

State will interfere as little as possible with individual liberty, and in the matter of education in particular, content itself with providing means and holding out encouragement.

THE MELBOURNE 'ARGUS' AND BISHOP MORAN'S LECTURE.

SOME kind friend in Victoria has been good enough to send us 'The Argus' of the 18th May, in which there is a leader on Bishop MORAN's lecture on the "Bankruptcy of Liberalism." We are very much obliged to our anonymous friend, but regret he should have put himself to so much trouble to such little purpose, unless, indeed, it was his intention to amuse us. The article of our contemporary is not worth much. As a criticism on the lecture, it is *jeune* in the extreme, and as an evidence of industry, it is deplorable. The writer does not appear to have read the lecture which he makes such great pretence of criticising. Indeed, there are so many passages in it coincident with certain parts of the leader which appeared in the 'Otago Daily Times,' in reference to the lecture, that we are disposed to think that the 'Argus' man derived all his information from our Dunedin contemporary.

For example, 'The Argus' says, "Liberalism, according to this Catholic luminary, was born amid the terrors and outrages of the French Revolution." The 'Otago Daily Times' said the same substantially. But this is untrue, as we pointed out subsequently. Bishop MORAN did not say what these two newspapers have attributed to him on this point. Again, the 'Argus' says, "It is hard to believe that Bishop MORAN is not densely ignorant of the principles and forces that have begotten the revolutions of modern history, and what is worse, absolutely at fault with regard to the position and influence of his own church." The 'Daily Times' said the same, though in different words.

The 'Argus' says, "We are paying the Bishop a higher compliment than he deserves, when we assert, with a whole shelf of historical authorities behind us, that the Papacy was a direct progenitor of the Revolution, and that the liberalism he denounces was largely nourished on its tyrannies and abuses." If the passage about the "whole shelf of historical authorities" and the compliment, be excepted, the 'Daily Times' said the same. The coincidence is striking. We wish to be polite and duly sensible of the favor done us, but really we fail to see in what the compliment consists. It is very gratifying to us, however, to learn that the 'Argus' man has behind him such an excellent library. But we regret that on the occasion of his writing this rather strong leader, he had not this "whole shelf of historical authorities" before him. To know that he only had it behind him, is not reassuring on the score of accuracy. An authority or two in support of his very extraordinary assertions would have been much more satisfactory than the assurance that he had a lot of authorities the back ground.

Towards the end of his article, the writer in the 'Argus' puts within brackets these words, "Cannot the ghosts of ALVA and his butchered victims haunt the dreams of this unconscious cleric." Our contemporary has, some time or another, read MOTLEY's Philippic, which he, as well as the author himself, has mistaken for calm, impartial history, and has treated his readers to this spicy passage by way of a finisher. But, although the reference is irrelevant, we must not find much fault with him, as it is only the usual red pepper with which newspaper writers generally season their otherwise insipid commonplace. The writer, of course, must in some way show that he is a man of learning and miscellaneous leading, and that if he only thought it worth his while, he could utterly demolish the Bishop's lecture. It might be a little difficult to do this in an intelligible way; but he could do it if only he set about it, as is plain from the slashing article in which he has condescended to notice the poor production!

It is not necessary to say anymore on the subject today; but should the editor of the 'Argus' change his position in reference to that "whole shelf full of historical authorities," and seriously set himself the task of refuting the lecture, we promise to forget the red pepper, the ghosts of ALVA and his butchered victims, and MOTLEY's impassioned romance, and calmly weigh his arguments. We would recommend him, however, not to confine himself to such authorities as SISMONDI, CARLYLE, and MOTLEY. Not one of these has written history.

PROGRESS.

THIS is the great cry of the day. None are louder in their demand of it than the gentlemen of the Press; and woe to any member of the fourth estate who is only suspected of being slow and conservative. His fellows are down upon him at once, and he is loaded with censure. And after exhausting the usual severe epithets of language, his censors generally conclude with declaring him to be an enemy of progress; that is, what they call by this name, as if that were the climax of criminality. We have been ourselves sufferers in this matter, and have been pronounced, more than once, to be enemies of progress.

This, however, is unjust. We are in reality its friends; but we demur to their definition of progress, and are unwilling to run the imminent risk of stepping over a precipice into a gulf. What they term progress, we regard as insanity. We hesitate to follow men who cannot agree as to the road, and cannot but look with suspicion on the teaching of the apostles of progress, when we find them opposed to one another even as to first principles.

This thing which is styled progress is the product of the efforts of advanced thinkers, as they call themselves. It is worth while to discover, if possible, in what this product consists. It will be a difficult task, nevertheless we shall attempt it. HUXLEY is an advanced thinker, and an apostle of progress; and what is his first principle? "Education is the instruction of the intellect in the law of nature." Nothing more. If a man has a soul, which is only an hypothesis, 'our highest wisdom' since it can be neither felt, weighed, nor measured, is to take no notice of it. As to religion, if people will have it, it should be, for the most part, of the silent sort, at the altar of the unknown and unknowable."—*Lay Sermons*, iii., 32, 11, 16.

STRAUSS is another apostle of progress, he teaches that "the idea of a future world is the last enemy whom speculative criticism has to oppose, and if possible to overcome." TYNDALL, a great man of modern progress, reproaches the clergy, who divert men's thoughts for a while from the "law of nature to such unscientific questions as death and judgment, as noble savages."—*Fragments of Science*, p. 68. The Roman Church, Mr. HUXLEY says, *Lay Sermons*, iv., 61, is the one great spiritual organisation which is able to resist, and must as a matter of life and death resist, the progress of science and modern civilization. But RANKE, a non-Catholic thinks differently, he says, "A slow but sure and unbroken progress of intellectual culture had been going on within the bosom of the Roman Church for a series of ages." *All the vital and productive energies of human culture* were here united and mingled. *History of the Reformation in Germany*, vol. I., book II., chap. I., p. 251, GUZOT, another non-Catholic, in his *History of Civilization*, lec. II., and *History of Civilization in France*, lec. IV., says:—"It was the Roman Church which powerfully assisted in forming the character and furthering the development of modern civilization; whose innumerable monasteries were philosophical schools of Christianity, whose monks and clergy were active and potent at once in the domain of intellect and in that of reality; and whose glory it is, that the human mind, beaten down by the storm, took refuge in the asylum of the churches and monasteries. Mr. LECKY, non-Catholic, again, *Rationalism*, vol. ii., chap. v., pp. 142, 154, 164, says—"The Papal Government has had no rival, and can have no successor;" and that "there can be no question that the Papal power was on the whole favourable to liberty;" and that the Catholic Church was the special representative of progress." Mr. FROUDE, too—*Times of Erasmus*—and *Luther*, p. 48, thinks differently from Huxley, and states that the Catholic Church was always "essentially democratic; while at the same time she has had the monopoly of learning." Mr. SAMUEL LAING, also another non-Catholic, *Obser. on the Social and Political State of the European People*, chap. xv., p. 394, says:—"The Catholic Church and her establishments were the only asylums in which the spirit of freedom and independence of mind were lodged, kept alive, and nursed to their present maturity; and that all men have of social, political, and religious freedom may be clearly traced, in the history of every country, to the working and effects of the independent power of the Church of Rome." And Dr. NEWMAN, *Office, and Works of Universities*, ch. ix., p. 165, sums up all in these pithy words:—"Not a man in Europe now, who talks bravely against the Church, but owes it to the Church that he can talk at all."