

remarkable manner. Then we were all for defence and looked out anxiously for the erection of forts and batteries, and the provision of everything that might enable us to show a bold front to the enemy. The deputation, however, that waited upon the Premier the other day were of a very different mind and all their object was to prevent measures worth speaking of from being taken to defend our shores. Even that man of peace Mr. Stout, although he represented himself as acting in the matter solely on behalf of Parliament, and against his private convictions, evidently felt somewhat warmly in the case, and considered that an unreasonable step had been taken in the remonstrance brought before him. And, indeed there has occurred very little to place things now on a different footing from that occupied by them during the late scare. It is true the disturbing cause that then existed has been for the time removed. We have not now before our eyes any cause more likely than not to result in immediate war as was the condition of things when the dispute on the Afghan frontier was at its height. The perils nevertheless, even of that situation have not finally passed away, and we cannot by any means foresee a distant time as that alone which shall see them renewed. The general consent seems to be that a temporary arrangement only has been made, and even that is not as yet concluded. The Afghan frontier moreover is not the one sole point in all the world concerning which a quarrel may occur between England and Russia, and even as we write possibilities that cannot be overlooked present themselves before the eyes of the world in the outbreaks that have taken place in southern Europe. Any state of affairs that may result in a complete alteration of the map of Europe is one to which England cannot be indifferent and in event of a settlement's being made by means of a general war, which after all is not an outrageously extravagant supposition it would most probably happen that England and Russia would be opposed to one another. It might happen moreover that France and Russia would be allied, and that would make the situation very much more threatening so far as these colonies are concerned. But as to the notion mentioned by one or other of the gentlemen who formed the deputation that it was still doubtful as to whether these colonies must necessarily be included in any war declared against England—that received its full contradiction in the information which the Premier said that the Government had received as to the intentions of Russia on a former occasion. We may be convinced that those intentions still and always hold good and the most peaceful attitude possible on our part would do nothing more than enable them to be carried with less trouble into effect.—The movement made by the colonies again with respect to the campaign in the Soudan has once for all identified them with the old country in her warfare, and in any case, it would be difficult to see how they could lay claim to immunity so long as they continue united to the Empire. It may again, sound very patriotic to rely on the defence to be made of the colonies by the Imperial fleet, but it may well be questioned as to whether such a patriotism will stand the test of examination. The true patriot is the man who is ready to make any sacrifice demanded of him for the sake of his country, and not he who for his own sake and to spare his purse is prepared to run the risk of embarrassing his country at the hour of need. Prior to the late scare, for example, and while it continued, very grave doubts were thrown by high authority on the efficiency of the fleet—and, although steps are being taken to remove all possibility of doubt, other powers are also taking pains to improve their naval standing. We do not see, then, how there can be any reasonable question made as to the necessity of defending our ports and harbours. The very safety not only of our towns but of English men-of-war themselves may depend on this, as in fact, the Admiral on the Australian station, according to the Premier, informed our Government when he refused to send a ship here unless such precautions were taken, and the defence of our coasts may be regarded as no more than a necessary part of the defence of the whole empire. Nor does it appear that the Government have done anything more than what was required in the matter. Reductions have been made wherever it was possible to make them—as in the case of the armed constabulary, and one expansion has been given to the volunteer system. The measures for defence, in fact, as we believe, have been very wisely undertaken. In this the Government have proved themselves fully capable. Mr. Stout, as he tells us, continues a consistent member of the Peace Society, and Sir Julius Vogel was certainly no wild enthusiast in the matter—on the contrary some of our citizens probably remember his appearance in quite an opposite character. Dispassionate and unprejudiced minds were, therefore, brought by the Cabinet to the consideration of the subject and the result seems completely satisfactory.

A BLIND MISLEADER.

(Catholic Review.)

THE Rev. J. Minot Savage, of Boston, as reported in a recent number of the Boston *Herald* has been discussing the "survival of the fittest" in reference to the religion of the future, and with characteristic boldness and confidence he expresses the opinion that the Catholic religion is not likely to survive.

The reasons which the rev. gentleman gives for this opinion furnish the best evidence that could be given that, whatever his attainments in general and polite literature may be, and whatever other claim he may have upon the attention of his hearers, he is, certainly, very far from having an adequate knowledge of the Catholic religion either in its principles, its dogmas, or its history, and, therefore, instead of guiding his people in the truth, he is leading them astray and doing great injustice to the religion which he so thoroughly and completely misrepresents. He says it seems to him that the Catholic Church is not likely to survive, 1. "Because it has been on the decline for the last hundred years." 2. "A large part of its dogmas cannot be justified by the scientific method of investigation." 3. "The Catholic Church, in its whole structure, as it pertains either to this world or the next, is a hard despotism of the extremest kind." 4. "A large part of its doctrines spring out of and are consistent only with a lower stage of moral development than that which the best part of the world now occupies," with a good deal more of the same sort; but the above contains the substance of his reasons. Observe, he brings no proof; he cites no facts; he does not argue the case; he simply expresses his opinion, but he does it with such a cool, confident, magisterial air, that its very extravagance is enough to make not only the Catholic but even the intelligent, well-read, unbiassed Protestant laugh outright. The fact is, take each one of the above specifications and the truth lies in the exact opposite of his assertions; and the only wonder is that a man in Mr. Savage's position would risk his reputation in making them. We are not going to argue the case at length. Now, each one of the counts in the indictment suggests a topic for elaborate discussion. But our denial is as good, we might justly claim better, than his assertion, inasmuch as we know *something* about the subjects discussed. But it will be sufficient for us to say in regard to each count:

1. That so far from the Catholic Church being on the decline, it never since the earliest ages, showed more signs of life and vigor than it does at the present time. It was never, more united, more harmonious, more aggressive. In fact, the best evidence of the life of the Church is to be found in the fears of its enemies who, while they openly deride its "pretension," at the same time dread its success, and stand in mortal fear of its advancing power and prestige. If the Church is on the decline why should they be alarmed and move heaven and earth to stop its progress?

2. To say that the wonderful system of theology of the Catholic Church "cannot be justified by the scientific method of investigation" is its highest praise, if by scientific method is meant that modern "science, falsely so called," which as Cardinal Newman says, "strives to get rid of the supernatural; which teaches us to laugh and jeer at believing everything we do not see; that attempts to account for everything by things known and ascertained; that would assay everything by the touchstone of experience"; in fine, that would relegate God to the unknowable, and rule Him out of His own creation. But, judged by the tests of true science, if the reverend gentleman had not been profoundly ignorant of the Catholic system he would have known that, merely in an intellectual point of view, it is the most wonderful production of human wisdom and human genius the world has ever seen. For profound logic, deep insight, comprehensive statement, and compact, convincing reasoning, there is not its equal in the whole range of literature, sacred or profane.

3. So, of the assertion that the Catholic Church is a "hard-despotism of the extremest kind," the fact is that it is the only perfect, living example and guarantee of true liberty in the world. It is pre-eminently a Church of law. Even the Pope is subjected to the law of the Church the same as the humblest, most insignificant member. At the same time the Pope, as the representative of the divine authority on earth, is the only power that can effectually bind man to God and man to man with invincible bonds. Obedience to law is the first principle, the essential *sine qua non* of liberty; and voluntary obedience, upon the whole, and in the long run, can only be secured for conscience sake. If there has ever been tyranny in the Church, it was in violation of the whole letter and spirit of her constitution.

But of all the indictments of our bold accuser, the fourth specification caps the climax of presumption and absurdity. "A large part of the doctrines of the Church spring out of and are consistent only with a lower stage of moral development than that which the best part of the world now occupies."

Think of that in connection with the fact that the "best part of the world" outside the Catholic Church are indebted to the traditions of that Church, which they have preserved, for all of good morals that exists among them. Think of it, too, in view of the fact that the Catholic Church, is the only Church in the world that has a settled, fixed system of moral theology, and the only principle of authority that can effectually bind men to its observance. The great, unsolved problem of Protestantism, in connection with the important subject of education of the rising generation, is a settled, fixed code of morals which shall be recognised by all. After many years of trial and anxious inquiry, they have not been able to agree upon a single principle of morality, much less upon the motives which should be proposed for its observance. The Catholic Church proposes not only the highest standard of human perfection, but it has also an admirable practical system for applying and enforcing it. It has a most wonderful code of ruled cases applicable to every condition and relation of life, and her beautiful sacramental system furnishes just the helps which weak human nature needs to aid in applying that code and living the life which it prescribes, while our non-Catholic friends are left to all the vagaries of an extempore, uncertain, capricious, go-as-you-please race for perfection, whose progress is doubt and discomfort, and whose legitimate end is confusion and despair. Protestantism may, indeed, survive, but it will not be the survival of the fittest. It has no organic life, no principle of unity, no power of continuity and reproduction. The seeds of disintegration and death are sown in its very constitution. It may survive as a spirit of antagonism to the truth, but as a religion it is doomed to early and inevitable delay.