in full, because we feel sure it is only necessary for our readers to read them for themselves to see at once their utter feebleness and inconsequence. The questions at issue in the later stage of the controversy were very plain and very clear. They were two : (1) Had the quotation from Manning been correctly given ; and (2) Was the correct quotation a statement of ' Catholic doctrine ' or was it not? These two points, it will be noticed, the *Outlook* writer carefully shirks and evades. There are plenty of Papal encyclicals and hundreds and hundreds of volumes by Catholic authorities on the relation of the Pope to the civil power, but he appeals to none of these nor advances one iota of proof of the position he has taken up. Instead, he seeks refuge in mere abusive generalities and in further appeals to the bigotry and prejudices of his readers. Father CLEARY, in his official and representative capacity, explicitly and in set terms denied that the statement in question was, as alleged, a statement of ' Catholic doctrine,' but the denial is not rebutted but simply ignored and set aside. The Presbyterian writers have determined that a certain thing is Catholic doctrine, and if it isn't it ought to be ; and so they bluster on and brazen it out to the end, crying out with their last breath, " No Popery " ! They have been in no way convinced or softened or led to think one whit more kindly of their Catholic fellow-citizens by all the columns of argument ; their defect is not one of the mind but of the will, and the only effect of explanation and refutation in their case is to harden and exasperate.

*

Are we, then, to discard controversy because the immediate aggressor in the attacks on the Church remains unconvinced and unconvinced? By no means. The real aim of public controversy is not to convince the individual, but to vindicate the Church in the eyes of the public. And in every well-conducted discussion some good seed is sown—quietly perhaps, but none the less effectually—in the hearts and minds of men of peace and good-will. So far as Catholics are concerned, there are two immediate and direct benefits which accompany almost all controversy. In the first place, it affords an opportunity for a clear and correct statement of the Church's teaching, and for the consequent removal of the mistakes and misconceptions which so often blind and prejudice our non-Catholic friends against us. In every community there are numbers of sincere souls anxious to receive and follow the ' kindly light ' which leads men to the truth, and controversy has helped a goodly number on their way from the land of darkness and mists to the one true fold of the Redeemer. And, in the second place, effective controversy tends to secure the Church from all merely malicious and gratuitous attacks. When the opponents of Catholicity know that they are likely to be brought to book, and asked to make good any statements they may advance, the knowledge is highly calculated to reduce both the number and the violence of their attacks. In this respect a marked improvement has taken place during the last four or five years in the attitude of outsiders towards the Catholic body, and the Church is