

book plate
Handwritten contents
The Plain Truth About the Bible.
By John Page Hopps.
Second Edition.
Price Sixpence.
London WILLIAMS & NORGATE 14, HENRIETTA STREET COVENT GARDEN.
Uniform with this Work: THE ALLEGED PROPHECIES CONCERNING JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT. AN EXAMINATION OF ALL "MESSIANIC" PASSAGES.
PRICE SIXPENCE.
The Plain Truth About the Bible.

The Plain Truth About the Bible.

I ENTER upon this investigation with no lightness of heart, with no emotion of pleasure; but none the less do I enter upon it undoubtingly as upon a duty that needs to be done. For a quarter of a century I have been trying to find out what is most needed in the religious world, to promote a free, pure, and devout search after truth, and I have come to the conclusion that the first thing to be done is to emancipate the human mind from the strange delusion that the Bible is the perfect, authoritative, and final "word of God." How that delusion stands in the way of seekers after truth, how it hinders honest inquiry, how it separates those who would otherwise be like-minded, how it gives a fictitious and unnatural life to palpable superstitions, how it tends to bring Religion itself into contempt, and to cloud the very face of God, I shall presently point out: here, I 'only say that it is high time it came to an end.

It will give pain to many to have this said, but the "plain truth" must now be told. What then? some may say, have we not been having the "plain truth" all along? I answer;—Not often, if at all: partly because the truth has not really been known, and partly because a variety of considerations have kept many public teachers from speaking out on this subject. Some of these considerations deserve a little sympathy and even respect, while others call for neither.

The "Orthodox" View.

The prevailing view—or the view that is believed to prevail—is that the Bible is the word of God; i.e., that God inspired men to write it, from beginning to end, as a perfect and final revelation of Himself and of His will to mankind; that upon belief in its absolute truth our hope of eternal salvation depends; and that to deny its infallibility and authority is dangerous heresy or even damnable infidelity. Now it stands to reason that, while such a view of the Bible prevails, anything like free inquiry respecting it is impossible. On the one hand, laymen have, of course, been taught to repress their doubts, and to even treat doubt as a temptation of the devil and a sin; while, on the other hand, any departure from the accepted view by a minister involved persecution and the possible loss of the labours of a life. So that the plain truth about the Bible has not been easily obtainable; and we are now in this curious and dangerous position,—that while it is still held to be orthodox to maintain the inspiration and infallibility of the Bible, and while the vast majority of ministers are pledged to that opinion, a mass of evidence, positively overwhelming, exists, to demonstrate that the Bible, amid much that is supremely good, contains every variety of historical mistake, scientific error, moral blemish, and spiritual stain. To say this is held to be the greatest heresy of the age, but I hold that to hush it up is both dangerous and immoral; and I warn those who denounce us for saying these things, that they are running terrible risks in staking everything upon the divine perfection of a book the serious and fatal defects of which no one, in twenty years, will be able to deny.

The Value of the Bible.

At the same time, I most earnestly desire to say that I am not insensible to the supreme value of the Bible. There, the devout reader may find recorded the purest, wisest, and most consoling thoughts concerning the dealings of God with man, and the hope of man in God. There, the anxious soul may see how men have sinned and suffered, risen and triumphed in days gone by. There, every tone of the spirit's yearning cry, and every cadence of its confiding song, can be heard. There, the sage may find more than he can master, and the child all that it can need. There, saint and sinner may see that their rapture or their remorse is not the accident of to-day, that other wayfarers have felt as they feel, and that the strange living link of a common experience and a

common destiny binds them to the great mysterious brotherhood of humanity. There, the heavy-laden may indeed find rest for their souls,—a refuge from earthly tumults, a shelter from the storm.

But the "orthodox" world is under a great delusion in supposing that this is so because the Bible is supernaturally inspired: it is under a greater delusion still when it imagines that the Bible is *all* wise, and beautiful, and good, as a whole: it is under the greatest delusion of all when it asserts that it is in every part the final and authoritative word of God. To dispel these delusions, then, and not to depreciate the Bible, is the object I have in view,—to make it possible to read the Bible with discrimination and true understanding, and to make it to us what it ought to be,—a book subordinate to conscience and reason, whose sacred duty it is to "prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."

The Main Object of this Inquiry.

I should, therefore, be utterly misunderstood if it were thought that I am anxious to "lower" the Bible, or to "discard" the Bible, or to prove that it is "false," or, indeed, to do any one thing with it as a whole, except to prove that it is *not* one thing at all, but a very composite work, requiring the greatest possible care and discrimination from the reader of it. What I want to shew is that the Bible cannot be infallible, seeing that it is unequal, inconsistent, and full of startling contrasts of good and bad, earthly and heavenly; and that it cannot be a supreme and final authority, simply because it speaks in many tones, and says the most opposite things. In reading the Bible, the one great requisite is a moral and religious faculty for choosing the good and leaving the evil. But if that is so, it is surely obvious that it is the human conscience and not the written word that is supreme,—the enlightened living soul and not the dead letter that really rules. A moment's reflection ought to convince any one that this is so; and it would be universally seen and acknowledged but for the fact, that everything, however obvious, is made to yield to the primary assumption and assertion that the Bible is the supreme, perfect, and final word of God. My main object is to demonstrate that it is not this—that it is, as I have said, *not one thing* at all, but many things, that it contains the most striking opposites, of good and evil, false and true. Hence, the conscience, the mind, and the devout soul, are and must be supreme.

Our Right to Inquire.

But we shall be told that we have no right to sit in judgment upon the "word of God," and that our "carnal reason" should be made to submit to that word. The reply is obvious. The reproof begs the whole question; for the very question at issue is,—What *is* the word of God? Nay, more; it is our very reverence for God and for the real word of God that makes us pause before giving credence to this or that which is *said* to be His word; for surely we ought to take the greatest possible pains to ascertain what is God's word; and surely the measure of our reverence for God will be the measure of our scrutiny of anything that comes in His name, or that is said to come from Him. When, then, we bring reason and conscience to bear upon the Bible, we are acting in a really reverential and religious spirit: and it is a shame to call that *revolt* against God which in reality is an anxiety to be careful and faithful in giving heed to Him. Our scrutiny of the Bible, then, is itself an indication of our desire to *know* the will of God.

Besides, it is surely the intention of our Creator that we should use our best and noblest faculties—the only faculties indeed that seem to lift us above the brutes. When God made us men and women, and put the light of reason and conscience within us, do you think that He intended us, on the most sacred of all subjects, to neglect or destroy the best guide He has given us? The question is a very simple one:—Are Conscience, Reason, and Science to be relied on here as elsewhere? It is useless to reply that in any given case of "difficulty" we must conclude that the difficulty would vanish if we knew all the facts; for, in the first place, this is to assume far more than is admissible, and, in the second place, it is frequently *not* true that we do not know all the facts: and this I shall presently shew. The real test is to be found in this question:—Why do we believe that the Bible is true at all, or that anything in it is true? The only valid answer is;—We believe it because it seems right and good. Well then, if we believe this or that to be true because it seems to us to be right and good, is it not our duty to reverse the process if necessary, and to deem this or that to be *false* if it seems to us to be wrong and bad? Any other method would logically land us in blank submission to authority; and that lands us at the feet of the Pope.

You *ought* to reason about the Bible, then. It asks you to reason about it. If you are to be true men and women you must reason about it. If you are to have a faith worth the name you must reason about it. If you are to know what you believe in you must reason about it. It is a poor, suspicious thing to go about telling people that they must not look into things—that they must not ask questions, and use their reason. It is falsehood, not truth that shuns the light of reason. It is guilt, not innocence that flies from the light of thought. It is weakness, not strength that asks you not to examine. What does Jesus say?—"Whosoever doeth evil hateth the light, and

cometh not to the light." We call ourselves Protestants. Let us beware lest we sell our birthright. It was the old Roman Catholic Church that cursed the men of old, when they rose up and said—Let us prove all things, and only hold fast to that which is good." It is the Roman Catholic Church that forbids reason to hold sway, and inquiry to bestir itself. But how much better are we when we talk about not using our "carnal reason"? Why that is just what they said to the first Protestants—" You must submit your reason—you must not ask such questions." And now the Protestant Church raises the same frightened cry. What is the foundation so sandy that it will not bear a strong man's tread? Is the argument so bad that it will not bear the eye of reason? Is the Church in such a plight that it will not bear the light of thought? Is the Bible so unsatisfactory that you must not look it in the face; What are men afraid of that they try to cry inquirers down? I propose to ignore that cry, and to go on in a path where God and Duty seem to lead.

The Inquiry Necessary.

But I pause for a moment to answer a grave question. "What," it may be asked, " do you expect to *gain* from unsettling people's minds on this subject?—what practical good can come of the critical examination of the Bible which you recommend? "This opens a wide question, and I can only just glance at it in passing, though before I conclude I shall have to refer to it again.

I might content myself with the reply that what I propose is necessary in order to really put us in possession of the Bible, and to enable us to properly use it. The arbitrary assertion that it is all alike true, inspired, and infallible, the word of God, and not the words of men, turns the Bible into a hopeless puzzle, and takes all reality, pathos, and beauty out of it. The assertion, on the other hand, that it is a precious record of the varying thoughts of men, of the struggles, hopes, fears, trusts, and doubts of men, floods it with meaning, and fills it with reality. It then for the first time takes its place as a part of the wonderful history of the race, and becomes indeed "profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Besides, the Bible is notoriously Burdened with so-called "difficulties," that have become such only because of this unnatural way of treating the Bible as a perfect book. Contradictions and errors there are in the Bible, and we need to be put into honest relationship with these. We do not want to have them denied and *explained away*, we want them recognized and *explained*. We want to know the history of these contradictions and errors: and this is possible if we will only treat the Bible in a proper way, as a book with a history. We shall see that contradictions and errors are to be expected in such a book, and we shall be able to see how they arose: nay more the contradictions and the errors will have a value all their own. But the way is stopped, and the whole thing is put upon a false basis and in an artificial light, the moment infallibility is claimed. More and more is the Bible being disparaged and flung aside for no fault of its own, but only because of the absurd claims made on its behalf.

It is important, too, to proceed with this inquiry, for the sake of vindicating the character of God Himself, to whom the most dreadful things are attributed. Why should our Heavenly Father be made responsible for the horrible proceedings imputed to Jehovah by the Bible? The fact is that this inquiry, inspired as it is by reverence for a just and holy God, is in the highest sense necessary and religious.

Then, as a matter of fact, belief in the infallibility of the Bible has stood in the way of progress; has given the sanction of a supposed divine attestation to all kind of errors; has bolstered up obsolete statutes, and perpetuated antiquated delusions, and made honest inquiry seem sinful or presumptuous. But if the Bible were seen to be what it really is, mankind would feel more free to bring reason and conscience into active play, and everything would be judged on its merits.

But perhaps the gravest evil connected with belief in the infallibility of the Bible is that Religion is thus daily brought more and more into collision with the intellect, the moral sense, and even the religious reverence of mankind. Indeed, I have no hesitation in saying that unless we can rescue the Bible from the hands of blind Bible worshipers, and present it in a sober and rational way to the world, the intellectual and moral revolt against it will become a peril to Christianity itself.

The Bible has Aggravated and not Settled Our Differences.

And here, before I go a step further, I point to a grave fact that lies right before us at the very beginning. The Bible is said to be the word of God, given on purpose to settle our differences and guide us into all truth. It is a perilous assertion: for it compels the reply that if God gave the Bible to that end He *has failed*. So far from settling our differences and guiding us into all truth, it has been the cause of division without end. Multitudes who would think and feel alike on all great religious questions have, at what they believed to be the Bible's Ridding, gone as far as is possible from one another. "See," people say, " see how good men and devout men differ. Does not that prove that the human mind needs an infallible authority?" See, I reply, see how this

supposed infallible authority has *divided* men, producing those very differences which you say it was meant to obviate or cure!

What is the Bible?

I take up the Bible, then, and what do I find? I find that really, in the ordinary sense of the word, it is not a book at all, but a collection of books or fragments of books of an extremely composite character. The only unity I find in the volume is the unity that is given to it by its nationality, and by its unbroken reference to a national Deity. In every other respect, it is altogether unlike the production of one mind, saying one thing, and seeking one end. Least of all is it like the production of an infallible and divine authority. To tell the plain truth, it is manifestly the most unequal and the most contradictory volume in the world, whose blemishes are as strongly marked as its beauties, whose deformities are as repulsive as its graces are attractive,—a volume reflecting all the lights and shadows of poor humanity, and not the changeless splendour of the mind of God.

An Infallible Bible Impossible Without an Infallible Text.

It is, of course, important to remember that the original writings are all lost, and that the only manuscripts now in existence are copies. These are of various ages and different values. As to the Hebrew Scriptures, existing manuscripts in the Hebrew language do not carry us beyond the tenth century; though there are in existence copies of the Greek translation of a very much earlier day. Copies of the Christian Scriptures are much older; but some of these contain only portions of what we call the New Testament: only a few are complete, and none carry us nearer to the originals than the fourth century. We are therefore separated from the original writings by an apparently impassable gulf. The gravity of this circumstance is increased by the fact that most of the ancient manuscripts are either imperfect or differ one from the other, or include books which we do not now reckon to be canonical. But it is only when we turn to the English Bible in our hands that we see the serious position we are in. That Bible, it is said, is infallible; but what is really meant is that the ordinary printed Hebrew Old Testament and the ordinary printed Greek New Testament are infallible. But we must go farther back than printed books. The great question is; whence came the Hebrew manuscript for the one, and the Greek manuscript for the other? The answer is, that in neither case have we one manuscript at all. The standard Hebrew Old Testament only came into its final form about 170 years ago, and the standard Greek New Testament received its last touches in 1550; and, in cases, various Hebrew and Greek manuscripts were used in the compilation of the standard versions. And so the startling fact comes out that the English Bible, as we have it, is not a translation of one independent Hebrew and one independent Greek manuscript, but of compilations which were put together less than 400 years ago, by fallible men in Italy, Belgium, Spain, Germany, and France. Since their day, manuscripts of very much higher value than any they had have come to light; and, as a matter of fact, we have now in existence Hebrew and Greek texts immeasurably superior to those which lay before the producers of the authorised translation. But these better texts are themselves only compilations. Is it not perfectly plain, then, that unless we can get an infallible compiler we shall never get an infallible Bible?

An Infallible Bible Useless Without an Infallible Custodian, Translator, and Interpreter.

But a practical difficulty of another kind comes in here; for the uselessness of even an originally infallible text is apparent the moment you ask;—And where is the infallible custodian, translator, and interpreter? The Roman Catholic Church cuts the knot of the difficulty by saying that God has still an infallible witness on earth, who is commissioned to declare His will and to interpret His word; and the Roman Catholic Church, in saying this, and in pointing to the Pope as the custodian and interpreter of the word of God, only supplies, though by a pure assumption, the necessary link in the chain. For an infallible text, in such a world as this, *needs* an infallible custodian, an infallible translator, and an infallible interpreter; and the ordinary orthodox Protestant has none of these. Hence the Babel of corrections, interpretations, and explanations, demonstrate nothing so surely as *this*,—that an infallible revelation has not been given, or that it has disastrously failed.

The History of the Old Testament.

Where, then, did the Bible come from? For the Old Testament we are of course indebted to the Jews. But it is all-important to remember that it contains only the *wreck* or re-construction of a literature. The Jews, however much they may have been "the chosen people," and whatever their privileges may have been as the custodians of "the oracles of God," were scattered and crushed by surrounding peoples, and altar and home

were alike desecrated and laid waste: and it was only after their return home from miserable and desolating captivity that they began to gather up the mangled memorials of better days. This being the case, it is obviously very difficult to say, when, how, and by whom the various books contained in what is now known as the Old Testament were written and brought together. Only one thing is certain;—that the Old Testament, as we have it now, had no existence 500 years before Christ. It was probably Ezra (B C. 450) who first attempted to found a canon of Scripture; and the Bible he put together, or sanctioned, included only the first five books, and even these he produced only by allowing to himself all the rights or privileges of a compiler and editor. A singular proof of this is found in the fact that the Samaritan canon includes only the Pentateuch that being the only canon in existence when the Samaritans quarrelled with the Jews; and their antagonism kept them from adding the books that were afterwards included.

It is thought that Nehemiah, a few years later, made or ordered the next great addition to the canon; adding Kings, Samuel, most of the Prophets, some of the Psalms, and other books. This brings us to within 400 years before Christ.

A third addition was made still later, including some of the Psalms, Job, Proverbs, the Song of Solomon, Chronicles, and Daniel. This brings us to 150 years before Christ. But even in the days of Christ himself the canon of the Old Testament was not considered absolutely closed; and for 100 years after Christ the book of Ecclesiastes, the Song of Solomon, and other writings were only doubtfully retained by the Jews. So that, in truth, the Jews knew nothing of an Old Testament, believed to be perfect from the beginning, verbally inspired and unimprovable.

A Greek translation of the Old Testament called the Septuagint, made or begun about 200 years before Christ, contained many books not reckoned by the Jews. It was this translation that was best known to writers of the New Testament, and to the early Christians writers.

The History of the New Testament.

The New Testament also has a history. At first, the early Christians had no sacred books beyond the Old Testament; and they wanted none. Besides, the various schools or parties which all too soon arose looked with suspicion upon any attempt to erect a new canon or add to the old. In very early times, however, gospels and epistles appeared—good bad and indifferent; and it would naturally come to be a duty to sift these, and set up a kind of authoritative standard of appeal. When was this done? It is extremely difficult to say, but it is certain that the earliest Christians relied very little on any written word beyond the Old Testament, and that, outside of that, they had no such feeling as we have respecting inspired and uninspired, canonical and uncanonical books. Two other things seem certain—that the original writings are all lost for ever, and that no copies known to us carry us beyond the fourth century. In fact, the more we know the more we seem to be driven to the conclusion that we shall never have a really perfect text of the originals, and that we shall never know by whom the Gospels, in their present form, were written. It is, however, a fact that between the second and fourth centuries it was a common thing for books of Scripture to be mentioned with more or less approach to a *list* of accepted books, and that in the second century a list of canonical books existed, very similar to our own. Beyond this, nearly everything is conjecture, except that at least 100 years lie between the death of Jesus and the *dawn* of the idea that there could be a New Testament, final, authoritative, and inspired. Even so late as the year 332 the Emperor Constantine had to order a list of sacred Christian books to be made; and still 100 years later Augustine felt it necessary to labour for some settled adjustment of the canon.

Bearing in mind, then, the history of the books that compose the Bible, is it going too far to say that the theory of its unity and infallibility is as irrational as it is arbitrary?

Four Leading Facts Concerning the Bible.

In the attempt to understand what the Bible really *is*, we must bear in mind four things:—*First, that the various books which make up the Bible were written or compiled during a vast period of time.* At least a thousand years lie between the writer of the earlier fragments and the writer of the last book. This is an important fact. These books were never written with the idea that they would ever be bound up together. They were never written with the idea of ever being put between the same covers and labelled "Bible"; and, as a matter of fact, the books composing our ordinary Protestant Bible never were so put together and labelled, till the reformers did it, less than 400 years ago; for, before their time, the Bible included books now deemed apocryphal. Now how natural it is that we should find in such a book, written at such immense intervals, and by so many men, a great deal of difference in the value and authority of its various parts; and how unnatural and unwise it is to take up the Bible, expecting to find it all equally authoritative, and all equally useful. Let us wisely distinguish, according to the light that is within us, and the facts of the case. Some of the books are

plainly mere national records of wars, and the struggle for life,—simply history. Others are evidently only statements of what the ancients thought about such great problems as the creation of the world, the beginning of the race, the origin of evil and so on—plainly, not the miraculously inspired statement of the precise facts, but the result of anxious men's thought on these things. Other books are mainly expressions of personal feeling, like the Psalms; while others are the fervid records of what the Jewish reformers said and did—as the book of Isaiah and the other books of the Prophets. It is clear, then, that we have in the Bible, not a consistent, infallible, and final revelation from God, but a record of what thoughtful men said and did in the olden time, in their efforts to find out God, and solve the problems of the universe.

A *second* fact is important,—that *many of the books are not original books at all, but simply compilations*. This is true, for instance, of the whole Pentateuch, which no free modern scholar would attribute to Moses; but, indeed, very little scholarship is needed for that. Moses could not have written, for instance, the passage about the time when the Canaanite and the Perizzite were "*then* in the land," as something past and gone (Gen. xiii. 7): for in his day they were there; neither could he have written the passage about the time "*before* there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. xxxvi. 81); for the first king came some centuries after Moses, and yet that passage supposes the establishment of the kingdom: neither could he have written the passage about the nations that were "*spued out*" before the children of Israel, for it was *after* his day that they occupied the promised land: neither, let us hope, could he have written the passage in Numbers (xii. 8) which declares that Moses was "*very meek, above all the men who were upon the face of the earth*. Assuredly, he could not have written, in Deuteronomy, the account of his own death.

But, not only is it the fact that the Pentateuch cannot be attributed to Moses: it is equally clear that these books cannot be attributed to *any one* person, as an original composer. The book of Genesis is now known to be a production of a very composite character,—a compilation of fragments, in fact, and of fragments very unlike one another, both as regards subject-matter and style. These fragments were put together by an editor belonging to a late period, who was more anxious to retain and preserve all he could than to make his various fragments agree. Headers of the Hebrew can see the differences of style in the different fragments, which have been pieced together to make this one book; but those who can only read the English may see that the book is a compilation, if they only notice the curious contradictions and the equally curious *duplicate* narratives in several of the books. Hence we have, for instance, two accounts of the creation,—one in the first and one in the second chapter; two accounts of the taking of the living creatures into the ark,—one in the sixth and one in the seventh chapter; two accounts of a discreditable transaction with Abimelech, in one of which (Gen. xx. 1-15) Abraham, and in the other (Gen. xxvi. 1-12) Isaac is the questionable hero.

The book of Deuteronomy is, as its name implies, a repetition of the Law; and it is a repetition which probably belongs to a much later date than the first giving of the Law in the earlier books, as, in many important particulars, it is a revised and altered edition of the Law. In this book, we have distinct traces of an ecclesiastical polity that could only have grown up after the time of Samuel and David. "The Law," be it remembered, was not a literary production, but a code, and a code that admitted of additions and readjustments; and such additions and re-adjustments the old Mosaic code received from time to time, and the results are seen in the very composite books that now stand first in the Bible—a veritable gathering of fragments, written and accumulated, not by one man at one time but by many men, during many hundreds of years.

The book of Psalms is another notable instance of compilation: and no one can read it with an open mind without seeing that it contains some of the worst as well as some of the best things in the Bible. Compare, for instance, the trustful piety of the 28th Psalm with the brutality and passion of the 109th: or compare Psalm lxxviii. 22-3 (where God is represented as promising that the foot of His people shall be dipped in the blood of their enemies, and the tongue of their dogs in the same) with the Psalm on the same page in which we find the divine prayer that God's saving health may be known among all nations. From no one mind did these Psalms come: and if some things were inspired by the spirit of God it would surely seem that others were inspired by the spirit of Satan. Another striking case of compilation is the book of Isaiah, which consists of *several* books or fragments, written, not by one man or in one age, but during a period of 300 or 400 years.

The book of Proverbs is another instance of compilation, as that book is simply a collection of wise sayings by many men, though probably edited by one.

A third fact is also suggestive;—that *we have only a small portion of what might have composed the Bible*. The truth is that what we have is only what chance preserved, or what reverence, and zeal, and patriotism retained. Did it ever strike you, in reading the Old Testament, what a number of other books are referred to? Why were not these books included? I have told you why. They were lost in the various buffetings the Jews got from other nations; so that the Old Testament, after all, is only a fragmentary collection of fragments. If the Jews had not lost the other books, our Bible might have been, perhaps, a dozen times as thick. I will just refer for a minute to these other books. In Numbers we have a quotation from a book called, "The Book of the Wars of the Lord"—there is a book of old Jewish Scripture lost to us. In Judges and Samuel, we read of "The Book

of Jasher"—there is another book lost. In Kings we read of "The Book of the Acts of Solomon"—that is another book we know nothing of. In Chronicles we read of "The Account of the Chronicles of King David"—this is also lost. We also constantly read of "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Judah" and "The Book of the Chronicles of the Kings of Israel"—but these are both absent. In Chronicles we read of "The Book of Nathan, the Prophet." In the same chapter we read of "The Book of Gad, the Seer." In the Second Book of Chronicles we read of "The Prophecy of Abijah, the Shilonite," and also "The Vision of Iddo, the Seer." Where are these books now? and what reason have we for supposing that they were less valuable than the existing books of Kings, or Esther, or Ruth?

In addition to these lost books, we have, in the ancient Greek version of the Old Testament, a number of books now called "apocryphal"; but it was a common thing for even the early Christian writers to quote these as *Scripture*. Baruch, Tobit, the Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, and other books were so quoted: and even Augustine, 400 years after Christ, held the books of Maccabees to be canonical. Nor were these early Christian writers any more orthodox in relation to the *New Testament*. Several of them, and to a comparatively late period, refused to admit books, as, for instance, the Epistle to the Hebrews and the second Epistle of Peter. Other fathers, of the highest authority, cited as "Scripture," books that have been shut out, such as The Shepherd of Hermas, and the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas, now labelled "apocryphal."

A *fourth* fact must not be forgotten,—that *the writers of the Bible do not claim infallibility for themselves*. It would have been a wonder if they had! The men who gave us the books of the Old Testament as they stand, knew perfectly well that they were human compilations of valuable documents or treasured traditions, and they were probably more conservative than consistent. The writers of the books of the New Testament, for the most part, either plainly tell us they are writing as reporters (Luke i. 1-4), or sufficiently indicate this "in the nature of their work. Besides, they disagree with one another; and, more than once, we are told that the apostles had to debate about grave matters, and settle them by discussion and vote (Acts xv.), that they even had quarrels and separated (Acts xv. 36-40), and that one great Bible writer (Paul) "withstood" another (Peter) "to the face," "because he was to be blamed" (Gal. ii. 11). How can men, so obviously fallible, have infallibility attributed to their writings!

And yet, with these facts before us, abundantly proving that the Bible is composed of books and fragments that the chances of a thousand years have brought together, people will go on talking of it as a unity—nay! as the perfect, final, and infallible word of God!

The Science, History, Morality and Religion of the Bible.

Passing now from these facts concerning the Bible from what we may call a *literary* point of view, I pass on to the graver considerations that relate to science, history, morality and religion. And, in the first place, I would lay stress on the fact that we have in the Bible, on the most important of all subjects, the character of God Himself, the gravest possible contradictions. It is indeed, wonderful that any one can believe that the volume came from God, seeing that the pictures presented of God Himself are utterly at variance with one another. In one book He is described as a dreadful Being who commands the most horrible slaughters, and who takes the part of a favoured people against the rest of mankind; in another book He is a God of love, and the Father of all men, whose tender mercies are over all His works. How are we to account for this if the Bible is the inspired and infallible word of God?

The explanation which is sometimes offered, that God adapted His revelation to man's capacity, and that from time to time He gave man what we find in the Bible, because he was not able to receive anything better, makes God the author of error, confusion, and contradiction. It is surely far more reasonable to conclude that the errors in the Bible were the natural results of ignorance on the part of man. These inconsistencies and errors in the Bible are very perplexing so long as people hold that it is all the word of God; and many distressing attempts have to be made to reconcile these inconsistencies and to disguise these errors. But the moment we accept the simple fact, that the Bible is a record of men's thoughts, men's experiences, and men's hopes and fears, all is plain and all is useful. The very errors have a value as showing us how men have 'groped after truth, and the very inconsistencies are precious, as showing us the progress men have made in seeking after God. The fact is, we lose the chief uses of the Bible so long as we regard it as the word of God; but it begins to be intensely valuable, and to be all alive with interest, the moment we accept it as the word of man.

Then, just as we might expect, we further find that the Bible contains a variety of passages which conspicuously betray the scientific ignorance, the defective morality, and the very limited religious insight of the writers of them. What are we say about the Biblical accounts of the creation of the world in six days, 6000 years ago; the nature of the heavenly bodies as mere lights and signs in the firmament, subordinate to the earth; the origin of man, and the date of his appearance upon the earth, and the familiar conversations of God with His creatures? What can we do with the statement that the children of Israel, to the number of more than two

millions,—a multitude equal to the united populations of Liverpool, Manchester, Birmingham, Leicester, Sheffield, Hull, and Bristol,—wandered about in a wilderness for 40 years with their flocks and herds, without fodder and with only miracle to depend upon for bread and water?—and what of *this* verse,—“And I have led you forty years in the wilderness: your clothes are not waxen old upon you, and thy shoe is not waxen old upon thy foot.” What shall we say of such stories as that found in II. Chronicles xiii, that the army of the king of Judah, consisting of 400,000 men slew, of the army of the king of Israel, 500,000 men,—and all “chosen” men? The figures are foolish in their wantonness. What respect can we have for a story like that in Numbers xiv, which tells us that Jehovah was only kept from indulging his rage by a stimulation of His vanity that puts Him in the meanest possible light? What are we to say about the amazing stories that appear in almost every book,—some of them grotesque, like the story of Balaam and the ass, or Jonah and the whale; many of them childish, both for their simplicity and their ignorance, like the story of the fall of the walls of Jericho and of the halting of the sun; while too many are indecent or positively immoral, like the story of the Lord's command to Hosea to go and take unto him “a wife of whoredoms” (Hosea i. 2) or the story of the Lord's command to Ezekiel concerning barley cakes and dung (Ezekiel iv. 12, 15)? The books of Joshua and Judges are full of the details of savage warfare, horrible slaughter, and fearful crime; and the greater the ferocity the more emphatic is the assertion that the Almighty commanded it or condoned it.

In an earlier book (Exodus xxi. 20, 21) we read that God Himself uttered *these* words:—“And if a man smite his servant, or his maid, with a rod, and he die under his hand; he shall be surely punished. Notwithstanding, if he continue a day or two, he shall not be punished: for he is his money.” Can we really believe anything so derogatory to God as that He expressly condoned cruelty and murder because the victim was the murderer's “money,” in other words his *slave*? In the same book (chapter vii. 18) we are told that God hardened Pharaoh's heart, and then punished him for doing what the hardened heart led him to do. Is *that* a reasonable or righteous thing to ask us to believe? In the book of Numbers (xv. 32.6) we are told that God actually commanded a man to be stoned to death, for gathering sticks on the Sabbath: “and all the congregation brought him without the camp, and stoned him with stones, and he died; as the Lord commanded Moses.” What a clear case of enlisting the sanction of Jehovah's name for a stern mortal lawgiver's discipline! In the same book (xxxi. 1-18), in the very midst of a series of assertions that “the Lord spake unto Moses,” we find the following horrible story. The Lord commanded Moses and his bands to “avenge the children of Israel of the Midianites,” and they did it. But they were too merciful for Moses (or the Lord) although they “slew all the males,” took captive all the women and children, appropriated all their goods and cattle, and burnt up all their cities wherein they dwelt, for so the ghastly record runs. So he was angry with them, and cried, “Have ye saved all the *women* alive?” and then issued this horrible order,—“Now therefore kill every male among the little ones, and kill every woman that hath known man by lying with him. But all the women children, that have not known a man by lying with him, keep alive for yourselves.” And they did it; keeping alive “for themselves” not less than 32,000 virgins (verse 85). Why, for doing things not a tithe as fiendish, the English people were nearly goaded to drive the Turks out of Europe: and yet, a verse or two on, the Lord goes on speaking to His favourite servant again, and with every appearance of approval. I say it is an insult to human nature to ask us to condone this: it is blasphemy against God to call the record His inspired word.

Or what shall we say of the horrible record in Deuteronomy xiii., where we are told that God commanded His chosen people to murder any one who proposed to worship any other God, even though the heretic were a brother, a son, or a daughter, or “the wife of thy bosom”; and where, further, it is commanded that any city guilty of worshiping any God but Jehovah shall be utterly destroyed with fire, its inhabitants all having previously been slain, because of “the fierceness of the anger” of Jehovah? Is it not true *faith* in God that leads us to see in all this only the ferocious spirit of a ruthless religious fanatic who mistook his own fierce and pitiless spirit for the spirit of the Lord?

Or what shall we say of the story which tells us that God tried Abraham by telling him to murder his only son? Only a demon would issue such a command; and only a man utterly unacquainted with the sanctity and supremacy of conscience would ever entertain the question of obeying it. Or what shall we say of the ferocious curse in Jeremiah (xlviii. 10) respecting those who failed to utterly annihilate the Moabites—“Cursed be he that doeth the work of the Lord negligently, and cursed be he that keepeth back his sword from blood:”—evidently the brutal curse of a ferocious destroyer, but here attributed to Jehovah. What can any rational and really religious human being say to the atrocities recorded in Numbers xvi., where we find Jehovah acting like an almighty demon, in causing the earth to open and swallow Koran, Dathan, and Abiram, and their houses, their wives, and their little children, and in burning up with miraculous fire two hundred and fifty “princes of the assembly, famous in the congregation, men of renown,” for merely telling Moses and Aaron that they were too forward; and where we also find Him the next day killing 14,700 persons with a plague, simply because they murmured at the destruction of the day before? Or what of Numbers xxv., where we find Him commanding Moses to cut off the heads of certain persons, and to “hang them up before the Lord against the

sun," that His "fierce anger" might "be turned away;" where also He is represented as destroying 24,000 more with a plague, and as specially blessing a sort of Israelitish Bashi-Bazouk who ran a woman "through her belly"? What is the good of talking about the infallibility of such a book? The only thing we have to do is to make a stand for the honour of a righteous God, and to do what we should do if we found these statements in any other book,—repudiate them, with grief and shame that anybody ever believed them. I know full well that within a page or two you will find statements just as beautiful as these are hideous; but that does not touch the question, except to shew the truth of the statement, that the Bible is a composite work, and that it has in it things good and bad, true and false, beautiful and ugly, lovely and hateful.

I have an intense repugnance to quoting these passages at all, and would fain avoid it: but how is it to be avoided? If people will persist in declaring that the Bible, from beginning to end, is God's word; and if, in saying that, they try to make it the master of the conscience and the ruler of the mind, and even try to make religious outlaws of us when we let conscience and reason guide us, we have no choice, we are absolutely obliged to do what is necessary to prove that this book is a human book, bright and helpful, it is true, with human aspiration, trust, and love, but also stained and marred with human passion, sin, and error.

Again; it must be perfectly evident that very many things in the Bible relate only to local circumstances and transient needs—nay, belong only to long-outgrown phases of civilization, humanity, and culture. To these belong a vast proportion of the rules and regulations contained in the books of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers;—rules and regulations concerning diet, social life, worship, and trade, some of which were doubtless wise enough in their day, but all of which are now either antiquated, ridiculous, or pernicious. Who, for instance, can attribute to the Almighty the regulation that the hare shall not be eaten, because he "divideth not the hoof" (Lev. xi. G), and that the swine shall not be eaten, only because "he cheweth not the cud" (Lev. xi. 7), or that shell fish shall be considered "an abomination" (Lev. xi. 10-12)? How ridiculous to call that a final and perfect revelation of the will of God which forbids the eating of oysters! How ridiculous, too, the supposition that the Creator Himself did not know the real habits and nature of the hare, but blundered in describing it as a creature that "cheweth the cud,"—the Creator Himself misled by the motion of the creature's lips and jaws! Or who can believe that God denounced the man who should eat the blood with the flesh of any animal, as one against whom He would set His face, and who should be cut off from among His people (Lev. xvii. 10)? What is the use of telling me that this is a portion of the infallible word of God? I deny it; and I deny it just because I believe in God, and trust Him, and love Him. Or who can believe that the Almighty, after making the most solemn preparations to shew Himself to Moses, did so only to give him minute directions, extending through seven chapters, concerning upholstery and joinery, about boxes, and tables, and rings, and lamps, and loops, and bowls, and curtains, and candlesticks, and rams' skins, and badgers' skins, and pans, and shovels, and basons, and clothes? (Exodus xxv.-xxx.)

Now, how are we to account for all this? It is perfectly easy to account for it if you take the book as it stands, and for what it *it is*, as a curious, instructive, but very composite and unequal collection of ancient records, each one reflecting a stage of civilization or a state of mind—each one telling, not of a revelation made by God, but of a discovery or thought on the part of man. If we see and understand *that*, all will be clear. Then, even the errors, the blemishes, and the atrocities will take their place as objects of interest; for then we shall not only be able to account for them but to find a use for them. No longer driven to explain them away, or to deny them, we shall give them their true place in the great process of human development; so that every word of the Bible will become valuable, as a record of some phase of the progress of the mind of man.

The Bible, *thus* understood, will become increasingly precious. It will gather pathos the more we find in it a record of the hopes and fears, the sins and sorrows, the wisdom and folly of struggling humanity; it will then live before our eyes with ever new meanings; its very imperfections will be storehouses of wisdom and knowledge; and the living present, gaining light from the past but trusting in God for itself, will find Him a God near at hand and not afar off.

I have spoken freely of the defects and errors of the Bible, but let it be remembered that I have had to do this only because of the untenable claims made on its behalf. I have already said that I see the other side. I go farther. I say that the Bible still stands as the book to which we must go for the noblest utterances of adoration, the most pathetic confessions of sin, the sweetest expressions of trust, the most tender and passionate pleadings of the heart in its yearnings after God, while, in the teachings of Jesus, we have that which the world can never hope or wish to make antiquated or outgrow.

The Bible the Word of Man.

But, for good or evil, the Bible is the word of man and not of God; it contains, not the oracles of Heaven, but the aspirations of earth. It grew from the old familiar soil of human longings and affections, hopes, and fears. It tells how men sought and suffered in days gone by, and by what strange paths humanity has gone in

seeking after God. It is not the *tomb* of inspiration nor the sepulchre of the Eternal; it is a witness, not to a voice that can be heard no more, but to a voice that waits *now* to speak in the living soul,—to One who will be to us all that He was to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob and David and Jesus and Paul. It has its glooms as well as its glories, its shadows as well as its sunbeams, its deformities as well as its beauties, but nothing need be wished away, for nothing is there but what belongs to the history of our kind. It is the world's most precious witness-bearer to God, and it will fulfill its highest mission when it leads you to Him for yourself.

God, then, we say, has not changed either in His disposition, His intentions, or His relations to man; and we are to Him all that men have ever been. From age to age we are borne on by the steady flow of His Providence. In science, in politics, in all the arts and aids of civilization, we are being slowly led on by His beneficent hand, and instructed by His enlightening spirit. The measure of our receiving is the measure of our capacity to receive. Revelation is really discovery, dependent, not upon God's willingness to reveal, but upon man's power to *see*; nothing is finished, nothing exhausted, in any field of knowledge or inquiry, the law of all things necessitating progress, but never allowing finality; the ages explain one another, and in the thoughts, the hopes, the aspirations, the activities, and the experiences of wise and holy souls in every age, God is perpetually becoming incarnated and revealed; the struggle after the perfection of what is human being simply the struggle after the discovery or development of that which is divine.

We bless God, then, for the Bible, and for all great souls and books; for they have all come from the same Eternal Master-Mind. The wells of salvation were not closed when the New Testament was written, and the voice of God was not hushed when it spoke to the last Evangelist.

The Uses of This Inquiry.

And now, in conclusion, I return to the question I glanced at in the beginning:—Why tell the people these things?—why unsettle the faith of those who seem to find the Bible an all-sufficient guide? The reply is an obvious one,—I made it years ago;—If we seem to snatch from any the staff on which they have been leaning with full content, this is our apology;—The staff on which you lean will presently be broken before all eyes and it will be well to be prepared for it, that faith in God may not go with trust in the infallibility of a book. In its stead, we offer you not the words of a book that are exposed to the assaults of time and the discoveries of every age, but the eternal truth and love of the Infinite God, assured to man, not by texts that may be doubtful, and sentences that may be obscure, but by the testimony of the living soul: which even when fed with creeds of men, still cries out for the living God. I say that is a message worth bringing to men,—a true' Gospel, putting to shame the bad news which is being dinned into their ears that this is a kind of God-forsaken world,—that God inspires men no longer, and that we can only live on the echoes of what He said to men thousands of years ago ! Rise up to the height of this great vital faith in God; consider what the effect would be if men in all the churches were to cease preaching that inspiration has ceased and is dead; and if they began to preach this truth,—that ours is the living God *to-day*; consider, I say, what the effect would be if only for one day this nation were to live in full possession of this faith and under the influence of it. The memory of that day, and the results of it, would be fragrant when all who took part in its sublime fidelity had long since passed away.

Another reason for doing this work is that when we recognise in the Bible a natural instead of a supernatural origin, we, for the first time, find a use for every portion of it. As I just now indicated, the Bible will become *more* instead of less interesting to us as we see in it a record of *human* struggles, thoughts, and experiences. Where we are now driven to blame and criticise, because of the theory of infallibility, we shall be able to feel sympathy and to admire. The old characters that look deformed, and the old writers that often look hideous, when they are set forth as fully and directly inspired by the Almighty, will look heroic or admirable when we see them as *seekers* after God, and *strivers* after the light, though amid thick darkness. Yes! the Bible will become a *living* book, a book full of interest and instruction just in proportion as we give up the palpably impossible theory that it is the complete and final word of God.

But there is yet another reason for seeking to put the Bible in its true place as a record of human thoughts: this is, that while it is regarded as a complete and final revelation of infallible truth it will inevitably be the cause of strife and division. The theory is that the Bible has been given as a perfect revelation of Divine truth, to end our doubts and to authoritatively declare what is true: the fact is that the Bible has split Christendom itself into fragments. Every man or Church has its own point of view and its own half-unconscious preferences, which lead to exaggerated clingings to certain portions of the Bible or to one-sided interpretations of it: and it is these that are exalted into divine and infallible revelations.

But not only because of one-sided points of view is the Bible productive of strife and division: it is so also because it is in itself an inconsistent and contradictory book. In fact, there is in it so much that is fragmentary, inconsistent, or equivocal, that (and perhaps to a greater extent than any other book in the world) it furnishes *material* for creed and theory builders of every kind. In truth, the condition of the religious world to-day

supplies a grotesque commentary upon the statement that the Bible is the word of God, given to settle our differences and lead us all to infallible truth. Sects and churches, wide as the poles asunder, go to it for proofs of dogmas and justifications of practices utterly opposed to one another; and the dwellers in this theological Babel all fancy they think as they do at the bidding of the Most High! Some time ago, when George Dawson repudiated the bloody sacrifices of the Jews, and their perpetuation in the form of the bloody sacrifice of Christ, as an atonement for sin, this was the swift reply from the other side:—"What I do you dare to question the Bible? Who, according to that book, enjoined the sacrifices of old? Who sent Moses to Egypt to deliver the descendants of Jacob from bondage? Who opened the red sea and formed a passage for their escape? Who sustained the whole nation where there was all lack of natural sustenance? Who assembled them round Mount Sinai, and gave them the laws and commandments which were to be their national constitution in the land to which they were going?" And so the hopeless, irrational, wearying fight goes on,—the one side urging that we must advance on to rational, humane, and really religious ideas, the other demanding submission for all time to the letter of a book. The process is a melancholy one. First, people give in to the superstition that the Bible is the final Word of God, then they take a particular point of view or bring to the Bible a foregone conclusion, then they see just as much as their point of view *enables* them to see, or as much as their foregone conclusion will *allow* them to see, then they busy themselves in persuading people that the result is the final, infallible, and perfect revelation of the will of God, to dispute which is to be damned! And this it is—this taking of one's own view of the Bible as the authoritative word of God—that is at the root of nine-tenths of the bigotries and extravagances and persecutions of Christendom. It is certainly at the root of the monstrous and pernicious idea that God will send to hell all those who do not believe certain dogmas that are said to be revealed.

Now if we could liberate the human mind and heart from this bondage to a contradictory book, and throw people back upon themselves—upon the reason, the conscience, and the affections,—the change would be enormous. People who now totally differ about their ideas of God and man and the future would soon approach one another, led by the same human instincts: and then it would be seen that they had all along been the victims of a theory which, though a mere assumption, had been powerful enough to deprive them of the use of their faculties, and to induce them to force themselves to believe the most unlikely and even the most distasteful and dreadful things. For see what people have forced themselves to believe. They have held by the ghastly fancy of natural depravity and the inherent sinfulness of the little child: they have insisted on the even ghastlier dogma of salvation by the offering of the blood and agony of an innocent man to an angry and exacting God: they have clung with fearful tenacity to the doctrine of eternal damnation, acknowledging that they hold it in spite of their natural repugnance to it, but actually counting that repugnance a reason why they should receive it, as all the more "a trial of their faith," which really means that they silence God's true voice in the soul to listen to an imaginary voice in a book: they have taught and quarrelled over doctrines of predestination, of election, of final perseverance, and one knows not what, sowing the Church, broadcast, with the seeds of bitter controversies and cruel discords, all because, instead of hearing the voice of God as it spoke to *them* in the conscience and the heart, they insisted on compelling that voice to be still or to become, in some feeble, unnatural and forlorn way, an echo of another voice that comes sighing from the past. And the agony of this conflict has filled Christendom with those very distortions of truth and discords of error which are cited as proving that God is not speaking to men now, but which really bear witness against us for not listening to His voice.

Judge you what the effect would be if from the minds of all good men and women a clean sweep could be made of the assumption that the Bible or some particular notion thought to be extracted from it, is the word of God from which it is sin to swerve: judge what would happen if they could all be left with their truest *selves*—with their common sense, their common conscience, their common humanity, and shall I not add—their common reverence for God? I venture to say that the Babel of tongues would be at an end: the parted currents would flow in one broad natural channel, and the light of a simple trust in God would be shed over all. And where *then* would be the dark, depressing, irrational, and cruel beliefs that now only live because it is thought they are "revealed"?

Then see how theologians have fought against science, which has had to make its way, even in modern times, against the terrorism of orthodoxy and the ban of the Church. See how people, in the face of the clearest evidence, contend for the most impossible theories of creation, transgression, and redemption. See with what vehemence they insist upon the inherent sinfulness of all human beings, the existence of Satan, the reality of an eternal hell, and the need of atoning blood. Would all this be so, if it were not for the delusion that a supposed revelation from God has told us the final truth about these things? The proof of this is that when reason and conscience and humanity are appealed to for more reasonable and humane ideas, we are deliberately told that the carnal reason (and even the carnal eyes) of man must submit to the word of God. In other words.—we must silence the living witness whom we can question and improve, and compel ourselves to listen to a dead witness who can neither be cross-examined nor corrected.

If, then, there were no other reason for telling the plain truth about the Bible, *this* would suffice for

me,—that the delusion as to its perfection, inspiration, finality, and supreme authority, has led and still leads to strife, to persecution, to the stifling of thought, to the perverting of the judgment, to the silencing of the tongue, to the warping of the conscience, to the hindrance of reform. Throw men and women back, I say, upon the voice of God in themselves, upon the grand and solemn facts of life, upon reason, conscience, and the living soul: then, and only then will they know the truth; and the truth will make them free.

Our cause, then, is the cause of the emancipation of the living soul from the dead hand of the past; the liberation of the human mind from the oppressive weight of mere authority; nay I the making straight in the desert a highway for our God. We are not rebels, striving against God; we are children, seeking Him. We believe that He is the living God for living men, and that He who spoke to the fathers will speak to us. We reverently and gratefully accept the good that is in the Bible, but we go to the God of the Bible for ourselves. We live in days that are rich with the accumulations of long laborious centuries,—with the hard-earned winnings of the thinkers of other days; and it would be a shame indeed if we were not better able than they to solve many of the great problems that oppressed their souls. Knowing this, we lift up our hearts to God for the light, the truth, and the guidance that belong to us to-day.

decorative feature

Works by John Page Hopps.

Published by WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London; or direct from the author (De Montfort Street, Leicester) on receipt of the prices named.

Summer Morning Songs and Sermons. Half-a-crown.

Beside the Still Waters: Spoken meditations on the permanent realities of personal religion. Two Shillings.

Discourses of Daily Duty and Daily Care. Second Edition. Two Shillings.

The Life of Jesus. Re-written for Young Disciples. Fifth Edition. Richly bound, gilt extra. One Shilling.

A Scientific Basis of Belief in a Future Life. Six Lectures. One Shilling.

Six Lectures on Channing, and his teachings concerning God, Man, Jesus, Christianity, the Bible, and the Future Life. One Shilling.

Twelve Sunday Morning Prayers: for the Twelve Months of the Year. One Shilling.

Spirit-Life in God the Spirit: A Meditation on God and Immortality. One Shilling.

First Principles of Religion and Morality. Twenty Lectures, mainly for the Young. One Shilling.

Verses by the Way. One Shilling.

The Plain Truth About the Bible: an inquiry into its origin, age, and authority. Sixpence.

The Alleged Prophecies Concerning Jesus Christ in the Old Testament:—five Lectures on Prophecy and the true meaning of the passages of Scripture usually regarded as foretelling the advent and work of Christ. Sixpence.

Light for Bible Readers: Notes on a Hundred Passages of Scripture, usually quoted to prove the Deity of Christ, the Separate Personality of the Holy Spirit, the Trinity, Salvation by the Punishment of Christ in our stead, and Everlasting Torments. A new edition (eleventh thousand). Threepence.

The Truthseeker:

A MONTHLY REVIEW, EDITED BY MR. HOPPS;

Containing Original Lectures, &c., on subjects of present and permanent interest. 3d. monthly. By post, from the publishers or editor, 3s. 6d. a year; Two Copies, 6s. a year, post free.

The following smaller works by Mr. Hopps may be had from the author.

The Four Guiding Voices: or, the absolute supremacy and divine authority of Reason, Conscience, and Love, in all matters pertaining to Faith and Life. Two pence.

The Church of the Future Foreshadowed by the Unitarian Church of To-Day. Two pence.

Satan Worship in Christendom. A Lecture. Twopence.

Jesus Christ the Son of God, Not God the Son. Third Edition. Twopence.

Jesus a Unitarian. The Four Evangelists Unitarians. Paul a Unitarian. Two pence each: or the whole work, in cover, price Sixpence.

Two Sermons for the Times:—"*Trust in the Living God*," and "*Preaching the Gospel*." Twopence.

A Unitarian'S Confession of Faith Concerning God, Jesus, Salvation, THE Bible, AND THE Future Life. Four hundredth thousand. One Penny. Sixpence a dozen.

What Must I Do to be Saved? and What Do We Teach? One Penny each.

Two Poems—"There is No Death," and "Come Away." Printed on Card in Two Colours. One Penny.
The friends of reverent free-thought and free-expression are invited to co-operate in an effort to extend the usefulness of

The Truthseeker,
Edited by the
Rev. John Page Hopps.

"THE TRUTHSEEKER," published on the first of every Month, is a free and unsectarian Review of books, events and inquiries relating to the development of religious life and liberty in the Christian Church.

Every number contains original lectures and essays, together with reviews of present and permanent interest.

Price Threepence.
London: Williams & Norgate, 14 HENRIETTA STREET,
COVENT GARDEN.

Manchester: Johnson & Rawson, 89 MARKET STREET, and J. HEYWOOD, DEANSGATE.

Leicester: J. & T. Spencer, 20 MARKET PLACE.

Any Bookseller can supply "THE TRUTHSEEKER" to order. A Post Office Order for 3s.6d, sent to the Editor (De Montfort Street, Leicester), or to the Publishers, will secure a copy for a year, by post, to any address. Two copies 6s, post free.

The Alleged Prophecies Concerning Jesus Christ in the Old Testament.

Five Lectures,
By John Page Hopps.
Sixpence.

LONDON: Trübner & Co. 57, & 59, LUDGATE HILL.

The Alleged Prophecies Concerning JESUS CHRIST IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Table of Passages Referred To.

The Alleged Prophecies Concerning Jesus Christ in the Old Testament.

Lecture I. Introductory.

ONE of the oldest, most popular, and most effective arguments in favour of the view that Jesus Christ was God, or at all events, a miraculous or supernatural, and therefore exceptional being, is the alleged existence of passages in the Old Testament, which are held to be predictions of his birth, mission, character, life, and death. This argument has appealed to a variety of peculiarities in human nature, which have caused it to be a telling one. People who could not appreciate a close train of reasoning, or be influenced by purely moral and spiritual considerations, have their sense of wonder gratified and their imagination excited by the consideration that the coming of Jesus and the circumstances of his birth, life, and death, were all foretold, ages before he appeared.

And here, at the very outset, I fully admit that the New Testament does more or less distinctly set forth Jesus Christ as the fulfiller of Old Testament predictions. The passages will come before us afterwards; here it will be enough to admit that the fact is so. But, while admitting that, we are forced on to the question—What then? Even in cases where there is a definite assertion of fulfilled prophecy, are we to give in to the evangelists without personal examination and the use of our own judgments? To do so would not only be foolish but base.

But the question is a far more complex one than it appears to be. As we go on, we find we are obliged to ask such questions, for instance, as these:—Were these alleged fulfillments of Old Testament prophecies *afterthoughts*? Did the Old Testament prediction suggest and half compel the New Testament fulfilment? Did Jesus himself believe that he was the fulfiller of Old Testament prophecies? If so, how far did he consciously try to fulfil them, and, as it were, lay himself out for their fulfilment? Or, if Jesus did hold that he fulfilled the Old Testament prophecies, did he not also lift those prophecies into an entirely new region, giving a moral and spiritual meaning and value to an altogether political and material reference? If so, how far did he suggest the higher truth, that not only *he*, but that *any* moral and spiritual reformer may be a true fulfiller of Old Testament

prophecies—their fulfilment being not a personal but a perpetual one;—so that he claimed to be the Messiah, as he also claimed to be a son of God, not as an exceptional being, but as one who presented conditions and reaped blessings within the reach of us all? I feel sure there is a great deal this, and that a cool, impartial, and close examination of the alleged fulfilments of Old Testament prophecies in the New, would lead to the discovery that the all-pervading idea is, that the hopes of Israel found in Jesus, not the intended and expected, but the true, because the moral and spiritual, realization.

The question thus becomes forced upon us, whether the evangelists themselves, in stating that such and such prophecies were fulfilled in Jesus Christ, really meant that the Old Testament prophecy referred to him, or only that it spiritually received its moral and religious fulfilment in him. Jesus himself certainly never gave in to the political and material hopes of the nation, and neglected, in a striking and defiant manner, obvious political and material references of the prophecies. He announced that he came to fulfil, but he only fulfilled by spiritualising, and by acting out on a heavenly stage the drama intended for an earthly one. It will thus be seen that the question is far from settled, even when we have admitted that the evangelists held the Old Testament prophecies had been fulfilled in Christ.

When we, however, examine these passages in the New Testament which affirm fulfilments of passages in the Old, several very curious facts come to light; these, for instance,—that many of the passages from the Old Testament, quoted by the writers of the New, are mere descriptions, misread or used by them as prophecies; or that, as quotations, they are vague, or palpably inaccurate, or mere illustrations. It will well repay us here to look a little at this.

Take, for instance, as illustrative of the use of mere *descriptions* as prophecies, the following:—In Matt. xiii. 14, 15, we find it stated that Jesus spoke in parables to the people, *because* they were dull and blind, and *because* it was "not given" to them to know "the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven;" and "in them," we are expressly told, was "fulfilled the prophecy of Esaias, which saith, By hearing ye shall hear, and shall not understand: and seeing ye shall see, and shall not perceive: for this people's heart is waxed gross, and their ears are dull of hearing, and their eyes they have closed; lest at any time they should see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and should understand with their heart, and should be converted, and I should heal them." In John xii. 87-41, the passage is quoted with the added statement, that the people "could *not* believe" in Christ, "*because*" Isaiah said or wrote that;—a horrible statement, which of itself demands of us a sharp scrutiny of these alleged fulfilments.

Now what do we find in the passage itself in the Old Testament? We find not a prophecy at all, but a statement of fact—a description of the dull, blind condition of the people in Isaiah's time. And it is this description of a fact before the prophet's eye that is taken as a prophecy of a far-distant event! Many other examples could be quoted,

See Luke iv. 16-21; John ii. 17; John xiii. 1b; John xix. 36; Acts i. 16-20; Heb. x. 4-7.

but it is not necessary to encumber the lecture with texts. It is sufficient to point out here, and to lay emphasis on the fact, that Old Testament passages containing descriptions of present facts are taken by the New Testament writers as prophecies of future events.

Instances of the second kind, mere *vague* quotations, are as frequent. It is, in fact, one of the singular and most suggestive peculiarities of these quotations, that they are often so vague and far-fetched as to almost hint, after all, that the quoters did not really mean to suggest that the Old Testament writers actually intended to point out the events of New Testament times, and to hint further, that the New Testament writers only used the Old Testament passages *as* descriptive illustrations. In one place, Matt. xxvi. 56, we have the vague general statement, that "all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled." And yet the very vagueness and generality here may indicate that the writer really regarded the events he alluded to as actual *fulfilments* of Old Testament prophecies. In Matt. ii. 28 we have the statement that Jesus dwelt in Nazareth, "that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophets, 'He shall be called a Nazarene.'" But such a passage is nowhere to be found. In John xv. 25, we have the very vague statement concerning the Jews' hatred of Christ,—"*But* this cometh to pass, that the word might be fulfilled that is written in their law, They hated me without a cause." But it is well nigh impossible to fix upon any definite passage as that which is here said to be quoted. In John xix. 28, in a description of the crucifixion, we have this—"After this, Jesus knowing that all things were now accomplished, that the scripture might be fulfilled, saith, I thirst." Again, however, we look in vain for any definite "scripture" where this is to be found. To say the least of it, it is utterly *vague*. In John xx. 9, we read that the disciples did not yet know the Scriptures, that Jesus "must rise again from the dead." Here is the perfection of vagueness. Where *are* the scriptures that prophesy the resurrection of Jesus? The evangelist does not tell; and most assuredly the Jews knew nothing in their own Scriptures of a dying and rising Messiah.

Inaccurate quotations form another though a closely allied class of quotations from the Old in the New Testament. One fact is important, that the majority of the passages in the New Testament quoted from the Old, as fulfilled by Christ, are not taken from the Hebrew Bible at all but from the Septuagint, a Greek translation of

the Hebrew. The original writers of the Greek New Testament, then, quoted at second-hand from the Greek Old Testament, errors and all; and, in addition, often quoted from memory, and quoted wrongly.

Then, finally, we have passages that are purely *illustrative*, which are hardly quoted as fulfilments, such as John iii. 14, 15, "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of man be lifted up: that whosoever, believeth in him should not perish, but have eternal life." In a passage like that, we have suggested the possibility of a use of passages for the mere purpose of illustration and analogy, even where the formula occurs, "That it might be fulfilled."

Besides these, we have a great number of passages to which, in subsequent lectures your attention will be directed, as furnishing abundant examples of palpably inaccurate and forced application. Many of these are in the Gospels; others are to be found in the writings of Paul. Of these last, Mr. Jowett frankly says:—"There is no evidence that the apostle remembered the verbal connection in which any of the passages quoted by him originally occurred. He isolates them wholly from their context; he reasons from them as he might from statements of his own," going off upon a word," as it has been called—in one instance, almost upon a letter (Gal. iii. 16), drawing inferences which, in strict logic, can hardly be allowed, extending the meaning of words beyond their first and natural sense. But all this only implies, that he uses quotations from the Old Testament after the manner of his age;" so that this very emphatic and suggestive statement about *Paul's* loose way of dealing with the Old Testament must be made applicable to *other* New Testament writers. That this must be so, I shall in future lectures abundantly prove.

The New Testament writers, then, extracted from Old Testament passages *forced* meanings and applications. In some cases, it is true, it may be difficult to say what the original passage means; in many others it is perfectly plain that the passages quoted do not for a moment mean what the New Testament writers make them mean. Again and again Old Testament passages, palpably referring to Old Testament times—to Hebrew politics, and national joys and sorrows, struggles, hopes, and fears—are violently torn from their connection and applied to New Testament events. I shall prove that abundantly before I close. At the same time, I must again remind you that, in some cases, the writers of the New Testament may not have meant anything more than to use Old Testament passages as apt quotations, just as we do. How often do modern writers describe a thing by saying—"As Shakspeare says," or "In the words of the poet," or "As one has said," and then follows the apt quotation.

From the play of Hamlet alone, we have taken out of their connection and applied to a thousand things, persons, or events, such phrases as these, for instance:—"Weary, stale, flat, and unprofitable"—"There are more things in heaven and earth than are dreamt of in your philosophy"—"Brevity is the soul of wit"—"Let the gall'd jade wince; our withers are unwrung"—"More honoured in the breach than the observance"—"There's method in his mudness."

When I was preparing this lecture, my eye fell upon a passage of this kind, in a pamphlet that came by post. The writer says—"Well may we say in the words of Shakspeare, 'Can this be true, can this be possible?'" It would be ridiculous to say that the writer meant to suggest that Shakspeare intended to point to the thing this new writer denounced in Shakspeare's words; and yet it must be confessed that the quoting in the New Testament of so-called prophecies from the Old is often of this kind.

But, after making a liberal allowance for that, the fact seems to remain that the New Testament writers do deliberately quote from the Old Testament, for the purpose of affirming that the passages they quote were actually prophecies of Christ. Can we account for this? I think we can. The New Testament writers probably believed that Jesus was actually the expected Messiah, and if so they would naturally take it for granted that what were regarded as Old Testament descriptions were applicable to him. If they remembered a passage that bore a verbal resemblance to what they were writing about, they quoted it; if not, they felt so sure lie did everything as the fulfiller of Scripture that they inserted only a general reference to the Scriptures, such as "That the Scriptures might be fulfilled." In the time of Christ, there was a revival of Messianic hopes and expectations. Pretenders and fanatics had arisen to gratify the eager longing of the nation, and it was of the greatest possible importance that the life of this candidate for Messianic honours should have his life, work, and death, linked on to the Old Testament records. Innocently and naturally, therefore, the writers seized upon everything that could possibly help them. It mattered not to them that they tore a scrap from its context to furnish a fulfilment of prophecy: it mattered not to them that the passage they conveyed away plainly referred to ancient political events. Christ *must* have fulfilled all Scripture, and so all Scripture had to submit to be mutilated or appropriated, to furnish triumphant credentials to Christ. They were not dishonest, they were only fanatical: they did not intend to pervert and wrest the Scriptures, they only meant to glorify them by linking them to the life and work of their glorious Lord. They acted as the writer of the Epistle to the Hebrews acted when he assumed that Christ, as the true High Priest, and, strangely enough, as the perfect sacrifice *also*, fulfilled and completed in himself all old sacrificial forms and truths; or when he took the Jews on their own ground, as believers in those old sacrificial ideas, and showed them that divine and deeper purposes and

transactions were accomplished by Christ. So indeed, may the other writers of the New Testament, in their affirmations of Christ's fulfilments of Old Testament prophecies, have mainly intended to show how far more gloriously this spiritual Messiah could fulfil the old national hopes than any agitator, warrior, or king.

But we need not be surprised at the most literal appropriation of old records as prophecies of new events. We have only to remember the history of the Christian Church, from its first centuries until now. What the New Testament writers did, the Fathers did, the old Presbyterians and Puritans did, Oliver Cromwell did, Joseph Smith did. One of our own writers

Higginson's *Spirit of the Bible* Vol. II., p. 165.

has well indicated that fact:—"Some persons have found, in every individual thing in Jewish Scriptures, a type and prophecy of something in the "" Christian. Swedenborg imagined a spiritual mystical sense to belong to the commonest incidents of the patriarchal and Jewish history. The Puritans and Scotch Covenanters applied to themselves, with undoubting faith, all the Old Testament promises and exhortations delivered to the Jews as the people of God; and they heartily launched against Popery, Prelacy, and Monarchy, all the woes of the Hebrew Scriptures against Babylon, Tyre and Edom, the heathen and their idols!" The very morning on which I wrote these words, I saw a report of a statement, made by a popular preacher, that the Bible is everything or nothing, and that, as it was in his opinion, everything, you must find in it prophecies of the late French and German war, of Mr. Gladstone's assault upon the Vatican, and of all the Papal and anti-Papal struggles yet to come. How much more necessary would it appear to the New Testament writers, to find somewhere and somehow, in the New Testament, references to one whom they believed to be the flower and consummation of the ages!

These observations have now led us on to the very heart of the subject. Admitting that the New Testament writers quote alleged prophecies from the Old, and that they held their literal fulfilment by and in the Christ of the New, it remains for us as we have seen, to ask:—But what did the original writers themselves intend to say? Now, fortunately, we can answer that question. We have not only the Septuagint, from which the New Testament writers quoted, but the Hebrew Bible, with a vast amount of knowledge concerning it, far beyond that possessed by those writers; so that, in point of fact, we are better able to understand the Old Testament than they. But it needs no learning or profound research: it needs only honest English reading to get at the facts. The common plan is to cut out half-a-dozen lines, or to isolate a few verses, or, at most, a chapter, from the body of the work, and to read the passage by itself, altogether apart from the context. In that way you could make a passage mean almost anything. The only remedy for this is to go back to the original records, and to read straight on. If that be done, the plainest man who can read his English Bible will have the key to the alleged prophecies. And what he will find out is this: that, in every case, the alleged prophecy is more or less obviously, as a rule is quite obviously, a reference to current events, national and political. The so-called prophet will be seen to be an ardent politician, moralist, or reformer, profoundly interested in what is passing around him, and intent upon the working out of his own thoughts for the good of the nation. Sometimes lie is the prophet of hope, sometimes of sorrow—now telling of empire, and glory, and prosperity, and peace, and now of despoiling, and desolation, and woe; but, always and everywhere, he is an observer of the signs of the times, he lives in the present or the immediate future, his heart beats in unison with the mourning or the exultation of his day. Dr. Milman, in his history of the Jews, points out that the writings of the prophets are "magnificent lyric odes" which give "a poetical history" of their "momentous times," and describe not only the futures of "the two Hebrew nations," but the fate "of the adjacent kingdoms likewise" "As each independent tribe or monarchy was swallowed up in the great universal empire of Assyria, the seers of Judah watched the progress of the invader, and uttered their sublime funeral anthems over the greatness and prosperity and independence of Moab and Ammon, Damascus and Tyre." "The poets of Judea," says Dr. Milman, "were pre-eminently national. It is on the existing state, the impending dangers and future prospects of Ephraim and Judah that they usually dwell." We cannot follow this writer in his after-thought that at least one of the prophets mixed up with his political and national utterances prophecies of a Messiah whose advent should be delayed for more than 700 years. Any theory of that kind appears to me to be in the highest degree unnatural, forced, and arbitrary.

Mr. Jowett plainly says that the Old Testament passages quoted by New Testament writers, are used "almost always without reference to the connection in which they originally occur, and in a different sense from that in which the Prophet or Psalmist intended them:" and it is that fact which makes it necessary to examine the alleged prophecies, and to resolutely see what it was that the original writer really meant. It is in doing this that we come across the undoubted fact that all the alleged prophecies of Christ in the Old Testament relate, in the original records, not to any remote future, not to any person unconnected with events then happening, but to scenes, circumstances, events, and persons all livingly connected with the prophet's own time.

Having got thus far, our way is perfectly clear; and all I have to do is to follow these alleged prophecies home to their source, and see what they really mean there. It will be an interesting and a curious investigation, and one that will well repay us in the end. If, however, in prosecuting this inquiry, any of those who rely upon

external evidences should lament to see one of the great buttresses crumble beneath our hand, let this be remembered,—that it cannot be a bad thing to know the truth, that it must be a bad thing to be depending on that which is ready to pass away, and that it can only be useful and good to lead God's children to rely upon the manifestations of Himself in the living soul.

Lecture II. The Book of Isaiah.

HAVING cleared the way by considering a variety of facts concerning the alleged prophecies in the Old Testament and their fulfilment in the New, I proceed now to name two principles concerning a genuine case of fulfilment of prophecy. First: a prophecy can only be recognised as such when it is simple and direct. If we allow that a prophecy may be complex and cloudy, we open the door to all sorts of impositions and vain imaginations, and men's fancies or prejudices, will create endless arbitrary meanings and interpretations; then, second, the *event* said to be predicted ought also to be clear, and as little ambiguous as the language that is said to predict it; for, if the language is not clear, the alleged prophecy may be made to mean almost anything; and, if the event is not explicitly stated, we have no guarantee that the alleged prediction and the event are related to one another. To this I will only add Priestley's shrewd remark, that if the passage in question was "not a prophecy when it was originally composed, it could not become one afterwards."

If these are sound rules concerning prophecy,—and I think they are,—we shall have solid ground to stand on, and good honest light to walk by in our examination of the alleged prophecies concerning Christ in the Old Testament, and we shall know what to do with statements such as that once made by a famous theologian,—that the "same prophecies have frequently a double meaning, and refer to different events—the one near, and the other remote—the one temporal, the other spiritual, or, perhaps, eternal. . . . The prophets thus having several events in view, their expressions may be partly applicable to one, and partly to another." We shall know, I say, what to do with statements like that—we shall dismiss them, as a mere contrivance for buttressing up a delusion. For what does that kind of argument come to? It comes to this, that you may make the alleged prophecy mean two things or anything. It would, therefore, be useless to show that the supposed prophecy referred to a political event in the days of the speaker; for, if we allow the loose accommodation of the theologians, the reply will be—"Yes, it is true that the prediction *primarily* related to the political event in the days of the speaker, but it also related to a spiritual event that should happen hundreds of years after the speaker's death." By proceeding in that way you can do just what you like with the record. The only safe, the only honest, the only legitimate method is—to find out the speaker's or the writer's meaning, and to stick to that. It is told of a great modern preacher that, in expounding a passage denouncing judgment upon the "young lions" of a people (whatever that meant), he said this undoubtedly referred to England, for were not three young lions quartered on the royal arms? And I believe it was a bishop who said that Isaiah predicted the modern locomotive and the railroad when he said—"And he will lift up an ensign to the nations from far, and will hiss unto them from the end of the earth: and, behold, they shall come with speed swiftly." However absurd that seems, it is not a whit less absurd than nine-tenths of the expositions of grave divines concerning the so-called prophecies.

I proceed, then, at once to ask—And what in relation to the predictions to be found in the Old Testament *was* the one meaning and intention? I put the question in that form on purpose, to convey the idea that, in the main the predictions in the Old Testament *were* related, and *did* refer, to one thing. What was that one thing? I reply, The restoration of the ancient Jewish people to their country from captivity, and the new splendour of their recovered national life; or the fortunes of the nation when beset by the foreign foe. These were genuine predictions, but they referred to pending events—to political changes already near at hand, needing no supernatural power to foretell, and admitting of no reference to altogether different, and far-off events.

I shall now proceed to show this, dealing first with the alleged prophecies concerning Christ, which clearly relate to pending political or national events; and then considering the alleged prophecies,—which are not prophecies at all, still less predictions,—concerning Christ, but which are purely personal descriptions of present or even past experiences; and, as being the richest of the so-called prophetic writings, I shall take, first, the prophecies of Isaiah. The first passage I shall refer to is one quoted in Matt. i. 21-23:—

"And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name Jesus: for he shall save his people from their sins. Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet saying; Behold a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us."

The reference is to Isaiah vii. 14. We turn to the passage, and what do we find? We find an account of the siege of Jerusalem by the King of Syria and the son of the King of Israel, and of the going of the prophet to the King of Judah, to reassure him, at the command of Jehovah, who tells him to say to the king, "Be not faint-hearted for the two tails of these smoking firebrands," and to promise that the confederacy shall not

prosper. Then Jehovah tells the king to ask for a sign to encourage him, but he declines, and then Jehovah says He Himself will give him a sign; and this very sign is described in the verse which is quoted by Matthew and applied to Christ. Here is the whole passage:—

"Therefore the Lord himself shall give you a sign: Behold, a virgin shall conceive, and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel. Butter and honey shall he eat, that he may know to refuse the evil, and choose the good. For before the child shall know to refuse the evil and choose the good, the land that thou abhorrest shall be forsaken of both her kings."

First of all note here, that the Hebrew word translated "virgin" is rendered "young woman" by the very best authorities; Dr. Vance Smith even suggests "young wife" with the article "the," and that "shall conceive" is not the future but the perfect tense, "has conceived." But, in particular, note that this is a sign for Ahaz, the king, to reassure him amid his political troubles, and in view of his capital being at that time besieged by two kings. The prophet expressly says: You shall not be defeated: this confederacy of the two powers will come to nothing; and I promise that before the time a child, now about to be born, is able to refuse the evil and choose the good, and while as yet it is eating infants' food, you shall see the destruction of your enemies. In plain English: Do not be afraid of these two kings, for in a few months they shall be destroyed in or from their own... kingdoms. And this really happened. A year after, one of the kings was slain; and the other the year following. That the child, who was designated as marking the time, should be called *Immanuel* (or God with us), suggests nothing uncommon. It was an ordinary event, that children should be called by names indicative of God's presence and help. Thus the prophet's name itself, *Isaiah*, means the salvation of Jehovah; but it was a common custom among the Jews to give these symbolical names, and it was perfectly appropriate that the child, which was to mark the period of the king's deliverance and triumph, should be called *Immanuel*, or "God with us." In the very next chapter (viii. 10), this same word *Immanuel* is translated "God is with us," and in connection with a reference to the King of Assyria and the political and military events of the prophet's own day. Barnes, one of the most orthodox of commentators, fairly says of this use of the name of God or Jehovah in giving names to children, "In none of these instances is the fact that the name of God is incorporated with the proper name of the individual any argument in respect to his rank or character." The great probability is, that the woman named was the prophet's own wife, mentioned in the very next chapter, as conceiving a son under the very same circumstances. That son, Jehovah told the prophet to call by another symbolic name; that son also he used and gave as a sign; for, said Jehovah, "before the child shall have knowledge to cry, 'my father and my mother,' the riches of Damascus and the spoil of Samaria shall be taken away before the King of Assyria." This, in the 8th chapter, is a precisely similar case to that under consideration in the 7th; and as, in the second case, the wife of the prophet is expressly mentioned as the woman who conceived the son who should be given for a sign, it may reasonably be supposed that the woman in the first case is the same or a similar person. But, be this as it may, three things are plain,—that the birth designated was a sign for a particular and very near event; that the sign related simply and solely to Ahaz and his political needs; and that the child to be born would be eating child's food in a few months from the utterance of the prediction; for it expressly says—Before this child shall have done eating child's food, the two kings that now distress you shall be destroyed. This being the case, it is preposterous to say that the prediction referred to a birth 750 years ahead! What sign would *that* have been to Ahaz? and what relation would *that* have had to the overthrow of two kings 750 years before?

But a few verses towards the end of chapter viii. clinch the whole thing. After comforting his king concerning the two kings against him, and describing the coming deliverance of the one and the destruction of the others, the prophet bursts into a defiance of the opposing kings and armies, and ends in this remarkable manner: "Now bind up the testimony"—or prediction, which I have uttered. "I will now wait for my God. Behold, I and the children whom the Lord hath given me are for signs and for wonders in Israel." What children? Why, the two children just mentioned—the one to be called *Immanuel*, and the other *Maher-shalal-hash-baz*—whose period of infancy would mark the limit of the existence of the invading kings, and who were called by symbolic names, indicating the help of God, and the swiftness of coming doom. But Matthew applies the prediction to Christ? I know he does; but that does not make it a proper thing to do. The prediction is perfectly clear, definite, and circumstantial; it related to particular persons, events, and circumstances in the days of the speaker, and in immediate connection with those persons, events, and circumstances. To take a prediction whose fulfilment is strictly limited to a year or two, and to make it apply to an event 750 years after, is altogether intolerable, especially when, by doing so, it has to be torn from its connection, and violently applied to a set of circumstances utterly different.

A little farther on, in chap. ix. 6, we come upon a passage which has been enormously relied on by those who have desired to find the God-man predicted in the Old Testament, but I will venture to say that the evidence is overwhelming that the wish has here been father to the thought. The verse runs thus:—

"For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace."

Now, keep well in your minds that this verse is a portion of the political writings we have just been considering. It is, in fact, only separated by ten verses from the prophet's outburst about his own children being signs of coming triumphs for his country and his king. Immediately upon that, he breaks out into an exultant song of hope about the rising hope of the nation, the king's young son, then only a few years old. All who know anything about the rhapsodies of loyalty, and the exigencies of the State, especially in troublous times, will understand perfectly well the prophet-courtier's joyous burst of song over this hope of the nation, young Hezekiah.

Another reading of the history of the time would make this refer to young Hezekiah's first child, whose birth, two or three years before the death of his grandfather Ahaz, would naturally cause great rejoicing.

The whole chapter is a torrent of mingled fury and joy—fury against the enemies of Judah, and joy over the nation's hope, the child born to the king. The prophet describes the horrible destructions that will come upon his enemies, and, at the end of every picture of woe, he shouts—"For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still,"—stretched out, that is, to crush and scatter yet more completely the enemies of Judah. And it is at the head, or in the very midst of this vivid description of approaching desolation, on the one hand, and triumph, on the other, that the verse occurs, "Unto us a child is born." The chapter is full of life, and eagerness, and haste; it relates altogether to surrounding and impending changes; and the "noise," and the "fire," and the "garments rolled in blood," are already there; the very kings and kingdoms are named that will be crushed or ruled by this child that "is born." Now, I submit that it is a monstrous thing to take the verse from its connection and apply it to the birth of a person 750 years farther on—to a person utterly unrelated to the circumstances here vividly described, and utterly unlike the individuals here clearly portrayed. The very verse before this describes a battle scene: let us read the two verses together:—"For every battle of the warrior is with confused noise, and garments rolled in blood; but this shall be with burning and fuel of fire. For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called "Wonderful, Counsellor, The mighty God, The everlasting Father, The Prince of Peace." What a positive incongruity it is, to introduce a description of Christ with a description of a battle-scene, with its "warriors," its "confused noise," its "garments rolled in blood," and its "burning and fuel of fire"! Equally incongruous is it to follow a description of Christ with a description of his sitting on the throne of David as a ruler and a king. But it is a most likely and admirable description of a young king, the living hope of a struggling people, of whom it fitly says, "the government shall be upon his shoulders." But he is called "the mighty God," and "the everlasting Father"? Certainly he is, and with great appropriateness, if you understand the words and their meaning. The names or qualities attributed to this child are—wonderful, counsellor, the mighty god, the everlasting father, the prince of peace. The only words at all requiring notice here are the two names, "the mighty god" and "the everlasting father." The last need mean no more than that the coming monarch would be the abiding father of his country—the glorious ancestor of an unbroken line of kings, as the next verse indicates; and in this very book (xxii. 21) a government administrator is called "a father to the inhabitants of Jerusalem." As regards the phrase "The mighty god," note that the particle *the* is not in the original; it is just a character attributed to the child, and not a personal and peculiar nature. As for the word "god," the Hebrew of that by no means necessarily refers to Deity. Moses is called a god (Exod. vii. 1): "And God said unto Moses, See, I have made thee a god to Pharaoh; and Aaron, thy brother, shall be thy prophet." In the Psalms the judges are called gods (Ps lxxxii. 6): "I have said, Ye are gods; and all of you are children of the Most High;" and Jesus recognised that fact, in John x. 35. But this word here rendered "god" is a frequent one in the Old Testament, and is often not translated god. In Job xli. 25, the word is translated "mighty." In Ezekiel xxxi. 11, it is again translated, "mighty," and is applied to the strong king Nebuchadnezzar, to whom this very word is applied, and who is equally called a god. In Ezekiel xxxii. 21 the word is translated "strong," applied to departed *herons*. So, in the verse before us, the same word is used, and the greatest scholars in the world read it *hero* or *potentate*, or render it by a phrase indicating a mighty ruler and conqueror. Martin Luther, in his German Bible, rendered it by two words meaning "mighty" and "hero." The other words require hardly any explanation; for, even as they stand, they are all applicable to such a king as the prophet longed for and hoped for, to rule over the hard-pressed nation; and it was with the genuine fervour and hopefulness of a poet-prophet that he hailed him as—Wonderful, counsellor, mighty hero, the abiding father of his country, the prince of peace.

I would only add, with regard to the application of this passage to Christ, that people who take the words "The mighty God" in their bare literality, and apply them to Christ, will find themselves in a serious difficulty when they come to the words, "The everlasting Father." Are *they* also to be taken in their bare literality? If not, why not? If yes, then will any orthodox believer explain to us how he is going to avoid "confounding the persons" when he accepts the statement that Christ was not only the *Hon* of God, but "the everlasting Fatter" too?

With two verses in the beginning of this chapter (Isaiah ix. 1, 2), I will conclude this lecture. These are quoted not very accurately, in Matt. iv. 15, 16. The quotation runs thus in Matthew:—

"And leaving Nazareth, he came and dwelt in Capernaum, which is upon the sea coast, in the borders of Zabulon and Nephthalim; that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying; The Land of Zabulon, and the land of Nephthalim, by the way of the sea, beyond Jordan, Galilee of the Gentiles; The people which sat in darkness saw great light; and to them which sat in the region and shadow of death light is sprung up."

Here, a few words from the chapter in Isaiah are lifted clean out of their connection, and made to apply to Christ, just because he is said to have left Nazareth, and gone to live in Capernaum; and this change of residence, we are asked to believe, was predicted 750 years before ! It is too much to ask. But turn to the passage itself in Isaiah, and you find what I have all along been pointing out, that it is part of a long, connected, and sustained description of political events then happening, and that it relates purely to these. In Isaiah the passage is descriptive, not prophetic: it tells of something that has happened, not of something that will happen in 750 years. It tells of a great political event *then* interesting the nation, the prophet, the court, and the king; and is entirely connected with the invasion of Judah by two kings, the hopes centered in the young prince, and the coming triumph of the nation over all its foes. It is the merest piece of accommodation to cut out this passage, or a part of it, as Matthew does, and apply it to an event altogether different, to a date unthought of by the writer, and to a set of circumstances as different from those described in the original record as anything could be. Isaiah is writing of kings, and courts, and peoples, and invasions, and battles, and burnings, and the alternations of hope and fear, light and darkness, among the people; and Matthew violently transfers the picture to a scene 750 years after, and to a man who had nothing to do with these things. Of course, it is open for any one to believe that Isaiah had two things in his mind—the burning events of his own day and the change of residence of Christ, 750 years after—and that he merged the two events into one prediction. But he who would believe that would believe anything, and all I can do is to lay the evidence before him, and pass on. But if I were offer such an on advice, it would be this:—Whatever faith you have in Jesus, rest it on surer foundations than on predictions that may fail you at any moment; rest it, as you surely can, upon a moral and spiritual basis which can never fail you—upon the rock of your own deepest convictions, which texts of Scripture can neither give nor take away.

Lecture III. The Book of Isaiah.

I NOW proceed with my examination of the passages alleged to be prophecies concerning Christ in the Book of Isaiah. In chapter xl. 3-5, we have the following:—

"The voice of him that crieth in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make straight in the desert a highway for our God. Every valley shall be exalted, and every mountain and hill shall be made low: and the crooked shall be made straight, and the rough places plain: and the glory of the Lord shall be revealed, and all flesh shall see it together: for the mouth of the Lord hath spoken it."

This is quoted in Matthew iii. 1-8, where it is applied to John the Baptist, as the forerunner and herald of Jesus. The opening of the prophecy, however, is itself conclusive as to its application. The chapter (xl.) and those that follow it are by a new writer, but we have the old familiar cry of the consoling teacher to a troubled nation:—"Comfort ye, comfort ye, my people, saith your God. Speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and cry unto her, that her warfare is accomplished." It is obviously the cry of hope to a people on the eve of redemption from its troubles. All difficulties will disappear, the crooked will be made straight and the rough will become plain, and, to "the cities of Judah," the cry will go forth—"Behold your God." It is the word of the Lord to His oppressed" people:" it is a promise of deliverance and return: and it can only be applied to Christ or to John the Baptist as his herald, by unlimited adjustment and arbitrary adaptation.

The passage in chapter xlii. 1-8. is much relied upon:—

"Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not cry, nor lift up, nor cause his voice to be heard in the street. A bruised reed shall he not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench: he shall bring forth judgment unto truth."

This is quoted in Matthew xii. 14-21:—

"Then the Pharisees went out, and held a council against him, how they might destroy him. But when Jesus know it, he withdrew himself from thence: and great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all; and charged them that they should not make him known: that it might foe fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Behold my servant, whom I have chosen; my beloved, in whom my soul is well pleased: I will put my spirit upon him, and lie shall shew judgment to the Gentiles. He shall not strive, nor cry; neither shall any man hear his voice in the streets. A bruised reed shall ho not break, and the smoking flax shall he not quench, till he send forth judgment unto victory. And in his name shall the Gentiles trust."

The point of similarity here is that Jesus did not hasten to assert himself, but charged the people not to

make him known: and this is taken as a fulfilment of the prophecy, "He shall not cry, nor lift up, &c.,"—a remarkable illustration of the ease with which predictions were found.

See a similar case, applying to the people, as this is made to apply to Christ. In Matthew xv. 7, we read, "Ye hypocrites, well did Esaias prophesy of you, saying, This people draweth nigh unto me with their mouth, and honoureth me with *their* lips; but their heart is far from me." But the passage in Isaiah (xxix. 13) is evidently addressed to the people of his own day. Perhaps all that Christ meant was:—"Ye hypocrites, the words of Isaiah fit you well, when he said, &c."

But the "servant" spoken of in the prophecy is not a person at all, but Israel or Jacob, the *people*, personified.

Mr. Sharpe is of opinion that this and other allusions to the "servant" refer to Zerubbabel, the viceroy or "prince" appointed by Cyrus to conduct the people to Jerusalem from Babylon. See Ezra ii. 1-2, Haggai i. &c., and Zech. iv. 6-9.

The Septuagint, indeed, actually reads it so, "Jacob my servant, and Israel mine elect:" but this is plain from the two previous chapters. On the same page as this very prophecy, we read (chapter xli. 8), "But thou *Israel*, art my servant," and, in the previous chapter (xl. 27), Jehovah addresses "Jacob" and "Israel," pleading with them. In this same chapter (xlii. 19) He speaks of His "servant" again, and asks "Who is blind, but my servant?"—evidently referring to the people Israel, who could not understand the leadings of God. A little farther on, after many warnings, and descriptions of experiences, and promises of help and comfort, Jehovah again addresses the nation (xliv. 1), "Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant, and Israel whom I have chosen." So that this verse, "Behold my servant, &c.," comes right in the very midst of a whole cluster of passages relating to the Jewish *people* as God's "servant," and referring to circumstances and events all occurring in the prophet's day. The identification is perfect. It was that *people* who were called God's "servant;" it was that people that should be gentle, gracious, and influential: and it was for *their* sakes that "God would go forth as a mighty man," and "stir up jealousy like a man of war," and "cry, yea, roar," and "prevail against his enemies." All that is in connection with the prediction which Matthew applies to Christ; but the merest glance shews how utterly inappropriate it is in relation to him, who certainly was not "blind," and who knew nothing of God as "a man of war" strong "against his enemies." But the whole thing is quite in harmony with the connected picture of a hard-pressed, suffering people, comforted by God as His "servant," and promised help and deliverance and a new career of glory and prosperity, even to the judging of the Gentiles. The passage can only be applied to Christ by sheer force of arbitrary accommodation.

Of the sixth verso of this chapter, Matthew Arnold says:—"We are familiar with the application of this to Christ; but it is said in the first instance of the ideal Israel, immediately represented to the speaker by God's faithful prophets bent on declaring his commandments and promises, and by the pious part of the nation persisting, in spite of their exile among an idolatrous people, in their reliance on God and in the pure worship of him. The ideal Israel, thus conceived, was to be God's mediator with the more backward mass of the Jewish nation, and the bringer of the saving light and health of the God of Israel to the rest of mankind." "*The Great Prophecy of Israel's Restoration.*"—Page 47.

In the 53rd chapter of Isaiah, we have a long description of Jehovah's "servant," in humiliation and sorrow, the whole of which has been applied to Christ, and with considerable shew of plausibility: but the analogy vanishes before a steady reading of the chapter, with its connections, before and after. You know the chapter well:—

"Who hath believed our report? and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed? For he shall grow up before him as a tender plant, and as a root out of a dry ground: he hath no form nor comeliness; and when we shall see him there is no beauty that we should desire him. He is despised and rejected of men; a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief: and we hid as it were our faces from him; he was despised, and we esteemed him not, &c."

Now I feel that any one who sets out to prove that this was never written concerning Christ has a very difficult task before him, not because the evidence is defective, but because he will have a dead weight of sentiment, habit, and prepossession against him: and I confess that I myself find it very difficult to dissociate Christ from the words "He was despised and rejected of men, a man of sorrows, and acquainted with grief." But it must be done.

And, in the first place, note that we must not isolate this chapter, or consider it apart from what goes before and comes after. The division into chapters is purely arbitrary and may really mislead. The description of this supposed person really begins with chapter lii, 13. In that verse we suddenly find ourselves before what turns out to be a sustained description of a sorrowful witness-bearer, now despised, rejected, or unknown, but soon to be the wonder of many nations. The last verse of lii. and the first verse of liii. are livingly related to one another. They contain a striking contrast which the break sadly destroys. "The lungs," says Isaiah, "shall shut then mouths before him" (with reverence and wonder), for "they shall see what they have not heard of," but *we*,

he adds, *did* hear, and yet who of us beloved? In fact, the 53rd chapter is inextricably bound up with all that goes before, and it is plain that reference is again to the *people* Israel, the servant of Jehovah, who, *all through, is addressed as His "servant."*

The suggestion has been made that the reference is to some well-known representative of the righteous part of the nation—some suffering confessor or martyr—who would be sufficiently recognised by the description given of him, and whose life and death stood as a testimony against the nation in general, seeing that it was the prevailing iniquity and faithlessness that made him necessary and that sealed his doom. It is certainly suggestive that in chapter 1. 5-6, we have this servant of God represented as saying "I gave my back to the smiters, and my cheeks to them that plucked off the hair; I hid not my face from shame and spitting." But this speaker is evidently supposed to be existing in Isaiah's day. See also chapter lvii. 1, where we have a pathetic reference to the central fact that "the righteous perish and no man layeth it to heart." See too chapter lviii. 1, where the prophet is summoned to "shew the people their transgression, and the house of Jacob their sins." The 53rd chapter deals, in a highly poetic form, with the national sorrow on the one hand, and the national sin on the other:—that is the central fact.

It is plain, too, that the circumstances referred to are either then existing, or just past, or at the very door; and these circumstances are all national and political. In the previous chapter the prophet calls upon Zion to awake, and upon Jerusalem to arise, to shake herself from the dust, and put on her beautiful garments. Direct reference is made to the people's captivity in Egypt and Assyria, and Jehovah announces His resolve to restore them. Then the prophet breaks out into that splendid cry—"How beautiful upon the mountains are the feet of him that bringeth good tidings." *What "good tidings"?* It goes on to tell us. The good tidings are such to the watchmen upon the poor crumbling walls, to the mourners in the "waste places of Jerusalem;" for the Lord, it says, "has made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all nations." Therefore the cry comes,— "Depart ye, depart ye,"—that is from captivity—"ye shall not go out with haste, nor go by flight, for the *Lord* will go before you, and the God of Israel will be in the rear." What is all that but the plainest possible description of a great *national* event—even the restoration of the captive "servant" of the Lord, the people Israel, to its own land? And yet we are asked to believe that the very next verse leaps over more than 500 years, and, without any warning or reason, commences a description of circumstances and scenes, and of a person altogether unrelated to what has just been discussed with so much point and fervour:—yes I and unrelated to what comes *after*; for, when this chapter ends, the reference again becomes obvious to a *people* regaining its place among the nations and shining with fresh glory. The widowed and childless nation shall return from captivity; it shall "break forth on the right hand and on the left:" its children "shall inherit the Gentiles, and make the desolate cities to be inhabited;" and "no weapon that is formed against it shall prosper." All that is only capable of one explanation—and that explanation is the *historical* one,—that the predictions of these chapters relate solely to *Israel* as the servant of the Lord and to its fortunes in captivity and restoration. The 52nd chapter is political and national; the 54th chapter is political and national; and the 53rd chapter is surely the same. It is simply incredible that between two chapters, plainly referring to present or impending local and political events, a chapter should occur, referring to events altogether different and to characters and transactions more than 500 years ahead.

The *person* of chapter 58, then, is obviously a *people*—the people all along treated and spoken of as a person; all along called God's "servant,"—the people also spoken of in Hosea xi. 1, where it is expressly said;—"When Israel was a *child*, then I loved him, and called my soil out of Egypt:" *i.e.* when the *people* Israel was in its infancy, I brought it up out of the land of Egypt. It is the *nation*, then, that is called God's servant or son: it is the *nation* that is now sorrowing, "despised and rejected:" and the sorrows and sufferings of the *nation* were truly described as borne on account of the sins and follies of individuals. The prophet-poet, with a striking fervour of imagery, pictures the servant of Jehovah, the Jewish nation, in captivity: and *we* sent him there, he cries,—we with our sins and wanderings: "all *we* like sheep have gone astray, and the Lord hath laid on him (*i.e.* on the nation, on His servant Israel) the iniquity of us all." In other words—the nation suffers for the people's sins. And now Israel, he says, is like a lamb brought to the slaughter; the nation has gone to its grave, with the wicked rich despoilers.' The nation itself is personified, and upheld as a separate being—not in itself base or evil. *It*, says Isaiah, had not been violent or false: *it* was still God's servant, God's chosen, or, as Hosea actually calls it, God's *son*; the sins of individuals had ruined it for a time, but God would bring it again from the degradation to which those sins had hurled it; and once again it should shine and rule, and "divide a portion with the great," and "divide the spoil with the strong." All this harmonizes with the chapters that go before and after, carries out the figure of the nation as a beloved and chosen servant of God, and leads on to the splendid promises that follow, connected with the restoration of the oppressed nation to its country and its prosperity.

The 49th and 50th chapters give a striking instance of the vivid way in which the nation could be personified and treated as a person. In the 21st verse of the 49th chapter the nation is pictured as a once childless mother rejoicing in children, with kings and queens as nursing fathers and mothers. Then in the first

verse of the 50th chapter it is treated as a woman who might possibly have been divorced. But the book abounds with this poetic treatment of the nation. I admit that it is not easy to see the meaning of every reference in the 53rd chapter, on the hypothesis that the person spoken of is really the people Israel; but we ought not to expect that: and yet I feel sure that a plain translation and a careful reading of it will bring out the meaning very much more clearly than most people would suppose.

Take for instance verse 9, which contains more than one misrendering of the Hebrew. The verse reads:—"And lie made his grave with the wicked, and with the rich in his death; because lie had done no violence, neither *was any* deceit in his mouth:" and the margin gives us a reference to Matt. xxvii. 57-60, where, curiously enough, a "rich" man is said to secure the body of Jesus;—a wonderful fulfilment of Isaiah's prophecy! thinks the reader. But the true sense is:—Although he was neither violent nor deceitful, he made his grave with the wicked, and was with sinners in his death. The authorised version bears improbability on the face of it, and adequate knowledge has decided against it.

Grasp well the fact that, *all through*, the people Israel is personified and addressed as God's servant: grasp also the fact that the prophet draws a sharp distinction between the chosen beloved nation and the individuals that are included in it: grasp finally the fact that the one burning thought in his mind is the restoration of this poor crushed sorrowing people to the old land; and I believe the chapter, with the chapters that go before and follow after, will be wonderfully clear. But, if we take it violently out of its historical connections and make it refer to a person and to events 500 years ahead; if, in a word, we read it as an extended prophecy of Christ, we shall still find it difficult to see the meaning of every reference. "What, for instance, are we to understand by Christ seeing his seed or his descendants, by his prolonging his days, by his dividing a portion with the great, and dividing the spoil with the strong? And yet all these are features in the description; and they have great significance when applied to the picture of a nation rising triumphant above its sorrows and its foes.

It is a curious thing that we find in the book of Jeremiah (chapter xi. 19) a very close resemblance to one portion of the description given in the chapter before us:—

"But I was like a lamb or an ox that is brought to the slaughter; and I knew not that they had devised devices against me, saying, Let us destroy the tree with the fruit thereof, and let us cut him off from the land of the living, that his name be no more remembered."

This is Jeremiah's description of his own case, and the suggestion has been made that Isaiah's description of the man "despised and rejected" referred to Jeremiah. But one thing appears to be certain,—that Isaiah wrote entirely concerning his own times, that he referred entirely to the condition of the nation in his day, and that only by arbitrary accommodation and adjustment can his words be taken as descriptive of *Christ*.

To show how loosely the Evangelists quoted passages from the Old Testament as predictions, just take the reference to the 4th verse of this chapter, in Matt. viii. 16-17.

"When the even was come, they brought unto him many that were possessed of devils: and he cast out the spirits with his word, and healed all that were sick: That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by Esaias the prophet, saying, Himself took our infirmities, and bore our sicknesses."

This is quoted as a direct case of fulfilment; but what is the fact? In the Gospel the case is one of *healing* physical sicknesses, of taking sicknesses away: in Isaiah, as we have seen, the case is one of the bearing of sorrow for another, in consequence of moral evil,—a totally *different* thing; and yet Matthew calls it a *fulfilment* of the prophecy!

Another well-known passage is in chapter vi. 9-10:—

"And he said, Go, and tell this people, Hear ye indeed, but understand not; and see ye indeed, but perceive not. Make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed."

This is quoted in John xii. 87-41:—

"But though he had done so many miracles before them, yet they believed not on him: that the saying of Esaias the prophet might be fulfilled, which he spake, Lord, who hath believed our report? and to whom hath the arm of the Lord been revealed? Therefore they could not believe, because that Esaias said again, He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their heart; that they should not see with their eyes, nor understand with their heart, and be converted, and I should heal them. These things said Esaias, when he saw his glory, and spake of him."

Now, note here first that the writer attributes to Christ the cry of Isaiah, "Lord, who hath believed our report?" The people did not believe in Christ, and the writer says that Isaiah foresaw this 750 years before, and referred to that, in fact prophesied that, when lie said, "Lord, who hath believed, &c." This is a striking instance of the loose way in which such old sayings were lifted out of their place in the Old Testament and made to apply to the events of the New. The other quotation will shew the same thing. The writer of "John" expressly says that the unbelief of Christ's hearers was a *fulfilment* of the prediction "He hath blinded their eyes, &c." The writer of John goes so far as to say that the people *could* not believe *because* Isaiah had said that, and

that Isaiah said it, having Christ in his eye, 750 years before. What are the facts? Turn to the place where Isaiah has recorded this alleged prophecy of Christ, and what do you find? You find that the reference to the prophet himself is as direct, as explicit, and as limited as anything could be. He tells us how, in the year that king Uzziah died, he saw a vision, in which the Lord spoke to him and said, "Whom shall I send, and who will go for us?" Then he replied, "Here I am; send me." And the Lord sent him, giving him this charge;—(see verses 9-10.) But not only does the *narrative* distinctly limit the whole thing to the prophet and the people of his time: the prophet's *question*, after receiving the charge, and the reply to his question, still more definitely fix it: for he asks, "Lord, how long?" and the reply is given, "Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate;" a description of things having no relation to anything in the life of Christ, but very true to events that happened in the days of the prophet.

The passage in chapter xi. 1-2, though widely regarded as a prophecy concerning Christ, is seen to be equally inapplicable to him when the context is read. The passage reads:—

"And there shall come forth a rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a Branch shall grow out of his roots: And the spirit of the Lord shall rest upon him, the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord."

But the moment we turn to the passage, and read what goes before and after, the connection of Christ with the passage utterly vanishes. This promised "Branch" from the stem of Jesse will, it says, be as an "ensign," which shall rally the people, who will be delivered out of the hands of their oppressors, the Assyrians, the Egyptians, and the other unfriendly powers. (See verses 10-16.) The whole reference is purely national and political, relating to the prophet's own day or to a time very near to it. To this "Branch," Zechariah (who wrote about the same time) refers (iii. 8 and vi. 12), and nothing is plainer than that it points to a political leader and deliverer in his own time. See also Isaiah iv. 2, where this "Branch" is promised, again in connection with escape from captivity. The "Branch" is probably Zerubbabel.

A passage in Isaiah lix. 20, is referred to in Romans xi. 26. In Isaiah it reads:—

"And the Redeemer shall come to Zion, and unto them that turn from transgression in Jacob, saith the Lord."

In Romans it reads:—

"And so all Israel shall be saved: as it is written, There shall come out of Sion the Deliverer, and shall turn away ungodliness from Jacob."

There is considerable difference between the two, but this is a common occurrence. The difference in the words, however, is nothing compared with the difference in sense. Paul quoted the words in relation only to the saving of all Israel, but Isaiah wrote them concerning a salvation accompanied by "vengeance" and "fury" against the enemies of the Lord. In short, Isaiah had in his mind the destruction of political enemies and the triumphs of the nation, (see chapter lix. from verse 17 to lx. verse 14,) while Paul thought only of a spiritual redemption. He quoted words that were moderately apt, but no real prophecy.

Isaiah lxiii. 1 is not quoted in the New Testament, but is often referred to as having a reference to Christ. It is a perilous passage to quote; for this Saviour, whoever he is, is not only like Christ because he comes in "righteousness" and is "red" as with blood, but he is also one who treads his enemies in his anger, and tramples them in his fury: and it is *their* blood and not his own that stains this awful Saviour.

The last passage I shall quote from Isaiah is that beautiful one said to have been quoted by Christ. It will in a very striking manner illustrate the loose way in which fragments of the Old Testament were taken from their connection and applied to the fresh incidents recorded by the New. The passage in Isaiah, chap. lxi. 1-2, is as follows:—

"The Spirit of the Lord God is upon me; because the Lord hath anointed me to preach good tidings unto the meek; he hath sent me to bind up the brokenhearted, to proclaim liberty to the captives, and the opening of the prison to them that are bound; to proclaim the acceptable year of the Lord, and the day of vengeance of our God; to comfort all that mourn;"

This is quoted by Christ in Luke iv. 16-21, and applied to himself thus:—

"And he came to Nazareth, where he had been brought up: and, as his custom was, he went into the synagogue on the sabbath day, and stood up for to read. And there was delivered unto him the book of the prophet Esaias. And when he had opened the book, he found the place where it was written, The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me to preach the gospel to the poor; he hath sent me to heal the brokenhearted, to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised, to preach the acceptable year of the Lord. And he closed the book, and he gave it again to the minister, and sat down; and the eyes of all them that were in the synagogue were fastened on him. And he began to say unto them, This day is this scripture fulfilled in your ears."

Thus far the parallel seems sufficiently striking, and if we idly took the matter for granted it would seem as though Isaiah had, in some way, foretold the advent of such a teacher. But a little thought will dispel that idea.

In the first place this description of the gracious speaker was probably written about the year 425 B.C.

The reader will note that various dates are assigned to different portions of this book. This is in accordance with a now generally accepted theory, that the book was written by different hands at different times, from the days of Ahaz to the time of Nehemiah, covering a period of about 300 years. and there is nothing so peculiar in that description as to compel us to look so far ahead for a person of whom it should be true. Whom does it describe? Plainly, the writer himself, lie says "The Spirit of the Lord is upon *me*:" and he undoubtedly thought he had been commissioned to preach good tidings to his fellow-countrymen. In a previous chapter (1. 4) similar words are used:—"The Lord God hath given me the tongue of the learned, *that I should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary*." This is all he professes in the verses before us; for all he does is to describe a good teacher, who should preach good tidings to the meek, bind up the brokenhearted, proclaim freedom to the bound, and tell of the judgments of the Lord. That is all: but the description might have applied to many persons during those 425 years, as well as to the prophet himself. But, beyond that, go to the passage in Isaiah, and what do you find? You find features that not only are not found in Christ and in his circumstances, but you find features that make the description utterly inapplicable to him. In fact, the quotation in Luke stops in a very curious manner just at the place where the inappropriateness of it begins to be manifest. It quotes the words "to preach the acceptable year of the Lord," but it does not add, as the verse in Isaiah docs, "and the day of vengeance of our God." That "day of vengeance" was appropriate in Isaiah's day, but not in Christ's. The truth is that the passage in Isaiah, like all the other passages adduced, relates to national and political events in or near the prophet's own time. In the previous chapter there is a florid description of the coming glory of the nation,— "Arise, shine," it says, "for thy light is come:" and, to make it certain that the reference is to the *nation*, we find the statement,— "For the nation and kingdom that will not serve thee shall utterly perish; yea, those nations shall be utterly wasted." What can that be but a reference to political ascendancy and national glory? Then it goes on to say: "The sons of them that afflicted thee shall come bending unto thee, and all they that despised thee shall bow themselves down at the soles of thy feet." It would puzzle the cleverest commentator to extract from that a spiritual meaning or a reference to *Christ*, but its appropriateness as a description of national ascendancy is obvious. Then comes the passage before us, with its description of the comforting and sympathetic teacher, who proclaims freedom for the captive, and the day of divine vengeance;—thus continuing the story of the nation's deliverance from its oppressors. Immediately following this, we find the promise, "They shall build the old wastes, they shall raise up the former desolations, and they shall repair the waste cities, the desolations of many generations." And that is a vital part of the passage which, nevertheless, is quoted by Christ as fulfilled in himself. The merest glance at it shows that his explanation is purely arbitrary, that the fragment he takes out is violently sundered from its connection, and that in no real sense can the passage be taken as a prophecy concerning Christ,—as it clearly relates to a long and sustained description of national and political events, connected with the Jews and referring to events happening or about to happen in the prophet's day.

What then? must we accuse Christ of error or falsification? By no means, though we should be obliged to do so if we accepted the orthodox theory that he meant to say Isaiah really wrote the passage as a prophecy to be fulfilled in Christ. My explanation is that Jesus meant to say no such thing—that lie simply read the words as a kind of text or motto, and that his announcement of fulfilment only meant that he had the old tidings to tell; and perhaps there was also the feeling that he could tell those tidings in a purer form, in a more spiritual form, uncontaminated with the old thirst for vengeance, and unlimited by local and political references.

"Believe in Christ's life and doctrine," said Rowland Williams, "you will see how the lisping utterances of a province grew from childhood to a world-wide stature of spiritual manhood[*unclear: d*]

In that sense it *was* true that the old description of the consoling teacher was fulfilled in Christ;—*not* because Isaiah had the slightest idea of describing any one but himself or some one in his day, but because his description of a consoling teacher was *more* realised, and that in a very pure and perfect form. It was a case of simple adaptation of old words to new events, not as fulfilments of prophecies, but as appropriate illustrations of character.

This finishes our examination of the great prophetic Book of Isaiah, and I am not sorry that it ends with Christ himself quoting that Book; for that leads us to a glimpse of the truth—that he fulfilled old hopes by surpassing them, and realised old dreams by making them more than true. He did not fulfil ancient prophecies concerning himself, for there are none: but he came in the spirit of the old hopes and longings, sifted out the things that were local, earthly, and temporary, and made them universal, spiritual, and eternal: and it will be well for us if our faith in him be based upon things that are universal, spiritual, and eternal too.

Lecture IV. Miscellaneous Passages.

I SHALL proceed now to an examination of the *miscellaneous* passages which are supposed to be

prophecies concerning Christ, but which really are references to passing or impending national and political events. In Genesis xlix. 10, we read:—

"The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until Shiloh come; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be."

I shall not dwell long on this: the only wonder is that it should ever have been cited as a prophecy concerning Christ, more than 1600 years before he came. The passage itself, though put into the mouth of Jacob, had, in all probability, no existence till many centuries after Jacob's day,—till, in fact, "Judah" had become a power under David; and then it expressed the fervid or defiant hope of the rising tribe. The word "Shiloh" points out, not a person, but a place, and the correct translation probably is, not "until Shiloh come," but until *he* (*i.e.* Judah) *come to Shiloh*. The very same words are used in 1 Samuel iv. 12: of one who "came to Shiloh." The reference to Shiloh is obvious. It was a sacred city of Israel, whom Judah envied; and the poet predicts that Judah shall yet possess it. Or "Shiloh," as the symbol of *rest* (with which word it is connected), may stand for the culmination of Judah's triumphs. Anyhow, it is to *Judah* that the "gathering of the people" is to be, and Judah is personified and glorified all through. A comparison of this "blessing" by Jacob with the "blessing" by Moses (Deut. xxxiii. 7) brings out this meaning in a striking manner. Moses is made to beg for Judah that "his people" may be brought to him, *i.e.*, that this tribe may occupy the first place and be, in fact, the ruling power. In both cases it is perfectly obvious that the reference is to the political fortunes of a tribe, and not to the spiritual reign of a Messiah. Applied to Christ, the prophecy is not only inappropriate but untrue, for the sceptre *did* depart from Judah before Christ came: it ceased in fact nearly 600 years before he came. But the application to Christ can best be shewn to be inadmissible by applying my favourite test,—by reading what comes before and goes after. Listen then to the whole passage:—

"Judah, thou art he whom thy brethren shall praise: thy hand shall be in the neck of thine enemies; thy father's children shall bow down before thee. Judah is a lion's whelp: from the prey, my son, thou art gone up. He stooped down, he couched as a lion, and as an old lion; who shall rouse him up? The sceptre shall not depart from Judah, nor a lawgiver from between his feet, until he come to Shiloh; and unto him shall the gathering of the people be. Binding his foal unto the vine, and his ass's colt unto the choice vine; he washed his garments in wine, and his clothes in the blood of grapes: His eyes shall be red with wine, and his teeth white with milk."

Who would apply the *last* half of the prediction to Christ? But the language might very well serve as a description of a jubilant and successful tribe

In Deuteronomy xviii. 15, we have a passage that is quoted in the New Testament in one place, and believed to be referred to in another. The passage is:—

"The LORD thy God will raise up unto thee a Prophet from the midst of thee, of thy brethren, like unto me; unto him ye shall hearken."

This verse, Peter quotes in Acts iii. 22, applying it to Christ; and, in John v. 40, Christ himself, without quoting any particular passage, refers to Moses who "wrote," he says, of him. Now, to begin with, it is, one may say, absolutely certain that Moses did *not* write the Book of Deuteronomy at all. If Christ thought he did, he only shared the general tradition of his day; but the facts are irresistible, and it is no longer possible to believe that Moses wrote the words before us. But, whoever wrote the passage, it cannot be applied to Christ. It is part of a message from Jehovah to the children of Israel, and it must be taken as a whole. The occasion was the remembrance of the shrinking of the people before Sinai, when they entreated that God would not speak by thunder and lightning, but through Moses: and it is upon that, that Moses is told to promise them a prophet "from among their brethren" like himself. What an utterly inappropriate thing it would have been to have promised them a prophet in 1000 years! The whole point of it lies in having the prophet now or soon. They trembled at the thunder and lightning of Sinai, they begged for the voice of a man and not the thunder of a God; and what they ask is promised them. But the special use of this prophet is explicitly stated. In the land to which they are going there are "abominations,"—cruel sacrifices, divinations, enchanters, witches, charmers, spirit mediums, (verses 9-12) But they must not hearken to these, for God will raise them up a true prophet, to whom alone they must listen.

The time and circumstances then are fixed, and the prophet like unto Moses, that shall be raised up "from among" them, is to be useful to the very persons addressed. But a succession of prophets is indicated, for the chapter goes on to distinguish between the good and the bad, the false and the true prophets, and a test is given whereby the true prophet can be known; and then the next chapter still further clinches the reference to the time of the speaker by dwelling upon the entrance of the Jews into the promised land. Besides, Christ was not a prophet "like unto" Moses: he was utterly unlike him; so unlike him that the Gospels contrast them again and again: so unlike him that in every point and on every ground the prophecy fails to be at all related to Christ, unless, indeed, we "spiritualize" the local promise, and see in Christ, what indeed we well may see, the culmination of the prophetic office in him; but *that* does not any more make the passage in Deuteronomy a

prophecy of him.

A passage in Jeremiah xxxi. 15, is quoted in Matthew ii. 17-18, as having been fulfilled by the weeping of the Jewish mothers for their young children, slain by Herod. The passage in Jeremiah is;—

"Thus saith the Lord; A voice was heard in Bamah, lamentation, and bitter weeping; Rahel weeping for her children refused to be comforted for her children, because they were not."

And in Matthew it says that the weeping of the Hebrew mothers in the time of Christ fulfilled that. But the verse is a statement of fact and not a prediction; and what does the following verse in Jeremiah say? It says that God *consoled* the mourners, by saying, "Refrain from weeping . . . for they shall come a; rain from the enemy . . . and there is hope that thy children shall come again to their own border:"—a perfectly monstrous reply if we think of the weeping of the Hebrew mothers for their dead children, but an equally rational reply if we think of what is clearly *meant*—the weeping of Hebrew mothers for their children gone into captivity. The taking of that passage out of its connection and its application to the time of Christ cannot be defended for a moment, while its reference to an ancient raid upon Judah is as obvious. The "Rahel" (or Rachel) of the passage is doubtless the wife of Jacob and the mother of Benjamin, the founder of the tribe to whom Ramah belonged. She is here poetically represented as weeping for her afflicted descendants, more than a thousand years after her death.

A passage in Zechariah xii. 10, would never have been pressed into service as a messianic prophecy, if it had not been quoted in the Gospels, as fulfilled by Christ. It runs thus:—

"And I will pour upon the house of David, and upon the inhabitants of Jerusalem, the spirit of grace and of supplications: and they shall look upon me whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for him, as one mourneth for his only son, and shall be in bitterness for him, as one that is in bitterness for his firstborn."

The reference to this is in John xix. 37, when, after the record of the piercing of Christ, the passage is added,

"For these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled, A bone of him shall not be broken. And again another scripture saith, They shall look on him whom they pierced."

It looks just as though any phrase that seemed applicable sufficed as a prophecy; though here the passage is not even *said* to be a prophecy, but is only quoted as an apt saying: but that suggests a great deal as to quotations in general of Old Testament scripture. A reference to the passage in Zechariah, and a mere glance at the context shews its utter irrelevancy as a prophecy concerning Christ. In the first place, it is to be noted that the word "me" and the word "him" refer to the same person: the verse itself shews that. It says, "they shall look upon *me* whom they have pierced, and they shall mourn for *him*"—plainly it should be "they shall look upon him whom they have pierced, and shall mourn for him." This is the reading of the best manuscripts. The person pierced and the person mourned for are one. The reference is to some person of very great political and national importance; for it adds;— "In that day shall there be a great mourning in Jerusalem . . . and the land shall mourn, every family apart,"—a state of things utterly opposed to the reality when *Christ* was pierced. But the lines that follow make it even ridiculous to apply the statement to Christ: for it says that every one shall mourn for the pierced one,—

"Every family apart; the family of the house of David apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Nathan apart, and their wives apart; the family of the house of Levi apart, and their wives apart; the family of Shimei apart, and their wives apart; all the families that remain, every family apart, and their wives apart."

Need anything be added to shew that the prophecy could not have referred to Christ, and that it is from first to last inapplicable to him? The time indicated is one during which a siege of Jerusalem is going on (verses 2 and 8), the end of it being the destruction of the besiegers (verse 9.) But nothing of the kind happened in the time of Jesus. Then, so far from mourning for him, they execrated him, and, as one has said, "curse him and his followers even to this day." The meaning of the passage probably is that they shall mourn for king Jehoiakim as they had before mourned for king Josiah, who was slain in the valley of Meggidon.

In the passage I quoted just now, John xix. 36, you would notice the statement that certain things were done (to Christ) "that the scripture should be fulfilled,—"A bone of him shall not be broken." This referred to the piercing of Christ's side in place of breaking his legs. But the quotation from the Old Testament is woefully far-fetched; is, in fact, about as bad a case of accommodation as could be found. The passage referred to is in Exodus xii. 40, where the direction is given not to break a bone of the passover lamb. This use of the words "For these things were done that the scripture should be fulfilled" shews how loosely that formula could be used, and out of what unlikely and inappropriate material a prediction, a prophecy, or a promise could be extracted.

In this same book, we have a passage which, in like manner, is quoted, in the New Testament as applicable to Christ. The verso is in Zechariah ix. 9.

"Rejoice greatly, O daughter of Zion; shout, O daughter of Jerusalem: behold, thy King cometh unto thee: he is just, and having salvation; lowly, and riding upon an ass, and upon (o even upon) a colt the foal of an ass."

The passage is mistranslated. We should read:—" Thy king cometh to thee (he is just, and hath been

saved), lowly and riding upon an ass, even upon a colt the foal of an ass." Probably, the person meant is king Hezekiah, who during some part of the Assyrian invasion had been in danger of being captured by Sennacherib.

The passage in which it is quoted is Matthew xxi. 4-5, where we find a record of Christ's riding into Jerusalem upon an ass, and the usual addition, "All this was done that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet." In the Hebrew the "ass" and the "colt the foal of an ass" are one and the same: but the writer in Matthew suspiciously blunders, and lands us in the absurdity of Christ's riding on two animals; for it says:—"And the disciples brought the ass and the colt, and put on *them* their clothes, and they set Jesus thereon." If we turn to the place we shall see that this is another case of arbitrary procedure on the part of the evangelist, in the taking of a scrap from a description of one event and violently applying it to another. The king spoken of in Zechariah is evidently a *political* king, and one possessed or looked for in the time of Zechariah. That king is utterly unlike Christ. He rides indeed into Jerusalem but that is the whole of the analogy. He is a ruler over vast domains, stretching from sea to sea; and, it immediately adds, the chariot, and the battle horse, and the bow shall be abolished, and the king shall be on peaceful terms with the Gentiles round about; and *this* is the king that rides into Jerusalem on an ass ! The picture is perfectly consistent and clear, but it is a picture which excludes Christ. It is the picture of a rejoicing people welcoming their peaceful but mighty monarch,—his enemies subdued or reconciled, and his dominion secure from sea to sea. It is worthy of note that in the 72nd Psalm we have a precisely similar description of the Jewish king's happy reign; and *that* too has been taken as a prophecy concerning Christ; but the inapplicability of it is manifest. The king there described is a *political* potentate, and phrases can only be applied to Christ by isolating them from their connection or spiritualizing the whole.

I shall quote one more passage from Zechariah. It is in chapter xiii. 7.

"Awake, O sword, against my shepherd, and against the man that is my fellow, saith the Lord of hosts: smite the shepherd, and the sheep shall be scattered."

This has actually been quoted, not only as a prophecy concerning Christ, but as a proof of his Deity; since God here calls this "man" His "fellow"; although the Hebrew word only means a *friend*. The passage is quoted in Matthew xxvi. 31.

"Then saith Jesus unto them, All ye shall be offended because of me this night: for it is written, I will smite the shepherd, and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad."

Here again, no affirmation is made that the passage from Zechariah is a prophecy now to be fulfilled. It only says "for it is written ": but it has been freely taken as a prophecy. Turn to the place and what do you find?—You find a description of a sorrowful time for the nation. Its "shepherd," or leader, is to be struck down, and "in all the land," it says, two thirds shall be cut off and die, and the remaining third shall be purified, and learn to call Jehovah their God. Not a word of this is applicable to Christ, but it is all a part of Zechariah's description of the scene connected with the smiting of the shepherd and the scattering of the sheep. It is simply a description of a terribly destructive invasion, and the scrap of it applied to Christ can only be made applicable by taking it utterly away from its connection. In all probability, the person meant is king Jehoiachin the successor of Jehoiakim above mentioned.

A passage in Hosea xi. 1 is quoted in Matthew ii. 18-16 as fulfilled by Christ. The passage in Hosea reads—"When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt." The passage in Matthew reads:—

"And when they were departed, behold, the angel of the Lord appeareth to Joseph in a dream, saying, Arise, and take the young child and his mother, and lice into Egypt, and be thou there until I bring thee word: for Herod will seek the young child to destroy him. When he arose, he took the young child and his mother by night, and departed into Egypt: and was there until the death of Herod: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying, Out of Egypt have I called my son."

This is a case of direct assertion of prophecy; and a very bad case it is. We have already seen, by proofs that are overwhelming, that the people of Israel were constantly personified, and called the servant or son of God. It is so here. "When Israel was a child," that is—when the *people* of Israel were in the infancy of their national life, "I loved him, and called my son out of Egypt "; and so, according to the record, He did, bringing forth the children of Israel out of Egypt. That the nation is intended is plain from the next verse, where we read that this "child" fell into idolatry, and "sacrificed unto Baalim, and burned incense to graven images." Then it adds,— "He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king, because they refused to return" (or repent). What is this but an explicit limiting of the picture to the child of God, the people of Israel, called out of Egypt, then fallen into idolatry, and then sent to captivity? And yet Matthew, violently cutting half a dozen words out of their connection, perverts them into a prophecy concerning Christ! I do not wonder that acute persons have been led to say that the story of Christ's being taken into Egypt was itself invented to match the invented prophecy. The case is made more palpably bad by the fact that the verse is not a prediction at all, but

an historical statement. It told of something past, not of something to come—" I *called* my son out of Egypt." But they who read the whole passage will see that the reference to the people Israel is clear. It must be noted, too, that "Ephraim" is also spoken of, and in a similar manner, (verse 8). Using the same beautiful and touching figure, and representing Jehovah as a Father dealing with children, the prophet says, speaking for God, " I taught Ephraim also to go, taking them by their arms."

A similar passage, similarly treated, is to be found in Micah v. 2.

"But thou, Beth-lehem Ephratah, though thou be little among the thousands of Judah, yet out of thee shall he come forth unto me that is to be ruler in Israel; whose goings forth have been from of old, from everlasting."

In Matthew ii. 1-6, we read:—

"Now when Jesus was born in Bethlehem of Judaea in the days of Herod the king, behold, there came wise men from the east to Jerusalem, saying, Where is he that is born King of the Jews? for we have seen his star in the east, and are come to worship him. When Herod the king had heard these things, he was troubled, and all Jerusalem with him. And when he had gathered all the chief priests and scribes of the people together, he demanded of them where Christ should be born. And they said unto him, In Bethlehem of Judaea: for thus it is written by the prophet, And thou Bethlehem, in the land of Juda, art not the [unclear: least] among the princes of Juda: for out of thee shall come a Governor, that shall rule my people Israel."

Here, the interpretation of the prophecy is attributed to "the chief priests and scribes," which, to say the least of it, is unlikely. In any case, test the passage in Matthew, by an original reading of the passage in Micah. Its application to Christ will then be a burst bubble. The ruler who is to come out of Bethlehem is definitely described (verse 5) as a man who shall deliver the Jews from the Assyrians, and waste the land of Nimrod; and the rest of the chapter is taken up with references to the cutting off of enemies, the destruction of chariots, the throwing down of strongholds, the abolishing of witchcraft, and the smashing of idols: all of which is utterly inapplicable to Christ, and yet it all occurs in the description of the ruler from Bethlehem and the events of his expected reign. The reference to the Assyrians limits and localises the prediction, and makes it inapplicable to Christ, in whose days the Assyrians had ceased to be an independent people.

The last passage I shall refer to is in Malachi iii. 1, which is quoted in Matthew xi. 10, as a prophecy concerning Christ's "messenger," John the Baptist. It reads thus:—

"Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me: and the Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come to his temple, even the messenger of the covenant, whom ye delight in: behold, he shall come, saith the Lord of hosts."

This "messenger" is, in Matthew xi. 10, distinctly said to be John the Baptist. But a reference to the passage in Malachi shews that this "messenger" is to herald in a time altogether different from that occupied by the life of Christ. It is a time of terror that is foretold. The very next verse asks, " But who may abide the day of his coming? and who shall stand when he appeareth?" "The Lord" will come with swift judgment. That day will "burn as an oven," and the wicked will be like " stubble," in that " great and dreadful day of the Lord:"—all of which does not at all apply either to John the Baptist, to Christ, or to his times. But further; the burden of the chapter is neglected "ordinances," and unpaid "tithes." On account of *these*, God will judge the people; and, to remind them of *these*, His "messenger" will come. The end will be accomplished in the purification of "the sons of Levi" (verse 8), that they may attend to the " offering" or ordinances of the temple" as in the days of old," and in the peace and prosperity of the nation, dwelling in its "delightful land" (verse 11-12). Besides, this "messenger" of the covenant is one in whom the Jews " delight." I need not dwell upon this, to point out the utter inappropriateness of all that to John, to Jesus, or to his times.

Thus, one by one, the broken reeds disappear:—and what then? What good will it do to tell these things? I answer;—Much good. It put you in possession of the truth, and that is always good. It takes away a false buttress to the pernicious dogmas of the infallibility of the Bible and the Deity of Jesus. It helps you to really understand the Old Testament, and that is a great gain: and finally, it teaches you to use your reason, to exercise your judgment, to cultivate your independence and freedom.

If these do not appear to you to be good things, I can only express the hope that something may happen to you to compel you to think for yourselves,—to cease to be children and to begin your intellectual lives as self-reliant women and thoughtful men.

Lecture V. The Song of Solomon.

THERE is something so supremely ridiculous about the allegation that the Song of Solomon was intended to be a spiritual allegory of the tender relation between Christ and the Church, that only the most overwhelming evidence would serve to convince any one that this was seriously maintained. But, maintained it *is*, as any one knows who is acquainted with the average teaching given from the ordinary pulpits. But the very headings of the chapters suffice; for the translators of the authorised version, assuming with cool audacity or childlike

simplicity that the Song *did* tell the story of the relationship between Christ and the Church, have placed a commentary at the head of every chapter: and these commentaries, when combined, form the following "orthodox" view of the book:—

The church's love unto Christ. She confesseth her deformity, and prayeth to be directed to his flock. Christ directeth her to the shepherds' tents: and shewing his love to her, giveth her gracious promises. The church and Christ congratulate one another. The mutual love of Christ and his church. The hope and calling of the church. Christ's care of the church. The profession of the church, her faith and hope. The church's fight and victory in temptation. The church glorieth in Christ. Christ setteth forth the graces of the church. He sheweth his love to her. The church prayeth to be made fit for his presence. Christ awaketh the church with Iris calling. The church having a taste of Christ's love is sick of love. A description of Christ by his graces. The church professeth her faith in Christ. Christ sheweth the graces of the church, and his love towards her. A further description of the church's graces. The church professeth her faith and desire. The love of the church to Christ, The vehemency of love. The calling of the Gentiles. The church prayeth for Christ's coming.

Matthew Henry, quaintest, shrewdest, and yet most orthodox of commentators, though he solemnly asserts the ordinary orthodox view, confesses that "it seems as hard as any part of Scripture to be made 'a savour of life unto life.'" "The Jewish doctors, he says, advised their young people not to read it till they were 30. He admits further, that the name of God is not in it, that it is never quoted in the New Testament, and that it has not in it "any expressions of natural religion or pious devotion." He goes so far as to say that we need to forget that we have bodies in studying it. He expresses the opinion, however, that it is a most *profound* book: "there are depths in it," he says, "in which an elephant may swim." He is right; and he might have added—in which an army of commentators might drown. "It requires some pains," says this commentator, "to find out what may probably be the meaning of the Holy Spirit, in the several parts of this book,"—a commentator's way of saying,—It is really very difficult to make anything of it! and yet we are warned that we may "wrest it" to our "destruction." A famous divine, quoted by Matthew Henry, says that if we ridicule this book, *i.e.*, if we do not believe it is an allegory of Christ and the church, we are "guilty of Blasphemy against the Most High." "Why will you set God at defiance?" he asks, "and add fresh fuel to His wrath?" Now it is perhaps difficult for some people to institute a really free examination of the book, in the face of such fearful threats, but I am going to do it, having long ceased to pay any attention to the threats of theologians. But I shall not "ridicule" this book, I shall only tell part of the *truth* about it.

First, as to the *author*. The book is attributed to Solomon—but it is very doubtful whether he wrote a word of it. If he did, it has a suspicious origin. The commentators say that "Solomon's songs were a thousand and five," and the Book of Kings says that he had a thousand wives and concubines. The coincidence is curious: This gives us a lady for every song, with five songs to spare; but, as the Book of Kings also tells us that, in addition to the thousand, he "loved many strange women," the spare songs are easily accounted for. Now, if any one calls that *ridiculing* the Book, all I can say is,—it is not *meant* as ridicule: it is meant as a plain statement of fact concerning the very significant and important question of *authorship*; for when the commentator says "it is not certain when Solomon penned this sawed song," it suggests that if he penned it at all, he penned it with far more reference to concubines than to Christ; and it sustains me in the assertion that one of the greatest scandals of Christendom is that the passionate, sensuous, and, in some cases, indecent language of a love poem like this should be applied to Christ: for it is only by a treatment of it which is both arbitrary and grotesque that it can be made even passably reputable.

After the point of authorship, comes the question of *intention*: and here the interest centres. But the intention lies, only too manifestly, on the surface. The book is an unmitigated love poem; and no one would have been more astonished than the author, to hear people gravely putting a religious and mystical meaning into it. A few local and personal references will make this plain:—Chapter i. 5:—

"I am black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon."

Chapter ii. 7:—

"I charge you, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, by the roes, and by the hinds of the field, that ye stir not up, nor awake my love, till he please."

Chapter iii 7-10:—

"Behold his bed, which is Solomon's; threescore valiant men are about it, of the valiant of Israel. They all hold swords, being expert in war: every man hath his sword upon his thigh because of fear in the night. King Solomon made himself a chariot (or, a bed) of the wood of Lebanon. He made the pillars thereof of silver, the bottom thereof of gold, the covering of it of purple, the midst thereof being paved with love, for the daughters of Jerusalem."

Chapter viii. 11-13:—

"Solomon had a vineyard at Baal-hamon; he let out the vineyard unto keepers; every one for the fruit thereof was to bring; a thousand pieces of silver. My vineyard, which is mine, is before me: thou, O Solomon,

must have a thousand, and those that keep the fruit thereof two hundred. Thou that smallest in the gardens, the companions hearken to thy voice; cause me to hear it."

In addition to these personal and local references that prove intention, the actual narrative and the style of it, are, of course, important evidence. I freely admit that there are a few lovely touches in the poem—as exquisite as anything Thomas Moore ever wrote—but, mixed up with these, are passages of the most questionable character—contemptible as third class love poetry—frightful as allegorical of Christ and the Church. Take this, for instance. Chapter iv. 1-5:—

"Behold, thou art fair, my love; behold thou art fair; thou hast doves' eyes within thy locks: thy hair is as a flock of goats, that appear from mount Gilead. Thy teeth are like a flock of sheep that are even shorn, which came up from the washing; whereof every one bear twins, and none is barren among them. Thy lips are like a thread of scarlet, and thy speech is comely: thy temples are like a piece of a pomegranate within thy locks. Thy neck is like the tower of David builded for an armoury, whereon there hang a thousand bucklers, all shields of mighty men."

I dare not read you the amazing description in chapter vii.; but Bishop Patrick says of the highly indecent second verse, that it refers to the baptismal font and to the Lord's Supper. To shew you, however, how the commentators "wrest" the tiling to *their* "destruction," I will point out how Matthew Henry deals with the passage I just read. The song says that the beloved one's hair" is as a flock of goats"—a most outrageous comparison; but the commentator, nothing daunted, drags in the hair of the Magdalene and the passage,— "the very hairs of your head are all numbered." The song says that her teeth are "like a flock of sheep, that are even shorn, which came up from the washing:" again an outrageous comparison, but the commentator says that, by teeth," ministers" are meant, for, says he, "they, as nurses, chew the meat for the babes of Christ,"—an unconsciously true saying; for it is too often the case that ministers treat their hearers as babes, and keep them so, even to the chewing of their intellectual food for them,—to use the commentator's simile. The song says her lips are like a thread of scarlet, and what this means is evident,—that she had pretty bright red thin lips !—but the grave divine sees in the scarlet lips" the blood of Christ" in which, he says, we are to be washed. And so the ridiculous far-fetched allegorising goes on; and the commentator who warned *us* against wresting the Book to our destruction, wrests it with a vengeance to his own.

A third point is the *plot*, or the *characters* that appear in the poem. The popular orthodox view gives us just *two* characters—Christ and the Church; but this lands us in endless confusion; for no two people, however absurdly in love, ever till lied so incoherently, debated so unreasonably, acted so ridiculously, quarrelled, flirted, and contradicted one another so bewilderingly. In fact, if only two persons form the *dramatis personae* or both of them must be insane. The only lucid explanation is that several persons speak during the poem—that, in fact the poem is either a series of amatory pieces, or a kind of love *play*. This is the view now held by the very best authorities, who have gone so far as to disentangle the parts of the various characters, and to give us the play in regular dramatic form. The characters are, say, at least six; and the poem or play is divided into about ten acts: so says Sharpe the translator. The characters are,—the Bride, called Shulamite; Solomon; and attendants. Shulamite is only the Hebrew feminine form of Solomon. Solomon and Shulamite, therefore, are similar to our Charles and Charlotte, Henry and Henrietta. It is easy to prove that there are more than the two characters concerned—the Bride and Solomon. Take, for instance, chapter vi. 1-3.—

"Whither is thy beloved gone, O thou fairest among women? whither is thy beloved turned aside? that we may seek him with thee. My beloved is gone down into his garden, to the beds of spices, to feed in the gardens, and to gather lilies. I am my beloved's, and my beloved is mine: he feedeth among the lilies."

Who asks that question in verse 1? It is evidently some one who addresses the Bride; and, as she is asked where her beloved is gone, the questioner cannot be the beloved. It must be some third character. Early in the Book, a curious instance of this occurs. Some one (of course the Bride) is made to say, "I am black, but comely, O ye daughters of Jerusalem, as the tents of Kedar, as the curtains of Solomon." Spoken by *one* person, this is the most contradictory incoherence. She is made to say she is "black" (or sunburnt) and yet "comely;" like the dark tents of Kedar and yet like the beautiful curtains of Solomon. The sense is seen for the first time when the verse is treated as a kind of dialogue, or soliloquy and chorus. The Bride laments—"I am suntanned!" then the women-chorus respond,— "but comely." "Like the dark tents of Kedar!" she mourns: "like the lovely curtains of Solomon," they reply. This is genuine love poetry, and is pretty enough in its way. It only becomes grotesque and nonsensical when grave divines take it on their reverend lips, and try to make it serve the purposes of religion.

Thus whether we consider the reputed authorship of the poem; the evident intention of it, gathered from the local and personal references in it and from the character of the narrative and the style; or the characters that appear in the poem, it seems plain that the Book is just what it appears to be,—a love-poem or amatory play, neither better nor worse than a multitude of oriental songs of the same nature.

A detailed examination of the poem would abundantly shew this:—one little illustration must suffice; and I

quote this because I can give it to you in the words of an accredited orthodox commentator, the late Dr. Eadie. Explaining the word "Shulamite," (chapter vi. 13,) he says, "In the passage, the scene lies in a garden, where the bride was unexpectedly seen by her lover. At once she retires. Her lover exclaims in ardour,—

"Return, return, Shulamith,

Return, return, that I may look upon thou."

Such being contrary to Oriental manners and etiquette, she promptly and indignantly replies,—

"What! will ye gaze upon Shulamith

As ye would upon a troop of dancing girls?"

In the authorised version, this absurdly reads like a question and answer; "What will ye see in the Shulamite? As it were the company of two armies:"—a marvellously insane reply! But even Dr. Eadie, with his keen eye to the true character of this love-making scene, indulges in the usual orthodox somnambulism, and says that this name *Shulamite* is "a poetical figurative title of the church personified" !

What lesson then do we learn from this exposure of the vain imaginations of theory-makers,—from this glance at the gross absurdities into which men may fall who once forsake the homely ways of simple common sense? I think the lesson is simply this,—that we should be guided in all things by sober *reasoning* and solid *fact*. When we read the Bible, we should read it with our eyes open, and with our ordinary faculties on the alert: we should not seek far-fetched meanings, and give way to loose imaginations; but in all things rely upon common sense, and stick to the plain and obvious interpretation. If what is written is bad, let us frankly say so; if it is foolish or erroneous, let us honestly admit it: for, to be bound by a theory of inspiration that prevents our being reasonable and honest, can neither be right nor good."

Thank God, all this is possible for us who worship here; for we are free to inquire, and to follow out any result of our inquiry; and, above all, we are delivered from the injurious old superstition that acceptance with God depends upon any opinion we come to respecting Church, or creed, or book.

Lecture V. The Psalms.

THE second order of passages commonly regarded as prophecies concerning Christ are mainly to be found in the Book of Psalms. For the sake of simplicity I shall confine this class to that Book, and may even go so far as to include all the passages cited from the Psalms as belonging to that class. This is not to be wondered at when we consider that the Psalms are really personal poems, meditative, devotional, and political. I shall hope to shew that the passages which have been taken, (or which have been even quoted in the New Testament,) as applying to Christ, really relate to experiences in the lives of the original writers, and that these passages can only be applied to Christ as mottoes or illustrative sayings might be applied to any one passing through similar experiences.

In the Hebrews, chapter i. 5-13, we have a cluster of references to the Psalms, all intended in some way to set forth the exalted nature or office of Christ. Into these I shall enter only for the purpose of shewing the real character of the original writings, leaving, as beside the question, the aim of the writer of the Epistle in applying such passages to Christ. The first quotation is from Psalm ii. 7, a passage which is also quoted in Acts xiii. 38. It simply consists of the words

"Thou art my son; this day have I begotten thee."

It is believed that the Psalm from which these words are taken was written 1000 years before Christ, and it would certainly require very decisive evidence to induce us to read it as applying to Christ. But the evidence is all the other way. The Psalm from beginning to end is a purely personal one, and descriptive of what is going on at the time. The writer glances at the kings of the earth setting themselves and taking counsel together against the Hebrew monarch, perhaps himself; and then he cries out exultingly, "I will declare the decree," as though he had read the book of fate. And what *is* the decree?—Simply that God has chosen the monarch as His son. That this is so is plain from the very next verse, in which God tells this son to ask for a wide extending dominion, and premises that he shall "break" the Gentiles or heathen "with a rod of iron," and "dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel." How absurd to apply that to *Christ*,—the poor, peaceful, unwarlike, and uninfluential teacher! And yet it is a part of the description of the reign of the person here addressed as God's son. The Psalm ends with a significant piece of counsel to the kings of the earth, to be wise and come to terms with this son of God, lest they anger him and be crushed. The Psalm from first to last is descriptive of a king before the poet's eye, for whom he predicts, in the glowing language of the East, all the power and dominion and glory a warrior-king could desire;—not a scrap of it agreeing with the life of *Christ*.

It may be useful to remark that there was nothing extraordinary in speaking of a Hebrew monarch as a "son" of God, "begotten" by God. The word "son" need indicate no more than filial affection; and "begotten" must mean adopted or chosen, for the being who is addressed as "begotten" that day, *exists*, and the "begotten" must therefore relate to position and acceptance with God.

A similar passage is quoted from II. Samuel vii. 14, where we find that the words "I will be to him a father, and he shall be to me a son," are distinctly spoken of Solomon the son of David; the words being simply wrenched from their connection and applied to Christ without the slightest justification.

The next passage is Psalm xcvi. 7; or, at all events, that is the nearest we can come to the quotation, in verse 6 of Hebrews i. "And let all the angels of God worship him." In the Psalm, the Terse reads, "Worship him all ye gods," the word "god," as is common in the Old Testament, meaning *mighty one*. But the call here is a call to the worship of Jehovah, before whom all are told to bow. It is the impassioned poet's personal cry that we find here;—"Confounded be all they that serve graven images, that boast themselves of idols, worship *him*, all ye gods." The words not only do not speak of a person besides God; they exclude any such person.

The next passage is Hebrews i. 8-9,—

"But unto the Son he saith, Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever: a sceptre of righteousness is the sceptre of thy kingdom. Thou hast loved righteousness, and hated iniquity therefore God, even thy God, hath anointed thee with the oil of gladness above thy fellows."

This is from Psalm xlv. 6-7. The person here addressed is evidently a very different person from Christ. He is called upon to gird his sword upon his thigh, and it is said that his "arrows are sharp in the heart of the king's enemies." His garments are said to "smell of myrrh, and aloes, and cassia, out of the ivory palaces." "King's daughters," it says, are among his 'honourable women,' and upon his right hand sits "the queen in gold of Ophir:" and in the very midst of this picture of the person addressed, occurs the passage "Thy throne, O god, is for ever and ever." Dr. Davidson says that the proper translation here is "Thy *God's* throne, *i.e.*, thy throne given and protected by God, is for ever and ever:" but, even retaining the phrase "Thy throne, O god," we can quite well understand it as meaning, Thy throne, O mighty *hero*; for so it is often used in the Old Testament,

See Lecture II.

and the verses before and after shew plainly that a glorious earthly king is meant.

The next passage is Hebrews i. 10-12.

"And, Thou, Lord, in the beginning hast laid the foundation of the earth; and the heavens are the works of thine hands: they shall perish, but thou remained; and they all shall wax old as doth a garment; and as a vesture shalt thou fold them up, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall not fail."

The passage is taken from Psalm ch. 102-7, where we clearly find it as an address to God, the Creator. Its application to Christ in any way is purely arbitrary and without warrant.

The last passage in this cluster is Hebrews i. 18.

"But to which of the angels said he at any time, Sit on my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool?"

The reference is to Psalm ex. 1, and as to that passage I have a few words of some importance to say, by way of introduction to a general view of the whole of that interesting Psalm. In the 1st verse, "The Lord said unto my lord," there are in the original two words for "lord" which unfortunately are merged in the translation. The one word for "lord" means *Jehovah*; the other word for "lord" means any dignitary. The verse is evidently addressed to the king by the poet, who calls the king "my lord" and says—"Jehovah has said to my lord—'Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool.'" Matthew Arnold renders the words, "The Eternal said unto my lord the king," and adds, that it is "a simple promise of victory to a prince of God's chosen people." But at the very beginning the passage is inapplicable to Christ. The picture is that of a king putting down his enemies and trampling them under his feet. The Psalm is quoted in other places besides this 1st chapter of Hebrews, and requires therefore a little elucidation. Fortunately this is perfectly easy, as the Psalm is so palpably a courtly poem addressed to the king. The nature of the Psalm, as a battle lyric, and its utter inapplicableness to Jesus, will be seen the moment it is read through. Note especially the brutal reference to the dead bodies:—"The Lord said unto my Lord, Sit thou at my right hand, until I make thine enemies thy footstool. The Lord shall send the rod of thy strength out of Zion: rule thou in the midst of thine enemies. Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power, in the beauties of holiness from the womb of the morning thou hast the dew of thy youth The Lord hath sworn, and will not repent, Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek. The Lord at thy right hand shall strike through kings in the day of his wrath. He shall judge among the heathen, he shall fill the place with the dead bodies, he shall wound the heads over many countries. Elo shall drink of the brook in the way: therefore shall he lift up the head." There is the clang of battle all through. The king ("my lord") is to sit at the right hand of his almighty warrior-God, who will send out His rod to smite his enemies; his soldiers shall be all willing, and give themselves as a fresh and beautiful free-will offering, to fight His battles, and the end shall be the universal destruction of his foes. Any application of that psalm to Jesus can only be violent, arbitrary, or poetical. Some of the phrases are, on any hypothesis, difficult to explain; but the drift of the whole is clear; and the drift is all *away* from Christ. The verse "Thou art a priest for ever after the order of Melchizedek" may refer to the priestly character of the kingly office, or it may be a bad translation of words meaning, *Thou shalt be great for ever, because thou shalt be a righteous king*, for the

name "Melchizedek" simply means a *righteous king*. But the application to a warrior king is perfect; and, by consequence, its inapplicability to Christ is evident.

The passage in Psalm xci. 11-12, is chiefly interesting as affording a proof that Satan can also quote Scripture, and dig from the Old Testament passages to serve as prophecies. When tempting Christ, Satan says,—Matthew iv. 6.

"If thou be the Son of God, cast thyself down: for it is written, He shall give His angels charge concerning thee: and in their hands they shall bear thee up, lest at any time thou dash thy foot against a stone."

The words occur in Psalm xci. very much as Satan quotes them, and his quotation is certainly not less apt than those we have been considering. In the Psalm, the verse occurs in a description of the blessedness of the man who dwells in the secret place of the Most High; and the safety he enjoys is described as the result of his making the Lord his "habitation." It might be applied to *any* good man, and, as Satan did not say it was a prophecy of Christ, but offered it as a promise or description applicable to persons who trust in God, there was a good deal of point in his quotation, and, on the whole, it is perhaps the most legitimate and respectable quotation we have had to consider

A passage in Psalm xli. 9, is quoted by Christ in John xiii. 18, as applying to his betrayal by Judas. He refers to that event as one that will occur," that the scripture may be fulfilled;

"He that eateth bread with me hath lifted up his heel against me."

The passage in Psalm xh. is purely personal to the poet, who is describing his own sorrows, then happening, probably 1000 years before Christ. He is telling of his "enemies," who "speak evil" of him, who speak "vanity," who attribute to him "an evil disease" and even his "familiar friend," whom he "trusted," is turned against him This is obviously a description of his own sorrows, and can only be made applicable to Christ just as it could be made applicable to any one whose case was similar. But, in fact, Christ's case was hardly similar. Judas was not his "familiar friend" whom he "trusted." The Psalm so describes this friend, but Jesus, we are told, knew from the beginning who should betray him; so that Judas could hardly have been regarded as a "friend," much less a "familiar" friend, and still less as a friend to be "trusted." The quotation is singularly inapt, and the utmost that can be said for it is, that it was a natural thing for Christ to express his sorrow in old familiar religious words, without at all intending to do what his over-eager followers made him do,—convert a description of personal sorrow into a far-reaching prophecy, and find the application in himself.

Three passages concerning the crucifixion are of some interest. One relates to the piercing of the hands and feet, and is to be found in Psalm xxii. 16. This will be best considered in connection with a second passage, in the same Psalm, verse 18, concerning the parting of garments by casting lots for them. This latter passage is in Matthew xxvii. 35—

"And they crucified him, and parted his garments, casting lots: that it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, They parted my garments among them, and upon my vesture did they cast lots"

Here is a direct reference to a prophecy and a statement concerning its fulfilment. All we can do is to turn to the place and see whether it really *is* a prediction of a future event, and whether, if so, the prediction answers to the alleged fulfilment. My affirmation is that the whole Psalm from which this verse is taken is a purely *personal* outpouring of woe. Christ, in his death-agony, appropriates the opening words of the 1st verse of the psalm "My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?" But the next verse shews how inapplicable the Psalm is to him, for it proceeds to speak of long-continued but unanswered prayer, day and night and assuredly Christ knew nothing of this. A little further on, we find the same person contrasting himself with his ancestors, to his own disparagement. "They cried unto Thee, and were delivered," he says, "but I am a worm and no man:" and that likewise is not applicable to him In fact, it is only a little scrap, severed from its place in the psalm, and read apart from the connection, that can be at all applied to Christ. In the Psalm, the cry about parting his garments and casting lots upon his vesture is followed by the cry "O my strength, haste thee to help me, deliver my soul from the sword, my darling (or my life) from the power of the dog, save me from the lion's mouth, for thou hast heard me from the horns of the unicorns." Here there is hope for the person spoken of, but there was none for Christ; the psalmist fears the "sword," but Christ's terror was the cross, and his death-blows came from the nails. Besides, this miserable being looks forward to praising God in the "congregation" with his "brethren," and, in general, to a happy deliverance from his ill users: not one word of which applies to the crucified one. The question for us is whether we have any right to cut out two or three lines from the Psalm, and make them apply to Christ, although they form part of an extended description the greater part of which is utterly inapplicable. Those two or three lines may and do bear a striking resemblance to two or three lines in the record of Christ's crucifixion, but many things must be taken into account;—the bias of the evangelists and of the translators, for instance, who dearly loved a prophecy and revelled in a fulfilment: but there is nothing so exceptional in the piercing of hands and feet and the dividing of the garments of a victim as to make a reference to Christ *necessary*. But such a reference is not admissible when many other portions of the description do not apply to him at all.

The other quotation connected with the crucifixion well illustrates the excessive eagerness of the Evangelists to work into their narratives the slightest scrap of Old Testament matter. In John xix. 28 we read that, in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled, Jesus said "I thirst;"—a very slender quotation, and slenderly supported as any one may see who will turn, to the place from which it is taken. The passage, or something like it, occurs in Psalm lxxix. 21, and I feel no hesitation in saying that the whole Psalm is as inapplicable to Christ as anything could well be. It presents us with the sorrowful complaint of a man miserable, repining, mistrustful, and bad-hearted. The poet is evidently telling of his own sorrows: the Psalm is emphatically personal to himself. He calls to God, as Oae who knows his "foolishness."—"Would Christ have done that? He cries," My sins are not hid from thee."—Did Christ ever do that? He says he fasted and went clothed in sackcloth.—Did Christ do that? Immediately after the statement about the vinegar for his thirst, he adds, verses 22-28, "Let then table become a snare before them: and that which should have been for their welfare, let it become a trap. Let their eyes be darkened that they see not; and make their loins continually to shake. Pour out thine indignation upon them, and let thy wrathful anger take hold of them. Let their habitation be desolate; *and* let none dwell in their tents: for they persecute *him* whom thou hast smitten; and they talk to the grief of those whom thou hast wounded. Add iniquity unto their iniquity: and let them not come into thy righteousness. Let them be blotted out of the book of the living, and not be written with the righteous." Imagine Christ talking like that! Why, he shewed a spirit the very opposite of that revealed in these revengeful words. He cried, "Father forgive them, for they know not what they do." And yet, remember, these wicked imprecations in the Psalm are a part of the cry in which occur the words "in my thirst they gave me vinegar to drink." The saying is evidently a poetic one, expressive of the unkindness of those to whom the Psalmist appealed. I was thirsty, he said, and they mocked me with vinegar. It was a poetic expression which might have occurred to any one, and which might describe any grief accompanied by pitiless neglect: but the proof is overwhelming that the Psalm is no prophecy of Christ.

The last passage I shall quote relates to the resurrection. It is found in Acts ii. 25-7, and 30-1. Speaking of the resurrection of Christ, Peter says,—

"For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face, for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption."

Then Peter adds, explicitly, that David,

"Being a prophet, and knowing that God had sworn with an oath to him, that of the fruit of his loins, according to the flesh, he would raise up Christ to sit on his throne; he, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption."

This is perhaps the most clear and emphatic of all alleged prophecies concerning Christ. Peter undoubtedly does say that David looked for Christ, and that he predicted his resurrection. Turn we then to the place where the prophecy is said to be found. It is in Psalm xvi. 10-11.

"For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption. Thou wilt shew me the path of life: in thy presence is fulness of joy; at thy right hand there are pleasures for evermore."

Note, in the first place, that the very highest authorities read, not "Thy holy one" but "Thy holy ones"—making the statement general, as to the lot of *all* God's faithful and holy ones. But this, though probably correct, is not my reliance. I rely upon my old court of appeal,—the context. We, as well as Peter, can read the Psalm for ourselves, and form our own judgment. It is *one* person who speaks throughout the Psalm: it is *he* whose heart is glad and whose flesh shall rest in hope: it is *he* who expresses his confidence that God will not leave his soul in hell nor suffer His holy one to see corruption. Now who is this speaker? Evidently the Psalmist himself, who tells his own hope in God. This is clear from verse 4 where he says he will not go after other gods nor offer their "drink offerings of blood." How utterly inapplicable is all that on the lips of Christ!—how perfectly in keeping with the case of one who lived in idolatrous times, and whose own pure worshiping of God contrasted with the idolatrous worship of others! The word "hell" in the passage really means the grave, and the cry of the Psalmist is a simple, natural expression of confidence in God—that He would take care of him, and guide him through the valley of the shadow of death into the land of light beyond. If we apply that language to Christ we can only do so just as we might apply it to any other trusting child of God: and Peter himself had no business to use it in any other way.

I have now fulfilled my promise,—to trace home to their source the alleged prophecies concerning Christ in the Old Testament. We have seen that the original writers lived for their own day, and were earnestly intent upon the fortunes of the nation in their times. They uttered many glowing predictions concerning the people they loved, and pictured glorious scenes of prosperity and peace. They described mighty deliverers, wise rulers, triumphant kings, and halcyon days for Israel. But alas! their dreams did not come true. What wonder, then, that Israel took these prophecies to heart, and went on hoping for the promised golden days! what wonder that even

now, broken and scattered as they are, the Jews still hug the old words to their hearts, and look for a Messiah yet to come! What wonder that the early Christians eagerly caught at the idea that all the unfulfilled hopes of Israel were fulfilled in Jesus of Nazareth !

And why have I tried to dispel that dream? First, because it is not good to believe even a pleasant thing if it is not true, since, above all things, it is our duty to face the truth: but chiefly because I want us to look forward, and to see that before us and not behind us lie the fairest hopes of the race. Jesus came only to shew us what we all may be. He was a messiah,—a being *sent* by God, for that is what it means,—just as each one of us may be. He was a son of God, to make *our* sonship clear. He came to do a better thing than to fulfil predictions; for he came to create a new brotherhood. He came to do a better thing than to make past prophecies come true; for he came to give light to future ages. It is true that I have laboured in these lectures to dispel the delusion concerning Christ's Deity and concerning his supernatural origin, but, in doing that, I restore him to the race, I bring him within the circle of humanity, I find his place in the history of our kind, I make him all our own. Freed from superstition we can now come to him,—not our God—not a mysterious, doubtful, double-natured being, not something abnormal, miraculous, exceptional, monstrous, and bewildering, but our teacher, our brother, and our friend.

The Person, Character, and Teaching, of Jesus.

Printed by Request [Price 6D.

A lay Sermon read to the Sunday Free Discussion Society. Turn Verein Halt, Melbourne, October 6, 1872.

John vii, 24. Judge!—not according to the appearance,—but *judge—righteous judgment!*

MY main object in this paper, is to review the *teaching* of Jesus, and to form a more accurate estimate than I have lately heard expressed of its worth in the past and present; but I have thought it right to include his *person* and *character* in my theme to protect myself from that misconception which is otherwise almost certain to arise. For in all questions connected with religion, the sympathies of men are so powerfully engaged, that the criticism of a *doctrine* is frequently regarded as a personal attack upon the *character* of him who promulgated it, if not upon that of anyone who may undertake its defence. I think also that erroneous impressions prevail as to the means we possess for judging the person and character of Jesus; and therefore that a few minutes may be profitably devoted to the consideration of those two points.

Now of the Person of Jesus, we of course know nothing *directly*; and our *indirect* information about him is as doubtful as it is scanty. The inevitable tendency of modern criticism is to throw doubt upon the personality of *all* those typical characters which tradition has handed down to us as the founders of human improvement. It was like the uprooting of an old affection to learn that Homer and Aesop were imaginary characters; and if the personality of Jesus has no greater title to historic reality, the arrival at that conviction must certainly cost a pang, for which nothing could compensate but the accompanying certainty of an approximation to reasonable probability, if not to demonstrable truth.

The evidence preponderates in my opinion *against* the reality of the existence of Jesus. It is most remarkable that a person of his asserted pretensions and views should himself have written —*nothing!* Not a word—to preclude the otherwise certain misconception and distortion of his precepts; to say nothing of his objects and personal character. This would certainly be quite intelligible on *one* supposition which has strong support in the Gospels; namely, that his regards were limited exclusively to *his own generation*, in which he plainly said that he expected that the heavens and the earth would pass away. But *this*—is to impute to him an *ignorance* wholly inconsistent with his asserted character, if not altogether fatal to it. Not only did Jesus himself write nothing, but nothing was written about him for such a long time after the date assigned to him, as to preclude direct disproof of any statement respecting him—however absurd; for inherent improbability or incongruity with contemporary history cannot amount to more than moral disproof. Of improbabilities may impossibilities—the story is full, but to those who are as full of faith, even such mountains are easily moveable. But when in addition—the utter silence is remembered of contemporary historians who made it their business to report every analogous circumstance; it should be evident that the constant adjurations throughout the Gospels to exercise faith,—not only met a perceived want in even that credulous age, but also indicated a consciousness even then, that the evidence was not in itself probable or credible to those, who could not possibly then discern that faith is an intellectual vice, instead of a virtue.

But it may be said Socrates also wrote nothing, yet his existence is not doubtful. True, but *first*, he made no such pretensions as did Jesus; secondly, we have otherwise the best authority of that age for believing in his real existence; and thirdly there is nothing improbable in his story. History had made its appearance in the

world, and if any history of that age is credible at all, those of Greece and Rome are *the most* so. There can be no comparison between the testimony of the cultivated Xenophon, Plato, and Aristotle, and that of the obscure and in fact—unknown writers of the Gospels; although the death of Socrates took place 400 years before Christ, when Xenophon was about 54 years of age, Plato 30; Aristotle being born 15 years later.

But of the existence of Jesus no mention whatever is made by the contemporary writers of Greece and Rome, or of the world; which proves that it could not have had any *prominent publicity at the time*, if any reality at all. The fact that he is not alluded to in the writings of Philo Judaeus, who was born about the same time as Jesus's asserted birth, and lived to old age in which he wrote extensively upon Jewish philosophy and religion; or in those of Josephus,

See Gibbon, vol. ii, p. 90(Bohn's edition), and Taylor's *Diegesis*, p p. 363-4 & 385-9, for evidence of the forgery of the passage in which Jesus is named.

who was born near the time of Jesus's supposed death, and wrote the history of the Jewish people and of his own time,—is ample evidence against the truth of the Gospels, even if their testimony presented a general aspect of probability instead of fable. But we have no such particulars of the Evangelists at all—as we have of the disciples of Socrates; and we know that their names were altogether arbitrarily attached to their putative writings, to give them what cannot but be a spurious authenticity, by some of the fathers; who, from their own statements, besides being grossly incompetent witnesses and judges, did not scruple to deceive, lie, and forge, whatever seemed to suit their purposes.

See Mosheim's *Ecclesiastical History* and Middleton's *Free Enquiry*

The Gospels themselves, the dates of which are thus mere guesswork, are known to have been selected by the same incompetent fraudulent old fathers from scores of others scarcely more incredible. In addition to this we have the positive testimony of several of them that the Scriptures were to be understood allegorically. Some say that Jesus—if he really lived—was not really crucified at all, but that Simon the Cyrenian was substituted for him. Some gravely contended that he was but a phantom. It appears that this was a not uncommon opinion; some saying that a portion, others that the whole of the Gospels, was not to be understood literally. But more important still is the witness of the Gospels themselves. They make Jesus speak distinctly of subsequent events,—and even of some—As Past,—which did not occur until long after his reputed death! One glaring instance is at verse 35 of the xxiii chapter of Matthew, where he speaks of the death of Zacharias the son of Barachias *as past*; although according to Josephus it did not happen until about the year 70.

"The story in Josephus, of Jesus the son of Ananus, (see Wars vi, v, 3) is evidently the basis of much of that of Jesus of Nazareth. The similarity of their vaticinations (compare Mat. xxiii is very striking. The 35th verse of the xxiii ch. of Mat. affords overwhelming proof that it was written long (say at least 20 years) after the destruction of Jerusalem, Zacharias, the son of Barachias, being killed in the temple 34 years after the reputed date of the crucifixion (Josephus, Wars iv, v. 4); and sufficient time must be allowed for the confusion of dates to arise. The cunning reference in the popular editions of Josephus to 2 Chron. xxiv, 21, will not satisfy the demands of the citation. For "from righteous Abel to Zacharias" is evidently meant to include the complete series from the first to the last notorious case of murder—and the passage in Chron. refers to a time 900 years before Jesus. The prophet Zechariah, who has also been suggested as the person referred to, and the manner of whose death has not been recorded, and was therefore not notorious, lived about 600 years before. The Zacharias of Chronicles also was the son of Jehoiada not Barachias; the prophet Zcchariah was the son of Berechiah. (Zech i, 1)."

This fact suggests the possible identity of the Jesus of Scripture with a Jesus son of Ananus, of whom Josephus speaks as prophesying the destruction of Jerusalem just before the event; and that it was when his character was invested with the divine or supernatural nimbus that his appearance was *ante dated* nearly half a century in order to set criticism at defiance. This was of course easy in an age and country, where there were no newspapers or records, which in any case would have had to prove a negative. The date of the story had only to be carried back beyond the memory of those addressed, to be secure from refutation. This theory concurs with the probably real conditions of the case, which are totally at variance with the received Gospel story. The date assigned to Jesus is altogether incompatible with that, but agrees perfectly with the theory which identifies him with Jesus son of Ananus, as the mere nucleus round which the stories of Chrishna and others, picked up probably by Paul in Arabia, and modified by the prevalent Neoplatonism, afterwards gathered. Of these we know that that of the slaughter of the innocents, and that of the taxing of the world are wholly incredible and mere inventions as applied to Jesus.

Paul's curious visit to Arabia, as mentioned by himself, is as incongruous with the rest of his story, as the fact,—that many of the leading incidents in the history of Jesus, are mere plagiarisms from the far older history of the Indian Christna—is fatal to the originality and historic truth of the Gospels. That Paul's epoch is also ante dated, and that his otherwise unintelligible visit to Arabia—much more probably ensued upon the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, concurs much better than the received chronology—with Lucian's supposed account of

Paul, as, "a bald longnosed Galilean, who had been taken up to the third heaven and had there heard unspeakable words," and whom he had actually seen; for Lucian was born *in the second century*, writing and dying *near the end of it*. And even without these materials for a re-adjustment of dates, there would remain to be accounted for, the long period of time between all these asserted events, and the date of the first authentic Christian writing, and respecting which no explanation whatever can be given on the orthodox hypothesis.

These conclusions must of course more or less affect our estimate of the character of Jesus. The son of Ananus was evidently no better than a lunatic, whose vaticinations related to nothing beyond the evidently impending destruction of the city and nationality of the Jews. But the *character* of the Jesus of the Gospels—imaginary or not—is another matter. As portrayed, impartial criticism must recognise in him a mild enthusiast, whose ideas of virtue and of philosophy were equally a caricature. But we judge of character mainly by actions, and those attributed to Jesus leave *his* open to considerable question. The most remarkable thing reported of him is, that he went about ostensibly practising thaumaturgy and curing diseases; for the expressed purpose, less of labouring for the good of others, than *to prove the truth of his doctrines!* (John x, 37 8) Than which nothing could be more absurd. If Dr. Tracy were to appeal to his clever cures, as proof of the accuracy of his theological opinions, we should simply laugh at him; because, there is no congruity or relation between the two things; the one can no more be proved by the other, than any theology will enable a man without medical knowledge to cure diseases; and the *pretension* to cure anything so, proves something very different,—the folly or the roguery of the *pretender*. Yet such was the *sole object* of the miracles of Jesus! Also much suspicion is thrown upon those miracles, by the plain statement that their success depended, not so much upon his ability, as on the credulity of the spectators. (Mat. xiii, 58. Mark vi, 5-6.) "And he did not many mighty works there, *because of Their Unbelief!*"—The very reason why he pretended to do them, and should have done them if he could! "And *he* Could *there* do no mighty work, save that he laid his hands upon a few sick folk and healed them. And he *marvelled* because of their unbelief." lie,—who "knew what was in man,"—the manufacturer of man, marvelled! For what purpose did he profess to work miracles but to cure unbelief? yet when the occasion served, and demanded it, he *could not* do so! Jesus's statement (Mark ix, 22) that "all things are possible to them that believe," is obviously untrue, for a mistake would then be impossible.

Further than this there is really little or nothing by which we can judge of his moral character. He admittedly lived the life of a vagrant, apparently helping himself—or directing his disciples to help him—to other people's corn (Mat. xii, 1. Mark ii, 23) and donkeys, (Mat. xxi, 2. John xii, 14,) and giving evasive answers to plain questions. He never was in a position of trust and responsibility, and we have not very encouraging means of judging how he would have acted if he had been in one. His asserted meekness was certainly not proved when he scourged the people out of the temple, an incident in itself devoid of all semblance of probability. (Mat. xxi, 12. Mark xi, 15.) His judgment appears to have been worse than indifferent in more than one instance; not so much perhaps in the fact that he expected very different results in that generation—for the wisest of men are often deceived,—as in that he selected the greatest rogue for his treasurer in the person of Judas. It may also be thought that he might well have taken care that the records of his life and teaching might come to us in such an authentic manner and reasonable form, that they would not have been open to such very grave suspicion; to say no more. The grotesquely ascetic character of his doctrines is in perfect keeping with the fact that it is recorded of him that he wept and groaned, while it is not hinted that he ever laughed or even smiled.

On the other side, what can be said? His devotion to his visionary purpose is, I fear, the best. He was sacrificed at last (accepting the story as credible) not with that confidence, enthusiasm and endurance which alone can give the halo of glory to the martyr, but in misery and despair! He begged that the cup *might, if possible*, pass from him! Not with the conscious joy of rectitude, but *sweating drops of blood!* He *implied* that he *believed*—whether he did or not—that his *God had forsaken him in his last agony*. *Could* this have been without a conviction that his life was an error, and his devotion a mistake? A pitiable case indeed! Let us thank common sense and straightforward criticism, that it is probably altogether fictitious. Pray observe that I regret as much as any one, that most of his good must be interred with his bones, and that the evil that men cause comes after them. I insinuate nothing against him but what the Gospels have said; and for *that* I do not blame *him*. I devoutly thank my philosophy that while pitying him as a deluded fanatic, and deploring the enormous evils which the teaching attributed to him has brought upon humanity, I can honor him for his good attempted, pity him for his misfortunes, and entirely exonerate him from all evil intentions. From the essential stand point of all religion—freewill—so much charity would be a simple impossibility. If man had a power of initiating action or motion as freewill implies;—if under the same conditions it were possible for him to act otherwise than as he does, there would then be room for blame to Jesus. With me, I rejoice to say, there is none. But religion can see no error without calling it *sin*. It assumes that faults are voluntary, intentional, and of choice, and calls the ignorant victim of inherited passion, vicious education, and stringent circumstance, *wicked, perverse, and damnable!* Blind to the inevitable fact, that, according to its own principles, *if sin can be, it must*

originate with the originator! That if man is bad, God—if there be one—made him so! It has no right to deny this, and then assert that God is the author and giver of virtue, of which it thus robs man. It cannot be charitable any more than consistent. Its pretensions to consistency would be absurd, if they were not repudiated; but its claims to be charitable are impudently false.

But in any case the necessitarian sees that all such visionaries are the victims of exalted imagination, as well as of external circumstance, and that the intentions of all are equally blameless. Rather, perhaps, that intention enters but nominally, or faintly if at all, into the causation of action. For man's intentions are—like his acts—necessary products of his constitution and circumstances, over which he has no control, and which he cannot select. Thus, and thus only, is charity possible. And *therefore*, "let us not condemn one another any more; but judge this rather, that no man put a stumbling block or an occasion to fall in his brother's way." (Rom. xiv, 13).

Poor Jesus! deluded visionary! Thanks be to common sense and growing knowledge, your story is happily altogether incredible!

But the *teaching*—whosoever it is—is here! and I wish to examine it impartially and truly. For it is a stumbling block in the way of many. I shall lay little stress on particular texts, which may be shewn to be *contradicted*, or as piety would say *explained*, by others. I shall not touch now upon the implied communism, nor on the toleration of the adulteress. Nor on the doctrine of *faith*, which deserves a separate paper. But I shall deal with leading admitted doctrines only; and shall quote, if at all, merely for general purposes of illustration.

The first thing to be done, is to distinguish what was peculiar in Jesus's teaching, from what he merely repeated; from what was taught hundreds of years before, by Confucius, Zoroaster, &c. Thus the doctrine of immortality was older than Moses, and was notoriously held by the Pharisees in Jesus's time. The common statement then that Jesus brought immortality to light, can only be made in wild contempt for veracity and fact. And for the golden rule,—*"Do not to others what ye would not that others should do to you,"*—Jesus deserves no more credit than any other man that quotes it with approval; but it must not be overlooked that in repeating it he spoilt it by putting it in the positive form—*"Do to others as ye would that others should do to you."* And the good of this maxim is very much exaggerated; for it is not of universal social application, and strict conformity to it would produce serious evil. If judges, constables and jailers were to do to our criminals as they would be done by, crime would have no check, and society would collapse.

This brings me to the next thing, which is to point out, that what Jesus repeated, he invariably exaggerated and caricatured. He could not inculcate that aggression and retaliation are evil, (because provoking strife, and therefore opposed to self interest as much as to morality,) without a caricature, and saying, that if struck on one cheek you should offer the other to be treated likewise. And, *"whoever shall take your cloak, give to him your coat also. If any one compel you to go with him a mile, go with him twain."* Such teaching is absurd; and in practice would be destructive of true morality, and of society also. So is *"resist not evil,"* and *"love your enemies,"* which is not only impracticable but wrong. Act towards your enemies so as to convert them into friends if you can, and no one will admire the wisdom and propriety of such conduct more than I. But to *love* them, is not more difficult than immoral.

And here I shall venture to lay down a canon, which I think is a decided advance upon any teaching of Jesus. I am satisfied that one great cause of the prevalence not only of immorality but of the vague and unfruitful ideas on the subject of ethics generally,—is the want of such a canon. But it is in diametrical opposition to the general teaching of Jesus. I hold that nothing would so much conduce to the improvement of morals generally both public and private as the fulfilment of such a rule as the following. I say that man individually and collectively should *never let slip any opportunity of pronouncing in the most emphatic manner possible, the broad distinction between good and evil, virtue and vice;* so far as he has attained to it. Love your enemies? Not at all. *Hate* them not, however evil they may be. For if they *are* evil, they did not make themselves. But *mark your dis-approval of evil conduct wherever you may find it.* I say not, "judge not, lest ye be judged," but, Judge, *inviting judgment;* as we do here. RESIST EVIL; ay! and to the death !

But according to Jesus, you should make no distinction whatever between your friends and your enemies, the just and the unjust. You are not to judge, but to love and bless, your enemies; do good to, and pray for, them! (Mat. v, 44-5) And what else in the name of common sense are you to do to your friends? You are thus told by Jesus, to ignore the distinction between, and suppress your own judgment of, good and evil, virtue and vice; Why? "That ye may be the children of your father which is in Heaven, *for* He maketh his sun to rise on the evil and on the good; and sendeth rain on the just, and on the unjust," without any distinction whatever ! ! ! Is not this either rank *blasphemy;* or else, a *complete refutation of the idea of God?* And this is not the only place where God is said to be *no respecter of persons.*

But though it is hard to find any doctrine originally taught by Jesus, there is one, which he has particularly appropriated; namely, the Forgiveness of Sins; and this I propose to shew, is both *false* and *pernicious.* And it is directly obnoxious to the rule I have laid down. For it places the good and bad upon a level, and is therefore

execrably immoral. If we look round on nature or on human society, we find that evil, or error,—ay! unconscious error too,—Is Never Forgiven. The evil consequences of evil acts are as inevitable as recurring day and night; and must be so until the acts themselves can be undone. And mark! it is solely *because* this is so—because we find that *fire* Always burns, that we keep our fingers out of it. And it is only because such ignorant notions, produced by such false teaching, prevail on the subject of morality, that we are less certain of the effects of vice, than of those of fire. The obvious result has been that men believe (as they have been taught) that they *may* touch pitch and *not* be defiled! They have been led to think that they may safely err, because repentance and forgiveness avert the natural consequences of error. The vile sale of indulgences was but the natural and proper fruit of such confusion of the principles of virtue and vice; and men for 1800 years have literally—upon this false promise of the Forgiveness of Sins,—Sold Themselves *to work iniquity before the Lord!* ! !

If men were similarly taught that fire does not burn, they would soon learn the truth by experience of the directly obvious effects. But though more complex and therefore obscure, the effects of vice and crime are not less certain; and *therefore*, though they *have* been taught this falsehood for 18 centuries, most men have been acute enough to see their interest in being *really* moral, and dispensing with that forgiveness of sins, which puts others, bound hand and foot, into the power of the priest. But even yet many cannot discern it. They think a man *may* lie or steal with impunity, if only *not found out*. Not so. *Nature's retribution is always of the most appropriate kind. Those who so misuse their judgment Destroy it.* Falsehood invariably causes the destruction more or less of the capacity to distinguish between good and evil, wise and foolish; and we frequently see this remarkably proved by the *silly* manner in which, after a career of deception, men of good original abilities, at last commit themselves and come to grief. But if they do *not* do this evidently to their fellows, the personal deterioration and degradation is all the greater, and all the more inevitable, *because* it is unconscious in operation and in effect, and demands intellectual foresight to avoid. I suspect that a much more direct connection than could possibly be perceived at once will yet be traced between lunacy and falsehood.

See corroborative remarks in Maudsley's Physiology and Pathology of the Mind. pp. 210-1.

That natural retribution in complex cases, though absolutely certain, is difficult to discern at first, is no disproof. That is quite in accordance with the method of nature in the development of intellect. To apprehend this truth demands the complete exercise of the logical faculty, involving a bold deduction and extended verification by inductions of great complexity. But the establishment of this as a fundamental moral truth, is worthy of the perfection of intellectual effort. Discoveries of greatest value have always been most difficult of achievement. But though as yet intellectually so hard to discern, this is instinctively, and generally admitted and affirmed in all such popular axioms as, "*Honesty is the best policy!*" Honesty Is the best policy. This is truer than all the Gospels. If it were not, morality would be a wild chimera, instead of a *growing fact*.

I must however turn, before I conclude, to Jesus's summary of the whole law.—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind. This is the first and great commandment. And the second is like unto it. Thou shalt love thy neighbour as thyself." (Mat. xxii, 37-9.) This is as obnoxious to my canon as the rest. Love your neighbours, good, bad, and indifferent, all alike ! And if their virtues and vices are not really theirs, but the capricious gift of God, I don't see why you *shouldn't*. But if the qualities which distinguish them, are their essential characteristics in accordance with which they *cannot but act*; I say, mark as plainly as possible upon every occasion, *your judgment* of their good or evil conduct, and so far do *your* part to educate posterity. *Judge, and be judged.* In complex and obscure cases, investigate, compare, discuss, and *judge* to the stretch of your capacity, *every phase of human conduct*; Approve the Good, and Condemn the Bad. On philosophical,—though not on religious,—principles, you may do this, and love the lovely to your heart's content: and without hating even your *evil* neighbour. You may *hate his evil conduct*, and if you like, the evil circumstances which produce it. But *he*, like *yourself*, is as good as his constitution and circumstances admit; and if he be so mischievous as to produce much evil or *even insecurity* to society, (which has preferent claims upon you exactly in proportion to its greater numbers) hesitate not, in your position as a member of society, to judge him, to stay him, to exterminate him, if necessary. But *not* in the *spirit of religion*. *Judgment* should be without love, and without hate, but not without discernment—blind. *After judgment, love the worthy*; but not the unworthy, who should be indifferent to you. But let *worth* and *worth alone*, determine your judgment and your love. One great blot upon the Decalogue is the fifth command, to honor your parents *irrespective of desert*, and for no reason but the personal relation to yourself! nothing could be more vilely immoral or subversive of the radical distinction between right and wrong, virtue and vice. *Do Not* then love your neighbours—or parents—*indiscriminately*. *Honor what is honorable*. Love *what is lovely*; But *condemn what is evil*, and *abhor what is vile*, as you would hate and shun your own destruction.

But love *God* First, says Jesus. Is God the better for your love? No! Is man? Yes, largely. Then, I say, love man, that is, the *worthy* man, first. Cannot God take care of himself? If not, how can he take care of you? *Morality* is—the manners of men *towards each other*. To love any other being (except woman) more, must

therefore be immoral and evil. It is this *putting God first*, that is the *evil essence of religion*. Hark to the man after God's own heart—David, (see Psalm cxxxix, 21, 2) "Do not I Hate them, O Lord, that hate thee? And am not I grieved with those that rise up against thee? Yea, *I hate them* with Perfect Hatred. I count *them* Mine enemies." What a diabolical utterance! Thus it is that the love of God, is, and always has been, the Perfect Hatred of *humanity*! When a man's *imaginative egotism* is once projected and exalted into the idea of a God and leads him to fancy that he can possibly owe a higher duty, than to his neighbour and himself, there is no length to which his pious enthusiasm will not carry him, to effect any purpose which he may be so unfortunate as to be persuaded is the will of his God! Let history tell how he has endeavored to emulate his fictitious divine fiend, in inventing horrid tortures for his unfortunate neighbour, whom he has deliberately sacrificed with holy joy, for a sweet smelling savour in the nostrils of the demon Jehovah! Could anything be more immoral? Yet Jesus taught all this *in effect*, when he said *love God first*. Yet we can freely forgive him, for he knew not what he did !

To conclude, what did Jesus teach that had not been taught before? Nothing ! The golden rule, which he spoilt, was better taught by Confucius and Zoroaster, and probably by thousands before them. So was the forgiveness of injuries as well as of sins. Even the precepts—to *resist not evil*, and to *love enemies*, did not originate with *him*, though he may have given more prominence to them, or exaggerated them more, than his predecessors. *Why then*, if he taught nothing new that was good, or good that was new, is he preferred to them, and falsely invested with particular credit, for repeating what others had said? Simply because his painful though impossible story, his unmerited wrongs, and miserable fate, have invested his memory with a melting pathos, which appeals directly and powerfully to human sympathy; which while it captivates the affections, *deceives the judgment*. Men are moved, aye, and to tears, far more readily by *reading fiction* than by *witnessing fact*. This is why men are utterly blinded to the otherwise obvious and vital defects of Jesus's teaching, and actually adore *him*, for what they would condemn another. And until men and women better appreciate and utilise their precious faculty of reason, and recognise their duty and interest in exercising it unreservedly upon every subject that comes before them, to distinguish and emphasize the distinction between good and evil, right and wrong, their very virtues will always be liable to run them headlong into vice, *and their Good will be Evil*. And again I say unto you,—Judge!—not according to the appearance, but *judge righteous judgment!*
Hokor.

H. Thomas. Printer. 75 Little Collins Street West. Melbourne.

Ideal Substitutes for God,

Considered in an Opening Lecture at Manchester New College, London, NINETY-THIRD SESSION, 1878-9.

By James Martineau, LL.D., D.D.

Principal of the College.

Third Edition.

Williams And Norgate, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden, London; AND 20, South Frederick Street, Edinburgh. 1879. Printed by C. Green and Son, London 178, Strand

Ideal Substitutes For God.

THIS College has always professed, as the crown of all its work, freely to teach Theology; and, in a recent Memorial to the Government, has prayed that, in every teaching University of the kingdom, provision be made for unfettered theological study, with appropriate honours, as a means of "developing the noblest branch of human learning" and "fostering the moral and spiritual elevation of the community." What then is "Theology," with which our life here is bound up, and of which we have ventured to speak as experienced representatives? The word itself, belonging as it does to a well-known group of compounds, indicates its own central conception. As Geology is the methodical knowledge of the earth's crust,—Physiology, of living organisms,—Psychology, of the self-conscious mind,—Ethnology, of the races of mankind,—so is Theology the doctrine or rational apprehension of God. He is its object; and those who teach it assume that our faculties can take cognizance of Him, no less than the Kosmologist assumes that he can intelligently construe the variety and unity of the world. The methods of seeking Him have indeed changed with the genius of the thinker and the temper of his age. But whether he has proceeded (with Descartes) from the Idea to the infinite Reality, or (with Wolff) from the contingency of the universe to its necessary Source, or (with Wolff) from the skill and beauty of nature to its intellectual Inventor, or (with Kant) from the moral law to its righteous Legislator, or (with Chalmers) from the records of past revelations to the character of the Revealer,—in every instance the light from afar which has sustained the inquirer's zeal has been still the same—the assured *Divine Knowledge*, in which the toil shall end. This is the inspiration of Theology; and if that living breath departs, it collapses and dies.

By watching the gradual change in the choice and complexion of words, we gain a kind of Nilometer,

which shows the shifting levels and gathering floods of thought, and warns us of the season's work. And it is not without significance that, in place of what used to be called the study of *Theology*, we now more often hear of the "*Science of Religions*" i.e. the systematic knowledge of what *men have believed and felt* on things sacred to them. The difference is obvious: it drops us down from a Divine to a Human object, from the yearning of Reason after its transcendent Reality to the history and critique of ethnic mythologies. As an element in the study of man, rich in psychological instruction, there is every ground for welcoming the new expansion recently given to this order of inquiries, and for rendering all honour to the leaders who open the way through them. And the treatment of them in the pure historical spirit, unperverted by theoretic preconceptions or apologetic interests, places them for the first time in their true position: for, as long as ancient and foreign religions had no reporter but the Christian theologian, it was vain to expect for them a sympathy adequate to their interpretation. Still, the importance of these studies is wholly anthropological. They tell the grotesque and pathetic story of our struggling race,—the dreams of its darkness, the guesses of its wonder, the surmises of its sin; but supply no selective rule for saving the true while pitying the false, and yield no Divine knowledge but what we bring to them. If, in pursuing them, we are already and independently furnished with our theology, they will reflect perhaps some rays of it here and there, and so adorn it with a fresh illustration; but, in themselves, they will merely pass before us strange forms of thought, on which we gaze as from an outside station, and which we treat only as phenomena of the world. They cannot therefore claim the place of the old "Theology."

Whence this change in the aspect and method of religious theory? Why has it parted with its Infinite Object, and taken up instead with men's poor fancies about it? Can the broken lights of primeval superstitions render a truer image of things Divine than immediate intellectual vision? Have we really come to that last resort of superannuated philosophy, an eclectic commonplace-book of favourite beliefs? No doubt, the reason is, that our age finds it easier to feel sure of what Religion is in man, than of what it says of God; and can treat it therefore with tenderness and respect as a subjective phenomenon, but hesitates to follow its daring launch-out on to the ocean of real being. Its power as an element of character, as an inspiration in art, as a federator of nations and factor of history, is freely admitted; and no place that it can fairly claim in the genesis of society and the regulation of life is denied to it. But that it knows its own meaning, and that that meaning is true; that what it sees is really there and no phantasm of the mind; that, when its mythical drapery is stripped off, anything substantive remains within;—on all this our generation, dazzled by its discoveries and deserted by its simplicity, feels bewildered and insecure. Yet we are naturally averse to supposing that mere emptiness and illusion can have a dominant influence in the education of mankind: so we try to find some solid little nucleus secreted at the centre of this brilliant nebula, and to make out that, if we could not lodge there now, it has belonged, or is going to belong, to some less erratic and more habitable world; and we insist that, though in itself it cannot pretend to much reality, it may symbolically stand for a good deal, if we do but construe it aright. We readily perceive that the higher forms of Religion assume (inter alia) some rule of human experience, e.g. that *the wicked lay snares for themselves*; or some attitude of the moral consciousness, e.g. the felt transcendency of duty over 'performance; and, seizing upon these included postulates, we say—"Here is the key: this is the whole story: we have got it now in the plain demotic character; and the hieroglyphics may be rubbed out." What is the result? Much, I think, what we should expect, where the text is disparaged to glorify the interpreter: *its* thought is twisted into a mask, through which *his* eyes look out; and under the guise of ancient sage or prophet, we are confronted by the commonplaces of to-day. Isaiah turns out to be a Martin Tupper.

Of this rationalistic reduction of religion to formulas of experience there are so many examples now-a-days as to indicate a general tendency of our time. Amid their varieties there is one cry in which all their voices concur. It is raised in Holland, but echoed everywhere. "No Metaphysics!"—which means, taken in the foreign sense of the word, "No inquiry into any *Real Being* beyond the phenomena of the world: that is a problem which, whether admitting of solution or not, is indifferent to the spiritual life of humanity: either way, Religion remains a personal and social fact, the contents and significance of which we may examine." In other words, "It is nothing to Religion whether or not there be a God! We may give theology its discharge and let it carry off all its beliefs, without prejudice to human trust and piety; these have ample support from the laws of our nature and the order amid which we are placed, without seeking any deeper base." It is no wonder that when this one common element of all known religions (for even Buddhism does not answer to the demand, "No Metaphysics!") is removed, very divergent accounts should be given of what the residuary essence really is. In this indeed they do agree;—that *Morality*, as next of kin to Religion, must succeed to its inheritance and take its name: only, as they have hitherto existed both together on domains by no means co-extensive and with followers far from identical, it is necessary, if the world is to feel no bereavement, to devise some transformation for morality,—to give it a step of preferment from the temporal to the spiritual peerage, and decorate it with the ostensible symbols of sanctity. The delicate question is, what these shall be. What shall we

do to morality in order to turn it into religion? 'Touch it with emotion,' says Mr. Matthew Arnold, and 'fix its eye on the *stream of tendency* as that continuous *not-ourselves* which makes for Righteousness.' Mr. Frederick Harrison has no objection to the 'emotion;' but prefers, as a Supreme Being, the idea of *collective Humanity* which claims the individual's service and weaves it into its texture for ever. The newest philosophy of Holland deems it enough that the morality shall be *ideal*; not the prosaic will of duty that toils under the burden and heat of the day, but the free flight towards visionary perfection to which midnight contemplation invites. Religion, we are assured, is "Moral Idealism."

See the discussion on "Godsdienst zonder metaphysica" and on the "Zedelijk Ideaal," in the *Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1874-5-6, by Hooykaas, van Bell, Hugenholtz, van Hamel, Kuenen, and others.

In this definition the modern tendency finds perhaps its most exact expression: and in the following comments upon the general doctrine, its terms will be prevailing in my thoughts.

Let it be admitted at the outset that, *within the limits of Ethics*,—if that were all the ground they claimed,—each of these teachers emphasizes an important truth. That on this scene of our life the course of things "makes for righteousness,"—that in "the stream of tendency" the defiling contents gradually subside and leave the waters purer as they flow,—that history, through all its tragedies, contains the promise of Right,—and that a firm trust in this ascending future is an indispensable support for human culture,—is a lesson so momentous, that his appreciation of it may well place Mr. Arnold high among moralists, if only it is not used as his passport of entrance among the prophets. So, again, nothing can be more seasonable than the counterpoise by which Mr. Harrison checks the sophisticated egoism of the preceding English philosophers. In proof of their dictum that Pleasure is the ultimate good and the end of all action, they have usually put the case of a solitary person set up in an empty universe, and insisted that if, on arising, he had one pleasant sensation and then passed away, it would have been worth his while to exist; but if the sensation were painful, he had better not have been; so that there is nothing eligible but pleasure. The absurdity of the argument lies in its quiet assumption (under the conception of loneliness) of Individualism, and its reduction of life to mere sentiency. This creature floating in vacancy is, by hypothesis, out of relation to anything but himself: all objects, all companions, are kept out of his way: there is nothing for him to go to or to act upon: he is a self-concentrated focus, surrendered to *passivity*, which has only a sensitive value. On these terms he is not a *man at all*; nor even so much as a sponge in the sea, which at least *does something* with the water around it. The human being is first constituted by precisely the system of relations which are all here omitted: we are what we are by reciprocity: the *individual* is not the factor, but the *product*, of society; and, to understand our nature, we must reckon with humanity first as a collective and dominant organism, whence he starts forth and differentiates himself. This independence and ascendancy of the altruistic relations, with the reverent self-subordination which they enjoin to the abiding and growing life of society, are vindicated with a just enthusiasm by our eloquent Positivist;—with an effect, however, which might have been greater, had not his afflatus carried him over from philosophy to allegory, and mystified his doctrine by expressing it in terms of "the Soul and the Future Life." A still deeper truth it is which has led the extreme school in Holland to resolve religion into "Moral Idealism." They have certainly hit upon the very experience which occupies the border-ground between ethics and faith, and carries the conscience over from rules of life to inward worship. On the one hand, do I not know that, in every alternative offered to my choice, I can both see the higher course and take it, and am solemnly bound to take no other? On the other hand, do I not also know, from the sad lessons of the past, that I shall not persistently do so; and that the will always pure and unselfish, just and true, though for ever possible, will be for ever unrealized? This conflict between character and conception is doubtless the cradle of religion: the interval between what we are and what we are guilty for not being, is that which turns our look upwards, to see if there be hope beyond these shadows of reproach, and which makes the heart low and tender to yield to any heavenly promise that may descend. The spirit that has set into this attitude, and, in the daily round of duty, is secretly drawn on by an infinite aspiration, already waits at the gate of heaven.

But it is one thing to be brought to the verge of Religion by sympathy with this or that part of its contents; it is another, to penetrate to its interior essence. And inasmuch as it is the aim of all these interpreters to retain the pieties of human character, while excusing themselves and us from any conscious relations with *the Living God*, I submit that they attempt what is impossible, and that the very life of Religion centres precisely in that which they discard. They feel the elevation and beauty of the best type of spiritual growth, but would fain dispense with its secret aliment and conditions. They look with wonder at the stately stem, as it springs aloft: they love the shade of the foliage: they admire the blossom;—but they cut the root. It is a repetition, at a higher level, of the mistake which the Individualists commit. These try to make a whole of the single person, and from his nature, measured in itself, to deduce a theory of his existence, though that existence is entirely made up of a tissue of relations with his kind and his theatre of being. Humanism corrects this error; yet again renews it, when it shuts up *mankind* within their reciprocal relations, and cuts them off from diviner affinities beyond. Neither ourselves, nor our race, surveyed as an island, can ever be interpreted aright: to understand what we are,

and even what we contain, we must venture the embracing seas and integrate our lives with the unmeasured sphere of being.

Do I then restrict the conception of Religion to the sentiments awakened by the presence of *Infinite* Perfection, and say that, short of this point, its characteristic spirit fails? On the contrary, I trace its secret power in all human relations where affection and duty are concerned. Reverence for character above us, at whatever height it may be, is the posture of a *religious* nature; and the aspiration it sustains, the trusts it fosters, the self-sacrifice it renders possible and light, fling into our life its fairest colours and tincture it all with sacredness. Let this devoutness of heart be free as you will: let it go everywhere and touch everything: the finite also is open to it as well as the infinite; and the minor pieties are not to retire or renounce their name before the greater. But then, for both there is this indispensable condition; viz. that the inward homage, whatever its direction, shall alight upon a *real object*, and not lose itself in the dilution of an endless search. When I am awed and subdued before the grace and grandeur of a moral superior, it is not because he suggests, but because he *realizes*, a higher conception of excellence: it is as a living agent, as a personal embodiment, of righteousness, that he wields authority over my conscience. Take away this element, tear the picture out of the volume of true history and cast it to the transient winds of imagination, and all is immediately changed. The image remaining the same, I may still admire; but no longer in grave silence,—rather with outspoken praise: of my compunction I am relieved: the strength of resolution is relaxed: the "lifting power" of a devout enthusiasm is gone; and if I have gained any new variety of thought, it is simply added to my culture, but does not transform my life. A conception which reports itself as empty of reality, even if it startles us into a momentary awe, can no more receive our reverent embrace than the shade of a departed ancestor or guide;

Frustra comprehensa manus effugit imago,
Par levibus ventis, volucrique simillima somno.

There is nothing to sustain the worshipful influence of its presence: we cannot venerate our own idea. *Here* it is that "Moral Idealism" falls short of the conditions of Religion; not because it is ethical, while religion is something else; not because it works among finite relations, while religion is concerned only with the infinite; but because its ideal perfection is known to be only in our heads, while the ideal of religion must be also real. Strauss himself makes the memorable confession, that "none but a book-student could ever imagine that a creation of the brain, woven of poetry and philosophy, can take the place of real Religion."

Kaiser Julien; der Romantiker auf dem Throne der Cäsaren, S. 12.

To mark then the step of thought which crosses the line into the hemisphere of Religion:—it is made when we affirm that over us and in relation to us the All-perfect Mind *exists*. Devout faith is a belief of *real Being* on the strength of *what ought to be*. If you look at it from the outside, you may call it the apotheosis of moral aspiration: if you name it from the interior, you will say, it is the revelation of God in the conscience. The former expression describes the ascent of my thought to its object; the latter, the descent of its object into my thought. As my purpose is at present only to clear the meaning and scope of words which are made mischievous by indeterminate use, I will not pause to vindicate the drawing of an onto-logical conclusion from a moral premiss. It is not the only paradox of Reason into which we are irresistibly borne away by that wonderful conception of *what ought to be*. It introduces many convictions against which the logic of physical science is for ever chafing; but which take no notice of the rebuff, and continue to be bases of social law and invisible bonds of human life. To these criticisms, if time permits, I will devote a few words before I close. Just now I rest on the position that "Moral Idealism" is not Religion, unless the ideal is held to be *Real as well as Divine*.

To test this position, suppose the element of *Reality* to be now admitted, and now removed; and compare the natural working of the moral ideal under the two conditions; to see whether in both instances alike it is marked by the effects which experience shows to be characteristic of religion.

Ever since the Epistle to the Romans was written, it has become a Christian commonplace that, in all moral experience, I am divided against myself; inwardly identified with a superior call that beckons me; outwardly liable to take my lot with the inferior inclination that clings to me. In such conflict, whatever be its issue, the real self is always that which votes for the good; conformably with Plato's rule, that no man, *of his own will* (though, possibly, of blind impulse), ever decides for the worse. If I choose aright, the previous strife is laid to rest, and my nature is at one with itself and its own ends. If I choose amiss, the storm within is fiercer than before; I rage against my own temptation; and if the fact be known, I am ashamed to walk abroad and carry about so false an image of myself. And thus it is with all men, so far as the moral life has developed its history in them. Set before them a just and righteous claim that demands them, and, if only you get the conception clear into their hearts, they are caught up into one spirit at the appeal, and muster as an army fresh from sleep. They

feel, perhaps for the first time, that they are themselves,—that they never knew themselves before. They have emerged from a disguising cloud, and beneath the sunshine their very essence has found them out. With all of us then, in some deep sense, the ideal self is the truly Real; and we disown as foreign whatever contradicts it.

Yet, in another sense, it is just this which is unreal; for it is never *realized*: it is something still to be, which not yet is. If you ask for the *actual* self, now and here, to-day and to-morrow, of each individual, it will be precisely that which he repudiates as the false one; wherein the struggle *is not over*, the temptation not banished, the unity not attained. Unless therefore fact itself is illusion, this other and relatively *evil* self is that which *really* is, both in each of us and in society. Yet, strange to say, it encounters a fate which befalls no other fact. Its right *to be a phenomenon* is disputed. Real as it is, it is *condemned for being there*, and has to skulk before an eternal protest which treats it as *marring reality*, and bids it take itself away.

What meaning then is to be put upon these two aspects of Reality, leading us at once to affirm and to deny it of the same object? To the Theist, the paradox easily resolves itself. That the moral consciousness on the one hand, and the observation of fact on the other, should give two measures of reality, does not surprise him. He sees in them only reflexions in little of two corresponding functions of the universe at large;—viz. indwelling thought, ideal purpose, free creativeness, determining it towards all beauty and good; and finite material conditions for the externalization and progressive expression of its spiritual origin and end:—i.e. *Mind*, eternally perfect; and *Nature*, perfectible by transition;—the one for ever being, the other only *becoming* (therefore partly not being) what it *ought to be*. Where the great whole consists of this permanent essence of reality and its partial negation, it is intelligible that both should report themselves in our derivative nature, and in their very lineaments claim their respective parentage, and by their native sympathies tend towards their home. In such a world there is no uncertain meaning in that consciousness of *a higher* that possesses me,—that sense of *authority* which every opening of duty brings,—that almost speaking appeal to my will that tells me, "This alone is right, and thou canst do it,"—that terrible conviction incurred by all wrong-doing, that I have lost *myself* and become alienated from an infinitely better than myself. These experiences necessarily belong to the relation between the opening conscience of an incipiently free humanity and the righteousness of an eternally free and holy God. We simply accept them, therefore, as telling us the truth: we *believe* our compunction, and have nothing to explain away in it: we do not construe it into a vain and illusory regret for what *had to be*, or think to rid ourselves of its demands by some apology or reparation to our fellows; but own to the full its grievous charge, of a dereliction of a Divine trust, and shrink abashed before the eye of the Supreme Perfection.

At the same time, the consciousness that what I have realized in act is not the true real, assures me that it has no roots and cannot stand; and that, just because I know this, I am not without the idea and love of that to which I have been faithless: so that the sacred affinity remains; the relation is not abolished; and hope springs up afresh. The local clouds of violated conscience cannot blot out the steadfast expression of eternal Will, all-embracing as the heavens: its everlasting eyes are over all, and know how to find the visual points in every answering mind. This objective persistence of a living Holiness is just the one steadying and sustaining power which condenses flying humours into force of conscience, and animates the waking toils of life with the glow of its divinest dreams. The women whom you could not frighten, and the men whom you could not move to say the false or do the wrong,—have they not been pre-eminently (I do not say exclusively) those who stood face to face with the Living Judge of Eternity, and in their own incorruptible perception heard His voice—"Stand fast, for I am with you"?—a voice which at once guarantees the possibility and completes the sanctity of the felt duty. Is it possible to deny that such conviction, with the habits of inward piety which it creates, naturally imparts stability to the will and elevation to the affections?

But this conviction, we are told, is "Metaphysical:" it affirms an existence beyond phenomena; and from our religion we are to take all Metaphysics away. Be it so: then our "Moral Idealism" loses its objective hold, and becomes a mere subjective exercise of imagination: and the question is whether this will still serve as well. The change (may we not say?) amounts to a removal of the ideal from the moral to the æsthetic field; whereby, though it may fix my admiration, it parts with all immediate relation to my will; for it contains in it no assurance of either its *authority* or its *'possibility'*, any more than is contained in the artist's dream of a statue nobler than the Apollo, or a picture more touching than the San Sisto. The bare conception of a better in character, rising in the imagination and known to be an imagination, no more touches the springs of action with the sense of what I ought to do and be, than the conception of brighter wits or finer person or happier lot. Any vain longing which it may excite is but like the wish that last night's dream were not *only* a dream, and is as likely to depress me with a nerveless feeling of inferiority as to lift me into strenuous faith. It is the peculiarity of the visions of conscience,—that which marks them off from all other play of ideality,—that they cannot be purely egoistic, and in becoming such would drop their very essence; that to a lonely, unrelated mind they would be intrinsically impossible; that they profess to come to us upon a mission, to destroy our absolutism and plant us beneath a higher which has a right to the homage of our will. If this profession be not true, the moral insight itself becomes illusory; and to detect the fraud thus put upon us is simply to break the back of all moral

power, and release the will from every pressure graver than the light weights of fancy. What seemed to be looking at us with such Divine appealing eyes is but a flattered portrait of ourselves: the tones that so deeply pierced us are but our own falsetto voice: there is neither substance in the sight, nor truth in the sound: let us pass on, as though they were not. Life, upon such terms, would be like one of those dual games, of chess or cards, in which a solitary player cheats his loneliness by personating the pair, and suffers a fictitious defeat by his own intentional mistake, and wins a hollow triumph by outwitting himself. It *no less takes* two to deliver the game of Duty from trivial pretence and give it an earnest interest. How can I look up to myself as the higher that reproaches me?—issue commands to myself which I dare not disobey?—ask forgiveness from myself for sins which myself has committed?—surrender to myself with a martyr's sacrifice?—and go through all the drama of moral conflict and enthusiasm between myself in a mask and myself in propria, persona? How far are these "emotional" semblances, these battles in the clouds, to carry their mimickry of reality? Are we to *worship* the self-ideality? to *pray* to an empty image in the air? to trust, in sorrow, a creation of thought which is but a phenomenon of sorrow? No: if religious communion is reduced to a monologue, its essence is extinct and its soul is gone. It is a living relation, or it is nothing;—a response to the Supreme Reality. And vainly will you search for your spiritual dynamics without the Rock Eternal for your Greek text

But perhaps it will be said that the moral ideal, when traced through its history, is not purely subjective, although at present a phenomenon of the individual consciousness; since it comes to us from minds other than our own; both concentrating and reflecting the social sentiment by whose light we see and in whose air we breathe; and also storing up an indefinite inheritance of ancestral judgments of character, not only transmitted by descent, but looking down on us from the portrait-galleries of history and permeating the whole substance of literature. The standards of excellence to which admiration and reverence turn have actually formed themselves, it is urged, outside of us: they are not personal inventions which we might *weave in vacuo*; but are presented to us as the objective fruit of human experience, the last distillation of good when all foreign ingredients are left behind; and it is not therefore without reason that we refuse to interpret them as egoisms, and feel them as claims upon us rather than as fancies within us. They do speak to us with an external authority: but this authority it is enough to treat as *social*, without attributing to it anything transcendental and divine. Why may we not, it is asked, set our foot on this reality, and so regain the missing power? This objection proceeds from those who regard the moral sentiment as communicated rather than indigenous,—as partly borrowed in our own time from other minds, and partly a legacy in our organism from a long past. They are ready to assent to Mr. Sidgwick's statement that "on the conception of the objectivity of duty the authority of the moral sentiment depends;"

Methods of Ethics: Supplement to 1st Edition, p. 45. See also 1st Ed. p. 62. "That in us which claims authority is never a mere sentiment, hut always a faculty cognizant of an objective rule or imperative which exists independently of its effect on our feelings."

but think that, since *they* have detected its rudiments and conditions of growth in external experience, its conception of the objectivity of duty is provided for and justified. The fallacy is obvious. It is one thing for a sentiment to owe its existence to outward conditions; it is another to carry in its meaning an objective reference: to grow from without inwards is not to look from within outwards; and the objectivity we here investigate is not in the genesis of the conception, but in its contents. Its inherent *belief* of an authority beyond us is not explained by discovering for the sentiment a foreign origin, physiological and psychological, of which we are wholly unconscious. The discovery is *yours, not ours*; and its very merit for your genius depends on its having been a secret to our thought. The objective sources of our moral feeling are absolutely hidden from it: its objective authority is absolutely clear to it: to identify the two is to affirm that the same thing may be simultaneously in consciousness and out of it.

Suppose, however, the fallacy removed from this analysis by our becoming conscious of the actual origin of our moral ideal, viz. progenitors in the past, society in the present; so that, thus far, there is no hindrance to our finding in them the "objective authority," the "imperative" rule independent of our own feelings, which the sense of duty carries in it. Still, there is another fatal disqualification in them for recognition as the real object of our reverence and the ideal standard of our aspirations. They are simply the general aggregate of social sentiment in our own and prior generations, the average of expected character through the ages of which we are the sons: for no means are suggested for filtering the descending stream and dropping its impurities as it flows,—its animal taint, its false admirations, its bitter selfishness,—and securing for us only the sweet waters of life. Can we say then that what is *thus* presented to us is *higher* than we,—*higher*, moreover, than our noblest and best men, in whom also and with intenser eye the conscience retains its upward look? No: historical and actual Society constitutes, by its opinions, a force larger indeed, stronger, more enduring than we; but not even approaching our own ideal, much less passing away beyond it towards infinitude. Nay more: social opinions are either the expression of conscience already there, and then they are the effect of the very ideal they are supposed to form; or, they tell simply what men like and dislike and mean to insist upon with each other; and

then they are not moral at all; the influence which proceeds from them is coercive only, not sacred,—compressing reluctant wills, but releasing none into a free enthusiasm. The objectivity, therefore, which is supplied to us by this doctrine is of the wrong kind for drawing forth the homage of reverent affection, and can offer only the blankest disappointment to any true moral idealism.

Besides, if the object in which the authority rests is a continuous and universal social will, it is for us a mere abstraction, in resorting to which we are aware that it is a figment or economy of thought, which cannot really exercise rights over us or claim any rational veneration. However subject we may be to impose upon ourselves by giving substance to such mental creations, they can never wield over us the power of concrete being, unless within their epitome images gleam forth of individual persons and visible scenes that have become endeared. Thus there is a magic in such words as *home* and *country*, through the generality of which faces look at us and fields and villages are seen: and these may become the occasion of some minor idolatries of the heart, shaping themselves however into the innocent forms of conscious personification and fervent song. But abstractions which have no such contents,—e.g. Law, Reason, Wealth, Opinion,—whatever pranks they may play with our Logic,—cannot persuade us to bow down and worship them. If the only *object* you have to offer for human homage be an impersonal conception of this kind, it is easy to see what will become of our religion under the change. We have only to substitute for the familiar terms of personal piety, which speak of "God" and the human "Soul," any of their supposed modern equivalents when the "Metaphysics" are discharged, and then estimate the gain or loss. Will then the Benedicite swell with the same tones of joy, when it has to sing—"Bless the *Eternal Law*, all ye its works; bless the *Eternal Law*, O my synthesis of organs"? Will the contrition which now cries—"Blot out my transgressions," "Cast me not away," "A broken heart Thou dost not despise," pour out its sorrows to a deaf "ideal," and shed its passionate tears on an abstraction that cannot wipe them away? Will any moonlit form be seen kneeling in our Gethsemanes, and rising from prostrate anguish to sublime repose through the prayer, "O thou *Eternal Not—ourselves that makest for righteousness*, if it be possible, let this cup pass from me; nevertheless, not as I will, but as Thou wilt"? Will any Crucified one lose the bitterness of Death in crying, "*O Stream of Tendency*, into thy hands I commit my spirit"? And to the Martyr, stoned to death, will any Heaven open and any Vision come, when he exclaims, "*Great Ensemble of Humanity*, receive me"? For my part, I cherish the hope that our unsatisfied "Modern Thinker," after vain trial of such devotions, may return to his rest, and say with a natural reversion of heart, "O Thou once Unknown, I thank Thee that though Thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, Thou hast revealed them unto babes."

Our comparison then of the effects on life of the subjective and objective ideal sums itself up in this: that without *personal relations* between the Human and the Divine, Religion is divested of all its higher attributes and intenser forces: it loses its link with morals: it ceases to transfigure the affections: it relinquishes its grasp upon the will. It was by emphasizing these relations that Judaism became indomitable; and by universalizing them that Christianity laid hold of the foremost nations and rose into the foremost faith of mankind; creating and diffusing a heart-worship, a self-reverence and self-surrender, a depth of spiritual experience, a literature of character and devotion, and a breadth of social compassion, which are the redeeming features of modern civilization. To paralyze these relations is to relapse into Paganism,—a Paganism, too, with emptying temples and retreating gods,—and to set up again the mutual play of Man and Nature, with the sanctity lost from both. The needs of the future cannot be provided for by any such helpless reaction, which forfeits what we have gained by reversion to what has been discarded; but only by ascending to a more commanding point, whence contrasts melt in harmony, and the outlooks to the right and to the left are embraced in one horizon and form but undulations of one world.

An undertone of pathetic regret may sometimes be heard in even the most confident critics of Christian Theism; as if, in substituting their abstractions, they were conscious in their hearts of administering a dangerous anaesthetic to Religion, which might leave it speechless and paralytic, if it even survived at all. They plead; however, that the risk must be run; and that, to save any remnant of moral life, the organism of faith must suffer excision of some members which have hitherto been the seat of an intense vitality. Men have always taken for granted that the Supreme Power "thinks and loves;" but the critics have now laid it down that these predicates "cannot be *verified*,"—a dictum which, giving no account of itself, relies for its effect on mere supercilious iteration. If, in Mr. Arnold's vocabulary, to "verify" means to "*test by experiment*," the complaint is true, but irrelevant: the inner attributes of the Supreme Cause cannot be submitted to Baconian experiments, with registered results tabulated under "Sic" and "Non." Yet their exemption from this criterion does not discredit their existence: for if a Divine Mind were really there, and in its essence were purely and only Thought and Love, it would equally transcend the interrogations of our experience. It is not by such methods that spiritual truths can be extorted. But if "*to justify by sufficient reason*" is here equivalent to "verification," the complaint, though relevant, is unfounded: for we are guided by no other reason in attributing thought and love to our fellow-men than that which warrants our ascription of them to God. In neither case have we any *immediate*

apprehension of these invisible affections of mind: in *that* degree of closeness they are known only as exercised by ourselves: in others we read them only by having thus learned their signs; and precisely the signs which assure us that we are not in a mad-house, but among companions directed by intelligence and moved by sympathy, repeat themselves in the legible order, beauty, and tendencies of the world. So similar are the marks in the two instances, that if intellect and feeling are allowed their causality in the one, legitimate induction (as Mr. Mill himself insists) requires their admission in the other: they must operate in both, or else in neither. How cogent this resemblance is, curiously appears from the fact that, with our modern men of science, it has become usual to accept this dilemma; and, as they will not admit Mind to be operative in Nature, they actually deny its efficiency in us. Both are automata alike; and all would go on the same, mechanically unrolling the scenery of life and history, though the superfluous appendage of consciousness were cut off. It is beyond the scope of my subject to criticise this pretended completion, but real subversion, of the philosophy of Descartes. Far be it from me to deny that in this, its last exploit, Reason has fairly clone for itself and proved its own inefficacy. The interest of the speculation for the present consists in this—that the parallelism between the Universe and Man is plainly indestructible; that the exclusion of intellectual power from Nature cancels it also in us; and that its self-assertion in us rationally secures its presence and its sway in Nature. If Nature is automatic only, so are we: if we are actuated by thought and love, so is Nature. The parallelism used to be denied: it is now admitted; and the ultimate "verification" is thrown back upon our fundamental self-knowledge of action from purpose and affection. There we may be content to leave it.

I conclude, therefore, as I began, with deprecating the separation between what are called the "Metaphysics" and the Ethics of our supreme beliefs. These beliefs, whose fertilizing influence is first felt far lower down, are found, when followed upwards to their springs, to have two co-ordinate sources,—one in the intellectual, the other in the moral region of our nature; the former bringing us to a transcendent *Cause*; the latter, to a transcendent *Righteousness*; together finding their unity in an *Eternal Will*. The exigencies of thought in dealing with its ultimate problems may require us, and the artifices of analysis may enable us, to contemplate them as distinct, and assign to them their respective lines of descent upon and through the mind arid character. But this detachment is *our* work, not *theirs*;—not a fact of life, but an illusion of the schools. In the common sense and feeling of men, and in the faith of Christ, they perfectly blend, and in blending support and complete each other; and no such strange paradox meets us, as the conception of a Universal Cause that has no character, or a Perfect Righteousness that has no Causality. The final object of the Reason and the final home of the Conscience are the same: these faculties are but the two wings that bear us thither; and if you disable either, we vainly struggle and never rise. Religion that is *mere* metaphysics offers us but a pale and icy reality: "Religion *without* metaphysics" offers us but a painted dream.

The truth of which the new doctrine is a caricature is perhaps this:—that the *progressive element* of Religion is to be found in an ever-expanding moral ideal as human experience enlarges and the human conscience increases its refinement and its range. New social perplexities of duty, new sufferings for compassion, new virtues for veneration, new temptations for conquest, enter the field as the ages open, and leave the old formulas of righteous life inadequate: and in nothing will a true piety show itself more than in freely embracing its more comprehensive trust, and suffering 110 filaments of habit to detain it from a higher perfectness. On the ontological side of Religion,—in the conception of Primal Being and Power,—there is no such process of advance: it is a fixed thought, and, as a necessary idea of Reason, does not add to its contents, but remains "the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever." Precisely, however, on this account is it the indispensable substratum for the moving images and varying colours of goodness and beauty as they unfold. "Without a permanent there can be no change; and the ideal which for ever grows must in its essence be secured upon the Real. It is idle to talk of evolution and laws of phenomenal advance, as if they superseded all beyond themselves. "Phenomena" of nothing, "Evolution" of emptiness,—what are such phrases but a Greek and Latin gibberish? To make a show of itself, there must be something behind: to develop itself, there must be a plenitude within: the very words bespeak the whole reality they are intended to deny.

And unless we are to throw away all idea of homogeneity and proportion between cause and effect, and between instinctive tendency and its fulfilment, the Rational and the Moral in us can neither have their beginning nor reach their end, in the absence of Divine Reason and Divine Right. If our human experience teaches us anything certain, it is this: that it is Thought which kindles thought, and Love which elicits love, and Character which moulds and refines character; and *that*, not *upwards*, the inferior prevailing to better the superior; but *downwards*, the greater lifting the less. To reverse this order, to educe Mind from what is not yet mind, and Conscience from blind and neutral force, is to put more into the effect than the cause provides, and *ipso facto* to convict the explanation of incompetency. And similarly when we face round to see whither our nature looks instead of whence it comes, we find not an appetency, affection, or energy of our being, that fails to meet its fitting *object*: through the range of the animal, the domestic, the social life, the several relations, of, which one term is within us, complete themselves by hitting upon the other in the external scene. The scientific

intellect slakes its thirst on the order and beauty of the world; and even when it ventures, in sympathy with the *style* of nature, on guesses and forecasts too daring for immediate belief, its vaticinations have often struck the truth. Is then this analogy to be first broken when we reach the highest levels of our humanity? Are we *there* flung out of all relations, though still furnished with their inward drift and cry?—still sent to seek, with prejudice that we shall not find? If we are to assume any concinnity in our nature, or any harmony of it with its theatre of being, such disappointment of its ends carries in it an improbability revolting to the Reason. And can then the "Moral Idealism" step in and deliver us? Yes; if it speaks to us, not in its own name, but in that of its Inspirer; if it stands before the Living God, taking thence its inner power and sending thither its secret prayer, and can utter its prophecies as foregleams of His righteous Will. At such a voice, Conscience becomes transfigured from human to Divine, and life on earth is turned into a "kingdom of heaven." But if, because its God is dead, it can only display its own imaginings, and propose them in tones of personal suggestion, without an organic faith to integrate them with the possible and the intended, it will wield no persuasive influence, but speak as a prophet ere yet the live coal has touched his lips. Its visions will pale and fade; its promises dissolve in unreality; and the sickened conscience that has trusted to it, sink into helpless debility. Human life is too strong for the grasp of spiritual æsthetics: let it remain within the hold of the All-ruling hand.

By the Same Author,

Price 2/6, New Edition,

Religion as Affected by Modern Materialism.

And

Modern Materialism: Its Attitude Towards Theology.

Or separately, 1/-and 1/6 respectively.

WILLIAMS & NORGATE, 14, Henrietta Street, Covent Garden.

Also, price 21/-cloth,

Essays, Philosophical and Theological.

In Two Volumes.

TRUBNER & Co., Ludgate Hill.

Also, price 7/6, cloth,

Endeavours After the Christian Life.

Sixth Edition.

LONGMANS & Co., 39, Paternoster Row.

Also, price 7/6, cloth,

Hours of Thought on Sacred Things.

Second Edition.

LONGMANS & Co., 39, Paternoster Row.

Also, price 7/6, cloth,

Studies of Christianity.

A Series of Original Papers.

LONGMANS & Co., 39, Paternoster Row.

SUNDAY FREEDOM TRACTS.

The British Clergy *versus* Dr. Cameron and the Dean of Melbourne on the Sunday Question.

[Please to Pass it on].

PRESUMING on the ignorance—or what they believe to be such—of the people of this city and suburbs, Dr. Cameron, the Dean of Melbourne, the religious papers and the Sabbatarians generally, are putting forth a number of statements with respect to Sunday observance, which have no foundation in Scripture or in reason; and are reproducing numerous sophisms and fallacies which have been refuted, by eminent divines and other writers, over and over again. It may be therefore advisable, for the information of the public, to cite the following opinions and dicta from the published writings of well known prelates and clergymen, whom even Dr. Cameron, with all his recklessness of assertion, will hardly venture to charge with aiming at licentiousness under the garb of liberty.

John Prideaux, D.D., BISHOP OF WORCESTER,

Maintains that on the Sunday all recreations whatsoever are to be allowed, which honestly may refresh the spirits and increase mutual love and neighbourhood amongst us; and that the names whereby the Jews did use to call their festivals (whereof the Sabbath was the chief) were borrowed from a Hebrew word, which signifieth to dance and to be merry, or make glad the countenance. . . . What is the cause (he says) that many of our sectaries call this day the Sabbath? If they observe it as a Sabbath, they must observe it because God rested on that day; and then they ought to keep that day whereon God rested, and not the first as now they do, whereon the Lord began His labours. If they observe it as the day of our Saviour's resurrection, why do they call it still the Sabbath; seeing especially that Christ did not altogether rest that day, but valiantly overcame the powers of death.—*The Doctrine of the Sabbath*. London, 1634.

Francis White, D.D., BISHOP OF ELY.

God imposed not this law (of the Fourth Commandment) upon Christian people by any evangelical precept; neither did He command the Gentiles at any time, before or after the Law, to initiate the example of resting the seventh day of every week. And therefore abstinence from worldly labour upon the old Sabbath, in imitation of God Almighty, would not be a work of holiness and true obedience in us Christians, but an act of judicial superstition. The evangelical law imposeth no commandment of total abstinence from secular labour, or from civil actions, during the space of a natural day, either upon the old Sabbath day, or upon the Sunday, or any other day of the week.—*A Treatise on the Sabbath Day*. London, 1635.

THE REV. P. Heylin, D.D., SUB-DEAN OF WESTMINSTER.

The Sabbath was not instituted in the beginning of the world. No Sabbath was kept from the Creation to the Flood. Neither was it kept from the Flood to Moses. Nothing is to be found in Scripture touching the keeping of Sunday. In the fourth century, from the time of Constantine to that of St. Augustine, Sunday was not taken for a Sabbath. Neither was it regarded as such during the next six centuries. The Lord's Day had no such command as the Sabbath, that it should be sanctified, but was left plainly to God's people to pitch on this or any other for the public use. And being taken up amongst them, and made a day of meeting in the congregation for religious exercises, yet for 300 years there was neither law to bind them to it, nor any rest from labour or from worldly business regarded upon it.—*The History of the Sabbath*,. London, 1636.

THE REV. Christopher Dow, B.D.

Sure our Saviour would never have styled his yoke easy, and his burthen light, had this strict observance of the Lord's Day been a part of it.—*A Discourse of the Sabbath and the Lord's Day*. London, 1636.

Robert Sanderson, D.D., BISHOP OF LINCOLN.

The following points ought to be taken as certain and granted amongst Christians:—1. That no part of the law delivered by Moses to the Jews doth bind Christians under the Gospel, as by virtue of that delivery; no, not the Ten Commandments themselves, but *least of all the fourth*, which all confess to be, at least in some part, ceremonial. 2. That the particular determination of the time to the seventh day of the week was ceremonial. And so the obligation of the Fourth Commandment in that respect, although it were *juris Divini positivi* to the Jew, yet it ceased, together with other legal ceremonies, since the publishing of the Gospel, and bindeth not Christian consciences.—*A Sovereign Antidote against Sabbatarian Errors*. London, 1636.

Gilbert Ironside, D.D., BISHOP OF BRISTOL.

It was never yet revealed by prophet or apostle that God would thus or thus punish honest, lawful, and harmless recreations upon the Lord's Day, with such particular judgments as are observed to have fallen upon some particular persons in divers quarters of this land. Let such threatenings be produced, and something is said.—*Seven Questions of the Sabbath briefly disputed Oxford*,. 1637.

Jeremy Taylor, D.D., BISHOP OF DOWN, CONNOR AND DROMORE.

The Jewish Sabbath being abrogated, the Christian liberty, like the sun after the dispersion of the clouds, appeared in its full splendour: and then the division of days ceased, and *one day was not more holy than*

another. And when St. Paul reproved the Corinthians for going to law before the unbelievers, who kept their court days upon the first day of the week, he would not have omitted to reprove them by so great and weighty a circumstance as the profaning the Lord's Day, *in case it had been then a holy day, either of Divine or apostolic institution.*—*Ductor Dubitantium*.

Isaac Barroav, D.D., MASTER OF TRINITY COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

St. Paul, the great patron and champion of Christian liberty, not obscurely declareth his mind that Christians of strength in judgment *did regard no day above another*, but esteemed all days (he excepteth none) alike, as to any special obligation, grounded upon divine law and right; in subordination to which doctrine we may add that this appears to have been the common opinion of the wisest and most orthodox Christians in the primitive church. . . . This law, as it was not known or practised before Moses, so it ceased to oblige after Christ; being one of the shadows which the evangelical light dispelled, one of the burdens which the law of liberty did take of us.—*A Brief Exposition of the Lord's Prayer and Decalogue*, 1681.

Robert Barclay, the CELEBRATED QUAKER.

We not seeing any ground in Scripture for it, cannot be so superstitious as to believe that either the Jewish Sabbath now continues, or that the first day of the week is the antitype thereof, or the true Christian Sabbath, which, with Calvin, we believe to have a more spiritual sense; and therefore we know no moral obligation, by the Fourth Commandment or elsewhere, to keep the first day of the week more than any other, or any holiness inherent in it.—*An Apology for the True Christian Divinity*, 1678.

Philip Doddridge, D.D., the EMINENT NONCOMFORMIST.

No one is by the Christian dispensation obliged to obey any part of the Mosaic law, as such, any more than he would have been if that law had never been given.—*Lectures on Divinity*, No. 209. 1763.

William Tindal, TRANSLATOR OF THE BIBLE.

As for the Sabbath, we be lords of the Sabbath, and may yet change it into Monday, or any other day as we may see need; or we may make every tenth day holiday only, if we see cause why.—*Answer to Sir T. More*.

John Frith, PROTESTANT MARTYR.

Our forefathers which were in the beginning of the Church did abrogate the Sabbath, to the intent that men might have an example of liberty.—*Declaration of Baptism*.

W. F. Hook, D.D., DEAN OF CHICHESTER.

As to the Lord's Day, we are not able to refer to a single passage in all the Scriptures of the New Testament in which the observance of it is enjoined by God. . . . Let then our fields and parks be open. And as there must be temptation in an alehouse, and as there can be no sin in reading, why should not our libraries be made accessible in the winter?—*The Lords Day*. 1856.

THE REV. F. W. Robertson, of BRIGHTON.

No one who would read St. Paul's own writings with unprejudiced mind could fail to come to the conclusion that he considered the Sabbath abrogated by Christianity. Not merely modified in its stringency, but totally repealed. . . . I cannot but believe that the false, Jewish notions of the Sabbath-day which are prevalent have been exceedingly pernicious to the morals of the country.—*Sermons*. 1852.

Henry Alford, D.D., DEAN OF CANTERBURY.

The Apostle Paul decides nothing; leaving every man's mind to guide him on the point.... I therefore infer that Sabbatical obligation to keep any day, whether seventh or first, was not recognised in apostolic times—*Notes on the Greek Testament*.

THE REV. Norman M'Leod, D.D.

I do not believe in the continual obligation of the Fourth Commandment. I have no faith in it.—*Speech in the Glasgow Presbytery, Nov 16, 1865.*

THE REV. J. A. HESSEY, D.D.

In no one place in the New Testament is there the slightest hint that the Lord's Day is a Sabbath, or that it is to be observed Sabbatically, or that its observance depends on the Fourth Commandment.—*Bampton Lectures.*

A Plea for the Sunday Platform

And A Protest Against the Attempt to suppress it.

A Lecture Delivered at the Theatre Royal on Sunday Evening June 13th 1880

—By— Charles Bright.

(Special Phonographio Report.)

"We are all very sensible,—it is forced on us every day,—of the feeling that the Churches are out-grown; that the creeds are out-grown; that the technical theology no longer suits us. It is not the ill-will of the people,—no, indeed,—but the incapacity for confirming themselves there. The Church is not large enough for man; it cannot inspire the enthusiasm which is the parent of everything good in history,—which makes the romance of history. For that enthusiasm you must have something greater than yourselves, and not less."—EMERSON.

Sydney: PRINTED AND PUBLISHED AT THE CAXTON PRINTING OFFICE, 114 PITT STREET. 1880

A Plea for the Sunday Platform and a Protest Against the Attempt to Suppress it.

MR. BRIGHT spoke as follows:—

I desire in my lecture of this evening to explain what in my opinion are the meaning and mission of the Sunday Platform, and to enter a protest against any attempt to suppress it. (Applause.) And, in order that this may be seen to be of any value, it is perhaps necessary in the first place that I should show that there is a decided and premeditated effort to be made, now or in the immediate future, to ensure such suppression. Even after all that has been said, people find it difficult to convince themselves that those who are making this effort are really in earnest in what they are undertaking. It seems such a monstrous thing, at the present day, and in an English colony, that any government should desire to interfere with the peaceable pleasure and profit of a large section of the community, who do no harm to any other section, that it is indeed difficult to conceive such an effort is to be persisted in. But, from the first, for my own part, I have been well assured that the attempt was a premeditated one, and I felt tolerably convinced that it would, at least for a time, be persisted in. There was some little while ago an article in the *S. M. Herald* very fairly, in many respects, discussing the question, and offering, for the *Herald*, tolerably strong opinions why such an attempt should not be continued; and in that article it was said that the writer believed that the words affecting public lectures had found their way into the Licensing Bill through an inadvertence, and that they were not aimed at the Sunday evening gatherings. I addressed a letter to the *Herald*, in which I pointed out that such a contention as this seemed to be scarcely tenable I said that I believed—and moreover it was not merely my own belief, but that of a gentleman of legal standing in this community whose opinion would rank deservedly high—that those words "any public lectures" had never before found their way into a Licensing Bill, either in Imperial or Colonial British legislation. (Applause.) I pointed out that the only method in which such words could possibly have found their way into the Bill by inadvertence would have been by their being copied from some other enactment; and as there would seem to have been no enactment of the kind from which to copy them, I asked the question—How, for what reason, and at whose instigation did they find their way into the Licensing Bill? That letter did not make its appearance in the *Herald*, for what reason I am not aware; but possibly in pursuance of the usual policy of that paper, never to advance too far in the direction of freedom. (Laughter.)

However, this phase of the question is now placed beyond farther argument; for, as you are aware, in moving the second reading of this Bill, Sir Henry Parkes, the head of the government, took occasion to declare his sentiments, and what those are I will read to you from the report furnished in the *Herald*. He said:—"In connection with this there was a proviso in the Bill as it now stood, that these licensed theatres or public halls should not be used for Sunday lectures or other purposes without the special authority of the Colonial Secretary. That appeared so he was told, very oppressive to some persons, but he failed to see the oppression. (Laughter.) He supposed there would be some movement made in society if the play of "Hamlet" was performed on a Sunday. Every religious sect in the country would feel scandalised, but that would be morality itself compared to some lectures. A lecture on the anatomy of the human frame might be made injurious to the welfare of the

whole community,—(laughter)—and if they were not prepared to have the plays of Shakespeare performed on Sunday, he did not see the hardship of requiring a person wishing to instruct the public being called upon to state what he was going to do. (Laughter) If certain lectures were given in a theatre on a Sunday or on a Monday, and the government did not step in to prevent them, there would be a loud outcry and very justly so. He was sure that House in the spirit of liberty and fair play was not yet prepared to allow large classes of the community to be scandalised by some indecent performance under the title of a lecture. And if the House was not prepared to have the plays of Shakespeare and other dramatists performed on Sundays, he could not see how they could allow these lectures to be given. It would remain for the committee to deal with this question when the Bill had passed its second reading, but he thought the principle could be defended, that the provision was no invasion of the liberty of the subject or of the liberty of the platform." Now that is the opinion expressed by Sir Henry Parkes in introducing the Bill, and holding that opinion, of course we can easily understand how those words "any public lectures" found their way into the measure.

Now, I do not intend to-night to enter on the discussion of the question as to whether it would be well or not for Shakespeare's plays to be produced on Sunday. But inasmuch as it has been said by certain clergymen that they would prefer to have Shakespeare's plays performed than that lectures like mine should be given, I affirm that I would far rather have Shakespeare's plays performed than suffer the infliction of many of the sermons they deliver. (Laughter and hear, hear.) Shakespeare's plays would at all events not cause a man to hate his brother man; while many of the sermons delivered on a Sunday do have the effect of sending away their audiences with hearts filled with hatred of those who are opposed to them in theology. (Applause.) At all events, the public are not now demanding theatrical performances on Sunday evenings, while they do demand Freethought lectures. With respect to the argument of Sir Henry Parkes, that certain lectures might be delivered which would be a scandal to the community, so in the same way certain newspapers might appear which would be a scandal to the community; but is that any reason why a man should, before producing a reputable newspaper, go to the Colonial Secretary and ask for a license to do so? Surely, the platform has a right to be placed in the same position of freedom as the Press, in a free community. But have any of these evils which the Premier professes to fear arisen? Have we had these lectures on anatomy of this exciting character? For something like six or seven years the Sunday platform has been an institution here in Sydney, and I will venture to say that throughout the whole of that time there has been nothing produced upon such platform that should call for any restrictive or oppressive legislation of the kind now referred to. (Applause.) Moreover, if legislation be needful, it should be made of that character that will touch where the contact is required. Do not, because there might possibly arise certain evils in a growing institution, evils entirely problematical, and not yet showing any sign of arising; do not on that account strive to bring the whole institution under the heel of personal and capricious authority. Let it grow, let it extend, according to the needs of the community, and legislate for the correction of the evils if they manifest themselves.

Thus having shewn from the speech of the mover of the Bill himself, that there is a decided effort to be made now or at an early time to suppress this and similar platforms, let me repeat that I am not in the least degree surprised at it, because I am well aware that there have been attempts made to cause such legislation as this to be introduced. Not only here, but in other places where the Sunday platform has been instituted, the clergy have been greatly exercised in mind regarding it. They have seen, to their disgust, that it is a self-supporting institution, that it is not likely to fall to the ground, as they at first hoped, for want of public patronage; and they have been consequently troubled in their minds as to the best method of dealing with it. Some have suggested, as I know, that it should be publicly proceeded against by such obsolete laws as might be raked out of the dust of past legislation, but this has been opposed on the ground that it would but turn the lecturers into martyrs, and make them more popular than ever. (Applause.) Hence, it has been deemed, the best means of suppressing it, that prominent members of the Government should be ear-wigged on the subject, and the result, I make bold to say, of such earwiggling, possibly, as we are informed by Sir Henry Parkes himself, with his full concurrence, is to be found in the Licensing Bill introduced into Parliament.

Seeing then, that this institution of a Sunday Platform is to be, if possible, suppressed, it becomes needful that we should consider what are its objects, and what its probable mission. And in order that we may fairly understand these we shall have to consider first what have been the object, the mission, and the nature of that other Sunday institution, the Pulpit. The ostensible object and mission of the Pulpit have been to minister to the spirituality, morality, and intellectual development of the people, and in the past doubtless it has, at times, acted powerfully in this direction. Even now, under exceptionally fortunate circumstances, *i.e.*, where the Pulpit is filled by a man of capacity and breadth of thought, it may be beneficial to those who resort to it. But the same object and the same mission, precisely, are those which are set before the Sunday Platform. Hence, in these respects, in the aims of the two Sunday institutions, they are on a par—in their avowed aims they are on a par;—both of them desire to minister to the cultivation and morality of the people. While thus agreeing in ostensible aims, however, in constitution, these institutions are precisely the opposite of each other, and I shall

proceed to show how this is the case.

Remember, that the Pulpit and the Platform, as institutions, are something more than merely pieces of furniture—something altogether apart from fixings. You may have a Pulpit which looks like a Platform, and in some rare cases you may have a Pulpit which is really a Platform. In America they are becoming, I believe, comparatively common. Apart from exceptions, however, the great difference between the two institutions is this:—The pulpit everywhere, (even if the person who fills it occupies the stage of a theatre) is the result of previous organisation. Thus, a committee has to come together, a congregation has to form, and the person who addresses it has to speak in such a way as shall be satisfactory to the organization which supports him. He is, in truth, no matter how free he may deem himself or be deemed by others, under the authority of certain persons who are in reality placed above him. Every occupant of a pulpit has to think of something else besides the simple question, what do I regard as truth? Every occupant of a pulpit has to turn side glances perpetually to another question,—what will be thought of this doctrine by those I am addressing? Will it be regarded as sound? Thus the pulpit wherever it is found, is under the control of sectarian organization. Now the platform, that is to say the Sunday Freethought Platform, is completely free of organization. The happy occupant of such a platform has not to go forth from the place where he stands in fear and trembling as to what the great "Mr. So-and-so" will think of what has been put before the public; or still worse, to speculate as to what the great "Mrs. So-and-so," who is such an ardent supporter of his organization, might have to say when he calls upon her in a few days time, lie has simply to place before those who come to hear him what he conceives to be truth, and nothing else. And that is a grand position.

The most fatal fault of modern society, as indeed it has been throughout so much of the society of the past, is this—that people are afraid to declare their real sentiments, afraid to speak out to the world the simple truth as they conceive of it. We can hardly realize the mischief that this has caused and is still causing to the world. In the words of John Stuart Mill—"Who can compute what the world loses in the multitude of promising intellects combined with timid characters, who dare not follow out any bold, vigorous, independent train of thought, lest it should land them in something which would admit of being considered irreligious or immoral? Among them we may occasionally see some man of deep conscientiousness, and subtle and refined understanding, who spends a life in sophisticating with an intellect which he cannot silence, and exhausts the resources of ingenuity in attempting to reconcile the promptings of his conscience and reason with orthodoxy, which yet he does not, perhaps, to the end succeed in doing. No one can be a great thinker who does not recognize, that as a thinker it is his first duty to follow his intellect to whatever conclusions it may lead. (Hear, hear.) Truth gains more even by the errors of one who, with due study and preparation, thinks for himself, than by the true opinions of those who only hold them because they do not suffer themselves to think."

On Liberty, 2nd ed., p. 61.

Such is the opinion of Mill, and there cannot be a doubt that numbers of occupants of pulpits, (and they, of course, influence in no slight degree the conduct of those people they address) are deterred from following out their thoughts to their legitimate conclusions, because doing so may endanger their position, or at all events, lose them certain valued patronage or friendship. It is on this account above everything, why a free platform is so infinitely superior, and will be still more, in the future, to the pulpit, which is from its very constitution, fettered.

Viewed within itself the lecture platform is a most admirable means of giving information to those who from their occupations during the week, or from disinclination to study, are unable to make themselves acquainted with the grand thoughts of the time, with the great and subtle questions that are now agitating public opinion, or with the arcana of scientific facts. On this subject I would read you a few words from an essay upon the lectures of that distinguished astronomer who is now delivering addresses with such success in Melbourne, Mr. R. A. Proctor, and whom before long, doubtless, we shall have the pleasure of hearing. (Applause.) In speaking of Mr. Proctor, the writer of this excellent essay under the head of "The Critic," in the *Australasian* of Saturday, 5th June, says:—"There are many people who are desirous of gaining knowledge who yet, from habit of mind, are not able to assimilate it with ease when presented in a book. The effort of translating the letters of the printed page into ideas and facts is too much for them. They want the ideas and facts put before them conversationally. It is far easier to get at their minds through the ear than through the eye. This is where the usefulness of the lecturer comes in. He collects a large number of people interested in his subject; he puts himself, with a lecturer's tact, into relation with their understandings, feels by an acquired sense when he is commanding their attention, and conducts them through a subject which many of them would have been quite unable to follow without his assistance." Now that very fairly I think presents what may be done by a lecture; and as I have said, there are also to be considered those people who have not time to study these subjects for themselves. If that be the case with a lecture on purely scientific topics, the remarks apply with even greater force to lectures on subjects connected with what is generally known as Freethought, *i.e.* opinions which are opposed to those entertained by the majority of mankind at the time when such views are presented. Mill

says:—" If there are any persons who contest a received opinion, or who will do so if law or opinion will let them, let us thank them for it, open our minds to listen to them, and rejoice that there is some one to do for us what we otherwise ought, if we have any regard for either the certainty or the vitality of our convictions, to do with much greater labour for ourselves."

On Liberty 2nd ed. page 82.

I have attempted to shew wherein the platform as a Sunday institution differs from the pulpit. It differs precisely in this respect, that the occupant of it is thoroughly free. He has not to go forth to bow down before anyone in possession of a little authority, from the sole fact probably of his possessing a great deal of cash. He can speak what he believes to be true, and as his opinions grow and enlarge the public receive the benefit of them. There is no obligation or restriction on either side, as none but those who desire to hear him need attend. (Applause.) But the whole of this great and important difference between these two Sunday Institutions—the Pulpit and the Platform, depends upon the fact, that, in the latter case, the doors are thrown open to all, without creedal questioning, who choose to come and pay the price of admission. It is simply upon that one fact that the difference turns between the Sunday Platform and the Sunday Pulpit. Here, at a lecture of this kind, whoever pleases to pay the price of admission, according to the various divisions of the house, can come and listen, and if there be any who will state they are too poor to pay, then, so far as I am concerned, the gentlemen who officiate for me at the entrances have directions to admit them free. If this were put an end to, if we had not this freedom, then we should have to fall back upon organisation, and the moment we do that, we have once more to be beholden to the men in lofty positions, and in truth no longer have a free Sunday Platform, but are starting another religious sect. For myself, I declare, I will never, if I can help it, be instrumental in starting another sect among the various conflicting theological cliques in the world. I have admitted that the Pulpit, constituted upon organisation, and in that respect differing so widely from the Sunday Platform, has been in the past of value to the communities in which it has played its part. Paine well says, "Every religion is good to the extent it inculcates goodness." This is undoubtedly true, but the converse must also be true—that every religion is bad to the extent that it inculcates evil. At the present time, for a large number of people, the sectarian religious sponge has been squeezed completely dry. It no longer furnishes any intellectual moisture. In fact it is productive of evil, inasmuch as it continues to keep up differences between people who would otherwise be inclined to coalesce for all sorts of good objects. Religion is evil then so far as it is simply conducive to sectarianism. The time is rapidly arriving when all these sectarian religions will have to give way to something better than themselves; and in my opinion that something better than themselves will be found in Sunday musical exhibitions of the highest character, and a free open and unfettered Sunday Platform (Applause.)

Sectarianism, be it remembered, is not a good thing in itself. It is a thoroughly bad thing in all its results, excepting so far as its teaching may make in the direction of moral goodness; but we know right well that a vast proportion of its teaching is based on speculative, yet changeless, creeds, which rational men and women are beginning to know to be false. They are beginning to perceive that there is no truth in the creedal statements that the eternal God ever walked the earth in the guise of humanity and was put to death by his own creatures, that a child was born without a human father, that three persons are One, that the judicial murder of one man made atonement for all who believed, and that the rest are to be tortured in flames for everlasting; these and various similar statements are beginning to be regarded by vast numbers as false, and as Thomas Carlyle says (in a passage quoted in Marcus Clarke's admirable pamphlet "Civilisation without Delusion") "the first of all gospels is this, that a lie cannot endure for ever." (Applause.) Truth has nothing whatever to fear from freedom of speech. Truth invites, does not shun, attacks; and if the Sunday Platform is allowed, as it must sooner or later be permitted, to develop itself unassailed, except by argument, the truth must benefit by the unfettered speech to which it will conduce.

There are manifold other agencies at work now, besides the Churches. In the remote past the Church was the sole teacher of anything in the shape of morality and domestic virtue. Now there are unnumbered secular agencies, most of them having had the churches opposed to them in their initiation. There are temperance societies, friendly societies, debating clubs, schools of arts, athenaeums, public libraries, and the press, and it is just as much as the old churches can do to come stumbling along after these institutions—(laughter and applause)—patronising them when they no longer require patronage, after having opposed them while they were struggling for existence. Every good and beneficial institution has been so treated, from the Sunday School itself upwards. All organizations of a catholic character will stand their ground, and if we can only be rid of religious sectarianism the result will be enormously beneficial to mankind. In speaking thus, I allude not to one sect, but to all. All in direct proportion to the power they possess, will persecute freedom. "We discern the evidence of this fact in every direction. It was once thought that in those sections of Christianity, where indeed the Christian belief is whittled away as thin as possible, that dogmatic opposition to other forms of belief would be at an end. But it is not so. Even such a sect as the Unitarians, who are almost everywhere cold-shouldered by orthodox Christians, who will not admit they are Christians at all,—even they sometimes

act as illiberally as the other sects. I have noticed an instance quite recently in an American paper. Some of you may be aware that there is a publisher in the United States, who, to the shame of that country, has lingered a full year in gaol for the publication of some obnoxious opinions—Mr. D. M. Bennett, editor of the *New York Truth Seeker*. I can say nothing regarding the work, for the publication of which he was imprisoned, as I have not seen it, but I know that men like Elizur Wright, James Parton, and Colonel Ingersoll would not uphold him if he had not been impelled to his work by a love of truth, and a desire to benefit his race. This man was cast into gaol, and remained there twelve months. A large number of his friends in New York, as the time arrived for his liberation, were determined to give him a grand reception. They applied for a large hall in New York, known as the "Cooper Union Hall." At first there was no objection offered, but after a while the committee of that hall, which is under Unitarian superintendence, having been established by the beneficence of a well-known Unitarian after whose name it was called, refused the use of the hall for the purpose. They were not liberal enough to throw open their doors to an arch-heretic like Bennett, and the result has been that the promoters of the movement had to obtain another, the Chickering Hall, and I believe a splendid demonstration, in which people from all parts of the United States assisted, occurred there on the 2nd May last. I refer to this to shew you that you cannot enter upon anything in the shape of sectarianism without at once entering also upon something which resembles the ancient religious bigotry. With the Platform this is of course altogether impossible. It is an institution founded in freedom. It asks for no mediator between the lecturer and the public. If the lecturer has something to say, and can say it so as to be attractive to the public, the public will come and hear him, and no one else is required or ought to be suffered to interpose between them (Applause.)

Such being the claims of the Sunday Platform, what is the nature of the attack made upon it? The time is past when any orthodox priesthood are enabled, directly, to fetter freedom of speech. As long as priesthoods had the power to do so, they did it. They attacked directly those who in any form of teaching were opposed to them in opinion, and crushed them. Of course, the Church which did this with the greatest vigor was that which from its unity occupied the most powerful position, but all churches have, to the extent of their ability, persecuted those whose opinions differed from their own. For some time, however, thanks to the efforts of Freethinkers, it has been unpopular to avowedly attack freedom of speech, and so side issues have been raised. Oh! no, they never, any of them, want to cripple freedom of speech! Those who imprisoned George Fox, the founder of the Quakers, did not wish to crush freedom of speech, only to guard the morals of the public! (Laughter.) So with those who attacked and imprisoned Bunyan, and placed Defoe in the pillory! And so in a most remarkable instance at a later time; an instance which I propose to dwell on for a little, because I believe it will prove most instructive to those who are opposed to us in sentiment.

In the last century religion in England was, as historians plainly shew us, at a very low ebb; a fact not to be wondered at when we remember that it was a state-supported religion, and that those who were called its teachers knew very well that they need not make any exertion to secure the support of the people they addressed. Hence, it is not strange to learn that religion had fallen into disrepute. There were fox-hunting parsons who prided themselves on hopping easily over a five-barred gate, parsons who rushed away as soon as possible from the few words they deemed it necessary to address to their parishioner on Sunday, in order to go and see a cockfight. These parsons ran away from the pulpit almost as soon as they entered it, and for any benefit that their flocks derived they might just as well have gone before,—(laughter)—left their pulpits to go into the vestry in order that they might drink with their boon companions. On all sides we are told the Church was in a dreadful state. The clergy, to a large extent, were hangers on for preferment to the Ministry of the day, or still worse about the ante-rooms of the king's German mistresses. Everywhere there was nothing but lethargy and corruption. No new churches had been erected, and no schools opened, we are informed, since the grammar schools in the days of King Edward and Queen Elizabeth. The masses of the people were ignorant and brutal. Such was the state of religion in the early portion of the last century, and what occurred? There were certain men in the English Church, itself, who could not be content with a mere sham religion. They must be in earnest, endeavouring to do something to awaken the people to the conviction of the greatness of the truth of that which they themselves believed. The most prominent of these men were the two Wesleys and Whitfield. Though differing completely from their religious views, let me own at once, that they did a grand work in, at all events, making people truthful and resolved that their lives and religious professions should be no longer at variance. What happened to them? In "The Life and Times of John Wesley" by the Rev. L. Tyerman, I find the following,—part of a letter from John Wesley himself:—"Being convinced of that important truth which is the foundation of all real religion that by grace we are saved through faith, we immediately began declaring it to others.

But in doing this, we were assaulted and abused on every side. We were everywhere represented as mad dogs, and treated accordingly. We were stoned in the streets, and several times narrowly escaped with our lives. In sermons, newspapers, and pamphlets of all kinds, we were painted as unheard of monsters." In order to shew you the opinion then entertained of this zealous and vital religion, I will give you a quotation presented by Mr.

Tyerman from a pamphlet by a reverend doctor of divinity of the time, who no doubt set much store on his knowledge of the dead languages, while arguing feebly in living ones. (Laughter.) This pamphlet was entitled "The Nature, Folly, Sin, and Danger of being righteous overmuch; with a particular view to the doctrines and practices of certain modern Enthusiasts. Being the substance of four discourses lately preached in the parish churches of Christ Church and St Lawrence, Jewry, London, and St. Martin's in the Fields, Westminster, by Joseph Trapp, D.D." (Laughter.) And what does Dr. Trapp, D.D., say?—"For laymen to officiate in reading prayers in any assembly, except their own families, is an encroachment upon the office of those who are ordained to holy functions; and for them to expound or interpret scripture is neither laudable nor justifiable, but tends to the confirmation, not the removal of ignorance." Having thus expressed his dissatisfaction at laymen intruding upon sacerdotal preserves, Dr. Trapp next proceeds to give his opinion respecting one not a layman—"For a raw novice, though in holy orders, to take upon him, at his first setting out, to be a teacher, not only of all the laity, in all parts of the kingdom, but of the teachers themselves, the learned clergy, many of them learned before he was born, is an outrage upon common decency and common sense; the height of presumption, confidence, and self sufficiency! so ridiculous as to create the greatest laughter, were it not so deplorable and detestable as to create the greatest grief and abhorrence, especially when vast multitudes are so sottish and wicked as, in a tumultuous manner, to run madding after him." Thus you see that precisely similar denunciations were levelled against those who followed Wesley and Whitfield, rather than the orthodox Church of England clergy, that are now used against those who come and hear freethought lecturers. (Hear, hear) And Dr. Trapp says further—"They (the Methodists) teach such absurd doctrines, and second them with such absurd practices, as to give countenance to the lewd and debauched, the irreligious and profane. For a clergyman of the Church of England to pray and preach in the fields, in the country, or in the streets of the city,"—this is one of the saddest features, "to preach in the fields or the streets of the city"—and, now by this Hill they want to prevent Freethinkers from speaking anywhere else. (Laughter.) Dr. Trapp goes on—"This is perfectly new, a fresh honour to the blessed age in which we have the happiness to live. I am ashamed to speak upon a subject which is a reproach not only to our church and country, but to human nature itself. Can it promote the Christian religion to turn it into riot, tumult, and confusion? to make it ridiculous and contemptible, and expose it to the scum and feoffs of infidels and atheists? To the prevalence of immorality and profaneness, infidelity and atheism, is now added the pest of enthusiasm." A great pest always to orthodox preachers! (Laughter.) "Our prospect is very sad and melancholy. Go not after these imposters and seducers, but shun them as you would the plague." When we find the clergy a century or so ago talking in that fashion of those who are now almost worshipped as religious lights, we cannot be astonished that they assail, as they do at this day, unlicensed Freethought lecturers.

In 1744, a pamphlet was published by one who did not give his name, but subscribed himself a gentleman of Pembroke College, Oxford," and this "gentleman," speaking of the Methodists says, "they are a tag-rag mob using lascivious and blasphemously languishing expressions when they talk of the Redeemer's love." They are "a set of creatures of the lowest rank, most of them illiterate and of desperate fortunes; cursing, reviling and showing their teeth at everyone that does not approve of their frenzy, and extravagance." (Laughter.) And of Whitfield, that outspoken preacher—one who is so highly thought of by the Methodists, in fact by all the orthodox of our time, this writer says, "he is crafty and malicious enough to be suspected of any wicked enterprise, a person of wicked principles, travelling over all counties to establish new fangled societies;" and he and his friends were "heads and spiritual directors of hot-brained cobblers, all big with venom against the clergy of the Established Church" The author "trembles and shudders," fancy that! the author, a gentleman of Pembroke College "trembles and shudders," lest the Methodists should be betrayed by their feelings and stretchings into a bed of eternal fire and brimstone, appointed for the reception of the lewd, the concupiscent, and the blasphemous." (Laughter.) I hope our friends, the Wesleyan Methodists of the present day, who are so prone to rain down upon Freethinkers similar blessings, will lay all this to heart. (Hear, hear.) One extract more: the Rev. L. Tyerman, says: "In addition to all this foam and fury against the Methodists, must be mentioned an equally vile attack of another kind. At the Brecon assizes, held in the month of August the grand jury deemed it their duty to make a presentment to the presiding judge to the following effect: 'that the Methodists held illegal meetings and that their preachers pretended to expound the scriptures by virtue, of inspiration;' that, by this means, 'they collected together great numbers of disorderly persons'—"disorderly persons"! very much like the "larrikins" I suppose, who, according to a recent "reverend" speaker come to my lectures. (Laughter) "Very much endangering the peace of our sovereign lord the king "George II and his German seraglio," and that unless their proceedings were timely suppressed, they might endanger the peace of the kingdom in general. At all events the pretended preachers, or teachers, at their irregular meetings, by their enthusiastic doctrines, very much confounded and disordered the minds of his majesty's good subjects, and this in time might lead to the overthrowing of our good government, both in Church and State." Finally the judge is requested, "if the authority of the present Court was not sufficient for the purpose, to apply to some superior authority in order to

put an end to the villainous schemes of such dangerous assemblies." This is taken by Tyerman from the *Gentleman's Magazine* for 1744 p. 504.

These extracts will shew you what was thought of Methodism at that time. I have dwelt on these occurrences and conflicts of the last century in order to indicate the difficulties which this movement which is now admitted to have done service of a highly moral and excellent character in that generation, had to encounter and the way in which it was spoken of by those who then plumed themselves on their orthodox conservatism. But different ages unfold different developments. The Conservatives of this day are fully prepared to accept all which was so obnoxious in the last century; quite prepared to see clergymen go outside their churches addressing people in the open air, if they so choose; quite prepared to see, moreover, a great extension of liberty of speech in the pulpit itself. But we have now arrived at a time when a vast number of people require something more for their intellectual, religious and moral well-being than that which was satisfactory in the last century. There are numbers of people who are almost or altogether outside the influence of the churches, chapels, and conventicles who find it beneficial, instructive, and entertaining to attend the Sunday Platform. If we need a proof of the fact that proof is before us here. (Applause.) I ask is there any more reason why there should be clerical attacks upon this institution of the Sunday Platform, which is being developed in accordance with the requirements best suited to itself, not having its laws dictated to it by others, but comporting itself in the way best suited to its own interests, is there any more reason why it should be subject to attacks in any shape, or attempted to be dictated to by government censorship, than there was for similar interference with the Methodism of last century? All people of open minds will admit that the Wesleys and Whitfield had a right to do as they did, to do what they believed to be their duty, and that they were justified in carrying on their work in the face of all opposition that might be brought against them. And at this day, are those who come forth upon the Freethought platform not justified in doing what they have found to their hands, doing a needful work which will produce its fruits? I venture to say that the outcome of the Reformation itself will shew no grander fruit than this Sunday Platform, when once it becomes an institution in all parts of the world. (Applause.)

In the customary style of subterfuge we are told by the clerical organs who attack this institution that they attack it, forsooth, simply on the ground that money is taken at the doors. Oh! they are once more, most anxious for freedom of speech, tremendously anxious! Well, we thank them for nothing. (Laughter.) We do not want their toleration. As Shakespeare says:—

"What needs the bridge much broader than the flood?"

"The fairest grant is the necessity."

We ask for no affected toleration for free speech at the hands of these gentleman we don't want it. They overdo the thing in offering it. All we ask from them is simply that they shall keep to their own business, mind their own concerns, and leave us alone. (Applause.) This overdoing of a thing is always a mistake; people who overdo anything are sure to render themselves ridiculous I noticed lately a most amusing instance of this kind in a humorous picture which I doubt not is familiar to a good many of you. There was an individual who, unfortunately for himself, had to have a tooth extracted, and who was blessed by nature with an extremely large mouth. When he saw the dentist standing with the forceps ready to operate, he opened his jaws so wide that the dentist stood back and politely remarked, "Don't open your mouth so wide, please; I stand outside." (Laughter.) Now, as regards those gentlemen who are so kind in offering us their toleration of free speech, I would simply ask them not to open their mouths so wide. They cannot open their mouths in affected toleration of liberty, without showing their teeth. I have here a copy of the *Protestant Standard*, which has been very much exercised in its editorial mind on this subject. On the 15th May (and it returned again to the topic in pretty much the same vein on the 22nd, and I daresay frequently since, for I do not often read it) it says—"We go in for free speech." Of course! (Laughter) "We have fought for free speech." Doubtless, against all those who wished to fetter them, but not for those they wish to fetter. "But then, free speech ought to be defined. Blasphemy is not free speech." If these gentlemen had been under the tender mercies of the Roman Catholic Church a few centuries ago, they would have been termed blasphemous. However, they now say to Sir Henry Parkes, "Let him give notice to the Sunday evening lecturers, Messrs. Bright and Co., that charges to their lectures on Sunday evenings are illegal, and that they must rely on the power of the plate, and we guarantee that the result will be, that the freethought lectures will be at a discount." (Laughter.) Further down in the same article,—"*We want no gag on 'free speech.'* We desire no crippling of lectures and knowledge. We have no fear from the paltry infidels who now live by their slanders on the Bible and its teachings. And we are convinced that the Bible has stood the charges of far heavier artillery than that of the mercenary infidels who now occupy the 'platform' of the theatres on the Sunday evenings in Sydney. But we think that Sir Henry Parkes has a right to insist that if theatres and concert halls, and shops and business houses are to be closed on the Sunday, Bright and Co.'s nostrums ought to be forbidden on Sunday evenings, ought, at least to be forbidden, unless on the free-trade principle of the 'plate'—which Mr. John Hurley will hold gratis." (Laughter.) Now that, you will see, is simply aimed, as all

preceding endeavours to crush freedom have been, in Protestant countries, (all at least excepting those where one sect has been very powerful, as at the time of the burning of Servetus, in Geneva, or the torturing of the poor Quakers and others in Massachusetts)—it is simply aimed at a side issue because they dare not strike openly. They indulge in shallow raillery at those they term "infidels," and endeavour if possible to get up a feeling against them, while at the same time striving to stop the only institution before the public which permits those they attack obtaining a hearing. They acknowledge the platform could not exist as a sectarian organization, and hence beseech that it shall be compelled to organize. Transformed into a pulpit they know its power is swept away.

To the denunciations and vituperations heaped upon infidels, I would merely reply in the words of Mill, in his "Essay on Liberty,"—"If Christians would teach Infidels to be just to Christianity, they should themselves be just to Infidelity. It can do truth no service to blink the fact, known to all who have the most ordinary acquaintance with literary history, that a large portion of the noblest and most valuable moral teaching has been the work, not only of men who did not know, but of men who knew and rejected the Christian faith."

On Liberty, 2nd ed., p. 93.

(Applause.) Let those who rail at infidels endeavour to manifest towards them some of that christian love about which they are so often and to such a sickening extent talking, when there is no use for it. Then, as Mill indicates, in their turn perhaps they would receive more justice than they possibly can at the present day from those whom they denounce and abuse.

Spite of the feeble opposition of bigotry, it will prove the mission of the Sunday Platform to carry the watchword of freedom further than it can at present be, or ever has been in the past, carried, by religious sects. Sects are always under the dominancy of the most bigoted and straightened minds, and hence all the pulpits supported by such sectarian efforts are circumscribed and dwarfed. But what men now require and are gradually establishing, is this very institution of the Sunday Platform, where no organization is necessary, where the man who has something to say, which he believes is of value to his fellow creatures, and who has the capacity of saying it in such a way that his fellow creatures will come and hear him, can be at full liberty to say it. We demand that this institution shall be allowed to develop itself according to its own laws, and we fail to see the justice of its regulations being formulated by the "gentlemen" who edit the *Protestant Standard*. They assert that if what they desire were brought to pass, the institution would immediately decline. Whether that be so or not, our desire is that the institution shall flourish, not decline, and to insure this consummation, it must be left to develop itself. In the past we have seen how interference with a cognate institution—the Press—has always been pernicious; whereas when the Press was left to develop itself according to its own needs it gradually attained to a magnificent power for usefulness. Supposing the Press had remained as it was in the past, when any one who had something to write to his fellow creatures, and wished to print it, had to go and bow down before some Mecaenas, some patron, and ask him for permission, where would have been its influence? That was the fashion formerly, and that would have continued had not the Press worked out its own freedom from censorship, and gradually acquired a position so that any man who desires to print his thoughts is able to do so without going to any Colonial Secretary and saying, "By your leave, sir." As the Press has thus been enabled to work out its freedom, to vindicate its right to expand and develop precisely as the exigencies of surrounding circumstances demanded, all we ask is that our own institution, that is just acquiring strength, shall be left to develop itself in a similar way.

Surely, in the past there has been enough of this intolerant persecution, without the same unhappy struggle being perpetuated in this century. It is difficult to understand how Sir Henry Parkes, who has been regarded sometimes as nearly a Freethinker himself, should consent to come down to Parliament and in the abused name of liberty propose to fetter this growing institution? Surely he, who knows nothing regarding it, save from interested and biassed hearsay is not such a good judge of its value as those who come and patronise it. Surely the people of this colony, from whom colonial secretaries spring, may be trusted to decide what is good for themselves without the leading strings of a Government official. I am happy to say that some among the members of Parliament have taken up a proper position and spoken out well on this matter, one gentleman especially. And really I think it should make Archbishop Vaughan himself laugh in his sleeve at the turn events have taken. He must be amused to observe that Sir Henry Parkes, who claims to be such a model in upholding freedom, should be thus endeavoring to fetter a free institution, while a gentleman who belongs to the Catholic faith comes forward as its staunchest defender. (Applause.) On the second reading of the Licensing Bill, Mr. Fitzpatrick (applause)—the leader of the Opposition—after speaking of the evils of intemperance for which the Bill was endeavouring to find some remedy, is reported by the *Herald* as follows:—"He was as much impressed with the evils of intemperance as any member, and he would go very far to check them, but he would see all the temperance societies farther before he would consent to gag men who desired to express their conscientious convictions on Sundays. Members inclined to support such a proposition were not three generations removed from those who would have shed the blood of those who differed from them in religious

belief. Were they to punish a man because he did not agree with their views of Christianity? Why, what a pretence of liberty it was to say that a man should not invite his friends to hear him in any house, provided he did not break the peace or utter libels. If such men's views were right, why should they not express them; and if they were wrong what harm would they do? The community was dotted with tens of thousands of men who did not hold their views of Christianity. These men did not force men to go to listen to them. Only those went who chose to go. If they stopped Mr. Bright lecturing who else would they stop? The views that gentleman expressed were not widely different from those of the Unitarians, and would they cause the Unitarians to close their church? When he read this clause his hair rose on his head and his blood crept to learn that in the 19th century they were to be asked to prevent educated gentlemen expressing their views on human nature and the great hereafter. Where would they draw the line? (Applause.) Now I say that all honour is due to a gentleman who utters sentiments of that enlightened character There were others who spoke to a similar effect, but in attempting to gauge the opinion of Parliament we must remember that those who are disposed to be bigoted rarely speak out, and it is not to be thought because a few members utter their sentiments as opposed to these clauses in the Licensing Bill, that therefore they may not, some time or other, be carried. Those who intend to support such clauses say nothing about it, but they vote; and although I myself do not believe that this Bill, will pass at all this session,

The Bill has, since been withdrawn by the Premier for the resent session. yet still I am well convinced that there has been sufficient organisation at the bottom of this effort to suppress the Sunday Platform, to ensure its being continued, and that the attempt will again and again be renewed to put it down by the strong arm of the law.

Under the circumstances I think the public, or that portion of them who desire this institution to continue, are perfectly justified in resisting such an attempt to the uttermost. It is a policy of repression worthy, as was said by Mr. Wilson, of a country like Russia, not of any country where free institutions are supposed to flourish. We do not want here the repose which is only to be secured by repression. There is danger in any one sitting on the safety valve of a steam engine to prevent the noise of the steam escaping. Better let it escape. The man who sits on the safety valve may perhaps enjoy the idea that he is stopping an agitation which is unpleasant to him, but he will probably suffer the subsequent inconvenience of being blown off his seat, and having to be picked up in shattered pieces.

And what, I would ask in conclusion, has happened to justify this attempt at suppression? Has there ever been the slightest reason offered why there should be any restriction at all, save and except that which we have seen, namely, the opposition of certain privileged cliques who desire to retain the ear of the public,—desire to prevent the public from receiving ideas different from those promulgated by themselves? We say, then, to those who are instrumental in bringing this law forward,—if it be restriction of the rights of the platform that you mean, we will oppose it to the uttermost, and endeavour to get all those who are deserving the title of free men, to help us in our righteous opposition. If it be not restriction, but patronage, then we indignantly declare we want none of your patronage; we simply desire to be let alone. Leave the Sunday Platform alone. In the near future it will vindicate itself as one of the grandest institutions the world has yet known, teaching the morality of science not of superstition, promoting intellectuality, developing individuality, and surpassing all Sunday organizations by its powerful support of wiry agency making in the direction of religious liberty and social freedom. (Applause)

decorative feature

"The Age" and Fairplay.

Reply of Mr. Thomas Walker to the Sub-leader of May 24th.

FOR the purpose of comparison I republish the sub-leader of the *Age* of the above date:—

"The very best cause may suffer from the character of its advocates; and we are satisfied that the cause of a free Sabbath is being very seriously injured by the injudicious people who bring forward Mr. Thomas Walker as one of its champions. It is the grossest insult that can be offered to men like Bishop Moorhouse and the Rev. Chas. Strong to find such a man placed shoulder to shoulder with them in the controversy. Mr. Walker is only known as a sort of Infidel Cheap John, who carries about with him wherever he goes a wallet full of scraps of Voltaire, Volney and Tom Paine, and is prepared to prove to any-body who will listen to him that he was consulted at the making of the creation, and is perfectly familiar with all its secrets. "Having flown over many" knavish professions, "Autolycus tells us that he finally settled in that of rogue as the most profitable of all. Mr. Walker is not Autolycus, of course; but he is almost as much favored by fortune, for he finds people ready to pay for hearing his ribaldry and flattering his egotism as easily as that famous snapper-up of unconsidered trifles found yokels to buy his extravagant stories about fishes singing songs a hundred fathoms above the level

of the sea, and usurers' wives being brought to bed of money bags. From figuring as a trance lecturer in the interests of Spiritualism, he now takes the platform as an avowed opponent of everything spiritual, turns upon his former friends with the usual violence of the renegade, and admits that he is an impostor by teaching down the things that he once taught up. That he should be able to gather an audience about him in such a city as Melbourne has always struck us as a circumstance of very unhappy augury. A moment's consideration should tell any thinking man or woman that the themes which he handles with such pertness and audacity have puzzled and outwitted all the commanding intellects of the day, and that problems which Spencer and Huxley and Tyndall have retired from in despair are not likely to be solved by a pinchbeck Bradlaugh, for whom the kangaroo and the savage have only just made room. Outside and behind the phenomena of nature there is a Power "absolutely inscrutable to the intellect of man; and as little in our day as in the days of Job can men by searching find this power out," says the last named physicist, with true philosophic humility; but the philosopher of the Melbourne Opera House, unillumined by a single gleam of reflection, backs himself to prove right off that there is no such Power at all, and the universe can be explained without it. There cannot be a doubt that a large number of people who look upon the Sabbath question with sufficient coolness to take no active part one way or the other would recoil with horror at the thought of being suspected of sympathy with a cause of which a person like this Mr. Walker appears to be accepted as a champion. They would be goaded at once into active hostility to the side that espoused him, and we do not see how anybody could blame them. Excellent Christians and churchmen are found in abundance to declare for opening the Library and Picture Galleries to the public on a Sunday, and only a fool or a bigot can see any anti Christian feeling therefore in the agitation. But it is a very different thing when an avowed hawker of secondhand Infidel wares of the Walker type is given a prominent place among the agitators. Everybody knows what the motive of his hostility to the Sabbath of the Bible is, and his appearance in the field is properly regarded as an attempt to advertise himself and his business. Our own efforts have been anxiously directed to the preservation of a reverential attitude in the discussion, and above all things to prevent it from getting into the hands of charlatans and coxcombs. The movement is ostensibly set on foot for the benefit of the working classes, and it is most undesirable that they should be led to regard it in an irreligious spirit, or as a covert attack upon Christianity. As long as they have the arguments and opinions of men like Bishop Moorhouse and the Rev. Chas. Strong to guide and inform their efforts, there is no danger of such a catastrophe. Christians of the type that are rapidly bringing Christianity to mingle itself in the sisterly embrace of Philosophy, may be safely trusted to expose the tricks of the sophisters and mountebanks who trade upon the ignorance of the masses, as Autolycus did upon the witless clowns and sheep boys of Bohemia. We do not want to have Mr. Thomas Walker gagged, because this is a free country, and every man has a right to talk as much nonsense as he can get his neighbors to swallow; but for goodness' sake let no one run away with the impression that Mr. Walker, who was a Spiritualist yesterday, is an Atheist to-day and may be a Jumper tomorrow, is in any way a recognised agent or spokesman for the Sunday Society.

In answer to the above charges and imputations, I, the same day, delivered the following reply at the *Age* office:—

To the Editor of the "Age."

SIR,—Since you admit you do not want to have me "*gagged*" because this is a free country," and I suppose your paper a portion of the "free press" guarding and procuring those principles of fair play, without which no country can be free, perhaps you will grant me space to reply to a leader of your to-day's issue. When I am compared to Autolycus who finally settled to the "profession" of a "rogue" because that was "the most profitable of all;" when I am called a "sort of Infidel Cheap John;" when I am accused of admitting that I am an impostor, and finally when it is urged that my motive in my "hostility to the Sabbath of the Bible" is only an attempt to advertise myself and my "business," which business you declare to be the hawking "of second hand infidel wares;" in common fairness I claim the right to be heard in my own defence, against these and your other accusations. Now in the first place, Mr. Editor, what warrant in fact have you for saying "Mr. Walker is only known as a sort of Infidel Cheap John, who carries about with him wherever he goes a wallet full of scraps of Voltaire, Volney and Tom [generally spelled-Thomas] Paine, and is prepared to prove to anybody who will listen to him that he was consulted at the making of Creation, and is perfectly familiar with all its secrets?" Surely you, who profess to be writing in the interest of morality, the Bible and the clergy, should not descend to the reckless utterance of such charges, unless you are well backed with the necessary proofs of them! To descend to such childish abuse as that just quoted is scarcely becoming the editorial dignity, and its silliness is exposed by yourself when a little later on you aver that I back myself to prove that there never was a "Creation" nor yet a "Creator" to consult with me. As to my "scraps" from the "Infidels" you have mentioned it may not be out of place to ask you when you poked your sagacious eye into my "wallet?" Am I right in surmising that you have been a regular attendant at all my lectures? If so, it is reprehensible of you to speak disrespectfully of the

ignorant "masses" upon whom such as I are reported to "trade." If not then how are you in a position to judge as to what "scraps" I use, or as to whether my "wares" are "second-hand" or original?

Because I was formerly a spiritualist and have had the manliness to "give it up" in more mature years, you charge me with positive dishonesty; call me a "renegade" because I advocate what now I am forced to accept by evidence as correct, and say that I admit that I am an impostor by teaching down the things that I once "taught up." If this method of reasoning be sound, it cuts the throat of every "converted christian." Not a single convert either from sin or heathenism, but preaches down what he once "taught up," to use your own expression. Paul becomes a self-admitted "impostor" because from being a persecutor of Christians, he accepted Christianity. Luther, Calvin, Knox, and all the reformers are admitted "impostors" because they preached down the "Romanism" which in earlier years they accepted and "taught up." Wesley was an "impostor" for like reasons. Gladstone is a self-admitted "impostor" because he altered his political views from Conservatism to Liberalism. Sir Robert Peel was a self-admitted impostor because from being an opponent of the Anti-corn-law agitation, he eventually announced his views as changed, and carried the wishes of the Anti-corn-law agitators into effect. Lord Beaconsfield was a self-admitted "impostor" for similar reasons. But why multiply examples. Is it not manifestly absurd to say that no change can be made honestly, and that all who alter or relinquish any of their views must necessarily be "charlatans"? And is it not a manly course to take, when you have discovered your mistakes, to announce them and to do all you can to get others out of them? Is he undeniably an "impostor" who takes this course? When neither Bishop Moorhouse nor the Rev. Chas. Strong will have their recent utterances contrasted, without complaining, with the Orthodoxy of their early youth, why should it be held a crime in me to modify my views in accordance with the growth of my intellect and the accumulation of evidence? And so far as your sneer about the possibility of my becoming a "jumper" to-morrow is concerned, permit me to say it will be time enough for you to complain on that score, when you discover me consorting in believing fellowship with the "jumpers." You may be a drunkard to-morrow for anything you or I can now prove to the contrary, but I shall not accuse you of being one until I have seen you drunk. Exercise then the same fairness to me.

I have never backed myself "to prove right off that there is no such Power" behind phenomena as that spoken of by Prof Tyndall. This is an unfair representation of my position. Behind phenomena I recognise the necessity for their substratum and whether this substratum be called "Power" or "Matter" or by any other name I do not now concern myself, but simply wish to record my protest against the assertion that I back myself to prove that no such "power" exists. If your meaning be that I deny the existence of "God," I again deny that this is untrue. The existence of "God" I neither affirm nor deny, since I contend that until the word is defined to me, it is unmeaning.

I fully admit that what Spencer, Huxley, and Tyndall cannot solve either to their own or the general satisfaction, it would be folly to expect me to finally settle. But if by this is meant that I have no right to hold or express an opinion on the matter, I join issue with you. If I have no right to hold and publicly express views upon unsettled questions, neither have the general clergy of Melbourne, for the same reasons. We are not all philosophers, nor bishops nor editors, but surely we have a right to our opinions and to the expression of them for all that! And if the truth were known, perhaps after all, you are not so opposed to my views as you now wish it publicly to appear, for I will undertake to quote from your leaders of the last two years expressions quite as heretical as any of my own, and which, if uttered by me, would have been called blasphemy and would consequently have received vigilant chastisement from your own pen.

It is customary, even to a criminal, to credit him with honesty until the charges brought against him are proved, and I therefore may justly complain that you discredit any honorable motives I may have in joining in the agitation for the opening of our Libraries and Museums on Sundays. To insinuate, nay, to positively declare that my motive in what I have done is simply "business" advertisement is mean beyond expression. Perhaps the knowledge that *some* editors and leader writers, write for pay, and just as they are "instructed," without any reference whatever to their honest convictions, may incline you to a warped judgment of the honesty of others and cause you to throw suspicion everywhere. Under these circumstances there would be some excuse for your charge, but otherwise there is none. Whatever you may say, I claim to be actuated by an honest love of the work I am doing, and I claim, as a citizen, my right to do it. What prescriptive right have you or the clergy to agitate for reforms? Why do you deny me, what you claim for the clergy and yourself in this respect? And although the movement is ostensibly set on foot for the good of the working men, by what virtue do you presume to declare yourselves the only friends the working men may have? By what authority do you call those "charlatans and coxcombs" who, whilst they differ from you on some points of theology, are yet anxious to see the reform in question carried out! Is it because it is an insult to Bishop Moorhouse and the Rev. Chas. Strong to have my name mentioned in the same breath with theirs? Without wishing to cast the slightest reflection on either of these justly honored names, I may ask who is to blame for the insult? I reply those narrow and bigoted individuals, who, in consequence of their intolerance, insist upon insulting these clergymen, because on this one

point at all events, I agree with them. They cannot help my agreement with them, neither can they help my expression of that agreement. And how can it be insulting to them, that I should agree with them? Evidently the insult is not offered by me but by those who persist in urging accusations against these prelates for what they can in no wise help. Then you should abuse these bigoted people, not me, for the insult you complain of. And in like manner if there be those who refuse to do good because there are those working for the same end and whom they dislike, and if there be others who will positively do harm because I am working for an admitted good, blame them, for the fault is theirs, not mine. I refuse to be the scape-goat of a pack of moral cowards and religious bigots. Either I have the right to do good or I have not. If I have I shall make use of the right, no matter who takes offence at it. If not, I want to know, why not? Those whom I represent are now by no means few, and they positively object to being ignored and insulted, when a movement is on foot in which they are admittedly interested. Their claim is just and would at any other time be readily conceded. They simply claim the rights of citizens to advocate for what they believe to be for their own and the general good. And when you, the clergy or any others insult or deny these rights, and rob them of what you yourselves enjoy, you become foes of liberty and act the part of tyrants.

I remain & c., Thomas Walker. Hawthorn, May 24th, 1883.

In place of the appearance of the above, the following was inserted in the "Notices to Correspondents:"—"We have received a letter from Mr. Thomas Walker vindicating his position before the public, but as we have no interest whatever in his views and do not recognise him as an authority on the subjects he handles, we cannot find space for it. Received.—' Please a Friend.' 'A Stanch Walkerite,' 'A Secularist.' * * * "

It will be seen that not only I, but others, had written and met with refusal of justice, because they had spoken in my defence. Again I replied by the following brief letter, which was not even acknowledged as received:—

To the Editor of the "Age."

SIR,—In your sub-leader of yesterday, you say you have no desire to "gag" me, yet in the very next issue you virtually admit you have done it; you refuse to publish my reply on the grounds that you take no interest in my views, and you do not regard me as an authority. If you have no interest in my views, why devote a leader to the abuse of them? Having taken so much interest, you certainly should take the further interest to grant the appearance of my defence. As to my being no "authority" on the subjects I treat upon, I have only to say, that has nothing to do with my claims. You have abused me and made charges which are untrue, I claim the right to refute these charges. If I am not an authority on my own views, I may be pardoned for saying neither are you. But this is a point for the public to decide. You have no moral right to "dub" me as you please and then to assume infallibility by denying me the right to reply. You have made accusations, I have replied, dare you leave the decision upon them to the public? This is all I ask.

Yours &c., Thomas Walker. Hawthorn, May 25th, 1883.

On the following Sunday I delivered a lecture to one of the largest audiences ever assembled in the Opera House, in reply to these newspaper calumniations. In the course of that lecture I stated it as a fact within my personal knowledge that more than one of the leader writers of the *Age* held views in close affinity with my own. By comparison of the leading articles of this paper, its lack of principle becomes self-evident, for in the course of a year almost every point of the compass is traversed from Atheism to Puritanism. Ostensibly a working-man's paper, it would appear that its only quality entitling it to that claim is its clap-trap and cheapness. From all appearances what it calls "the masses" in its columns, it calls "them asses" in its council chambers. So far as the writer (whom I have reason to believe is a Spiritualist) of the sub-leader above quoted is concerned, I need not mention further his lack of logical consistency. The fact that he talks about "the making" of "creation" is sufficient to display either his verbal redundancy or his want of clearness of thought, or as is most likely, both. And the fact that he should make it appear in one paragraph that I admit, what he says I deny in another, shows that his memory was too weak and his logic too flimsy to tide him through a single article. His unfairness, or folly, or both, are displayed by the fact that he presumes to gauge not only my abilities and moral proclivities, but my acquirements, without having heard me deliver half a dozen lectures in his life. Perhaps this is giving him credit for too much. It is more likely he has heard none. I do not wish to boast, but in self-defence, if it be needful any further, I may be excused for saying that to fill the Opera House Sunday after Sunday for nearly two years; to conduct several debates; to hold numerous week-night meetings; to secure 761 votes in the electorate of Richmond when contested by seven candidates, all men of wealth or political fame except myself; to receive the abuse of most of the clergy and that touchy old lady the *Age*, requires something more than a few "scraps" from three freethinkers. I mention these facts not egotistically, but to show the absurdity of the writer's criticism. Let me recommend a "scrap" from one of the writer's *own* authorities. He has

quoted Prof. Tyndall against me; now let me confront him with Tyndall's own words:—" Most heartily do I recognise and admire the spiritual radiance, if I may use the term, shed by religion on the minds and lives of many personally known to me. At the same time I cannot but observe how signally, as regards the production of anything beautiful, religion fails in other cases. Its professor and defender is sometimes at bottom a brawler and a clown. These differences depend upon primary distinctions of character, which religion does not remove. It may comfort some to know that there are amongst us many whom the gladiators of the pulpit would call 'Atheists' and 'Materialists,' whose lives, nevertheless, as tested by any accessible standard of morality would contrast more than favourably with the lives of those who seek to stamp them with this offensive brand. When I say 'offensive,' I refer simply to the intention of those who use such terms, and not because Atheism or Materialism, when compared with many of the notions ventilated in the columns of religions newspapers, has any particular offensiveness for me. If I wished to find men who are scrupulous in their adherence to engagements, whose words are their bonds, and to whom moral shiftiness of any kind is subjectively unknown; if I wanted a loving father, or faithful husband, an honorable neighbour, and a just citizen—I should seek him and find him among the band of 'Atheists' to which I refer. I have known some of the most pronounced among them, not only in life, but in death—seen them approaching with open eyes the inexorable goal, with no dread of a 'hangman's whip,' with no hope of a heavenly crown, and still as mindful of their duties, and as faithful in the discharge of them as if their eternal future depended upon their latest deeds."

I need say no more except to advise the writer of the criticised article to become more familiar with his own authorities.

At the conclusion of my lecture in reply, a vote was taken, and by a show of hands fully 3000 people designated the article as "unfair and cowardly." I now submit the *pros* and *cons* for the silent decision of the Melbourne public.

Thomas Walker.

Hawthorn,

May 29th, 1883.

THOS WALKER. Hawthorn, May 29th, 1883. PUBLISHED BY THE AUSTRALASIAN SECULAR ASSOCIATION. Offices: 108 Elizabeth Street. THOMAS WALKER, President. GEO. KEYSTON, Secretary. Member's Subscription—Ladies, 1s 6d-; Gentlemen, 2s-6d-; Families, 5s. per Quarter; paid in advance—Stephens, Printer, 106 Elizabeth Street, Melbourne.

The Bishop of Melbourne's Address

To his Church Assembly,

September, 1882.

Summary Of Subjects:

Salvation Army; Parish Guilds; Work of Clergy and Laity; Larrikinism; Popular Amusements; Lay Preaching; Duty of the Church to her Young Men; Sermons of the Clergy; Religion in State Schools.

Dunedin: Printed at the 'Daily Times' Office, High Street, Dunedin. MDCCCLXXXII.

The Inaugural Address.

The Bishop of Melbourne delivered his inaugural address, in which he said: —The Diocese of Sydney is now engaged in a most solemn and important duty. It is selecting the persons who are to be submitted first to the Bishops of New South Wales, and then to the Bishops of Australia, as those from whom our future primate is to be elected. You will, I am sure, join with me in the earnest prayer that all who are concerned in this great duty may be led to perform their part in it with a simple desire to promote the welfare of the Church and the glory of God. May God grant that the future Primate of Australia may be not less faithful to his Master and not less zealous in his office than the beloved and lamented Frederic Barker. I recently received from Mrs. Barker a printed account of the last days of her departed husband, and I am sure I need not apologise for repeating here one or two sentences of that touching and impressive statement. At a religious meeting which Bishop Barker attended a few weeks before his death, the verse, "To die is gain," was thus read, "To have died is gain." "The Bishop thanked the reader for reminding them of the true rendering, adding, Yes, to have died; death itself is no gain, it is the wages of sin; but to have died, to have passed through the grave and gate of death into the presence of Christ, that will be great gain." This firm confidence in the love and power of his Saviour accompanied him to the end. "After the last paralysing shock to his nervous system, he said, 41 think this shows I must not go back to Australia. I am perfectly composed. I am resting on the Rock—the Rock of Ages. As I

have had a second attack, there is no reason why I should not have a third—Ebenezer! It is good that a man should both hope and quietly wait." This was the prevailing frame of his mind to the end. His last audible word was "Ebenezer!" There is a divine store of help, he seemed to say, and hitherto, even up to the drawing of the last breath, "The Lord hath helped me." That is his parting testimony to us whom he loved, and remembered to the last. "Our men die well," said John Wesley. And that is no small thing; for no man can well be false when he is consciously passing into the presence of Eternal Truth. May God enable each of us to keep the like unswerving faith, and to deliver the like parting testimony. "Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his." I desire at the very beginning of this address to thank many generous laymen, and especially Mr. Ormond, whose noble offer gave us all so powerful a stimulus, for their liberal donations to our Cathedral Fund. The building, as you see, is rapidly progressing, and is already developing a chaste grandeur of form and a balanced fitness of details, which few of us had realised from an inspection of the rough plans which were at first laid before us. It is not, however, for the beauty and harmony of its design that we shall principally value it, but rather for those great spiritual uses to which we hope to make it subservient. As a school of preaching, of divinity, of sacred song, and as the natural centre of our Diocesan Services, Societies, and Organisation, it will supply a felt want, and stimulate, we trust, a larger and more effective activity. The mention of the Cathedral naturally suggests Trinity College, and the generous benefaction of Mr. Joseph Clarke, which has enabled us to proceed to the erection of much-needed additions to the building. Plans have been prepared on a comprehensive scale by Mr. Blackett, of Sydney. These, I believe, have given general satisfaction, and it is the first portion of this large design which we are now beginning to carry out. More and more, as I realise the work to be done in this colony, I become convinced that we must train our own clergy. Colonial youths understand the life of our people, and not only more readily conform to its conditions, but also more easily resist its temptations. It is to be confessed, however, that at present candidates for our theological scholarships are neither so numerous nor so well-prepared as we could desire. There must be many young men in Melbourne employed in various ways—as clerks especially—who, if they could procure efficient tuition without leaving their ordinary work, would gladly give themselves to the great work of the Ministry. The Warden of Trinity College and I held recently a consultation on this subject, and he has kindly promised to give such facilities as those to which I have referred, to any who may desire to enter upon preliminary study for holy orders. Mr. Leeper informs me that almost all the subjects of the Arts course are taught in the College, and that as the whole of the lecturing is done at night, men who are precluded by the nature of their occupation from attending University lectures, would receive all the assistance they need in preparing for examination. "The whole of the expense incurred in following such a course would be £20 a year, as Mr. Leeper generously offers to admit non-resident theological students to the College lectures at one-third of the ordinary charges. This £20 a year would cover University fees, College fees, and the cost of books, and would enable a young man to obtain a degree at the University without further expense. Mr. Leeper only stipulates that such students should show at a preliminary examination that they have knowledge and ability enough to make it probable that they will be able to obtain a degree. Of course the abler and better prepared of these students would gain our theological scholarships as they fell vacant, and so passing into residence would obtain the full advantage of College society and discipline. The offer of these great advantages is now made to the pious young churchmen of this diocese, and many, I trust, will be found to claim them at once. The terms are easy, and it is not impossible that promising students, who are too poor to bear even these light charges, may obtain some slight help from church funds. We have just held our Annual Meeting in connection with the Bishop of Melbourne's Fund, and I will only now remind you shortly of certain facts which were there set forth in detail. This is the only general fund of the diocese. If, therefore, any churchman fail to contribute to its support, he is practically ignoring his churchmanship, and acting simply as if he were a member of a small congregation. Again the contributions to this fund are all voluntary, so that if they be suffered to fail or fall short in any single year, the effect must be either a total abandonment of some of our work or a reduction of the stipends of 48 of our country clergy, and of 40—that is of the whole body—of our readers; a reduction, that is to say, of the stipends of those who can barely live and pay their way as matters now are. I have to congratulate you on the large increase to this fund which was exhibited by our last year's Report, and to beseech you to be unremitting in your endeavours to sustain, and, if possible, to augment that increase. This is far the most important of the funds in connection with our church, for any serious failure here would inflict a paralysing blow on the efficiency of our whole organisation. We have heard much of late about the doings at Home of the Salvation Army, and much, in spite of what may be good in that organisation, to cause sober Christians pain, and to make them anxious about its possible future. Doctrines are being taught which we cannot regard as scriptural. Excitement is being encouraged which is not healthy, which may lead to excess, and which must lead to re-action. Wild dances and wilder cries are permitted, which border on profanity. Midnight meetings of both sexes are encouraged, which must be fraught with danger. On all these accounts we cannot view the movement without the gravest misgivings. But when we remember the millions of working men and their families who are

living in secular animalism, without God in the world, it is impossible to say to earnest men give up your agitation, or even to condemn unconditionally measures which have attained some degree of success where we have failed. One thing, however, I can see plainly—that the ways of the Salvation Army are not our ways; that between the sweet, sober piety of the English Church and the unbridled excitement of the jumping, shouting crowds of converted roughs and "Hallelujah lasses," there is a great gulf fixed. We may pray God to help and guide them, and to deliver them from their too obvious dangers, but imitate them we cannot. At the same time, it is surely lawful and necessary to learn from them. Do they not teach us such lessons as these? The value of popular and emotional forms of address, of outward symbols and watchwords, of closer organisation and fellowship, of enlisting every individual in aggressive work; above all, of the power of prayer and praise, and of the holy enthusiasm kindled by these to touch with contagious force the torpid souls of the indifferent? Let us lay these lessons to heart, my brethren, and ask God to show us how we may best turn them to account within the limits of our own more sober, and, as I believe, more scriptural system. Bishop Thorold used words in his last charge as wise as they are stirring. "If we would not see the mass of the working people," he said, "hopelessly surrendered either to a gross animalism or a dismal unbelief, we must throw our prejudices to the winds, and organise a brotherhood of Christian workers, which, with simple creed, resolute purpose, real sacrifice, and fervent devotion, shall march under the church's banner, and preach her gospel for the salvation of souls to Christ." These words point to comprehensive organisation, and indicate, I believe, one of the great wants of our church. I would say to each parish clergyman—aim at supplying all the wants, and enlisting all the workers of your parish. The more works you start, the more workers you will want, and the more you will get. How often I have heard it said by energetic laymen—there is nothing for me to do in the Church of England. Why? Because nothing needs to be done. Ask your own conscience, my brethren. At the taking of the last census nearly 300,000 people—more than a third of our whole population—set themselves down as belonging to the Church of England. For the supply of the spiritual wants of these we are clearly responsible. But is there one of us who thinks that we are approaching to an efficient discharge of this duty? Let each parish clergyman say to himself—One-third of the people here (such is the average) declare that they belong to me. What are their wants, then, for body and soul? What are the needs of parents, of children, of young men, of young women? How can I supply to all these classes relief in distress, institutions for the promotion of temperance and economy, amusement for their leisure, instruction for their intellect, food for their heart? By so much as I fall short of doing this I fall short of doing my duty. I do not like to speak of my own experience, brethren; but I may mention, for the encouragement of others, that when I was incumbent of St. John's, Fitzroy-square, with a population of 14,000 poor people, and without either parsonage or endowment, I found it possible to organise societies for all the objects I have named, and it was my experience that as I multiplied works, I increased workers, and stimulated zeal and confidence. What indeed can resist a body of men, warmed by mutual sympathy, encouraged by the sense of support, and animated by the feeling that they have got a grip of their whole task, and are by God's blessing mastering it? Let me just transcribe for you the account of what has been done by such comprehensive organisation at St. Alphege's, Southwark. Eight years ago the mission was started in one of the most abjectly destitute parts of London, and in five years it had collected a congregation of more than 1000 souls, with from 300 to 400 communicants. The incumbent describes his work as follows:—"Every hour of the day, from 6 in the morning till 11 at night, is either taken up in cheering the hearts of weary workers or in seeking the careless, or in consoling, encouraging, and rebuking such as have been brought to God. There is the daily supervision of our Training College, our College Schools, National Schools, Boys' Home, Children's Kitchen, Creche, District Visitors' Work, Clubs, Bible Classes—(I have between 300 and 400 men and women attending my two classes),—accounts of moneys received and paid, &c. Yet in the spiritual work there is happiness, and encouragement and pleasure in the temporal." So much may be done by comprehensive organisation. Amongst the various institutions for the organisation of lay help, guilds in many parishes are taking a prominent place. Some of our old friends here may possibly have to get over a natural prejudice against the word "guild." It has a mediaeval sound, which seems to connect it in some way with the Roman Church. The association, however, is misleading. It comes from an Anglo-Saxon word meaning "to pay;" because the original Saxon guilds of 10 families contributed to a common guarantee fund intended to pay the legal fines which might be incurred by any of their criminous, members. Hence merchant guilds, with their guild-halls; and hence, too, ecclesiastical guilds. The word is better than "club," which would carry misleading associations, but it is not far from being the ecclesiastical equivalent of that word. A parochial guild has this great advantage—it gathers into a felt and recognised unity, with all the concomitant advantages of sympathy, close friendship, and the inspiration of members, persons who, engaged in separate parochial labours, might never get beyond individualism, with its isolation, caprices, and tendency to ebbing energy and interest. Again, it finds a home and furnishes direction to young people who have few, if any, friends to encourage them in holy living and working. Its bond of union is commonly the promise to lead a godly life, and to seek help to this end in regular worship and attendance at Holy Communion. Its work embraces choir duties, night schools, Sunday

schools, youths' clubs, sewing classes, mothers' meetings, Bible classes, and visiting those who stand in need of visitation, as the sick and needy, the parents of school children, the unconfirmed, those lately confirmed, families visited by death, hospitals, gaols, workhouses, and penitentiaries. Members of guilds also employ themselves in getting up concerts and readings for the poor, in managing burial clubs, clothing clubs, book clubs, and penny banks; as also in organising meetings for the promotion of good works, and in attending and speaking at such meetings, and last, not least, in endeavouring to procure work for fellow-guildsmen, for penitent women, and for godly people who have fallen into distress. I have been thus particular in specifying various kinds of work, because I have found that people in these colonies have been deterred from forming guilds by ignorance of their possible objects. A word upon amusements is naturally suggested by such an enumeration of good works as that which I have just made. The question of popular amusements seems to me, in the presence of our continually increasing larrikinism, one of the greatest urgency. It is not to be solved by silly declamation and furious puritanical abuse of every one who tries to make our amusements a little more reasonable and elevating. I have formerly expressed the opinion that our people devote far too much of their time and money to the pursuit of pleasure, and I have seen no reason since then, I am sorry to say, to alter my opinion. But we shall not improve the people's amusement by simply cursing them, and passing by on the other side. "The question is," says Karl Hillebrand, "how to employ the leisure hours of uneducated and half-educated people who must always remain such." It is clearly a difficult question, and one which, with the shortening of the hours of labour, is becoming more difficult every day. We may possibly attract the *elite* of our workmen into Working Men's Colleges, Church Guilds, and Christian Young Men's Societies. But what of the great mass who can find pleasure neither in reading nor thinking, and what, moreover, of the large number of married workmen who cannot satisfy themselves with the pure and quiet pleasures of home? Karl Hillebrand suggests "some kind of secondary employment, which shall bring in some small profit, and shall not be fatiguing." In Sheffield, in my early days, large numbers of workmen were kept from the public-houses, and greatly improved both in health and pocket, by renting and cultivating small garden-plots on which they raised vegetables for household use, and grew the simple flowers of country gardens. I fear that Australians might object to the work which this healthy and humanising amusement might cost them, and that they will be found to prefer the spectacle of a game of cricket or football. Could they, however, get over their first disinclination, I am persuaded that they would find both health and pleasure in garden work. Music is attractive to the population of a sunny land like ours, and I would suggest to the clergy that young men who care nothing for study are often found to take pleasure in concerted music, and readily join brass bands, string bands, or drum and fife bands, which meet for practice in school buildings. Mr. Gosman recently suggested that a volunteer cadet corps might be organised in different neighbourhoods for rifle practice and drill, and I certainly cannot see why the rifle-butts and the drill-ground should not prove as attractive in our time as did the archery-butts on the village green in the days of our forefathers. There is use as well as amusement in such exercises as these, and young men would be sensible of this, and find in it a stimulus to perseverance. Again, for older men, parochial clubs are often found to be useful. I once furnished some rooms for such a purpose, which included billiard-rooms, refreshment bar for coffee and tea, large reading-hall, and rooms for the meetings of sick and benefit societies. Smoking was allowed, and we soon nearly emptied some of the drinking places, and were heartily thanked by the wives of working men for preserving the health and substance of their husbands, and for sending them home in their right mind, and with their wages in their pocket. The mention of my own club reminds me of the care taken to promote harmless amusements in the parish of St. Peter's, London Docks. You will remember, perhaps, what a wonderful work was done there, how all the people were made to love the church, how 500 communicants were gathered from amongst one of the lowest populations in London, and how the clergy could say at last of a district which had been a sink of impurity, "not only has open professional sin been swept away from the streets of St. Peter's; but, besides, there is not one known house of ill-fame in the whole parish"—though such places swarmed round all its borders. It is interesting to ask how men who achieve such results dealt with the question of amusement. Here is their account of it:—"In the evening the men fill the new schoolroom, smoking, reading, playing bagatelle (there are two good tables) or skittles, or racing in the running-ground outside. On Wednesday evenings the desks are cleared, and the neighbours pour in for the weekly concert, which once a month resolves itself into a ball. The drum and fife band practices twice a week, as also the stringed-instrument band. In the winter there are all sorts of things going on—theatricals, nigger entertainments; anything to keep them out of the public-houses and out of the streets." The lads' club, which devoted itself principally to athletics, was under the superintendence of a paid officer, known as the "chucker out," and, says the author of the account from which I am quoting, "No boys' club in the east of London can possibly exist without such a functionary." There is one passage more in connection with these entertainments which I must transcribe for you, lest any one should imagine that the conduct of such amusements is easy or without sore trials:—"Those who have had to do with this sort of thing will know something of the disappointments, rebellions, discouragements, ingratitude, and failures, that have to be patiently borne with and

triumphed over. . . Perseverance is the secret of success in such work, of course, under the blessing of God. We hear much of the success of the modern church movement in England; but do we consider enough the price paid for it—the energy, courage, patience, and dogged determination required in order to secure it? That is the way, depend upon it, and the only way, to conquer Melbourne larrikinism and to sanctify the overwhelming wild energy, which boils over in its excesses. Who has greatness of heart enough to try it on a large scale? I turn next to the subject of Sunday-schools. The clergy, especially in country districts, can very seldom teach in the Sunday-schools. If, therefore, they fail to give instruction to the teachers, their influence of a didactic kind can scarcely be said to reach the minds of the children at all. For this and other reasons I say unhesitatingly, that there should be no parish in the diocese without a Sunday-school teachers' class, conducted by the clergyman. Many indirect advantages are secured by the holding of such a class. Opportunity is afforded to the clergyman for answering questions, for discussing difficulties of practical management, for deepening sympathy between himself and his fellow-labourers, and for drawing closer the bond of brotherly feeling between those who are actively labouring for the spread of Christ's kingdom. I observe (from returns made to the Sunday-school Association) that in some cases teachers' classes have been started, and then abandoned for lack of attendance. Was care always taken, I wonder, in these cases to make the class interesting? Nothing can succeed which is allowed to drop into a monotonous uniformity. I would suggest, then, that the ordinary routine of Scriptural exposition might, with advantage, be interrupted from time to time by a social meeting, where, with the help of music, bright talk, and perhaps with one or two short pithy addresses, the teachers might spend a pleasant evening, and realise the fact that Christian brotherhood meant something more than mere community of labour. Again, if I may judge from my own early experience, it would add greatly both to the interest of such meetings, and to the love of their members for the church of their fathers, if from time to time the clergyman would give a short course of lessons on the church's manual of devotion, the Book of Common Prayer. I believe there is not one churchman in a hundred who has carefully considered either the history or the composition of those prayers and praises which he takes into his lips every Sunday. Unconsciously, perhaps, we feel the elevation of their thought, and the charm of their exquisite language, but how little do we ordinarily realise of the variety, the profundity, the comprehensiveness of their petitions, of the dominant purpose of worship which determines their arrangement, or of the solemn and tender associations which cluster round their origin and history. From Freeman and Palmer and Proctor, all this might be easily learnt, and be made, with care and pains, both a means of profit and a source of the deepest interest. A respected clergyman of this diocese, whose name were I at liberty to mention it would lend great weight to his judgment, stated recently "that eight out of ten male scholars leave school about 15, unconfirmed, and never go any more, either to church or Sunday-school." Such an experience as this can scarcely be general; but if even it be not uncommon, is it not one of the most terrible facts with which we could be confronted? Does it not mean that the church is largely losing her young men, and that she ought to stick at no sacrifice and no toil to stop so fatal a leakage? To some of the subjects of a Bishop's address you might be disposed, perhaps, to give but a perfunctory attention, but the man who fails to give his best thought to a fact of this gravity, proves himself, *ipso facto*, to have no real case either for the Master whom he serves, or the church to which he belongs. Why, then, let us ask, do so many of our boys drift away from church on leaving school? This is a wide question, and one which may not admit of a simple answer, seeing that the causes in operation are many and diverse. People point to the prevailing scepticism, the precocity of our youths, their spurious independence arising from defect of home influence, and the attractions of outdoor life in a genial climate. No doubt each of these causes has its influence. But surely we cannot say that a youth is specially sceptical who has for years attended a Sunday-school class, where he has received intelligent instruction. Surely, again, if he resisted the snares of spurious independence till he was 15 years of age, we are not to suppose a sudden access of that infirmity in all cases. What, then, is the last straw which breaks the camel's back? Suppose it to be granted that a youth has been tugging for some time at the elastic band of mingled duty and affection which bound him to the church, what stimulates those final desperate efforts by which he breaks it? More than one thing, perhaps, again. Still, let us try to discover those circumstances which are likely to have had most influence. With growing years there is in every boy a double development—of will and of intellect. The expanding intellect demands enlargement and satisfaction. New questions are arising in the soul, and a quickening curiosity to explore unknown realms of thought and knowledge. Is provision generally made in our Sunday-schools to meet this need? We talk about wanting employment for our laity. Well let me ask this, and let me ask it of my lay brethren who are just as much bound to extend the kingdom of Christ, according to their opportunities, as I am:—Are our most intelligent laymen ready, first, either to build separate class rooms for adult scholars, or to take classes of such to their own houses for instruction? and secondly, are such laymen ready, nay anxious, to make such a book as Farrar's *History of St. Paul*, the basis of study for advanced lessons, or to give such instruction in the wonders of God's works as shall naturally lead the mind of an intelligent youth to the Divine Creator of all that is good and beautiful, supplementing such lessons, as occasion shall serve, by trips of a semi-scientific character to the habitat of a

plant, or the exposure of a geologic formation? No one can conceive the blessedness and the blessing of such work as this, unless he has attempted it. But besides the growth of understanding in boys, there is, as I have said, a development of will, of the sense of self-dependence and personal dignity, which must to a certain extent be respected. Now, how does the church try to meet this? I believe that as a rule it does not try at all, and so necessarily does harm. Young men, like young nations, are very sensitive. They suspect that their youth may be despised, and are constantly on the watch for signs which may justify such a suspicion. Hence, the necessity for great and even tender consideration on the part of their elders. Now, there are many boys in the senior classes of our Sunday-schools, whose parents do not attend church. Consequently they have no seats provided for them, apart from the school, even if they desire to continue their attendance. They have grown too old to relish the company of little boys, and if they separate themselves from the school they find themselves thrust into corners, and treated as if they were of small account—the very thing which provokes their developing manhood to dislike and resistance. You may say, perhaps, that this is a necessary result of our pew system, and that on the whole it is not desirable to abandon that system. I am certainly not prepared to advise its abandonment at present, but this I do say most emphatically, that if we keep the pew system, free pews should be reserved in a good place—pews just like the others in appearance, for the elder scholars of our Sunday-schools. Vestrymen, I know, sometimes talk about loss of funds, but even on this low ground—and it is so low as to be almost beneath consideration, when regard is had to the interests involved—can it be good policy to drive away from church, at the most susceptible period of their life, those who, if loved and cared for, would become our best and most valuable supporters? I do hope that at least in this respect we shall endeavour to reform our treatment of elder scholars. In connection with this subject, I would just repeat the suggestion which I have offered once before, that a very strenuous effort be made to keep together, by classes, occasional services, or other means, those who have recently been confirmed. The season of confirmation I always found to be the parish priest's best opportunity. Hearts are then tender, minds have been recently exercised upon subjects of sacred interest, and if only the good intentions of that time can be developed into fixed and steady purpose, I believe that hundreds of souls now suffered to drift away into worldliness, might be secured for Christ and for heaven. I have suggested what I think to be best in regard to the elder scholars. It would seem, however, to be very desirable in town parishes where effective lay-assistance is procurable, and where church accommodation is scanty, to endeavour to organise special services for the younger of the Sunday-school children. In my last London parish there was a service of this kind every Sunday morning. It offers special advantages. The service can be shorter, and it can be brightened with hymns specially suitable for children, and sung at shorter intervals than would be desirable in the ordinary service. The addresses, to, might be specially adapted to the wants and capacity of the young hearers, might be largely interspersed with appropriate anecdotes, and above all be made short and telling. Should the clergyman, perhaps, feel that in this way he was shut out from the opportunity of giving Sunday instruction to the younger members of his flock, he can easily remedy this, by catechising the children in church once a month at an afternoon service. I believe that he would thus give them more effective instruction than by taking them to church every Sunday to listen to sermons wholly unsuitable to their age and capacity. Laymen would of course naturally take the ordinary children's services. And I must say that the circumstances of the present day seem to call, in general, for a considerable extension of the prophetic office in the church. A Bishop of Manchester observed, in his sermon before the Church Congress at Newcastle, "Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, Teachers—these are the needs of the church to-day. Priests, possibly, for quiet ordinary times, but prophets for crises. And if anyone cannot see that the church is passing through a crisis now—fiercer, sharper, more intense than any which has tried her for generations—he cannot read the most obvious signs of this time. But now whence are we to obtain any great access of prophetic power to deal with that great crisis which is upon us? Partly, I cannot doubt, from an extension of lay preaching. In order to prevent misunderstanding, I beg you to observe that in what follows I refer to the work of lay preachers who shall not receive any regular stipend, who shall not leave their ordinary secular calling, and who, although appointed to a distinct position in the church, may at any time retire from it. There can be little doubt, I think, that the prophetic ministry was more frequently exercised by laymen in the early church than it has been in later days. Most of you are perhaps aware that Origen, a layman, was invited by two Bishops to preach at Cæsarea, and that although what was done was objected to by Demetrius of Alexandria, it was not on the ground that a layman could not preach, but only because he should not have been asked to do so in the presence of Bishops. Even this was not granted by the two inculpated prelates, who affirm in answering the charge, that "wheresoever there are found those qualified to benefit the brethren, these are exhorted by the holy Bishops to address the people." This testimony is confirmed by the apostolical constitutions, which enact (viii., 22), "Let him that teaches, although he be one of the laity, yet if he be skilful in the word and grave in his manners, teach, for they shall all be taught of God." Such was the custom early in the third century. Subsequently this liberty of prophesying was somewhat restricted, but still, as late as the 5th century, we find among the canons of the fourth council of Carthage, canons subscribed by St. Augustine, the following:—" *Laicus proesentibus clericis,*

nisi ipsis jubentibus, docere not audeat We may clearly infer from this, that the laity might teach when the clergy were absent; and, with their consent, even when they were present. It is perhaps worthy of notice also, that the same council admit by implication that women might teach, not members of their own sex only, but men also, so long as they did not teach in the public assemblies. The words are "*Mulier, quamvis docta et sancta, viros in conventu docere non pcesumat.*" Such teaching as that of Miss Marsh, and, indeed, of most of our female evangelists, would fall within the lines which are marked as permitted by this canon. The only authoritative utterance of our own church on the subject of lay preaching is to be found in the 23rd article. These two points are to be noted. We observe, first, that the prohibition of the article extends only to ministering in the congregation; that is, in the parish church. To this prohibition, the Puritans objected at the Hampton-court Conference that it was not rigid enough, implying, as it plainly did, the lawfulness of lay ministration and preaching when it was not in the congregation. We notice in the second place, that even in the congregation the prohibition extends only to those who are not "chosen and called to the work by men who have public authority given unto them in the congregation to call and send ministers into the Lord's vineyard." Thus it is clear that any Bishop may, if he pleases, as Bishop Perry did, give authority to laymen to preach in the congregation in the absence of the parish clergyman. Hitherto that authority has been given only in the form of a license, probably because no service has been provided by the church for the setting apart of such lay ministers. This would seem, however, to have been rather by oversight than by intention, for the Act 3, Edward VI., provides that "the ordination services to be drawn up by six prelates and six other men of this realm, shall include Archbishops, Bishops, Priests, and Deacons, and other ministers of the church." Having regard, I suppose, to this intention, definite steps have been taken by some Bishops in England towards supplying this want. In 1805 the Lower House of Convocation passed the following resolution:—"That this house, recognising the importance of encouraging lay agency, is of opinion that the spiritual wants of the church would be most effectually met by the constitution of a distinct office such as that of sub-deacon or reader, as auxiliary to the sacred ministry of the church." In the following year (1866) the Bishops of both provinces, at a meeting held under the Presidency of Archbishop Langley on Ascension Day, "passed a series of most important resolutions, sanctioning and encouraging the employment of duly appointed lay-readers." I do not possess a copy of those resolutions, but upon the question of commission and formal setting apart, I find that last year Archbishop Tait recommended, in accordance with the resolutions of 1866, "that when suitable men have come forward and been approved, they should receive, as in London, a formal commission from the Bishop, with such religious service as may deepen in their minds a sense of the responsibility of the position on which they are entering, and may be the instrument of calling down God's blessing on their labours." Such a commission exists in the diocese of London, and one has recently been issued in the diocese of Durham. You will observe that in the passage quoted above, the Archbishop uses the words "when a man has been approved." He explains his meaning in a subsequent part of the same letter thus—"There seems to be nothing to prevent each Bishop from requiring a test of fitness, and arranging for those who can avail themselves of it some suitable course of instruction, by which busy men may be assisted in preparation for such work without an undue interference with the claims of their ordinary secular callings." Courses of instruction have already been provided for such lay candidates both at St. Paul's Cathedral, London, and at Keble College, Oxford. I am sure that amongst the canons of our own Cathedral there are those who would be as willing as they are able to deliver courses of lectures to candidates for the lay commission on such subjects as the following:—"Biblical Exposition", "Dogmatic Theology," "Homiletics and Pastoral Theology." Such lectures would not necessarily require in the student the knowledge of any language but English, and would be followed by an examination. I do not think that the time is ripe for the consideration of a change in the designation of such lay ministers. The title of sub-deacon has been proposed, but to this there are several objections. The ancient sub-deacons were rather vergers and sacristans than teachers, and their orders were indelible. The title "reader" has been appropriated in this diocese to laymen, who having left their ordinary calling, receive a stipend, and practically perform the office of pastor as well as teacher in their several charges. I incline myself to the apostolical title, "Teacher." This word would exactly describe the function to be performed on its prophetic side, and would mark the fact that it did not include the pastoral office. Such a title would no more exclude the reading of the service than does the title "reader" the preaching of sermons. This question, however, must be dealt with, I think, by the General Synod. It is enough for the present to use the title "Honorary Reader." And after all, it is not so much the name, as the thing, which is of highest importance. We must all recognise the fact that the number is increasing of pious laymen, whose general education is at least equal to that of the clergy, who are often good and practised speakers, and who are admirably qualified by their zeal and ability to supplement the work of the clergy in preaching the gospel. The church needs their help, and I now give notice that I shall be ready to set apart to their office with a solemn service, and to issue an appropriate commission to all honorary readers who, being nominated by a clergyman, shall pass the elementary examination to which I have before referred. I will here barely mention, what nevertheless I deeply feel, that we have done scarcely anything yet in

this diocese to organise the spiritual work of women. I was delighted to assist recently at the inauguration of the Girls' Friendly Society, and I would earnestly commend its work to the support of my brethren the clergy. It has had a wonderful success in England, and only needs loving and prayerful attention to attain a similar measure of influence among ourselves. At the same time, I think we need something more than societies for the help of the friendless. We need some organisation for workers, especially for such as feel a disposition to consecrate their whole time to Christian labours. A deaconess' institution, which should secure to ladies who feel that they have a vocation for spiritual work, shelter, companionship, and direction, could, I believe, secure to us valuable help which is now lost. In such institutions much might be done to deepen and develop that power of direct, simple, religious appeal which is peculiar to women, and has given to some of them such wonderful influence as teachers. There can be no doubt, however, that for the exercise of her prophetic function the church must depend principally upon the preaching of her clergy. And, my reverend brethren, how should the knowledge of this fact quicken our desires and our efforts to meet that terrible crisis of which the Bishop of Manchester has warned us by the best energy of our heart and intellect. During the past year a rather remarkable criticism of modern preaching was published by one who wishes us well—Professor Mahaffy. We may learn much, no doubt, from so thoughtful a book, but its chief effect upon me, I confess, was to reveal the great difficulty of the question, even on its intellectual side. The preacher, we are told, should have abundant intellectual culture to give variety to his thoughts, and yet should be careful not to launch out into critical or scientific topics in his sermons. He should not be too logical, and he should not be too emotional. He should be strongly and healthily dogmatic, and yet he should avoid dogmatism on points where public opinion will not sustain him, as on such subjects as eternal punishment and divine decrees. He is to study variety of matter and form, and yet is to avoid all excess of variety. "If he employs anecdotes, and descends to particulars in order to give colour to his sermons, he is thought familiar; if he keeps to dogma only, he is thought too dry." "Nothing," we are told, "displeases our people more than having their traditional religion questioned." There is a powerful society, we are reminded, which cares not to be disturbed, which hates to be alarmed, and which desires little more from the pulpit than a confirmation of its prejudices. And yet, on the other hand, it is not to be forgotten that "no man will be great as a teacher who is felt to be avoiding the burning topics of the day," or who, "keeping within the bounds set him by the theological public, takes no lead in the march of opinion." Nothing is more certain than that "the so-called safe men in a church are among the surest causes of its decay." One rises from the perusal of such a criticism with an almost comic sense of the hopelessness of getting any practical direction from it. One thing only is very clear, that if the critic changed places with the preacher, and gave no more certain sound than his book gives, he would soon be left to preach to empty benches. It can be surely matter of little astonishment to find that the book ends with a recommendation that preaching should be a luxury seldom indulged in, and then principally by men of special aptitude, who by constant iteration can safely preach over and over again the few good sermons which are alone worth delivering. I do not wish to find fault with much that is excellently said in this essay, and I think that we all may get valuable hints from it. At the same time I venture to say that it will be a bad day for the Christian church when the majority of her ministers give up preaching the everlasting gospel. It may be well to have an authoritative selection of the very best sermons for the use of those who have little talent and less time for this sort of effort. But I am sure that the use of such sermons should be the exception and not the rule, unless indeed the minister is to sink into a mere machine, and to lose touch of the spiritual life of his people. No doubt it is very desirable that we should all seek to improve our sermons. And if I were asked what I think to be principally lacking in them, I should say painstaking. What we all need is more soul-travail, more prayer to God for the patience and industry, which by large reading and close examination of God's word and the heart of man, can climb at last to so lofty a point of view—so towering a Darien-peak—that we can catch the vision of broad oceans of truth, and feel the quickening breath of new islands of hope, not too far off in the distance. It is only the delight of such visions of truth which can quicken within us the longing to tell others what we have found, and can wing our words with something like life and eloquence. You cannot manufacture true eloquence. Rhetoric, with a bright glitter in it which shall dazzle thoughtless eyes, you may manufacture. But it will be good for nothing if it cover only dry secularity or vacant platitudes. It will stir no one, shame no one, open no hearts, alter no lives. Truth with life in it, truth seen and grasped and loved as something above one, as a light from the Eternal, destined to throw its healing beams into the darkness of lost lives; that is the only thing which can inspire true eloquence. Again, suffer me to remind you, my reverend brethren, that if we would make our sermons effective, we must take as much pains in the expression of truth as in the pursuit thereof. Give me something to say, cries the fluent man, and I want no more. Yes you do!—you want self-control enough to set limits to your fluency, which, if it be suffered to run over, will so dilute the truth with mere flux of words as to rob it of all smiting force. We must try to preserve to the thought all its native keenness of edge; for it is only by hurling it thus against the woolly indifference of the worldly mind that you can cut a way for it through this all but impenetrable medium. Long talking is not a praise but a reproach to a man, unless the subject of his thoughts be such that with all his efforts he cannot get his thoughts said

adequately in fewer words. Yes, infinite painstaking; mental toil that shall tire us worse than a manual labourer ever could be tired, that is what we need. Is any of us thinking perhaps of throwing away his manuscript? That is a perilous thing for a young man to do, unless indeed he be sent to minister to very ignorant people. But if you will throw away your manuscript, then prepare for intenser toil than when you had it. For unless you would fail, you must be just as accurate, just as concise, just as careful to put nothing but fresh natural colouring into your metaphors, as when you had your book. I have dwelt on this matter at length because there are so many mistakes about it. Some men, who ought to know better, refuse to reveal all the pains they take in order to get the empty praise of superior powers, as if their painstaking were not infinitely more to their credit than powers of any sort could be. Others, again, talk about trusting to the guidance of the Spirit, as if the Spirit could ever guide a man into idleness or into neglect of the uttermost improvement of both thought and vehicle of which he was capable. If some of those people who talk about trusting to the Spirit could only hear themselves; could only realise the feebleness, confusion, and insupportable tediousness which make up the result, they would scarcely be impious enough to attribute such causes to the Spirit of God. If, my brethren, when we have done our best and uttermost, we consciously fail, as alas ! too often we do, then it may well be that there was lacking to us that hearty prayer to God, to lift up our spirit into enthusiastic love of souls, and desire to glorify our Redeemer, which can alone give the tongue of fire to the most careful preparation. Within the last year a new movement has been set on foot to secure Bible reading in state schools. It is entirely a layman's movement. It began in South Australia, and has there obtained a wonderful success. Gradually it spread across our western border to Warrnambool and Geelong; and the other day some members of the committees of those western towns called together the ministers of Protestant denominations in Melbourne, to listen to several proposals. It seems not unlikely that this agitation among our pious laity may spread. It is very little that I can say about this new league at present. But in view of possible discussions I desire to set down here some conclusions which have been already established, and some principles which are, I believe, as certain as death. First, it has been proved that at least 100,000 children in Victoria never enter a Sunday-school. It follows, from the mere fact, that these are amongst the worst or the worst-guided of our children. Those who keep away from our Sunday-schools need them most. Secondly, it has been shown to be impossible for the ministers of religion to undertake the task of religious teaching in state schools. Taken together, they number 703, while the number of instructors in public schools is 4 130. Of the 703 ministers, 172 are stationed in Melbourne and the suburbs, leaving the rest to do the hard, incessant work of the country districts. How can this small body of men, overworked already, add to their labour the tuition in sacred knowledge of children who require more than 1000 teachers? Thirdly, if the clergy could do the work, the conditions imposed by our act would insure failure. It requires a compulsory law to get our children into the day schools. And you ask us to induce children to remain voluntarily to be taught religion when they have been tired by the labours of the day. As things are, it would no doubt make little difference if even we were permitted to teach before school, but to require us to teach after school, is to make a demand which is simply ridiculous. At a recent meeting of the Public Teachers' Association at Adelaide, "the president stated that he had given notice three times in the West Adelaide school to the effect that he would read the Bible half an hour before school hours, but not a single child attended. He had also tried the experiment in the evening with the same result." Seldom, indeed, has such an effort proved even moderately successful, and it is absurd to put it gravely forward as a practicable measure. What is to be done, then, you will ask? Well, my friends, I will say at once that I believe we shall never have peace, either in the political world or in our own consciences, until some kind of elementary religious instruction is given in the state school by the teacher. I say this because I believe that it is impossible there should be any effective morality which is not based upon religion. I would ask any sober Theist who may doubt this to read and carefully study Professor Seeley's remarkable work on *Natural Religion*. The book takes as its motto Wordsworth's words, "We live by admiration," and it shows that nothing good ever was done, or can be done, in poetry, in art, or in ethics, except by men who fix their eyes on something greater, nobler, and more beautiful than themselves. Try to make an artist by teaching him the rules of art. A pedant you may make in that way, but an artist, never. If he is to get the tenderness, the life, and the inspiration which appeal to human souls, which touch them, sweeten them, ennoble them, he must have his own spirit kindled and uplifted by a beauty, grandeur, a solemnity in nature which he feels to be infinitely admirable, and infinitely beyond and above him. It is so in morals. Try to form a good or great character by teaching rules of morality. You may create a Pharisee or a Philistine by that method—a man "who is pure, as the dead dry land is pure"—but a large, noble, affluent, influential soul, never. Men can only be lifted into higher moods and motives by in tensest worship of what is seen to be infinitely good, and infinitely beyond and above them—in a word, by religion. The enlightened Theist must be just as certain of this as the most devoted Christian. To try to form character or improve conduct (the great end of life) without religion, is the wildest and stupidest dream which ever misled the fanatic or the visionary. There are some things in education of which I am doubtful. Of this I am as certain as I am of my own existence. Miss Francis Power Cobbe is at least no bigot, and what does she say of the future of

a life without God? "I honestly think," she observes, "that the process of making atheists, trained as such into philanthropists, will be but rarely achieved. And I venture to propound the question to those who point to admirable living examples of Atheistic or Comtist philanthropy, how many of these have passed through the earlier stage of morality as believers in God, and with all the aid which prayer and faith and hope could give them? That they remain actively benevolent, having advanced so far, is (as I have shown) to be anticipated. But will their children stand where they stand now? We are yet obeying the great impetus of religion, and running along the rails laid down by our forefathers. Shall we continue in the same course when that impetus has stopped, and we have left the rails altogether? I fear me not. In brief, I think the outlook of atheism, as a moral educator, as black as need be." "If," says Professor Naviile, "there is a man on earth who ought to fall on both knees and shed burning tears of gratitude, it is the man who believes himself an atheist, and who has received from Providence so keen a taste for what is noble and pure, and so strong an aversion for evil, that his sense of duty remains firm even when it has lost all its supports." Now secularism is practical atheism. The man who never thinks of God lives really without Him. And what, then, is likely to be the future of those 100,000 children, nearly the half of our children of school age, who never hear about God at all? We know what their homes are. The mere fact of their absence from Sunday-school tells us this. You know what are the special temptations of youth, and you know, I suppose, that some of the most attractive and sensational literature of the day is little else than a Satanic irritation of the strongest and most destructive passions of our nature. Well, then, here is a child, who has never been taught to think of any obligations to God, turned loose in the midst of this literature to choose for himself. Tell me, as an honest man, whether you think the power to read under these circumstances a blessing or a curse. For my part, I say at once, that to call our present reading, writing, and arithmetic business an education is nothing better than a cruel jest. So strongly do I feel this, that at times when I see the fresh young creatures swarming out of the doors of our schools, a dull heavy pain settles over my heart which I can hardly master. I want to help them, and I cannot. I see them launched upon the down-hill road to selfishness and misery, and I cannot stop them. So far as words are concerned I have done my best for them, and done it vainly. I cannot persuade their parents that they are passing them through the fire to the Moloch of immorality, and I can only pray that laymen who see clearly what I see may be more successful. Do you believe these things, my friends? If you do, the question is as good as settled, for then you will meet others with the determination to arrive at an agreement, and to get religious morality taught in some form in our state schools. If, however, you do not believe what I have said—if you think that to teach our children to read and form letters is education, and that you can make men moral by telling them to be so, or by leaving them to the chance influences of life—then it is useless to attempt anything, for excuses are as plentiful as blackberries, and difficulties bristle round us at every step. In that case, things must be left to go on yet longer in the old bad way. More children must be sent into the world without a glimmering of religious principles, more bitter conflicts must be waged between politicians and churches, until at length, in the midst of a swelling tide of evils, men may be scared into trying to raise religious embankments when perhaps it is too late. Beware, however, I would say to politicians, how you arouse and exasperate conscience. It can shatter your parties as if they were egg-shells, and sweep aside your poor bickerings about "the meal-tub" (as Carlyle calls it), as if they were the disputes of children. For "the meal-tub" is a poor thing at the best, and 60 long as man the immortal dreams dreams of the infinite, of that which, under any name is more real to him than his own soul, you can never force him to give up his eternal birthright for a mess of pottage. Shame on him, death to him if you could—for the only sure foundation of order and happiness, in these days of royal assassination, reckless suicide, and cynical materialism, is to be found in that brotherhood of Christ which rests on the fatherhood of God.

Australasian Secular Association

Established, 1st August 1882.

Rules

Ordered to be Reprinted as Amended.

1883.

Name.

1. This Association is called "The Australasian Secular Association."

Acknowledgment.

2. The Provisional Committee appointed to draw up the Rules of the Australasian Secular Association has been guided by the Rules of the National Secular Society, the Eclectic Association of Victoria, and the Free

Discussion Society, and has made such alterations and additions as were deemed necessary.

Principles and Objects.

3. The objects of Secularism are to maintain the Principles and Rights Freethought, and to direct their application to the Secular improvement of mankind.

4. By the Principles of Freethought are meant the exercise of the understanding upon relevant facts, independently of every intimidation.

5. By the Rights of Freethought are meant the liberty of free criticism for the security of truth, and, the liberty of free publicity for the dissemination of truth.

6. Secularism relates to verifiable knowledge, and to actions, the issue of which can be tested by experience.

It declares that the promotion of human improvement and happiness is the highest duty, and that the test of morality is utility.

That human improvement and happiness cannot be effectually promoted without civil and religious liberty; and that, therefore, it is the duty of every individual to actively attack all barriers to equal freedom of thought and utterance for all, upon political, theological, and social subjects.

7. A Secularist is one who deduces his moral duties from considerations which pertain to human welfare, and who, practically recognising the above duties, devotes himself to the promotion of his own and the general good.

8. The objects of the Australasian Secular Association are to disseminate the above principles by every legitimate means in its power, the Formation of Branches and the Affiliation of Kindred Societies, and to secure concerted action throughout Australasia on all matters pertaining to the general good.

Membership.

9. Members may be either Active or Passive.

10. The Active List consists of those who do not object to the publication of their names as Members of this Association.

11. An Active Member's duty is to send, as often as possible, reliable reports, to the President or Secretary, of Special Events, Sermons, Lectures, or Publications affecting Secular Progress. He should also aid in the circulation of Secular Literature, and generally in the Freethought propaganda of his neighborhood. Where a local Society exists, he ought to belong to it, whether or not it be a Branch of this Association.

12. The Passive List consists of those whose position does not permit the publication of their names, except at the risk of serious injury. The knowledge of these names is to be confined to the Executive, and the members will be referral to only by initials.

13. It is earnestly requested that persons in an independent position will enroll themselves only as Active Members.

14. Member's Yearly Subscription shall be—For Adult Males, 10s.; for Ladies, 6s.; for persons under 18 years, 5s.; and for families, 20s., and shall be paid quarterly, half-yearly, or yearly, in advance. Persons may be admitted free on satisfying the Executive that they are unable to pay the subscription, and that they are doing good Secular work.

15. Any person who shall be nominated by a Member of the Association, or who shall sign a form of declaration, as hereinafter provided, and forward it to the Secretary, with not less than one quarter's subscription, may, in the discretion of the Executive, be admitted a Member of this Association. Should any candidate be not admitted, the subscription shall be returned.

16. Any Member more than six months in arrears may, provided due notice of his default shall have been sent to him, and disregarded by him, be erased from the Roll of Membership.

17. The Executive shall have power to expel any Member, but the Member so expelled shall have power to appeal to the next General Meeting of Members, or to a Special-General Meeting called for that purpose.

Meetings, Officers, &c.

18. The Executive Council shall consist of a President, three Vice-Presidents three Trustees, Secretary, Treasurer, Librarian, and twenty Members of Committee, nine of whom shall form a quorum.

19. The Executive Council and two Auditors shall be elected by ballot at the Annual Meeting; they shall hold office for one year, and be eligible for re-election, and shall be nominated verbally or in writing to the Secretary, with the consent of the nominee, not less than seven days prior to the Annual Meeting.

20. Any Member of the Executive Council absenting himself from three consecutive Meetings, without a satisfactory explanation, shall be deemed to have vacated his office: and any vacancy occurring, through resignation or otherwise, shall be filled at the next Ordinary Meeting of the Association.

21. The Executive Council Meetings, for the Election of Members and transacting Executive Business, shall be held each month.

22. The Ordinary General Meetings, for receiving contributions and transaction of general business, shall be held every quarter.

23. Annual Meetings, for receiving Committee's and Auditors' Reports and Balance Sheet, the Election of Officers, and transacting any other business that may be deemed of sufficient importance by a vote of the Meeting, shall be held at such times and places as the Council shall determine.

24. Special Meetings may be called by the Executive at any time.

25. The Executive shall call a Special Meeting upon a requisition, signed by not less than 50 Members, fourteen days prior to holding the Meeting, due notice of which Meeting shall be given by circular to every member not less than seven days prior to date of Meeting. No business, other than that of which due notice has been given, shall be transacted.

26. Rules shall in no case be adopted, altered, or rescinded, unless at a Special Meeting called for that purpose, and thereat carried by an absolute majority; and due notice of every new rule, alteration, or rule proposed to be rescinded, must be forwarded to the Secretary.

27. The Secretary shall keep minutes of the proceedings of all Meetings of the Association, and of all Meetings of the Council; keep all books, issue members' cards, receive and hand weekly to the Treasurer all monies, furnish quarterly financial statements, transact all correspondence, and hand over all books, papers, and monies of the Association in his possession, at the request of the Association.

28. The Treasurer shall pay in all monies received to the Bank of the Association weekly, and present the Bank Pass-books and Vouchers for all payments weekly to the Secretary, and to each yearly Meeting of the Association; and the Bank Passbooks made up to date to every Quarterly Meeting.

29. The property of the Association shall be vested in the Trustees of the Association.

30. All payments shall be made by cheque, signed by the Treasurer, and three Trustees.

31. When convening the Annual Meeting, the Secretary shall issue a circular epitomising the year's proceedings for the information of Members generally.

32. At every Meeting of the Association, the President, or one of the Vice Presidents, shall take the chair, or, in their absence, a Chairman shall be elected, and he shall regulate the proceedings, decide questions, keep order, and carry into effect all the rules of the Association. His decision in all disputes shall be final, and he may always exercise, at his discretion, his right to vote.

33. The Secretary shall be paid a salary fixed by the Association.

34. The Treasurer shall be paid a salary of 1s. per year.

35. The Executive Council, subject to the ratification of the Association, shall, when possible, engage a Lecturer, who may also be an Officer of this Association, at a remuneration agreed to by both parties.

Affiliated Societies.

36. Affiliated Societies, whose members join the Australasian Secular Association, shall pay 6d. per year, per member. All such Societies shall each elect a member to the Council of the Australasian Secular Association, who may be an addition to the already existing Council. Branches wishing to nominate those living at a distance, may appoint corresponding Members.

Standing Orders.

37. At all Executive Council Meetings, and at Ordinary General Meetings, Annual Meetings, and Special General Meetings, the first business to be entertained shall be—reading the minutes of the previous Meeting, and their adoption or otherwise. The consideration of business arising from the minutes, postponed business to take precedence. Correspondence to be read; each letter or communication to be disposed of before entering upon other business. Then shall follow general business, including appeals, reports of Committees to be adopted, objected to, or referred to Committee for further consideration.

38. Any Member, when proposing a motion or amendment, or discussing any question, must rise and address the Chairman; and no Member shall be interrupted, unless by a call to order, when he shall sit down; the member calling to order shall then state his point of order, and the Chairman shall decide upon the same.

39. Any Member desirous of proposing either an original motion or amendment, must state the nature of such motion or amendment before addressing the chair in support thereof, and shall write it in form, if required, sign and deliver it to the Secretary, who shall add thereto the name of the seconder; and no motion or amendment shall be withdrawn without the sanction of the Meeting, nor shall any motion be entertained until seconded.

40. If more than one Member rise at the same time, the Chairman shall decide which is entitled to precedence.

41. The Mover of any motion or amendment shall be held to have spoken to the same in the discussion of either.

The Secunder of a motion or amendment shall not be held to have spoken if he has only seconded the same without remark.

No Member shall be allowed to speak more than once, except strictly in explanation, or in contradiction of a misstatement, excepting the mover of the motion, who shall have the right of reply, and no speaker shall occupy a longer time than ten minutes. No further discussion shall take place after the mover of the motion has replied.

42. No Member shall propose more than one amendment upon any motion.

43. The Chairman's decision shall be final on all questions of order or practice, and he shall state the same without comment or argument.

44. Only one amendment shall be discussed at one time, and, upon the adoption of any amendment, the original motion shall be deemed rejected, and the amendment carried shall be acted upon as an original motion. It is competent whether the amendment is carried or not to receive other amendments, one at a time, to be disposed of in like manner, and decided on until the subject is disposed of.

45. Should the Chairman desire to speak to any question under discussion, he must do so before the reply of the mover of the original motion.

46. Questions touching the interpretations of the Rules shall not be considered or answered unless submitted to the Secretary in writing prior to the opening of the Meeting.

47. In the event of any Officer or Member of the Association having urgent business to place before the Association, it shall be competent for him to move the suspension of Standing Orders, and, if agreed to by the Association, such business shall take precedence of all other.

48. All questions brought under discussion at any Meeting, shall be decided by the majority of Members present, by show of hands.

49. In case of any doubt or difficulty arising as to questions of practice and points of order that are not met by these Standing Orders, reference shall be had to Parliamentary usage.

Discussion and Debate Rules.

50. The Lectures, Discussions, and Debates shall be held in such halls, and on such dates as the Council may determine, and shall each evening be open to the Public on condition that they conform to the rules.

51. The Secretary shall arrange for securing eligible lecturers for week-night debates, and for sufficient attendance to take collections or admission fees at the door, to which two Members of Council shall always attend in person.

52. The introductory Lecture, on evenings set apart for general discussion, shall occupy no more than 30 minutes, and may be extended to 45 minutes by special permission of the Chairman. No speaker except the Opener shall speak twice in the discussion, unless in default of Speakers and by special permission of the Chairman. No speech shall exceed 10 minutes, except that of the Opener, who shall have 15 minutes after the discussion to reply, not later than a quarter to ten, and that of the leading opponent, who may be allowed 20 minutes.

53. No person shall take part in the discussion unless present at the commencement of the Lecture, except by special permission of the Chairman.

54. If the Chairman desire to speak to the question he must do so before the Opener's reply.

55. Set debates, conducted according to rules agreed to on both sides, may be held at any time and place, subject to approval

Library Rules.

56. The Executive Council shall be also the Library Committee of the Association.

57. The Committee shall meet to inspect the Library and books prior to the annual meeting in each year.

58. The Library shall be maintained and extended by donations, or loans of books from Members, and by purchase by the Committee.

59. The Librarian shall keep a catalogue of all the books, and a clear record of the Members to whom, and the dates on which any book shall be issued.

60. Each book may be detained for one month; after which month three pence per week shall be charged.

61. The Librarian shall collect and pay to the Secretary all fines for overdetention or damage etc., as laid down in rules 60 and 65; and he shall report to the Secretary monthly all such monies which may be due and unpaid, and shall issue no more books to defaulters.

62. There shall be no additional subscription: but Membership of the Association shall confer all the advantages of access to the Library.

63. No more than one book at a time shall be issued to any member.

64. No book shall be issued to any person not a member of the Association.

65. Any volume lost, mutilated, defaced or soiled to the dissatisfaction of the Committee shall, if required, be paid for to the Librarian at the valuation of the Committee by the Member in whose possession it was when so misused.

decorative feature

Member's Declaration.

I am desirous of joining the Australasian Secular Association, in order to extend its principles, and I pledge myself to do my best, if admitted as a Member, to co-operate with my fellow-members to obtain the objects set forth in its rules.

Name_____

Address_____

Occupation_____

Dated This_____

Active Or Passive Member_____

STEPHENS, PRINTER 106 ELIZABETH STREET, MELBOURNE.

De Natura

A Poem on the Religion of Nature, and the Nature of Religion.

By Thomas Walker.

Price Sixpence.

Cape Town: Dormer, Delahunt & Co., 9, Burg Street. 1881.

De Natura.

Great Goddess, Nature, or Great Nature, God!

Male, female, dual, all! from star to sod !

I, thy child, and part thyself, fall prostrate

At the shrine that suffers no apostate.

All worship at a common altar here

(Nor can they 'scape from th' universal sphere),

Be they the devotees of love or fear.

The children of the far and mystic East,

Who slay their offspring that the gods may feast;
The worshippers of Brahm the Supreme King;
Of those strange gods the mythic Veddas sing—
Of Christna, Siva, Vishnu, Ganesa;
The six-faced God of war Kartikeya;
Of Kali with her wild dishevelled hair,
Her blood red hands, her eyes of fiendish glare,
Her twice formed arms that bear a giant's skull,
With necklace grim, of human heads in full—
The worshippers of these their homage pay
But to the powers of night, or powers of clay—
They at the shrine of Nature, fall and pray.

The sons of Egypt by the mystic Nile
Where mild Osiris wore his summer smile,
And Isis wooed her lover at the dawn
'Till Horns from their love embrace was born,
Knelt but at Nature's shrine, at early morn
Or fading eve, when priest and people torn
From daily cares, unto their God
Offered the first fruits of the fertile sod.
It was to Nature they out-poured their praise—
Nature, revealed in all her won'drous ways.

The sun Osiris with his tender rays,
The strong God Horus with his eye ablaze,
God Ra the parent of the summer days,
Nephthis the goddess of the misty haze,
And Set, the evil one, who nightly plays
The foe of Amon, in the western maze,
Are names that suit the first poetic lays
Of early faith, imbued with Nature's traits.

The Am'rous God of ancient classic Greece,
The King of summer plenty and of peace—
And yet the God of thunder and of war—
Was Zeus, the Theos, travelled from afar,
From still more Ancient times, when 'neath the sky
Of burning India, the sun's bright eye
Was called by name *Dyans*—worshiped so
As king of brightness—by his sons below.

Apollo was the name for "God of light,"
Who bore aloft the sun to banish night,
Who died, and lived again, and shone on high,
When summer welcomed him to th' Northern sky.

The far famed Romans too, at common shrine
From universal force, made Gods divine.
The charioteer with youthful face, and bright
From whose encircled head twelve rays of light
Resplendent shine to chase the night away
Is Sol—the Sun—the God of our *Sunday*.

Selene, Luna or Diana great,
Are launched upon the self-same stream of fate.
For birth—the mythic minds of Greece and Rome,
For fame—the midnight skies through which they roam,
For deeds—what poets dream about the moon,
Their deaths—that knowledge which is man's best boon.
They are the self-same goddess—queen of night,
The orb, whose silv'ry beams dispensed the light,
To which, in fair Arcadia, the young,
The brave, and fair, to joyful music sung,
Or flowing from the harp in pleasing airs,
Fell gaily to the dance when joy was theirs.

And e'en when we have partial lost the myth,
The primal door of faith was opened with,
Still, chaste Diana, in the midnight sky,
Is full of wonder as in days gone by.
The ocean tides that follow in her train,
The ebb and flow of all the mighty main,
Responsive to her glance of virgin love,
Make show as tho' they have a conscious move,
Whilst wavelets seem to leap and kiss the beams,
Which e'en, unto the human lover, seems
The tender soul of his most am'rous dreams.

In ages past where frowns the icy North,
There lived a race of valour and of worth;
Sea Kings, rude teachers of the arts of war,
Who sang the praises of the mighty Thor.
These, too, from Nature had construed their Gods,
And Nature, dreaming, furnished them abodes.
The warmth of summer and the morning light,
The foe of winter and the ban of night,
Was Thor, the chief God of the Norseman bold,
Loved more than all, since he dispelled the cold;
Tho' he, when anger dwelt within his eye,
Hurled with his hammer, thunder from the sky.
Baldur, the white God, was the gentle sun
Who, after he, his God-like course had run,
Was slain *in winter* by the mistletoe,
The only thing that dwelt in spheres below
That had not sworn it would not harm the God.

When Baldur dreamt that he should suffer harm
He breathed unto tho æsir his alarm.
Then *Frigga*, to prevent an awful fate
To all that was in nature, journeyed straight
And begged that not a single object would
Do ought to harm the Beautiful and good;
Save that she thought the mistletoe too young,
To have an oath upon its feeble tongue.

Then in Asgard, the mansions and abodes
Of Odin, and his peers—twelve other Gods—
Baldur, would be a mark for one and all:
Try wound him as you might—he could not fall.
But Loki, evil one, to Frigga went
Disguised as some old hag, with body bent,
And drew from her the secret that he sought,
And then, the unsworn shrub to Asgard brought.

Whilst all the Gods were happy in the game,
Loki unto the God blind Höder came
And asked him why he naught at Baldur threw?
Höder replied, "The god is not in view.
"I have no sight his noble form to see,
"Such joy of æsir; it is not for me!
"Besides, my heart is further filled with woo
"Since I have naught, that I could venture throw."

Loki replied, unto blind Hoder, thus:
"It makes me sad that thou art not with us,
"But take this little twig within thy hand,
"And I behind thy god-like form will stand
"And guide thy arm, and give it gentle aim
"At happy Baldur with the woundless frame,
"So that thou may'st with æsir join the game."

So did they do, and then the mistletoe
Pierced Baldur's noble heart, and laid hi in low.

When Baldur fell the Gods stood speechless still,
Amazed with horror at the evil will
Of him, the author of this dreadful deed—
Which made the hearts of Gods to burst and bleed.

When they recovered from their speechless state,
Deep vengeful anger and a bitter hate
Rose up in every heart, and made them swear
Dire vengeance to the slayer of the Fair;
But they were then within the hall of peace,
And so, for some brief time, their ire must cease.
Then tears, and wailing lamentations deep,
Were heard around—for every God did weep.

Frigga, at length, with woe-filled voice, arose
And asked which God among all present chose
To win her love and earn her sweet good will?
"For this," said she, "shall be to him who will
"Ride fast to Hell and Hela's heart infil
"With pity for our Baldur. Who will go"
And offer ransom to the queen below "
That Baldur may return and end our woe? "

Brave Hermod, son of Odin, answered "I,
"I to the shades of Death will quickly fly,
"And if to pity Hela's heart incline
Good Baldur's hoped return shall be with mine."

Meanwhile, on burning ship, put out to sea,
Was borne the corpse of Baldur solemnly!
The Goddess Nanna, when she saw the sight,
With grief o'erwhelmed then joined her husband's plight,
And at his funeral-pile was burned that night.

Sleipner, the horse of Odin, God Hermod rode,
And was nine days and nights upon the road.
Through dark and lonely glens o'er cast with gloom—
Where naught but dreary shades around him loom—
He journeyed on, till to the bridge he came!
That crosses Gjöll, or Styx—doubtless the same—
And stopped there a space to ask the maid
Who kept the bridge, if Baldur thence had strayed?
The maid replied that Baldur has passed o'er!
So Hermod spurred his horse to speed once more.
At last the gates of Hell burst into view,
With bolt and bar made fast, that none pass through;
But Sleipner with tremendous leap—their heights
O'ertops, and on the other side alights.
In Hell, in chief of seats of all below,
Loved Baldur sat, to be distinguished so;
And Hermod with him spake the whole night through,
And such sweet mem'ries so inspired the two

That they, with love and pity, filled each word,
And unto tears each list'ning object stirred.
When morning came, to Hela Hermod went
And told her why by æsir ho was sent,
And asked of her release of Baldur's soul,
O'er which she exercised Supreme control.
"I plead with grief that thou let Baldur go,"
"Bespoke the god. "All nature is in woo"
"Because of him. There's naught that is but weeps"
"Through days and nights; and sorrow sweeps"
"Her heavy shadow o'er the Gods above,
"That thou hast charge of him, whom all things love."

"Then I will test thy words," she terse replied,
"Thou back unto high Asgard quick must ride,
"And tell the Gods that I will Baldur keep
"Unless *all* things in nature for him weep.
"Naught, dead or living, must refuse a tear,
"Or Baldur ever hence remaineth here."

Uprose then Hermod, still with heavy heart,
And strode across his steed, to thence depart;
But, ere he went, came Baldur to his side,
And, so 'tis said, Hermod a tear espied:—
"Take this to Odin, 'tis but a simple thing,
"But ask him, for my sake, to wear this ring,
"It may perchance his mem'ry backward wing,
"To think of me; so ask him wear the ring
"As symbol of my love, and think of me.
And Nanna, too, did presents send, for she
To Frigga sent her thimble, made of gold,
In memory of the love they'd shared of old.

When it was told to æsir what transpired,
While Hermod was in Hell, they straight enquired
The love there was in Nature, for the God
Who once gave love to all, from world to sod?
Then tears of grief from ev'ry object flowed,
All tilings in Nature wept, and sadly showed
How much they loved good Baldur who was dead.
All things in Nature wept, save one old hag,
Who caused her evil fiendish tongue to wag
In mock'ry of the woe all things displayed,
While she her cavern kept thus undismayed.
It was the Evil Loki, so 'tis said,
Who thus replied, "Let Hela keep her dead."

This story oft unto the Norseman told,
Amid the snows of Winter and its cold
Was but a tale of how the kingly sun
Yields life, in winter, to the Evil one.
The self-same war of darkness and of light,
Of summer and of winter, day and night,
Of evil and of good, that in the East
Was burden thought and theme of ev'ry priest.

That wondrous battle, 'twixt the good and ill,
With all our science is a mystery still.
What constitutes the ill, what makes the good?
Or is there ill at all? These questions would
We ask of science, for we desire to know
If *all* be good, which man, not thinking so,
Has, through his ignorance, conceived as ill,
And thought dependent on some demon's will?

Is it the truth that sin is but the bud
That shall develop in the flower of good?
Is Nature perfect for the lasting hour?
The bud, as such, as perfect as the flower?
Is Nature growing to some higher state,
Or does perfection. *now* upon us wait?
That Nature changes, all who list may see,
But can each tireless change perfection be?
Are we on-rushing to some perfect goal?
Or did we from some first perfection fall?
Or yet again, throughout the endless range,
Is *relative* perfection in each change?
'Neath questions such as these there flow the streams
Of Subtle thought and Philosophic dreams,
And clashing waters, seethe and foam with doubt,
Whilst dark contentious brood upon their route.
Hence is it true there dwells a mystery still
In the Eternal fight twixt Good and Ill.

It is the Sabbath day, now see the throng
Wend through the fields, and lanes, and streets along
To city, or to village church, which stands
The fairest edifice in Christian lands.
Hark to the music of the —sweet toned bells—
Music, like to the wave, which falls and swells,
And dying soft has scarcely passed away,
Ere once again the same rich tones will play
Their notes of joy upon the breath of May.
Amid the clusters of the tall beech trees.
Whose whispering leaves responsive to the breeze,
Of Autumn, and of gentle sabbath air,

Seem animated by the soul of prayer,
There stands the lonely church—the house of God!
Birds sing glad songs and happy flowers nod,
And Nature dreams beneath a mystic spell,
Lulled to half-slumber by the sabbath bell
Which, from an ancient Tower, in ivy clad,
Tolls sabbath calls, in music sweetly sad.
Within, the worshippers, on bended knees,
With solemn joy that sabbath grants them ease.
From toils and tumults of a week of care
Are lip-launched out upon the sea of prayer.
To whom their prayers?
Whom do they worship here
Are they devout because of love or fear?
List, hear them pray! "Oh God, stretch forth thine"
"And save us, now and aye, from every harm."
"From pangs of death, from terrors greater still,"
"Which, after death, the depths of hell infil—"
"Oh save us from the Fiend in darkness cursed,"
"Of all the creatures Hell-born, damned the worst."
"Oh save us from Eternal Death and Hell;"
"Oh save us from the curse, since Adam fell,"
"The deepest, blackest, ire filled most of all,
"Which, for a fall, could ere on mortal fall!"
"Oh save us from thy wrath, thy lasting ire,"
"Thy anger, hate, and dread 'consuming fire.'
"Oh save," and so the prayer goes on," Oh save—
"For some salvation do they madly crave; '
'Tis fear, the demon *Fear*, that acts the part,
And cries so plaintive from the listless heart.

The Christian from the Pagan differs not,
Their Faith are subject to the common lot.
'Tis but in *names* that a change is found;
Like many weeds that on the earth abound—
All faiths are rooted in the self-same ground.

The deep "unknown" that gives the Pagan dread,
The home of Fear, the haunt of evil dead—
The land of ignorance—hence Fear and pain,
Is also to the Christian dreaded bane.
What Zoroaster "God Ahriman" names,
The Christian by the term of "Devil" blames;
Destroying Siva of the Hindoo race,
Among ourselves as "Satan" takes his place.
Egyptian Typhon is "The Dragon" dire,
And Hades, strange, has now become "Hell-fire."
King Pluto is the type of our Arch Fiend,
Whilst Pan, with horns and hoofs has got him screened,
So that we may not recognise his birth,
Nor think he has his like upon this earth.

These creatures are the wildest shapes of Fear,
Which at the voice of Ignorance appear,
And in the gloom, make stoutest hearts recoil,
Live they on Pagan or on Christian soil.

'Tis thus that fear these common forms creates,
And paints for man the demons which he hates.
Man is but man, and whatso'er his mould,
Fear rules his heart and gives him to behold
Dread Fiends, so long as he is ignorant,
And of the God-born truth in bitter want.

The Christian God on winter's shortest day,
Like Mithra, Bacchus, Sol, and long array
Of other Gods, is born a feeble child,
From his chaste virgin mother, undefiled.
Why is he born, just when the sun is born?
In self-same month and on the very morn?
Why when the sun begins to grow in power,
Should we affix for Christ the natal hour?
Why, too, should Magi from the distant east,
Behold the *Star* of this the highest Priest,
And bring him myrrh and frankincense and gold,
Sacred to the *Sua* in the days of old?
Strange, too, the mystic letters I. H. S.,
Which from the Greek will read as I. E. S.,
The name of Bacchus, the Phoenician, Yes !
Now Bacchus was the sun, and on the day
When Christ was born, he too commenced his sway,
And I.E.S., when put in Latin speech,
Give Jesus—the God whom Christians beseech!

His harbinger, on' longest day of June,—
St. John the Baptist of the Ancient rune—
Was born, when light contracts the lengthened hour,
And when the sun diminishes his power;
Hence did he cry unto the Prince of Peace,
"Thy days must grow, but mine must now decrease."

When Christ was born, rose *Virgo* in the sky,
And from that constellation, shone on high
The youthful sun, and on a winter's morn,
From star-robed Virgin, in the sky was born.
Like Christna, sun-god of the Hindoo sage,
At birth, bright angels in sweet songs engage,
And shepherds from their pastures rude and wild,
Give welcome to their sun-god born a child.

When Christna the divine was born on earth,
The cruel Tyrant Causa learned his birth,
And fearful, it is said, lest ho should fall,
To children slaughter took—to one and all!
That Christina might be slain, his dreaded foe,
Who, helpless now, might safe receive the blow.

Likewise, at birth of Christ, King Herod reigned,
And ordered death—for so it has been feigned—
To every child made subject to his rage,
By falling brief of two short years in age.

One Gospel writer has this story told—
The other writers have not made so bold—
Forgetful that, e'en then, his cousin John
Had scarcely yet attained the age of one,
And yet remained where Herod slaughtered *all*
Alive, and ready for his future call!

Ascending slow towards the summer sphere,
The sun in sign of *Aries* does appear,
Called *Lamb* by those who with the stars did plod—
So after Mithra termed "The Lamb of God."

It was the custom in the days of old,
That all the great should have their fates foretold;
And so the sun, as some great mighty power,
Must know the fortune of his natal hour.
Hence, priests of Mithra (other name for sun),
When he was born would for his image run,
And bring it from a cave and then foretell
What labours he'd perform his fame to swell,
How he should die, and then descend to Hell,
And thence should rise again and shine on high,
As King of Heaven in the summer sky.
So worshippers of Mithra, thus we learn,
Had formed a faith which Christians do not spurn.

Years ere the Saviour of the Christian race
Had 'mong the stars of heaven received a place,
The Incarnation, Resurrection, Fall,
The mystery of the Atonement, all—
All that Christians have preserved in Creeds,
The Persians had to meet their mental needs.
Nay the very forms, e'en the outward show,

We practice now, the Persians practiced so!
The priests of Mithra oft-times would assist
Their followers to take the Eucharist;
And Baptism, and Penance were in vogue,
To make a Saint of him, erst—while a rogue!
Hence nothing new we find in Christian creeds,
They form a tree full grown from older weeds.

And older than the faith of Persian Kings,
Older than Assyrian bulls with wings,
Older than Avesta the book of lore,
Which tells the stories of our father's fore,
Far older than the faith which Judah saw,
Aye, older than the famed "Mosaic law,"
Was that strange faith of Egypt long ago!
First here the Immortality of man
Received a godly sanction and a plan.
'Twas here Osiris, kingly "Judge of dead,"
Unto immortal realms the Spirit led.
'T was here the Resurrection first was taught.
'T was here that the Atonement was out-wrought.
'T was here the "Judgment day" was first assigned
To judge the dead whom evil had maligned.
'T was here that Gods first walked upon the Earth,
And entered human form by human birth.
'T was here that the immortal bad and good
First 'fore the judges of the dead had stood
To give account of what their days had been—
Whether good or ill, bountiful or mean—
And so to judgment gain and thence depart
To meet the fate most suited to the heart.
In fact, 't was here when Judah was unknown,
Whilst Jews were savages in deserts lone,
Two thousand years ere so-called Moses wrote
The so-called "laws"—which he from Egypt brought,
That the Egyptian priests along the Nile
Were teaching to their followers the while,
The faiths of Christendom and doctrines all
From the Atonement, e'en unto the Fall!
What then is Christianity but this:—
A Faith, out-growth of all the rest that is,
Blending of all that ere its day had been,
Commingled streamlets, as one river seen?
A tree in flower that ere its time had been
Long growing through the bud and vernal green?

Nor think at time of Christ, the growing ceased,
For since his day the tree has much increased,
And twig and branch from Pagan Rome has won
Till Pagan faith and Christian are but one.

The mind once habited to certain ways
To keeping festivals, observing days,
Is oft-times like a rock on mountain sides,
That started once fast to the valley glides,
And gathers speed as it falls rolling o'er;
So habit gains as it repeats the more.

In those brave days of old when Rome was great,
Their Festivals were kept by all the State,
In honour of the Gods that Rome adored—
In gratitude for aid the Gods afford.
Time-honoured were these customs to the mind,
And high the place tradition has assigned
To their observance at the stated time,
When seasons brought again the days sublime.

When that base Emperor, vile Constantine,
Broke the succession of the Pagan line,
And with a cruelty both mean and coarse,
Would make men Christians by the rule of force.
The Pagans with a faith of Pagan mould,
Were servile to the force of custom's old,
And so, compelled to change, changed but the name
And left the faith and habits still the same.
Hence Pagan faith the Christian calend taints,
And Pagan Gods are lost in Christian Saints!
The ancient Faith of Rome in currents strong,
Yet bears the ship of Christendom along.

But what of Jesus, if these facts be true?
Is he a myth lost henceforth to our view?
We think him to have been the "Nazarene,"
A member of the brotherhood Essene,
A brave reformer throughout Palestine!
On him a superstitious race of men
Have pinned their myths to worship o'er again.
'Tis thus this gentle, lowly, humble man,
Formed the foundation of a priestly plan,
To keep intact the myths of bygone days,
And to preserve the tenets and the ways
Of many Worships blended all in one,
Till Jesus has become our "God the Sun."
So e'en the Christian bonds at common shrine
And worships Nature as a God, divine!

Oh, goddess, Nature, ruler of my heart,
What is't we know that thou dost not impart?

'Tis thee in us that worships, and yet we
While we do worship, do but worship thee!
We are thy children nursed in thy lap,
And thankful unto thee for what may hap;
Thou givest all and takest all away,
Both life and death do but thy will obey!

Where'er we look 'tis only thee we view!
The mighty star, the crystal drop of dew;
The ocean with its flow of ebb and tide,
O'er whose broad bosom, storm built Titan's ride
Or gentle zephyrs blow, or broods the calm,
Or wave-girt islands breathe a spicy balm;
The rock-built mountain towering to the sky,
Where birds of highest flight ne'er deign to fly,
Capped by a mantle of eternal snow,
That feeds the Crystal spring with gentle flow,
Warbling as it falls to the vale below;
The forest wild where lurks the beast of prey,
'Mid tangled thickets, dark, at high noon-day,
Since to their depths there steals no sunny ray;
The rivers broad, that channel out the earth
With solem dirge, or flow with rippled mirth;
The woodlands merry with their thousand hues,
That glitter in the sun 'neath morning dews;
The sandy desert, and the lifeless plain;
The smiling valley and the sacred fane,
The depths of space where rolls our planet on,
Where star encircles star, sun circles sun;
The tiny drop of water from the sea,
A living world of animalculae!
All, great or small; oh, Nature! is but thee
From atom small to deep infinity.

decorative feature

NEW POLYNESIAN ORCHIDS.

DESCRIBED

BY BARON FERD. VON MUELLER, K.C.M.G., M.D., F.R.S., E.L.S., F.G.S., F.R.G.S., C.M.Z.S., H.F.R.H.S., &C.

Bulbophyllum sciadanthum.—Stems compressed and at least their upper joint gradually broad-dilated and flattened; leaves narrow-lanceolar, elongated; umbel 8-10 flowered, sessile; stalklets very long, bearing at the articulated summit a minute thinly acuminate bract; lobes of the calyx rose-colored; the upper lobe ovate-lanceolar; lower lobes deltoid-semilanceolar, connate into a short almost semi-ovate base; inner lobes lanceolar, not much shorter than the outer, slightly longer than the labellum; the latter somewhat thicker than the other portions of the calyx-limb, ovate-lanceolar, towards the base slightly dilated, but not distinctly lobed, above the base callous from two depressed incrustations, thence upward smooth, at the margin somewhat membranous, at the base provided with a very short unguis; free part of the column extremely short, not prominently denticulated; tube of the calyx slender, twice or three times as long as the lobes, at first bent

downward.

On the summit of ranges at the sources of the Waimasse-River in the Island Upolu of the Samoan Group; Betché.

An epiphyte; pseudobulbs not seen. Leaves attaining a length of nearly one foot and a width of about one inch; their consistence not very thick. Umbel partly clasped by the base of an elongated leaf and generally supported also by several diminutive leaves. Stalklets $2\frac{1}{2}$ - $3\frac{1}{2}$ inches long. Height of the calyx-limb hardly above $\frac{1}{3}$ of an inch. Ovary narrow as in *Sarcochilus*, measuring about one inch. Pollinia dropped from all flowers which came under dissection. The labellum not being very carinulate, this plant might be transferred to *Dendrobium*, if indeed any difference of the pollen-masses may not remove it into another generic group. In flower during November and December.

Dendrobium Johnsoniæ.—Racemes conspicuously stalked, glabrous, bearing several very large white flowers; bracts deltoid or lanceolar-ovate, much shorter than the stalklets; outer three lobes of the calyx semi-lanceolar, narrowly acuminate, of about equal length, the two lower of these with their adnate base forming a short deltoid-saccate prolongation; the two inner lobes nearly twice as long as the outer, elongated-rhomboid, attenuated into a narrow wedge-shaped base, pointed into an acumen at the summit; Labellum (labial lobe) somewhat shorter than the inner lobes, but exceeding the outer in length, ridged along the median line of its lowest portion by a narrow callous vertical straight plate with a free and blunt end, lateral lobules of the labellum nearly semi-orbicular, from one-third to half the length of the plainly membranous almost ovate but slightly acuminate main (upper) portion; column adnate up to the stigma, terminated by two short recurved tooth-like lobules; anther emarginate at the summit; fruit truncated-pear-shaped.

Eastern peninsula of New Guinea; Rev. James Chalmers.

Had it not been my particular desire to accede to a wish of the enterprising discoverer of this magnificent orchid, that it should be named after the "daughter of the Rev. Mr. Johnson of Surrey-Hills, New South Wales, a young lady, who materially had assisted the New Guinea Mission," I should have hesitated to describe this plant for publication, no leaves being transmitted with the flowers. Of the latter from 10-12 in the racemes received, pure white (to judge from the dried specimens) except a rosy tinge of the labellum, particularly over its lateral lobules. Inner lobes of the calyx tender-membranous, remarkably large, thus attaining a length of nearly VI inches. Pollinia dropped from all flowers examined. Semi-mature fruit already half an inch thick, about as long as its stalklet. *Dendrobium Johnsoniæ* differs essentially from *D. macrophyllum*, near which it will have to be placed systematically, in not downy racemes, in less elongated pedicels, in very much shorter bracts, in the not yellowish flowers, in double the size of the inner calyx-lobes (though similar in form, unless more dilated), in their being very distinctly-extended beyond the other portions of the calyx, in the more elongated and less roundish upper part of the labellum and in the elongated basal ridge of the latter.

Along with the flowers of *D. Johnsoniæ* I received those of a species, allied to *D. undulatum* and *D. Joliannis*, which new congener I should like to distinguish in honor of the finder as *D. Chalmersii*; it differs from both already by the lobes of the calyx being more pointed, the inner of them decurrent, the basal pouch shorter and the labellum proportionately longer with a comparatively broader summit; *D. Chalmersii* agrees with *D. Joliannis* in minute bracts and also almost in the size of the flowers, but has the terminal part of the labellum still broader, so much so as to exceed considerably the width of the lower portion, the reverse taking place in *D. undulatum*. Leaves not obtained. Racemes 3-4 inches long, glabrous; color of the flowers faded in the transmitted dried specimens, perhaps yellowish. Stalklets fully as long as the flowers, if not longer. Lobes of the calyx twisted-and wavy-crisp, narrowly acuminate, the 3 outer semi-lanceolar, the lateral somewhat smaller and not attenuated at the base, but narrowly decurrent from the upper lobe along a portion of the column to the two lower lobes, the latter adnate only to form the short basal roundish-blunt prolongation, thus the lateral lobes not so distinctly interior as usual. Labellum measuring about half an inch, slightly "longer than the other portions of the calyx, its terminal lobe in outline almost renate, much crisped, somewhat folded back, hardly shorter than the lower portion of the labellum, which is roundish semiovate, produced at the junction with the upper lobule into a short blunt tooth at each side, and raised along the axis by three slightly elevated lines; column at the apex deltoid-bidentate; pollinia clavate-oval.

Dendrobium fililobum.—Glabrous; stems very slender, not jointed arising from a fibrous root, enclosed in elongated membranous scales at the base, terminated by a single linear-lanceolar rather long flat leaf; peduncle very thin, about as long as the clasping lanceolate-linear rather elongated and rigid bract, bearing seemingly only one or two pale-yellowish flowers; stalklet about twice as long as the calyx, the five lobes of the latter tender-membranous, from a broadish base narrowed almost to hair-like thinness, the inner lobes somewhat shorter than the outer, but all in proportion to their narrowness extremely long, the lower two produced at the base into an oblique semiovate-conical prolongation; labellum purple, about three times shorter than the calyx-lobes, narrow-linear, acute, glabrous, dark-colored, at one-third of its height produced into two minute violet-colored, decurrent lobules, the median line raised; free part of column very short; ovary slender.

On trees at the sources of the Waimasse-River in the island of Upolu of the Samoan Group, at an elevation of about 2,000 feet; Betche.

Stems yellowish, 6-10 inches high. Pseudobulbs none. Leaves 5-7 inches long, $\frac{1}{2}$ - $\frac{2}{3}$ inch broad. Floral bract yellowish, nearly one inch long, complicated. Flowers resembling those of *Eria (Mitopetalum) speciosa*, but the lobes still narrower. Stalklets 1 $\frac{1}{2}$ -2 inches long. Outer lobes of the calyx slightly exceeding one inch in length. Pollinia already dropped from the only flower available for dissection. Fruit not seen. Flowering in December. Allied to *D. tipuliferum* (G. Reichenb., in the *Gardener's Chronicle* 1877 p. 72), from Fiji; leaf not vaginated, outer lobes of the calyx not much broader than the inner, nor dark-purple, labellum except the solitary tooth-like lobule on each side quite entire at the margin. Other species with very narrow lobes of the flower are *D. bijlorum*, *D. camaridiorum*, *D. acuminatissimum* and *D. longicolle*. Anomalous in the genus as regards the inarticulated stems.

DEFINITIONS OF SOME NEW AUSTRALIAN PLANTS,

BY BARON FERD. VON MUELLER, K.C.M.G., M.D., PH. D., F.R.S.

(Continued.)

Tetratheea aphylla.

—Leaves undeveloped; branches thick, cylindrical and slightly rough; stalklets a little longer than the calyx and as well as this shortly glandular-downy; sepals 5 lanceolar, "about three times shorter than the petals; filaments rather thick, very short; tubular summit of the anthers black-purplish, by about one-third shorter than the cells; ovary scantily glandular-downy, its cells bearing one ovule.

West Australia; from the late Mr. James Drummond's collections, in which no indication of the precise locality of this plant is given. Nearest in affinity to *T. efoliata*, but the branches stouter, neither twisted nor (as far as the fragmentary state of the specimens allows to judge) anywhere velvet-downy, anthers not rough, their tubule not quite so long and not pale-colored, ovules solitary;—fruit unknown.

Chenopodium rhadinostachyum.

Erect; general vestiture of short spreading jointed but not very glandular hair; leaves small, in outline ovate-or rhomboid-lanceolar, with several short rather acute tooth-like lobes, the base gradually tapering into the leafstalk; flowers exceedingly small, clustered into minute glomerules and these again arranged into axillary and terminal simple or branched and soon interrupted spikes; floral leaves reduced to bracts, hardly longer than the clusters, broad towards the base, acute at the apex; sepals deeply concave, but not keeled (while young); stamens one or more in each flower; filaments at length exceeding the sepals; ovary vertical.

Near the Finke-River; Rev. H. Kempe. An annual, pleasantly scented herb, from a few to several inches high. Largest leaves measuring about one inch in length, but most of them smaller. Longest spike attaining four inches, others variously shorter, especially the secondary spikes. Young flowers similar in size and structure to those of *C. carinatum*, but none seen in an advanced state.—The leafless almost paniculate spikes much like those of *C. ambrosioides* and of *Dysphania plantaginella*.

Bertya oppositifolia. — (F. V. M. O'SITANESY.)—Tall; leaves large, opposite, oval-or oblong-elliptical, slightly recurved at the margin, above quickly glabrous, beneath as well as the branchlets grey-velvet-downy; flowers of both sexes singly sessile; segments of the calyx four, oval, nearly glabrous, three times as long as the four thereto opposite persistent ovate bracts; column of stamens as long as the calyx; anthers but little longer than broad; styles 3 or oftener 4, dilated at the base, deeply cleft into 2-4 rather long stigmatic lobes; ovary 3-4-celled; fruit ovate-globular, 1-2-seeded, velvet-downy.

At the base of Expedition-Range, Thozet and Kilner; on sand-ridges near the Nogo-River, rare; *P. O'Shanesy*.

Length of leaves as great as that of *B. Findlayi* and *B. pedicellata*, but width much greater; general vestiture as well as the flowers similar to those of *B. oleifolia*; division of calyx quaternary as in *B. quadriseppalea*; position of leaves different from that of any congener, although occasionally opposite leaves may occur in *B. oleifolia* also; augmentation of ovary-cells to four likewise exceptional in the genus.

Bertya dimerostigma.—Glabrous; leaves small, scattered, linear, somewhat acute, at the margin refracted to the broad and flat midrib; flowers axillary, sessile, solitary; bracts three times shorter than the calyx, broad-linear, persistent; segments of the calyx five, nearly lanceolar, overlapping at the base, hardly half as long as the fruit; style scarcely any, stigmas 2-3, short, each cleft to the base into only two divisions; fruit ovate,

slightly pointed, glabrous.

In desert-country near Victoria-Spring; Giles.

Differs from *B. Cunninghamsi* in verrucular not angular branchlets, in shorter pale-green leaves, in absence of distinct stalklets of the flowers, in at the whole lesser stigma-lobes and possibly also in the staminate flowers and seeds, which hitherto remained unknown.

(To be continued).

ON SOME BEETLES COLLECTED BY COLONEL T. B. HUTTON.

BY D. BEST.

[Read before the Field Naturalists' Club of Victoria 17th April, 1882.]

Colonel Hutton, having for some time been collecting Coleoptera about Dandenong, sent to the Club, by Mr. Goldstein, a portion of the collection, to ascertain if there was anything amongst them of special importance. Dandenong is situate about 20 miles from Melbourne in an easterly direction, and, had it not been that I have myself collected there on two or three occasions, I should, from the nature of the country, have certainly expected the bottle handed to me by Mr. Goldstein to contain some rare specimens. I was not, however, disappointed in finding they consisted almost exclusively of the commoner kinds, the best, perhaps, being a fine Elater (*Chrosis illitd*). The specimens comprised a total of 49, and may be classified as 5 Elaters, 1 Curculio, 20 Longicorns, 1 Dynasteni, 2 Rutelini, 8 Malacodermidæ, 7 Plinidæ;, 2 Tenebrionidæ, 2 Lucanidæ, and 1 Buprestidæ. The last-named must, I think, have been put into the bottle by mistake, it being the well-known and beautiful West Australian *Stigmodera Roci*, and, if occurring at Dandenong, would certainly be a fact well worth noting, as I have no knowledge of its ever before being taken in Victoria. Probably Colonel Hutton will enlighten us upon this point. Of the Elaters the only one, as previously stated, of any value, is the *Chrosis illita*, which is general in most parts of the Colony, being taken in the parks around Melbourne, also at Ballarat and other places; the remaining four are procurable all through the Summer under the bark of the gum-trees or flying about in the dusk of the evening. In the Longicorns we have one specimen of a by-no-means common variety of *Sympliyletes pulverulens*; one *S. decipiens*, plentiful enough on the wattle, in which it also breeds, during the Summer months; five of *Hehecerus marginicollis*, to which the same remarks apply; four of *Stenoderus suturalis*, an even more common insect; and a rather fine specimen of *Stephanops nasuta*. There are also 7 specimens of *Epithora dorsalis*, which I have taken in every part of the Colony where I have been collecting, but some that I got last January in the Western district differed from the present ones by being decidedly larger and of a much darker color. It was, however, beyond all question, the same insect, and this leads me to recommend collectors, in arranging their collections, to label separately the specimens of all insects they may get from different localities, as they will not only serve to show the many varieties occurring, but will be useful in determining the limits of their habitats, &c. The one specimen of Dynastini is a male of *Chiropatys latipes*, and is common about Melbourne, as are also the two Rutelini; one being *Anoplognathus analis*, and the other *A. olivieri*. The former was in my younger days well known to all boys as the common Cockchafer, and common indeed it was, as we had only to go over to what is now Carlton, and at the first gum-tree in flower we could always secure them by dozens. It may still be frequently taken on the gum saplings about the Yarra in the neighbourhood of the Asylum or Heidelberg. The 8 Mala-codermidæ consist of 5 *Metriorrhynchus atratus* and 3 the name of which I do not know; the former may be taken in numbers from off the *Leptospermum lanigerum* and *L. scoparium* when in flower, and is generally a very common insect. Of Tenebrionidæ the only two specimens belong to the genus *Pterohelœus*, whilst the two Lucanidæ are both males of *Ceratognathus niger*. The name of the one specimen of Curculio is unknown to me, but although I have it in my collection I do not think it is by any means of common occurrence.

Before concluding, I would express the hope that the example set by Colonel Hutton, in collecting and forwarding to the Club specimens for examination, will be followed by many others over the whole Colony, as it is through such collections, humble in themselves though they may be, that a great deal of valuable information is derived. So far as lies in my power I will be only too pleased to furnish information, and in both Entomology and the other branches of Natural History I have no doubt we possess several members who entertain the same feelings as I do on this subject.

Proceedings of Societies.

The Field Naturalista Club of Victoria.

ORDINARY MEETING.

The usual monthly meeting of this Club was held at the Royal Society's Hall, on Monday evening, the 17th April, the attendance being good, and Mr. H. Watts occupying the chair. After the preliminary business, which consisted of several nominations for membership, and the promise by Mr. D. Le Souëf of a paper on Snakes, was dispatched, the reading of the papers in the programme was proceeded with. These consisted of, first, a few notes by Mr. D. Best, on some Coleoptera collected in the vicinity of Dandenong by Colonel Hutton. The specimens, for the most part, comprised the commoner kinds of beetles to be found around Melbourne, the majority being Longicorns, with a few Elaters and some of the less numerous families.

Dr. T. P. Lucas followed with a further contribution of his essays on Geology, and his remarks relative to the origin of mineral veins and the occurrence of gold provoked an animated discussion, many members taking part therein, the majority appearing to dissent from the views expressed by the writer.

The Rev. J. J. Halley, one of the Vice-Presidents of the Club, at the invitation of the Chairman, offered a few observations on his recent visit to Europe, alluding to the interest shown in anything Australian by the Zoological Institute at Naples and by the various Microscopical Societies in England. He promised to give, on a future occasion, for the benefit of the Club, a more detailed account of what he had seen and learned during his visit.

The exhibition of specimens, which always follows the reading of papers, was an interesting one, comprising some fine exotic Curculio and Longicorn beetles shown by Mr. C. French. A rare bird of the genus Knot, undescribed by Gould, by A. J. North. Some rare shells, notably *Cypræa madagascarensis* and *Cypræa decliris*, also *Conus betulinus* and *Corbula truncata* the latter, a shell recently found in Victorian waters, and not hitherto known as inhabiting them—by Mr. J. F. Bailey. Some fine birds, viz.,—Fairy Prion, Crescent-marked Oriole, Painted Quail, and Allied Dottrel, by T. A. F. Leith. A Queensland Alligator's Egg, by Mr. J. E. Dixon, and by Mr. F. Spry, Lepidoptera collected by him since previous meeting.

After a pleasant conversazione the meeting was brought to a termination.

Annual Conversazione.

That the Second Annual Conversazione of this Club should have attracted so large an audience as crowded the rooms of the Royal Society's Hall on Wednesday evening, the 26th April, is evident proof of the growing popularity of this deserving young Club, and must have been a source of great gratification to its members. It was certainly a disappointment that the retiring President, Professor F. McCoy, F.G.S., &c., was unable, owing to a severe attack of bronchitis, to be present; but his valuable address lost none of its interest in the hands of the Rev. J. J. Halley, one of the Vice-Presidents, who, at short notice, kindly undertook the reading of it. The address, which appears further on, detailed the proceedings of, and the useful papers contributed by, members of the Club during the past twelve months; but the portion most deserving of attention was that referring to the intention of the Club to offer to the scholars attending the schools in and around Melbourne prizes for the best collection of and essays on Natural History, the same to be sent in prior to the next Annual Conversazione. This announcement was received with considerable applause, and is certainly a step in the right direction. The address was immediately followed by a Lecture entitled "Beauties and Curiosities of Protophytes, a first form of Plant Life," by the Rev. J. J. Halley, who treated this so instructive a subject, illustrated as it was by diagrams, in his usual genial and comprehensive manner. A second Lecture on a somewhat similar subject, entitled "Microscopic Life around Melbourne," was delivered by Mr. H. Watts.

The exhibits as a whole were unusually good, but the palm must be given to the Birds, the display of which was greatly superior to that of the previous year. Especially noticeable were the Paradise Birds, Pigeons, &c, from New Guinea, shown by Mr. C. French, as was also Mr. T. A. F. Leith's very handsome case of Australian Birds; and Mr. A. Coles, of Kyneton, is to be complimented upon the superior manner in which his exhibit of Wading Birds and Flying Gurnet was mounted. Mr. D. Le Souëf had a fine specimen of the gorgeous Himalayan Argus Pheasant, also one of Imperial Pheasant, and a very nice little collection of Indian and other Butterflies, Snakes, Lizards, &c. The conchological specimens (principally shells of the genus *Cypræa*) of Mr. J. F. Bailey proved very attractive, more especially as the exhibitor devoted most of the evening to affording visitors every information in connection with them. Mr. Bailey had also a fine lot of Minerals and Fossils collected during the past twelve months, as well as several cases of Insects. Deserving of mention also was Mr. W. R. Guilfoyle's exhibit, comprising four vols, of dried plants indigenous to the Colony, all arranged in their natural orders, and these, with his large photos, of the *Wellingtonia gigantea*, or mammoth tree, and Miss

Guilfoyle's collection of Fish, &c., in alcohol, formed a most interesting group. Australian Insects were exceedingly well represented by portions of the cabinet collections of Messrs. D. Best and C. French. The former includes 350 species of Longicorn and 230 of Buprestis Beetles, as also a fine case of Hymenoptera, or Wasps;—the latter comprised a varied collection of four drawers Buprestis and one of Cetonia Beetles, a case each of Butterflies, Hawk-moths, and timber-feeding Moths, amongst all of which were many exceedingly rare and beautiful specimens. Mr. French had also a fine case of large Longicorns containing 52 species of the genus *Batocera*. In the case of beetles shown by Mr. F. H. Du Boulay were some rare species of some of the best families of Australian Coleoptera: this exhibitor had also a case of Butterflies. The sole exhibitor of Marine Algæ, Hydrozoa, and Bryozoa was Mr. H. Watts, whose carefully-prepared specimens, which were hung on the wall, attracted a good share of attention. Occupying a table by itself was a most interesting collection of 64 species of Victorian dried Ferns, very carefully mounted, and shown by Mr. F. Pitcher. Mr. J. E. Dixon's two cases representing Insect Architecture showed some of the many curious forms of habitation adopted by our hymenopterous and other insects, and evidently proves Mr. Dixon to be a close observer of their habits. A case containing a select series of the eggs and nests of the Australian Falconidæ was shown by Mr. A. J. Campbell, and Mr. P. Dattari exhibited a large case of very fine exotic Beetles. On a screen were hung a number of Native Weapons, &c., from Cape York and New Ireland, sent in by Messrs. T. G. and W. Sloane; and adjoining them were several Zulu assegais, from Mr. J. H. Matthias, who also showed specimens of the blue clay in which the diamonds are found at the South African fields. Mr. F. Wisewould had a number of Victorian Snakes, and the young of Native Bears and Opossums in various stages of development; and Mr. C. French, jun., had a very creditable case of Victorian Insects of his own collecting. Mr. J. F. Roberts exhibited two very curious plants, one being the rare *Amorphophallus zebrina*, and the other the equally rare orchid *Cypripedium superbum*. The complete collection of dried Epacridæ of the Grampians, recently presented to the Club by Mr. D. Sullivan, of Moyston, also formed an interesting exhibit. The Rev. J. J. Halley had in the kindest manner brought with him one of his Microscopes, but owing to his being so occupied with the Address and his Lecture, he unfortunately had but little time to devote to it. A pleasing feature in connection with the exhibits was the collection of rare live ferns and other plants kindly lent for the occasion by Messrs. Law, Somner, and Co.

The President's Address.

"Another pleasant year has passed, and we again meet to celebrate our usual annual 'commencement,' as the University men say, by a *Conversazione* on the second recurrence of the anniversary of our opening day.

"The Field Naturalists' Club of Victoria now has on its Roll one hundred and forty ordinary members, including nearly all the best known Victorian lovers of Nature, and of the out-of-door exercise which is inseparable from the working of a Field Naturalists' Club, and which gives it both its great healthy attraction and its peculiar usefulness. This substantial increase on the number of last year is a very satisfactory proof of the favor with which the Club is viewed, and gives promise of increased prosperity and usefulness in the future. Amongst the Honorary Members, as you know, are the most distinguished Naturalists in every department of Natural Science in this and the other Australian Colonies.

"The papers read at the regular meetings during the year have embraced almost every branch of practical Natural History, and were as interesting as they were varied.

"The first paper of the year was a highly valuable one, by Mr. F. C. Christy, on the 'Lepidoptera of Japan.' Mr. Christy is a very old colonist, well known in the old time for his knowledge of English Lepidoptera, of which he had a considerable collection of his own taking or breeding, and who had begun to work well upon our Victorian Lepidopterous Fauna. He was thus well qualified, on going to Japan, to commence the study of the Lepidoptera of that country, and to quickly recognise the curious fact, which had struck previous observers, of the great resemblance of the Lepidopterous Fauna of Japan to that of Europe; many of the species even being identical. In this instance the great curiosity is that the near resemblance to the European Lepidopterous Fauna is much more striking than in many of the intervening countries at a less distance. Both the Moths and Butterflies show this curious agreement, and it is not at all confined to species which could in any probable way have been imported.

"Mr. H. Watts, who for many years has been well known as an industrious and successful investigator of our shore Fauna and Flora, has at several of the meetings exhibited and described many fine and interesting species of Sea-weeds, and that group of minute molluscoida, the *Polyzoa*, of which group our shores exhibit a greater variety than probably any other part of the world.

"Our illustrious colleague, Baron von Mueller, has contributed no less than three papers, during the year, on new or rare plants recently discovered,—one of them being the rare Orchid *Pterostylis vittata* found by members of the Club near Brighton. And, as of the Baron it may well be said that he adorns every subject which he touches, our transactions will have a lustre in his subjects for which we are all much beholden to him.

"Mr. W. H. Wooster, of Springfield, Goldie, has entered upon a series of interesting papers detailing his observations on the animals of his district. And here I might point out that the most interesting and important observations in every branch of Zoology hitherto published, at home and abroad, have been of the nature of local Faunas; as, similarly, the best works, containing the most valuable observations on living plants, are of the nature of local Floras. There is so much to observe everywhere, which has not yet been duly set down upon paper, that any persons confining themselves to the local natural productions of their own parish or township might write in time a most useful treatise which would last, like White's 'Natural History of Selborne,' or Paget's 'Natural History of Yarmouth,' or Mac-gillivray's 'Natural History of Dee-side,' as standard highly valued field contributions to knowledge for all time. It is astonishing also how little technical knowledge is necessary to begin such works or series of observations with, as one may see by noting the early life and mental condition of those charming describers of the natural objects of their districts under the greatest difficulties, Hugh Miller, of Cromarty, and Peach, of Cornwall. Mr. Wooster has already given us his observations on the Native Bear (*Phascolarctos*), Opossums, Bandicoots, &c., and is understood to be preparing early continuations of his observations on the lower animals of his locality for the Club. Observations such as these on the habits in a state of Nature of even our commonest animals are highly desirable, as so few of the observations made are accurately recorded; and nothing is more calculated to make our Club really useful to Science, as genuine field observations on any of the living inhabitants of our country.

"Our excellent Secretary, Mr. Best, has continued his papers on the 'Longicorn *Coleoptera* of Victoria.' These wood-eating beetles are wonderfully numerous in Australia, and although the grand series collected by that excellent Melbourne Entomologist, the late Dr. Howitt, never fails to excite my astonishment, yet not only Mr. Best but my excellent assistant in this department of the National Museum, Mr. W. Kershaw, have added to the series enormously, and new species are being added every year. Considering the injury done by the larvæ of these beetles, as well as those of the many wood-eating *Lepidoptera*, to the timber of our forest trees, it is astonishing that their natural enemies in other countries, the Wood-peckers, should be entirely absent from Australia.

"Another of our Entomological colleagues, Mr. C. French, has chiefly added to our transactions during the year by his papers on those favorite plants, our Native Ferns, his monograph on which will be completed in one more paper, already promised.

"Mr. D. Sullivan, of Moyston, has given two interesting papers of great value, as showing to our members the true type of a Field-Club paper, namely, local Fauna and Flora of the immediate neighbourhood of the dwelling-place of the observer. In this case, Mr. Sullivan has added greatly to the interest of that mountain range by giving us a 'Census of the Grampian Plants,' If we had such a census of the natural products of many other restricted localities in Victoria, we should be showing the great value of our Field Club, not only in making known many new species, but, what is still more valuable, noting and recording the habits and geographical distribution of species already known. His second paper adds to his reputation as a most diligent and observant collector in the same district of a very restricted group of plants representing in Australia the Heaths of similar latitudes in South Africa,—it is his monograph of the '*Epacridæ* of the Grampians.' It is to be hoped that Mr. Sullivan, Mr. French, and our other botanical observers will give of their superfluous stores to form an Herbarium to be kept in the rooms of the Club for reference, and as a help and incentive to the other members desiring to attain a knowledge of the native plants of our Colony.

"Mr. J. F. Bailey, who has often added to our knowledge of Victorian Conchology, has given three papers on general Conchology during the year. And, similarly, Dr. Lucas has treated of general Geology, with the object of aiding the members who may be desirous of making field observations on the Geology of our locality.

"Mr. Goldstein, who is so practised an observer, and so skilful in preparing objects for the microscope, has given very interesting demonstrations of the 'Yeast-plant,' and the changes of the *Protococcus*.

"One of the most valuable and interesting of all the essays we have had contributed to our meetings is the admirable paper on the 'Marine Fauna of the Eastern coast of Australia,' by that accomplished comparative anatomist, Mr. W. A. Haswell, whose studies under the best observers of Germany and England render his settlement in this part of the world a lucky chance; for the working out of many problems concerning our Marine Fauna required just such skilled and well-trained observations as he is so well fitted to make and contribute to our literature from time to time.

"Mr. Le Souëf, the indefatigable Honorary Secretary of our Zoological and Acclimatisation Society, exhibited living specimens of the two largest serpents of our warm Northern frontier, namely, those Great Rock Snakes, the Carpet Snake (*Morelia variegata*), and the true Diamond Snake (*Morelia spilotes*), which are by some considered distinct species, and by others to be only varieties of the one. They are the peculiar Australian generic representatives of the Rock Snakes or Pythons of South Africa and India, and the Boas of South America.

"Two pleasant papers on the 'Carenums of Mulwala,' New South Wales, were contributed by Mr. Thomas

G, Sloane, of that place; and the last for the year was by Mr. W. R. Guilfoyle, on the '*Pituri*' plant and its curious effects on the functions of animal life.

FIELD-DAYS.

"The Excursions of Members of the Club into the country on the 'Field-days' have been as well carried out and planned as formerly, and, considering the difficulties which most of the members, who are nearly all busy men, find in leaving their business by day, they have been fairly well attended. In all cases they have been productive of great enjoyment to the members, who, after reaching the locality chosen for the meeting, break up into little groups of twos or threes according to their particular studies; and, on re-uniting, the results have always been the acquisition of many rare and, of course, in a new field like this country, innumerable "new" or undescribed and unnamed species. The collections made during these excursions, when properly prepared, have usually been exhibited at the general conversazioni which are held at the end of each of the ordinary monthly meetings of the Society, and are a source of great enjoyment to all lovers of Nature, and show the advantages of a Field Club in bringing the natural products of a district under notice in a very striking and satisfactory way. The members are thus enabled to exchange their duplicate species of one locality for those of another, and every object suggests an interchange of observations and experiences of the collectors, which is so interesting and valuable that I am sure, if informally recorded in a kind of common-place book belonging to the Club, we should soon have a delightful volume which would be eagerly read both here and at home.

"A new interesting movement of practical utility for enabling the younger observers to learn the methods of preserving and setting up specimens of Birds, Fish, Insects, and Plants, &c., has been commenced during the past year with excellent results, and the information and instruction given at the meeting held for the purpose was so highly appreciated that several other meetings of the same kind will be held from time to time.

"A good commencement of a Natural History Library has now been made, and, in addition to various standard works furnished by the members and friends to the cause, the Club subscribes to several of the more important English periodicals on Natural History subjects.

THE FUTURE.

"Amongst the projects for the future it is intended to offer prizes to the pupils of the State Schools in the various parts of the Colony for the best collections of specimens of the natural productions of their locality, with papers relating to them; the papers and specimens to be sent in in time for the Annual Meeting and Conversazione next year. When we remember the great good which followed from my old friend, the late Rev. Professor Henslow, encouraging by prizes the formation of collections of Plants and Insects, and papers on their places of occurrence, &c., by the school children of his parish; and recall the delightful evidence which he has given of the growth of intelligent habits of observation and orderly records of facts in plain, clear, truthful language, by these young people of both sexes in Suffolk—the children often adding great varieties, and sometimes entirely new additions to the previous scientific records of the country, in which they often anticipated the Professor (to his great delight) in recognising—and remembering his evidence on the influence for good of such occupations on the character and habits in after-life as those children grew up, I think the Club is not only deserving of commendation for setting such an object before it, but that probably the Government, through the Education Department, might be inclined to lend a helping hand to the good work.

"I may now make a few suggestions for the next year's work. In the first place, so little is known and so much is ready to hand which, if carefully and accurately observed and recorded, would be a real addition to human knowledge, that every member of the Club may be assured that he can do really good work without any great sacrifice of time or money. Field observations are the main things wanted of members of the Club, and as I know that many a good observer is stopped on the threshold by not knowing the name of the object he desires to write about, and as a large proportion of the natural objects about us actually have no names, or are at present undescribed, I will mention an excellent plan to overcome this difficulty. In all cases, if you can get a specimen of the object, preserve it and designate it in your journal or note-book by a number; having distinguished it in this way, all your observations can go on unchecked. If you send such a numbered specimen to be preserved in the Museum of the Club, all the future observations on A, B, No. 1, or No. 50, &c., can be referred safely to the right species when that is determined, and each further observation on the given species might refer always to it under the same number, an index being made as you go on to show at what pages of your journal entries concerning No. so-and-so are to be found. In this way the observer need not stop to determine the species at first, and many a good observation may be saved that might otherwise be lost.

"The habits of few of our native quadrupeds are as yet well recorded, and anything added is worth having. The Birds are much better known than those of most countries, but of several species the nests and eggs are not

well described. Of Reptiles, the Snakes are pretty well known, but the Lizards and their habits have been little observed. Of Frogs, the exact sounds uttered by the different kinds are scarcely recognised, although with a lantern in country gardens on Summer nights the determination of which sound belongs to which frog is easy. The metamorphoses and early habits of the immature young of the Sand-frogs and the Tree-frogs are scarcely known. Of all fishes, the time and seasons of coming, and going, and of spawning, have yet to be recorded in successive years by many observers. Of *Mollusca*, the males of our so-called Paper-Nautilus have not yet been found, and the habits of most of the other Cuttle-fishes would form an interesting record. The tongues, with their patterns of teeth, have yet to be figured for most of our univalve shells. And the general distribution of the bivalves, and especially the soft Ascidian Molluscoids, have yet to be recorded. The soft compound Ascidians, which abound on our shores after storms, or which are easily dredged, have often the most strikingly beautiful colors when fresh, which disappear shortly after death; and the record of these, either by description, or, better still, by the aid of a box of moist colors, would be good work for a Field Naturalists' Club, and which none other can so well be expected to do. Very few of the Worms, either of land or sea, are yet known of their proper living colors, and these, with their habits and distribution, are to be noted. Of Insects, the multitude unknown is almost unlimited. The late Dr. Howitt here, and his friend, Mr. Bakewell in London, working together, have done wonders with the Coleoptera or Beetles: and his collections bequeathed to the University are now under my care, and available to the members of the Club for reference; but the other orders have been little worked, and I have many hundreds of new species of *Neuroptera*, *Diptera*, *Lepidoptera*, *Hymenoptera*, and the lower types, as well as of the *Arachnida*, or spiders, from the neighbourhood of Melbourne. The chief good work for the members of our Field-Club in connection with these is the observation and record of habits, the breeding and noting the larvæ with their food, habits and cocoons of the Lepidoptera, and the habits and colored drawings from life of the Spiders, with their webs, trap-doors, and other food-catching or dwelling structures. The attempt to describe the new species without the means of referring to the great European Collections, and the extensive literature of every group in all the languages of Europe, is only likely to burden the subject with useless synonyms. The Zoophytes, or Corals, and *Hydroïda*, as well as the *Echinodermata*, or Sea-Urchins, and Star-fish, are pretty well-known from dried specimens, but their colors when alive, and particularly of the Sea-Anemones, are only partially known. From time to time the Decades of the Zoology of Victoria, which I am publishing for the Government, will give some help in identifying many objects on which further field observations may well be made; and the *Southern Science Record*, published by some members of the Club, affords a vehicle for publication which will give zest to the coming year's labors.

"And now, with many hearty good wishes for the success of the Club, I must again thank you for your kindness in enabling me to address you a second time as President."

The audience, having enjoyed a pleasant evening's entertainment, gradually dispersed, and the second Annual Conversazione of the Field Naturalists' Club of Victoria terminated shortly after 10 o'clock.

The Royal Society of Victoria.

The ordinary meeting of this society was held on the 20th April, Mr. R. L. J. Ellery, the President, in the chair. A number of new members were elected.

Mr. James Stirling read a paper on "The Phanerogamia of the Mitta Mitta District," in which, he gave an interesting description of flora found in that neighbourhood.

A paper was read by Mr. W. W. Culcheth, C.E., on "Notes on Irrigation," which occasioned some discussion, in the course of which, Mr. Kernot expressed a doubt whether successful irrigation was not impracticable in this country, on account of the high price of labor. Mr. Culcheth said, he thought, the labor difficulty might be overcome, and he knew of no conditions which would render an irrigation scheme impracticable here.

The Microscopical Society of Victoria.

The usual monthly meeting of the Microscopical Society of Victoria was held on the 27th April. The Vice-President (Rev. J. J. Halley) occupied the chair, and there was a fair attendance of members.

Mr. G. Matthews, of Ballarat, was nominated as a country member.

The Acting Secretary acknowledged receipt of the February number of the Journal of the Royal Microscopical Society, and the Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales, vol. vi, part 4.

Mr. Bale submitted a design for a Stage-micrometer, in which a plate bearing the slide is moved across the stage against an opposing spring by a fine screw with graduated head: the eye-piece being furnished with a single cobweb, or silk fibre, the screw is turned till one extremity of the object is coincident with the cobweb, then turned further till the image of the object has completely crossed it; the number of the divisions of the

screw-head which have passed an index point giving the diameter of the object. This system of micrometry does not appear to be in use in England, but in some German microscopes it is applied to one of the screws which control the stage-movements.

Mr. Allen exhibited an interesting Lichen, found in the Cape Otway forest, belonging to the genus *Cladonia*, and known as the Coral Lichen.

Mr. Halley described his visits to the principal Microscopical Societies of England, and gave an interesting account of the Royal Microscopical Society and the Quekett Club, also of the Leeuwen-hoek Club, of Manchester, which is limited to seven members, who meet at each other's houses in rotation.

Among the exhibits were some sections of Australian plants, double-stained very successfully by the Rev. T. Porter, also a variable low-power objective by Zeiss, shown by the same gentleman, and *Synapta spicules*, *Trichina spiralis* in human muscle, *Meridion circulare*, a species of *Schizonema*, and other diatoms, shown by Mr. Halley.

The Royal Society of New South Wales.

The annual meeting of the Royal Society of New South Wales was held on 3rd May, in the Society's large hall, Elizabeth street. There was a good attendance, and Mr. H. C. Russell, the president, occupied the chair.

Several new members were introduced.

Mr. P. N. Trebeck moved, and Mr. W. G. Murray seconded, the adoption of the following report, which was taken as read:—

"It affords the council much pleasure to report that the affairs of the Society show increasing prosperity. The number of new members elected during the year was 46; one name was restored to roll. The Society lost by death 3 members, by resignation 6; 10 were struck off the roll for non-payment of the annual subscription; the election of 5 new members was cancelled on account of non-payment of the entrance-fee and subscription. The actual increase is therefore 24, and the total number of members on the 30th April, 1882, 475. The Society's Journal, vol. xiv, for 1880, has been duly distributed to all the members entitled to it, and it is expected that vol. xv will be ready shortly. At the council meeting held on March 22nd, 1882, it was unanimously resolved to award the Clarke medal for the year 1882 to James Dwight Dana, LL.D., Professor of Geology and Mineralogy of Yale College, New Haven, United States of America, in recognition of his eminent work as a naturalist, and especially in reference to his geological and other labours in Australia when with the United States Exploring Expedition round the world in 1839. During the past year the Society has received 645 volumes and pamphlets as donations; in return it has presented 531 volumes to various kindred societies. The council has subscribed to 39 scientific journals and publications, and has made important additions to the library, notably 90 volumes of 'The Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society of London,' thus completing the series from the year 1801 to the present time. In all, the sum of £206 19s. has been spent upon the library during the past year. During the year the Society has held eight meetings, at which 13 papers were read; and three of the sections have held regular monthly meetings. A conversazione was held in the great hall of the University on the 28th September last, which was attended by about 600 members and their friends. The council reports that during the past year the mortgage upon the building has been reduced from £2,000 to £1,500, and during that period the sum of £25 4s. has been received towards the building fund, of which £10 10s has been paid by those members who have kindly promised an annual subscription of one guinea; the amount now standing to the credit of this fund is £35 12s. 3d. The council hopes that during the ensuing session the members will make an effort to greatly lessen, if not entirely clear off, the debt upon the Society's premises. During the past year the sum of £23 18s. was received by the hon. treasurer, from thirteen members of the Royal Society of New South Wales, towards the Biological Laboratory, Watson's Bay, which, together with a contribution of £25 from the Society's funds, making £48 18s., has been handed over to that institution. At a meeting held by the council on the 26th October, it was resolved that the Society should offer prizes of £25 each for the best communication containing the results of original research or observation upon certain subjects to be set forth from time to time. A circular containing eight subjects, and the conditions to be observed in competing, &c., has been freely distributed throughout the Australian Colonies, Europe, and America. The Bill for incorporating the Society was approved by the Parliament of New South Wales on December 16, 1881; the thanks of the Society are due to Mr. G. H. Reid, member for East Sydney, for introducing the Bill; the Hon. Professor Smith, C.M.G., for taking charge of it in the Council; and to Mr. Heron, the Society's solicitor, for the preparation of the draft, and for his attention to all legal matters connected with its passage through both Houses."

The balance-sheet showed that the receipts for the year, including a balance in the Union Bank of £8 15s. 7d., were £1,048 0s. 3d., while the expenditure was £987 7s. 10d., leaving a balance in the bank of £60 12s. 5d. The building fund account showed a balance in hand of £35 12s. 3d., and the Clarke memorial fund account, £218 2s. 3., which is placed in the Oriental Bank as a fixed deposit.

The motion was put, and adopted unanimously.

The ballot for the election of the officers and council was taken, and the result afterwards announced as follows:—President, Mr. Chr. Eolleston, C.M.G.: Vice-Presidents, Messrs. Robert Hunt, F.G.S., and F. N. Manning, M.D.; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. H. G. A. Wright, M.R.C.S.E., and L.S.A., Lond.; Hon. Secretaries, Professor Liversidge and Dr. Leibius; members of council, Messrs. H. C. Russell, B.A., F.R.A.S., W. A. Dixon, F.C.S., C. S. Wilkinson, F.G.S., Charles Moore, F.L.S., G. D. Hirst, W. G. Murray.

The following new members were also elected:—Messrs. Samuel Cornwell, jun., Fletcher Dixon, Alfred G. Milson, James Milson, Alexander James O'Reilly, B.A., (Cantab.), Alfred Shewen, Mark W. Trail, Sydney A. Want.

Reports from the sectional committees were read, showing that the following officers had been elected for the session:—Microscopy: Chairman, H. G. A. Wright, M.R.C.S.E.; Secretary, P. R. Pedley; Committee, Dr. Ewan, F. B. Kyngdon, G. D. Hirst, H. O. Walker. Medical: Chairman, Dr. P. Sydney Jones; Secretaries, Dr. H. N. Maclaurin, Thomas Evans, M.R.C.S.E.; Committee, T.C.Morgan, L.R.C.S., Edin., A. Roberts, M.R.C.S.E., Dr. Mackellar, G. Bedford, M.R.C.S.E., Dr. Craig Dixson, Dr. Ewan

The President then read his annual Address, which, through pressure on our pages, we are compelled to hold over.

The Linnean Society of New South Wales.

The monthly meeting of this Society was held on Wednesday evening, 26th April, at the Free Public Library, the President, Dr. James C. Cox, F.L.S., in the chair. Dr. William Williams, Darling-hurst-road, was elected a member of the Society. The following donations were acknowledged:—*Southern Science Record*, vol. 2, No. 3, March, 1882; *Eucalyptographia*, 8th Decade, by Baron Ferd. von Müeller, K.C.M.G.; *Journal of the Microscopical Society of Victoria*, vol. 1, No. 4, vol. 2, No. 1; *Results of Rain and River Observations in New South Wales during 1881*, by Mr. H. C. Russell, Government Astronomer; *Catalogue of the stalk and sessile-eyed Crustacea of Australia*, by Mr. William A. Haswell, M.A., &c., from the Australian Museum. The following papers were read:—L. *Botanical Notes in Queensland*, part 2, by the Rev. J. E. Tenison-Woods, F.L.S. 2. *Description of a new Gobieso from Tasmania*, by Mr. E. P. Ramsay, F.L.S. 3. *Descriptions of Australian Micro-lepidoptera*, No. vii., by Mr. E. Meyrick, B.A. 4. *Notes on a species of fly (Stomoxys) said to have caused the death of several persons in New Caledonia*, by the Hon. William Macleay, M.L.C. Mr. Brazier exhibited part 4 of the French "Journal de Conchologie," 1881, with a plate showing a splendid figure of his *Bulimus Rossiteri*, described in page 586 of vol. vi of the Proceedings of the Linnean Society of New South Wales. Also a specimen of his new *Partula Layardi*, from Havanah Harbour, Vate, or Sandwich Island, New Hebrides, and an albino variety of the species from the same locality. Dr. Cox exhibited and read a descriptive note on a stone hatchet from Barranjoey, Broken Bay. The Curator of the Australian Museum exhibited collections illustrative of the fauna of Lord Howe Island, which had been recently obtained there by Mr. Alexander Morton, including the following:—Birds: *Porphyris melanotus*, *Strepera crissalis*, *Porphyria melanotus*, *Procellaria Gouldii*; *Halcyon vagans*, *Dactylositta trivirgata*. Echini: *Strongylocentrotus* (sp.), *Hipponæ esculentus*, *Echinometra lacunter*, *Breynia Australasia*. Geological specimens: 20 specimens of various rocks, from the sea-level to a height of 2,840 feet: some specimens of recently formed rocks, containing semi-fossilized shells of *Bulimus divaricatus* and *Helix* (sp.), and portions of the carapace of a turtle. Mollusca: Five recent species of land shells, *Helix sophiæ*, *Helix textrix*, *Helix* (sp.), *Vitrina Hillii*, *Bulimus divaricatus*, two species of oysters — *Ostrea mordax*, *Ostrea cuculiata*; *Tridacna elongata*. Corals: *Tulipora* (sp. P), and a large reef-coral. Fishes: two species of *Serranus*, and about 10 species of rock fish (Labrida?). Mr. Ramsay also exhibited a native head-dress, from New Guinea, beautifully ornamented with the feathers of the Paradise Bird. The Rev. J. E. Tenison-Woods exhibited, among other rare Bryozoa from New Caledonia, a specimen belonging to a new genus, cup-shaped, with the cells on the external surface. A special vote of thanks was accorded to Dr. R. R. Read for his donation of a very rare and valuable book, "Figures of Molluscous Animals, selected from various authors, etched for the use of students, by Mrs. Maria Emma Gray." This example was a presentation copy from Mrs. Gray to T. P. Woodward, and contains a large number of MS. notes and corrections.

Royal Society of South Australia.

At the usual monthly meeting of this Society, held on Tuesday evening, May 2, there was a good attendance of members, His Honor Chief Justice Way occupying the chair as President.

The Hon. Secretary announced a long list of donations to the library; also that the Waterworks Department had forwarded specimens of the strata gone through in the well-boring at the Waterworks Yard on the

North-East Park Lands.

Mr. D. B. Adamson showed a very ingenious planetary map of the Southern Hemisphere, whereby the position or time of rising or setting of any indicated star or planet may be discovered almost instantaneously, and at any time of the day or night.

Professor R. Tate directed attention to a pseudo-morphid of quartz after calcite, forwarded by Mr. J. G. O. Tepper from Clarendon. The same gentleman had also forwarded a piece of fluor spar and a presumed fossil in slate from Field's River.

Mr. S. Pollitzer mentioned that during an excursion to the neighbourhood of Field's River in search of the traces of the glacial period in this colony, some time ago discovered by Professor Tate, he had found a large block of granite, quite distinct from the prevailing geological character of the district; and Professor Tate stated, in reply, that Mr. Stirling Smeaton had also found traces of the same erratic character further north.

Dr. E. C. Stirling exhibited and explained Williams's Freezing Microtome, intended for making large sections of animal tissues for microscopical purposes by the medium of ice and gum solution. The instrument may be popularly described thus:—A cylindrical wooden box, about six inches diameter and six inches high, having a metal cylinder in the centre, is filled with equal parts of ice and salt. This is then covered with a glass lid, having in the centre a small round or square metal plate. On this plate the tissue to be operated upon is gummed after being saturated with highly concentrated gum solution. This metal plate comes into contact with the cylinder, passing through the middle of the ice and salt mixture, and the gum above is consequently frozen; but as it freezes in its natural state without undergoing crystallization, it enables the razor to cut the frozen tissue without fracturing it. The razor is mounted in a frame, regulated by set-screws, enabling the operator to shave off a section $\frac{1}{600}$ of an inch in thickness, or even thinner. Dr. Stirling exhibited several large sections of animal tissues, mounted for microscopical purposes, as made by the use of this instrument, and remarked that one possessed an historical interest. He explained that when in England lately he made application to the Home Secretary for licence to try some experiments upon dumb animals, with a view to testing the virtues of ligatures made from the sinews from kangaroo-tails, which he believed to be far superior to those made of "cat-gut," so-called, because the latter, being made by a process of partial decomposition, were liable to melt away within twenty-four hours when used as a ligature around an artery, and thus occasion great danger to the patient; but the sinews from the kangaroo tails, being in a natural state, would last for many days, and in the meantime a proper closure of the artery would take place, and the ligature would in time be absorbed. The Home Secretary, in his wisdom, refused the application, and he was obliged to wait for an opportunity to try the experiment upon a human subject. This opportunity occurred, and proved to be eminently successful, though the patient died. The death, however, occurred through other causes, and the ligature was then examined, after a lapse of ten days, and it was found that the artery was properly closed, whilst the ligature was in process of absorption, as shown by the section of the artery now exhibited by him. Some discussion followed upon this, and in answer to questions, Dr. Stirling said he considered the sinews made ligatures far superior to any others known.

Professor Tate mentioned that whilst in the Northern Territory he had seen Mr. Foelsche, who had shown him the several plants used by the natives there medicinally, including the *Sarcostemma australe*, which, it had been stated, was used by the natives as a remedy for small-pox. As the disease supposed to be small-pox had not prevailed amongst the natives there since the occupation by the present white population, there were no means of ascertaining the reputed virtue of the plant, which extended as far south as the vicinity of Port Augusta, or even further, and during one period of water famine had supported horned cattle for some time by milky juice, when eaten by them.

The President asked if it was known when the last epidemic of supposed small-pox occurred in South Australia, and the Assistant Secretary stated that in the early part of 1839, when he arrived here, many of the natives were much pitted with marks, which they ascribed to a visitation just previous to the advent of the white men on these shores. Other speakers followed, and it was mentioned as a curious circumstance that the disease, which appeared to be so fatal to the aborigines, seemed never to have been communicated to the white settlers; but it was also pointed out that the epidemic in South Australia occurred before its settlement by Europeans, whilst that in the Northern Territory occurred after the abandonment of Port Essington, and before the advent at Port Darwin of the present settlers.

The Assistant Secretary mentioned that he had noticed great quantities of blood exuding through the skin and at the caudal extremities of some Port Jackson sharks which he had caught and carefully abstained from wounding in any manner. The body on the softer parts assumed a red blotched appearance, and the blood seemed to come out like a perspiration whilst the sharks were dying.

The Hon. Secretary stated that Mr. W. L. Wragge, one of the members, had received the gold medal of the Scottish Meteorological Society for a valuable series of observations taken during several months on Ben Nevis, Mr. Wragge taking the higher station, and Mrs. Wragge recording at the lower one at Fort William.

The paper upon "Diurnal Lepidoptera of Balhannah District," being almost purely technical, was taken as

read, Professor Tate giving a brief *résumé* of its contents; and the same course was adopted with Mr. J. G. O. Tepper's paper upon "Some South Australian Lizards."

The Eoyal Society of Tasmania.

A monthly meeting of this Society, the first of the present session, was held at the Museum, on Monday, April 17, Mr. Justin McC. Brown in the chair.

Mr. W. F. Ward, Government Analyst, who had previously been nominated by the Council, was balloted for, and declared unanimously elected as a Fellow of the Society.

The Hon. Secretary (Mr. Barnard) brought forward the usual returns.

The Secretary called special attention to the extent and value of the donation (No. 10), from the Trustees of the Australian Museum, as an act of great liberality, especially coupled with the promise of a future gift of skins of New Guinea Birds, whenever mounted specimens are available for the purpose. "In exchange, the Trustees would be glad to receive skins or skeletons of Thylacines (Native Tigers), and skulls or skeletons of small Whales; also fresh-water Fishes and Crustaceans."

The Secretary read a letter from Baron F. von Mueller, K.C.M.G., with a short paper, entitled, "Remarks on the Vegetation of King's Island."

Mr. R. M. Johnston, F.L.S., followed with a "Note and Description of the first discovered representative of the Genus *Pupa* in Tasmania," with a drawing of the Shell.

The meeting closed with a vote of thanks to the writers of the papers, and to the donors to the Museum, making especial mention of the presentation of Birds from the Australian Museum, and of Shells from Miss Lodder.

At 8 o'clock the members adjourned to the upper rooms of the Museum, when an exhibition of the telephone took place, at which a number of ladies were present by invitation. Mr. R. Henry, the superintendent of telegraphs, conducted the proceedings, and commenced by giving a lucid and interesting description of the construction and uses of the instrument. Communication was made with Pearson's Point, Mount Nelson, and Battery Point; the extreme distance traversed being about 20 miles. The experiments were very successful, and afforded much gratification to those who witnessed them. Twelve telephones were employed on the occasion, by which means the various messages and replies were made audible to a number of persons simultaneously. In addition to conversation held between the several stations, music and singing were introduced, the airs being distinctly heard in the room.

In conclusion, Mr. Henry gave explanations of the working of the phonograph and microphone, which were attentively listened to.

Notes, Memoranda, &c.

The Late Charles Darwin.

A great man has just passed away from amongst us. The enthusiastic naturalist, Charles Darwin, whose patient industry and invariable candour won him the goodwill even of his enemies, has joined the great majority, at the ripe age of 73, after a life, as a scientist, of almost unparalleled activity, and the propounding of a theory which may fairly be said to have resulted in a revolution of thought throughout the learned world, from San Francisco to Nagasaki, and from Cape Town to Archangel.

It was the development of this latter idea, perhaps, that created more enemies for Darwin than did any other of his voluminous writings. The theory of Evolution is by no means a new one. It was hinted at by Lucretius in his celebrated poem, in which he enunciates the hypothesis that all the material Universe is the result of a fortuitous concourse of atoms. These atoms, he tells us, originally moved forward in parallel lines, and when reminded that if so the atoms would move on in that direction for ever, since parallel lines never meet, straightway suggested that a slant was, by some mysterious means, given to their original course. Had Lucretius known of the law of gravitation, at that time unheard of, he might have answered the objection in a much more satisfactory manner. Similarly, the same writer was in ignorance of thousands of facts connected with biology, and only recently demonstrated by modern science, and, therefore, utterly incapable of dealing with that "mystery of mysteries," the variety of animal and plant life. His hypothesis, therefore, was regarded as the idle dream of a visionary philosopher, an atheist withal, an eloquent poet, but knowing far less concerning natural history phenomena than the school boy of the present day who has read through the educational primers upon

botany, zoology, and animal physiology. The theory of evolution was at a much later day advocated by Lamarck and others, and still later by the anonymous author of the "Vestiges of Creation." In these cases, however, although the rough hypothesis might have been characterized by a great deal of truth, the *vera causa* assigned was by no means backed up by phenomena. The respective writers, therefore, received most unmerciful castigations from Hugh Miller, Prof. Sedgewick, and others, and the Lamarckian *cum* Vestiges theory fell into disrepute.

It remained for Darwin not only to revive the theory, but to place before the world a reasonable *modus operandi* by means of which changes in species and gradual evolution, from the simplest to the most complicated organisms, had been brought about. His theory (which, by the way, is altogether misunderstood by thousands of his admirers) is, that all species are prone to vary by almost imperceptible degrees; that in some cases the variations are in favor, surrounding circumstances being taken into consideration, of the animal; that there is almost invariably a superabundance of births and a consequent struggle for existence; that in such struggle the individuals of a species possessed of any advantage of structure will be more likely to live and bring forth offspring than are their less fortunate *confreres*. Hence the idea of the survival of the fittest, and by a series of these gradual changes and destructions, after thousands, it may be myriads, of centuries, a new species altogether dissimilar to the members of the original stock. It is notable that Darwin did not touch upon the origin of life. How the primal germ came into existence he did not venture to assert. In this respect he appears to have been possessed with all the modesty of Newton, who, when asked to give a reason for the force of gravitation, straightway replied, "I know of none save that it is the will of the Creator."

The views of Darwin, however, in his "Origin of Species," and more especially in his "Descent of Man," were considered hostile towards the popular interpretation of Genesis, and, as a consequence, drew down upon him a good deal of clerical opposition, which was all the stronger from the circumstance that the new theory was as hotly combated by men of science as by priests and bishops. It is doubtful, however, whether the worst foes of the great naturalist were not rather his most enthusiastic admirers than those who openly professed to be his opponents. The propositions put forward by Darwin with the utmost diffidence, and so unassumingly that no one could take offence at the language, even if differing from the idea, were brought forward as if fully demonstrated, and in language that, as Professor Mivart says, "was positively insulting" by scientists such as Vogt and Hæckel. "I think," were the modest words used by the originator. "We know," was the dogmatic dictum of many of his followers. "If such a thing is, then I imagine such a thing may be" is an almost stereotyped expression characteristic of the writings of this great philosopher. "Such things are, therefore such things must be" is the dictatorial *ex cathedra* utterance of many of the least worthy disciples of the master.

The publication of the theory has brought the doctrine of evolution prominently forward, and caused it to be studied by persons who, otherwise, would have paid no attention whatever to the subject. Even clergymen of the most orthodox school, as witness the late Canon Kingsley, are firm Darwinians to a certain extent. There is no doubt whatever that gradual variations, and the law of the survival of the fittest, have played a most important part in the history of the organic world, and that sexual selection, a sort of supplemental theory of Dr. Darwin, has played a most important part also. But as the originator added a supplement, so other investigators may add still further supplements. It may be, as Professor Mivart appears to think, that there was appointed from all eternity, by an all-wise Creator, a law by which, at a given time, new species shall arise by natural birth from their progenitors. And other causes may, by patient investigation, be brought ultimately to light. Meanwhile, those who seek to unravel the mystery must take an example from the life-long conduct of him who has lately departed from this earthly scene, who, being dead, will not be forgotten, and with regard to whom, let us hope, the most virulent of his adversaries will say, in all humility, "*Requiescat in pace: the good*" that thou hast done live after thee, and if, peradventure, thou hast inadvertently done evil, let the grave hide it,—let the dust cover it."

The "Catalogue of the Australian-stalk and sessile-eyed Crustacea," by Mr. W. A. Haswell, has been printed by order of the Trustees of the Australian Museum, Sydney, and is, according to the preface, intended as the first of a series of works of a similar character. It is a volume of over 300 pages, and contains descriptions of all the known Australian Malacostracous Crustacea, amounting to 540 species, and including many which have not previously been recorded as occurring in Australia. It also gives very many new Australian localities for species already known as natives of our shores. A very large proportion (over 200) of the species were originally described, and in many cases figured, by Mr. Haswell in a series of papers running through the last three volumes of the journal of the Linnean Society of New South Wales, and necessarily representing a vast amount of careful and most valuable scientific work. Mr. Haswell has, moreover, extended and improved most of the specific descriptions of older authors in those cases where the species have come under his own observation, thereby greatly facilitating the identification of specimens. The introduction gives a concise account of the general structure of the orders included in the Catalogue,

The publication of this work places the student of the *Malacostraca* in a more advantageous position than

that occupied by observers in almost any other department of Australian Natural History, summarizing as it does the whole body of information obtainable on the subject and presenting it in a compact form. We sincerely trust that the expressed intention of publishing similar works on other classes will be carried into effect as soon as practicable, and that the selection of authors for the work will be as well made as in the present instance. We should like also to see our own Museum following the good example set by the Sydney institution, so that each Museum could be occupied at the same time with a different class, to the manifest advantage of scientific workers. We may instance the *Bryozoa* as a class of which a synopsis is much wanted and could readily be prepared from the large amount of material available.

In conclusion we may take some slight exception to the title given by the Museum authorities to the work under consideration. Doubtless the *Edriophthalmata* have been conventionally known as the "Sessile-eyed Crustacea," still the term is wanting in scientific accuracy, since the vast group of the Entomostraca are just as truly sessile-eyed Crustacea as those to which the term is applied in the Catalogue. The title "Australian Malacostraca," with which Mr. Haswell heads his pages, should therefore, we think, have been adopted as the title of the book in place of the inexact and possibly misleading one actually made use of.

Notes and Queries.

Having occasion recently to pass through the Botanical Gardens and Domain, my attention was arrested by what to me appeared a new feature of insect life. I observed, a cluster of the common red ant on one of the branches of a young eucalyptus engaged, as I at first thought, dismembering some unfortunate insect victim which had fallen a prey to them; but, on closer inspection, I was surprised to notice that they carefully avoided injuring the insect, and, indeed, seemed to be going through a sort of "caressing" motion with regard to it, while the object of their attentions made efforts to disengage itself from their embraces. The insect, which in body, was about the size of a pea, and semi-transparent, exuded at intervals from the anus a milk-like fluid, upon each of which occasions there was a rush of the ants, who immediately sucked it away. I shall feel glad if any one can enlighten me upon this certainly interesting phase of insect life, which may be no novelty to others, but is so to me. I am aware that the ant is known to milk the "aphidæ," and squeeze them for the sake of a kind of saccharine fluid which they yield; but I was not previously aware of any other insect being used by them for a similar purpose until the above mentioned incident came under my notice.—ALPHA.

The Treatment of Criminals in Relation to Science.

An Essay

READ BEFORE THE ROYAL SOCIETY OF VICTORIA, MELBOURNE, ON MONDAY, 11TH NOVEMBER, 1872.

BY H. K. RUSDEN.

Melbourne: George Robertson, 69 Elizabeth Street. 1872.

Price Sixpence.

Melbourne: Stillwell and Knight, Printers, Collins Street East.

The Treatment of Criminals in Relation to Science.

BY H. K. RUSDEN.

[Read before the Royal Society of Victoria, 11th November, 1872.]

THE proper method of disposing of criminals is a subject upon which there appears to be as great a diversity of opinion, as any with which I am acquainted. If the best plan has ever been proposed, it would seem to have found small favour; for I know of none—whether practised or not—which is not widely and loudly condemned, not excepting even those most in vogue. Some persons still advocate flogging and hanging; others exclaim at such expedients with horror, as being not only wrong, but brutal, and also ineffective as deterrents. Some, with Mr. C'arlyle, would swiftly sweep from the universe the Devil's regiments of the line. Others find more joy in trying—however ineffectually—to bring one sinner to repentance, than in giving countenance and assistance to thousands of other men who need everything *but* repentance. Some are for doing more or less than *justice* to the criminals; some few to their victims—past and future; some few regard the claims of society; but in what justice to any of them consists scarcely two persons agree. I believe that this variety of opinion arises from want of clear perception of the nature of crime and of criminals, and of the relations of society to both. Most of those who are best acquainted with the subject—agree,—that there is a large and more or less distinct class of persons, who by birth, education, habit, and therefore inclination, subsist entirely—or mainly—by crime; by

systematically preying upon their neighbour's property, generally with small care whether their neighbour's lives become involved in its acquisition. It appears that though occasional accessions from without are received by this class, they are actually trifling in number, and comparatively easy to deal with; it does not seem that the ranks of crime would thus be permanently augmented, but for the association with the criminal class which the adoption of such a career necessarily involves. On these points the evidence of experts is consistent, as a rule;

See F. Hill "On Crime" M. D. Hill "On the Repression of Crime." Dr. J. Bruce Thomson's "Psychology of Criminals," in the Journal of Mental Science, Oct. 1870. Quarterly Review "The Police of London," July 1870, &c.

but one of the leading psychologists of the day traces all such cases of apparent aberration from a moral type, either to hereditary taint or physical lesion.

Dr. Maudsley's address before the Psychological Section of the British Medical Association, *Lancet*, August 10th, 1872. In justice to myself, I must state that with the single exception of the above allusion, any coincidence between my paper and Dr. Maudsley's invaluable address, is purely accidental. This paper was prepared for the meeting of the Royal Society of Victoria on the 14th October, and Dr. Maudsley's address was not received in Melbourne until the following mail.

The broad assertion frequently made, that members of the criminal class can readily be recognised at a glance by an acute officer, is scarcely eligible as a basis of action. A very remarkable statement, however, made by one of the highest authorities on the subject, is worthy of the gravest attention. Mr. Fredk. Hill (for many years Inspector of Prisons in England and Scotland), in his valuable work on "Crime," gives as the result of his long experience and statistical knowledge (p. 55), that "nothing has been more clearly" shown than that crime is to a considerable extent "hereditary" And he further says (p. 56), "If all the" criminals in the present generation could be collected and "placed in confinement—the young to be cured, and the old" to pass the remainder of their days under control, the next "generation would probably contain but few thieves." And he continues, "One of the most serious evils perhaps of the" system of short confinements is, that it allows the "perpetuation of a race of criminals. So long as a man is in" prison, he cannot at any rate become the father of future "offenders; and as the greatest number of crimes is committed at that age at which the passions are most violent," this consideration is a further and important reason for "long and unbroken periods of confinement." Report for 1836, p. 23. A most important statement, which Mr. Hill proceeds to corroborate with statistical proof. But even Mr. Hill scarcely appears adequately to recognise the entire scope and significance of the evidence he adduces to support it. He shows that the actual number of criminals bears to the number of crimes constantly committed a very much smaller proportion than is commonly supposed; that the large majority of offences is committed by criminals who have been imprisoned and released; that thousands of crimes are committed by one criminal, and that the loss to the community by his depredations amounts to many thousands of pounds. And this is not only probable, but inevitable, if his theory is correct. If there is a large number of persons whose profession is crime, it *must* be of almost constant commission; and as is otherwise probable, the crimes unreported and perhaps unsuspected, bear a large proportion to those detected or even known. A single party of Manchester pickpockets is estimated to have cost England more than £26,000 (p. 59).

Mr. Hill speaks of the imprisonment for life of all our criminals at once, as very desirable, though scarcely practicable; and appears to regard the state of public opinion as a more insuperable difficulty than even the cost of their arrest and maintenance. The first obstacle must, I think, give way, if it be only plainly and often enough shown that the balance of results would be clearly and largely good. And if a criminal cost much more in plunder, surveillance, detection, conviction, and occasional imprisonment, than he would in detention for life; the latter course must clearly be the most economical. The diminished expense for detections and convictions in the future should not be omitted from the calculation. And even if ten times the present expenditure were found to be necessary for gaols at first, a large economy would thus inevitably result; while far more important objects would also be attained; namely, the increased security to society of life and property; the fewer accessions to the criminal class from evil example and association; and the certain check to the propagation of criminal children. This, as the most perfect of all preventives, is an object of such transcendent importance, as should counterbalance many weighty objections, did such exist. But prevention has always been subordinated to cure, and to cure of the most imperfect and impossible description; instead of being adopted as *itself* the most perfect cure of all.

But it seems more than doubtful whether any extra expense would be involved for gaols—even first. "No unreformed inmates of a prison," says Mr. M. D. Hill (*Repression of Crime*, p. 465), "however extravagant" its expenditure, cost the community so much as they "would do—if at large. This fact has been so often "proved that I must be allowed to assume it as undeniable." It has been estimated that a criminal at large costs three or four times as much as when perpetually imprisoned.

See p. 502, quotation from *Weekly Dispatch*, 14th October, 1855.

But even if the cost should be found to increase a little, that little would inevitably soon decrease; and

before I conclude, I shall propose an expedient by which the cost—and every other real disadvantage—would be reduced to a minimum, while incalculable benefits would demonstrably result to the community, both physically and morally.

The broad proposition—that *no convicted criminal should ever be released*, is one which can scarcely be expected to gain ready acceptance on its first proposal; though I look upon its ultimate adoption as certain. The wisest and most beneficent suggestions have always met with strenuous opposition at first, and have never been cordially adopted, until the objectors discovered that the ends they *themselves* had most at heart, were actually being best effected in spite of their opposition. Man, however, never learns anything—except under compulsion. Few will contest that of all economic subjects, this is one—the solution of which is of the first importance, or that it has yet to be found; and fewer still will fail to recognise that the moral aspects of the question are more important still.

The present state of things is notoriously unsatisfactory, but the full extent of the mischief produced can scarcely be apprehended, for it is of daily increasing proportions. A worse than foreign enemy is maintained by us in our midst, and favoured with every advantage that our civilisation can furnish. We endow the criminal—known or unknown—with every protection from the ministers of the law which is accorded to the honest citizen, and actually assume that he has not done what we know he has done, until a certain method of proof has been fulfilled; and any loophole that a clever lawyer can find, is made effectual to save him from the legal consequences. But if—by force of circumstances, a conviction follow, the consequences tend rather to confirm him in his evil career, and perfect him in his profession. He lives as before, at the cost of his honest neighbours, with medical and every other attendance free; the most select of the society he prizes most, and no more work than is exactly calculated to keep him in health. He is far better fed, housed, and cared for, than many honest labourers;

See *Argus* (supplement), 16th October, 1872, as regards the prison dietary scale in America. Also, *Mayhew's London Labour and London Poor*, (to which I have lost an important reference) as regards the Dietary Scale in England. Also at Munich, and Valencia, see *Repression of Crime*, pp. 552 and 556, &c.

And he not only knows it, but proves by returning to it as soon as possible, that he appreciates it. But this is not all. Exactly in proportion to his reward for his crime, is the discouragement to the honest labourer, who cannot but be made too well aware of the difference in their fortunes on every fresh liberation of the protected idler, to whose support he knows he has to contribute! The only wonder is that crime is not more general than it is.

I would define a *criminal* as one whose acts are *habitually* predatory, and in contravention of the laws which protect property and person. If a criminal act were shown to be incongruous with the character and previous habits of the perpetrator, I would not call him a criminal; but if his criminal act were shown to accord with his habits and disposition, I would at once class him as a criminal upon his first conviction. A second conviction should be taken as decisive—as to criminal habit and disposition under any circumstances. One criminal act may not *prove* a habit or disposition; but its recurrence *is* proof of a liability which *must* augment with repetition. A habit is only a more advanced stage of the same course. But habits are formed and confirmed under ordinary conditions of life; and there can hardly be a more glaring or mischievous fallacy than the supposition, that conduct produced by the discipline, and exhibited within the precincts of a gaol, will probably be maintained under opposite conditions outside it, and in the face of habits which were the outcome of previous longer life, and which are stronger in proportion. "Can the" Ethiopian change his skin, or the leopard his spots? Then "may ye also do good, that are *accustomed* to do evil." (Jer. xiii. 23.) Experience and statistics combine to prove the strict truth of this wise saying, and that it is impossible to make good citizens out of confirmed bad ones. In fact, they must be Transformed physically, before moral reform can be possible. Every tree is known by its fruits, and good deeds should no more be expected from bad men, than grapes from thorns, or tenderness from tigers. Vice to the vicious, and crime to the criminal, are as natural as heredity, habit, and association can make them; and if their subjects are temporarily susceptible *under certain conditions* to corrective influences, they are inevitably more so to the predeterminations of inheritance and habit, when the conditions are renewed under which they were originally developed. Every individual is as much an example of the Persistence of Force, as is any other object in the universe. The force of habit is as certain and necessary as that of gravity. And this is admittedly a fact, proved by the statistics of crime, so far as they have been investigated. In Dr. J. Bruce Thomson's article on the "Psychology of Criminals" in the *Journal of Mental Science* (Oct. 1870, p. 343), he says: "They seem not amenable to moral treatment. All the appliances of chaplains and teachers, with all "the discipline of prison legislation, are not known to turn" any from the error of their ways. The criminal goes out "of and into prison many times, and the hopeless imbecile" is not reformed if a professional criminal. Such are set "at large, after short sentences, to my seeming, with as" much judgment as guided the Knight of La Mancha," when lie in his morbid philanthropy set at liberty the" wild galley slaves going to punishment. I have asked" all the principal governors of [gaols in] Scotland, if "they can point to a

converted thief, but *they never "knew an habitual thief man or woman, who became "honest and industrious.* A distinguished writer, who has, "as he says, looked more criminals in the face than any man in" Scotland, and has well studied their characteristics, says—"as to reforming old thieves—find me the man who has made" an honest working man out of an old thief, and I'd next set "him about turning old foxes into housedogs. The feat is "impossible." Mr. M. D. Hill, in his work already quoted, gives ample reasons for entirely distrusting the so-called statistics of *reformed* criminals, (pp. 589—594.) In fact, reliable statistics on the subject are impossible; for no test applied to a criminal when under gaol discipline, is of any value as regards his conduct when beyond it;

Lord Stanley, on the 12th Jan., 1857, said: "Moreover, the men who were the best behaved in prison, were often the worst behaved out of prison—and for this reason, that they were the men who were most susceptible to any influences whether good or bad, which were brought to bear upon them. The man who was docile to good influences, was apt to show himself equally docile when placed in contact with his old companions." See *Repression of Crime*, pp. 631-2. See also pp. 563, 586 to 594, 615-6, 655-8, 693, &c. &c. I quote Lord Stanley as a man who did not speak without being well informed on the subject, as well as because he has given the reason convincingly.

and the conditions of test imply a surveillance, more or less equivalent to that discipline. But the statistics of reconvictions *are* reliable, as far as they go; and experience, so far as certain, agrees with the theory that criminals *cannot* really reform, and that therefore they *never do*. In fact, if a man guilty of crime were by any possibility to become a worthy member of society, that would only prove that he was never really a criminal; that is, that his criminal act was not habitual or characteristic. But supposing it possible that a small percentage of genuine criminals *could* reform without relapse. Should the very doubtful chance of the reform of one criminal weigh for a moment against the imminent risk, not only of *his* not really reforming, but also of his influencing for evil—not one, but many—hitherto innocent members of society, to become criminal like himself?

But even were all this otherwise, or doubtful,—society is no more called upon to show consideration or tenderness to criminals, or to try—to its own prejudice—to change their nature, than it is bound to tame every tiger, or civilize every serpent. As Mr. F. Hill remarks, the "humanity of the "English law is in fact, inhumanity both to society, and to" the criminal himself." Doubtless it may be plausibly urged that a criminal is but the product of circumstances, with the determination of which he has actually less to do than society itself; and therefore that the Justice which Mr. Carlyle invokes upon him, would *really exempt him from punishment altogether*. But though the premiss is certainly true, the conclusion is absolutely false. Though society may be spoken of as a kind of personality—in so far as it has a power of acting, its personality is constantly changing, and it certainly is *not* to *blame* for the shortcomings of its previous personalities in past epochs. It *can* do no more than act for the best in *present* circumstances; and cannot do so better than by marking in the most practical and emphatic manner possible, the full breadth of the radical distinction between good and evil—right and wrong—so far as it has attained—so slowly and painfully—to the knowledge of it. All other kinds of knowledge are surely worthless in comparison; but the value of this is practically depreciated and ignored by every man who fails to pronounce and establish it to the full extent to which he has the opportunity. This is a duty—which, it appears to me, is fully as incumbent upon society, as upon the, individual, if not more so. Yet this is where both the individual and society constantly fail, and hence I believe, the slow progress which morality really makes.

One of the most surprising things in connection with the subject is, the small practical sympathy shown for the *victims* of criminals. To judge by the sympathy commonly exhibited, we might imagine that men in general regard the probability of their becoming *criminals themselves*, as much greater, than that of their being made the *victims* of criminals. Although punishment is administered to the criminal far too much in the spirit of revenge, from a sense of "*wild justice*," as Bacon calls it, and is arbitrarily measured by some idea of impossible quantitative proportion to the turpitude of the offence—instead of simply by the probabilities of its repetition—the "*wild justice*" is very rarely extended to the unfortunate victim. How rarely is compensation afforded to the victim of robbery or personal violence of any kind! The criminal—once caught—appears to exhaust public attention and sympathy. Would not public funds be more *justly* appropriated to pensioning the victim of a brutal rape, than in maintaining her ravisher in ease and idleness? Though not prepared to advocate state compensation to the victims of the depredations or violence of criminals generally, I believe it would be difficult to disprove the Justice of such a proposal; as crime takes place solely by the failure of society to maintain the sufferers in that security, which is surely the tacit condition of good 'behaviour. Why do not those who talk so much of *justice*, seek to apply it here? But they do not. And I do not,—but why? Because utility is the only rational basis of human action. And while the criminal classes remain at large, they would manage to get the bulk of the compensation as well as the plunder. Futile attempts at imperfect justice have always resulted not only in injustice, but also in enormously evil consequences, which weigh far more heavily on the

worthy than on the unworthy members of society. It is therefore incumbent on society—and it is also expedient for it—to recognise the claims of prospective victims; rather than as at present, to its own and their detriment, to devote its whole attention and expenditure to the amelioration of the condition of the criminal.

Theoretical principles of nearly every form corroborate the view, that consideration for the criminal should be subordinated to the interest of society. Whether we adopt the admirable saying of Buckle, that the perfection of government is the maximum of security with the minimum of interference; or Bentham's criterion of the greatest happiness of the greatest number; or the more widely acknowledged authority, which may be said to lay down that it is expedient that one man should die for the people; we are equally warranted in coming to the same conclusion, that a criminal—a proved criminal—should never again have the opportunity of injuring a worthy member of society. For that one possible victim to the mischievous propensities of the criminal, is obviously entitled to more consideration and protection than the criminal himself; besides which, though one person *may* by a bare possibility be the *sole* victim; not only is that rarely the case, but the *security* of *all* is jeopardised and infringed.

Mr. Carlyle, however, enounces a remarkable theory. He asserts that Justice should be executed upon the two-legged human wolf as a palpable messenger of Satan. But his view of *justice* extends no further than the act for which he invokes revenge! But has not the "merely ill-situated pitiable man" a claim, and a prior one to be avenged? For his urgent temptation, his unconsciously acquired evil habits, his worse associations and worst ignorance, his undesired birth in degradation, his inheritance of iniquity and passion? Why should *he*, rather than Mr. Carlyle—have been born to vice and its hopeless uncompensated consequences, in conditions which would have equally shapen in iniquity his scornful contemners? Surely *justice* should regard causes as well as effects, and withhold both hate and blame from those who, with different antecedents, would have been different men?

But the rectification of antecedents is an impossibility, and Society should therefore relinquish the vain chimera of *justice*, the opportunity for which has irrevocably past; and should devote its whole attention to the modification of consequences, so as, out of the present possibilities, to evolve the greatest future good. Is not a weighty obligation laid upon *us* all to do so, in virtue of those superior conditions which we so undeservedly enjoy, and which have made us what we are? Is it *justice* to hate and revenge, in conditions which *justice* would actually exchange? Should we not rather exercise our unearned prerogative of position with scrupulous care, as those to whom the future of the human race is temporarily entrusted, to produce the best possible conditions for our successors? When Mr. Carlyle claims, as a child of God, a right—and asserts it to be his duty to put an end to those whom he styles "palpable messengers of Satan,"—does the old adage occur to him, that it is a wise child that knows its own father? Like causes produce like effects. Would not the same causes which made one—a palpable messenger of Satan—have done the same for the supposed child of God, and *vice versa*? If not, can there be any ground for belief in causation at all? And if divine paternity made the difference, where is the *justice* of the distinction made? It is excluded. *Justice* then forms no valid ground for the punishment of any criminal whatsoever. *Justice* is an impossibility without a reversal of the past. The idea of *punishment* also, should therefore be discarded; particularly as it is *per se* a mere barbarity devoid of good result (unless as a feeble deterrent to others), and essentially unjust in principle. We can at best only so act in the present, as to educe good and avoid evil in the future.

Another very important consideration should lead us to the same conclusion at which I have arrived on other grounds,—that *a criminal should never be released*. It is characteristic of the criminal classes, that they are both unscrupulous and improvident, and set at nought the restrictions which society imposes upon the numerical increase of morally-disposed persons. An enormous impediment to the moral progress of the people would be at once removed, were convicted criminals never liberated to propagate their evil kind; the honest poor would be so far relieved from competition—at an immense disadvantage—with others who scruple not to avail *themselves* of means of subsistence from which honesty excludes; a part more or less—of the burden of foundling and reformatory asylums would be saved to society; the proportion of uneducated—or rather mis-educated—children would be largely reduced; and the first direct step probably in the history of the world would have been taken to improve, or rather to stay the deterioration of the race of human beings. For it must be obvious that if those below the general average of morality and intelligence multiply—as we know they do—far more rapidly and promiscuously than those above it, the tendency *must be* to lower the general average. And that tendency is enormously enhanced by the consequently increased competition, against which the honest poor have to contend in living, and in educating their children. And the highest authorities agree, not only that the majority of criminals are the children of criminals, but also that the large majority of the children of criminals become criminals themselves. And this is only what might naturally be expected by those who believe in cause and effect. It is inevitable—by that law of the persistence of force, which is as much the explanation of habit as the cause of heredity. And for all these reasons a criminal *by habit* should never be released under any circumstances.

The increased security to Society generally,—the rescue from injury and depredation of those who would otherwise be victims,—the banishment from society of constant evil examples,—the prevention of the production of a large number of evil children; these are advantages which are obvious, and can scarcely be over-estimated. The disadvantages appear to be all embraced in the one item of the cost of maintenance. But it seems doubtful whether that would not actually be reduced, even if all convicted criminals were incarcerated for life. I have already quoted the weighty opinion of the Recorder of Birmingham to that effect, and it is obviously true of those prisons in America and elsewhere, which are (said to be) self-supporting. But it must not be forgotten that it is precisely in such institutions that the life conditions of the criminal are made entirely superior to those of the honest labourer with whom he is made to compete, and whom, in a place like England, he thus helps to starve. Prison labour, if made remunerative, is thus doubly objectionable, and the cost of maintenance should be considered irrespective of the results of the prisoner's labour. But even then the increase of criminals by example and propagation would be checked, and the total number of criminals would therefore certainly diminish. The cost of police; now mainly engaged in watching and re-catching released criminals, might be safely reduced, so as probably to more than compensate for any extra expense in gaols.

And as regards the criminals themselves, the most plausible objection appears to me to be, that perpetual imprisonment would operate too much as a premium to crime, if they were to be maintained in conditions (as at present) vastly superior to those of the honest labourer. For this cruel and pernicious anomaly, a remedy should then be found, and I have one to propose. The maudlin nonsense that we hear about the loss of precious liberty is altogether out of place, and would be unworthy of a moment's consideration, but that there are morbid sentimentalists who constantly repeat it. But liberty is prized by the *active* and *industrious*, not by the *idle* and *lazy*. The simple incontestable fact that our thieves and forgers, as a rule, repeat their offences as soon as they regain their liberty, proves that they really appreciate their comfortable quarters, their gratuitous medical and other attendance, their food and exercise carefully regulated to maintain them in perfect health; and above all, the consciousness that their life in clover is at the expense of the honest labourer and taxpayer. Deprivation of liberty would be a punishment to an active mind and body, to a person to whom work is pleasure, and to whom debt, dependence, degradation, and depredation are equally repugnant. But criminals prove by their acts that they prefer gaol-life to freedom (M. D. Hill, p. 523-4); for they regularly adopt, as soon as liberated, the very means which experience has taught them are the most certain to secure their return to it. The only plausible argument to the contrary is, that attempts *are* sometimes made to escape. But these are notoriously rare exceptions, and arise from a love, less of liberty than of license, and hatred of social restraint rather than desire for free action; and these attempts to escape, admittedly prove extra intractability and impatience of social obligation. No attempts are made to escape from Munich or Valencia prisons.

Though perpetual imprisonment would prevent convicted criminals from contaminating Society, and propagating criminals, after their conviction, it is still open to grave objections. For the honest starving poor who contribute to their support should not be so mistaught that crime will entitle them to State maintenance and solve all their difficulties; and if criminals were made by their labour to pay for their keep, they would so far compete with honest labour, which would thus be placed at a disadvantage, though entitled to preference for any employment or expenditure. It therefore remains to be shown that there is a sure means both of preventing an increase of the expense of maintaining criminals and of avoiding, at the same time, the slightest appearance of offering to *them or to others* the premium to commit crime, which are the defects of the system of perpetual imprisonment. If, in attaining perfectly these ends, my proposal can be proved to present also the means of acquiring knowledge of the most important character, unattainable otherwise, and which would confer unprecedented benefits upon the human race generally, it is difficult to see what more could reasonably be desired. Nevertheless, I undertake to fulfil all these conditions, and also leave no room for the common complaint of competition with honest labour. More than this, my expedient has already been tried on a small scale, and with perfect success.

Sir G. C. Lewis says, that "by vivisection, important physiological facts have been established. Some of the ancient physicians of the Dogmatic sect were permitted by the kings to open the living bodies of convicted criminals, a practice which was defended against the objections of the Empiric sect, upon the ground that it is reasonable for a few criminals to suffer for the benefit of many innocent men. In modern times, likewise, the practice of inoculating criminals with the matter of the plague, for the purpose of throwing light upon contagion, has been recommended if not practised; and it appears that the French Government used in the 10th Century, to furnish annually to the physicians of Montpellier a living criminal for dissection." Sir G. C. Lewis takes this statement at second hand, and throws some doubt upon it, by adding in a note, that he has been unable to verify it by reference to the original author. See Sir G. C. Lewis' *Methods of Observation and Reasoning in Politics*, vol. i., pp. 162-3.

It is well-known that much modern knowledge has been acquired by experiments on the living subject, and could not have been otherwise attained. And it appears that they have been much more freely practised in

Germany and France than in England.

In the English Cyclopaedia, under the head of "Inoculation," it is stated that that preventive of a deadly disease was very slowly adopted in England, after its introduction from Turkey in 1721, by Lady Mary Wortley Montague, "and it was not until after it had been practised on six "criminals (whose liberty was promised to them if they "recovered, which they fortunately [!] did) that it was "generally received." My proposal is, to adopt this expedient and apply it generally; not, of course, to inoculate our criminals with small-pox, still less to liberate them afterwards; but to utilise as subjects for physiological, medical, and surgical experiment, *all our criminals without exception*. They should be divided into, say three classes; of which the first might be simply made subjects of experiments in diet, or in the trial of the effects of drugs of such a character as to produce the least inconvenience or pain, and extending over long or short periods. The second class might be used for experiments of a more critical or important character—if, indeed, any experiments involving such results as the improved health, longevity, and morals of the human race should be called other than important. The last class should be reserved for experiments in which life might be risked or taken. But the welfare of society in the advancement of medical and physiological knowledge should always form the prime consideration, and every other should be entirely subordinated to the scientific perfection of the experiments. No unnecessary pain should be inflicted; in fact, it would be generally indispensable to avoid it by means of anaesthetics. But even without their use, I confidently appeal to competent physiologists to say whether a capital surgical operation, in sound tissues, causes nearly as much actual pain as one ordinary gaol flogging;—a mere revengeful barbarity—which is barren of all good results that would not be far better and more amply attained by my proposal. Judges and juries would have solely and simply to determine the class to which any particular criminal should be assigned; and a felon of the deepest dye might thus be privileged to become the means of conferring unequalled benefits upon the human race. In the selection of subjects, I should, however, be inclined to allow the skilled experimenters as much latitude as the exigencies of science might demand or suggest, if subjects of experiment were required for any particular purpose. Every organ and function of the human body might thus be brought under direct observation and scientific experiment far more completely and advantageously than in the case of Alexis St. Martin.

Sec "Will the Coming Man Drink Wine?"—*Atlantic Monthly Magazine*, 1868.

All the objections to my proposal that I have been able to foresee are, the apparent inhumanity involved in its execution, and the alleged defect of moral right to put it in practice. For if there could be any question as to the deterrent effects of the plan, or the transcendent importance of instituting experiments upon the living human subject, I think those points may be best examined when I consider the advantages to be attained.

And first as to the inhumanity. I not only deny, but *retort* the charge. The fact is, that Mr. Hill's remark, already quoted, that humanity to criminals is inhumanity to society, is strictly applicable to the case; and the real difference between my position and that of my possible opponents is, that *I* prefer to exhibit my sympathy and humanity towards the unfortunate Mary Egans, Sullivans, Grahams, and Eltons, &c.; towards the innocent victims, than towards their criminal ravishers and murderers. I feel that as a member of Society which distinctly *owed* the protection and security, which it failed to afford to those helpless women in their dreadful need, I am bound to acquit myself of the responsibility which I certainly share, and this paper is my contribution to that end. If I have opponents, let them recognise that they are not only defenders of such villains as Sanders, Branch, Elton, Ritson, and Weechurch, &c., but their rewarders, and the accessories before the fact of the like crimes and outrages, if not participators in them, in the future.

But I extend *my* sympathy and humanity to millions besides the victims of robbery, murder, and rape. Millions of innocent sufferers from excruciating diseases of every description will have good hopes of release from their pangs by means of the rapid increase (which the proposed system is calculated to produce) in medical knowledge, which has hitherto languished under disabilities almost equivalent to prohibition. I can even discern a possible solution of the gigantic evil of poverty, which afflicts so heavily a large proportion of our fellow creatures, and dooms their progeny to inevitable ignorance, and probably to crime. Are we to show no humanity to these innocent victims of our social errors, but exhaust it upon those who, by their own act, have cancelled their title to consideration. And is it even a wrong to *them*, to make them, or rather to confer on them the privilege of being, against their wishes, of inestimable use to the Society they have wronged? The special aims of my proposition are to expand and exalt human sympathy, and to concentrate it upon the most legitimate objects.

The *right* of Society to act generally for the decided benefit of its aggregate body, is ordinarily admitted to be beyond question. As regards the taking of life, the *right*, I think, has been more rarely questioned, than the *policy* of Society in doing so, and thereby conducing indirectly to the acquittal of the guilty. The *last* is of course not a defect of the *law*, but of its *administration*; and the general diffusion of knowledge seems its only legitimate cure. The abstract right to take life is a transcendental point, which should be dealt with on its own grounds. The possession of the *power* may be logically maintained to constitute the *right*. *Power* indisputably

vindicates *natural* right in every other case beside that of man; and in human action it does the same where no injury is inflicted elsewhere. The question then becomes; Is it right that to benefit society, an evil should be inflicted by it upon an individual? This is conceded freely when that evil amounts to no more than a small fine, or a temporary deprivation of liberty; and now the question is narrowed to one of proportion. Now the estimate of the value of a human life is altogether arbitrary, and if anyone likes to assert that *per se* it is so precious that nothing can be put in competition with it, we can only oppose our opinion to his. But should he condescend to reason on the subject, weighty arguments may be adduced to the contrary. The fact that thousands risk and sacrifice their own lives for the most trivial of objects may prove no more than their opinion, but opinions are as good on that side as the other. It may also be said that human life, like everything else, where very redundant, *must* have a smaller value. But waiving that, death being the inevitable lot of all, what is taken is an uncertain number of years or days of life. The value of these years or days may be estimated in two ways; the good work done, or the pleasure experienced. The first of these would be amply satisfied by my proposition, which, I contend, provides for unsurpassable good to the human race. And as to the pleasure of the individual, *that* has an ample off-set in the pleasure taken from others; in the direct injury to some, and the lessened security of all. The consideration of the evil lives into which many are led by the greater prospect of impunity, should I think bear preponderant weight. But I have already given ample reasons why the interest of one unworthy, or even worthy, member of society should be subordinated to the interest of its aggregate body and posterity.

But as regards the *right* or *justice* of taking the life of a criminal; I may safely assume that my transcendental objector must grant that, for reasons already given, it is absolutely impossible for any human being to ascertain in what *justice* would consist, or to estimate only approximately the due weight to be allowed for inheritance of evil disposition, education, and provocation. But his premises are also understood to involve that in the next world perfect justice can and will be meted out to him. *Therefore*, the surest way to act justly to a criminal, is to leave the account of justice to be equitably balanced there, and despatch him with all convenient speed to where that consummation is to be achieved. On these principles—consistently applied—to inflict any punishment, as such, *but death*, is to incur the risk of committing an injustice; and to despatch a criminal forthwith, is the surest way to avoid inflicting an excess of evil. But as any defect of justice is to be so speedily rectified elsewhere, it becomes a minor question, if any, whether the evil we inflict, for the purpose of effecting a great good, be in excess or defect of justice; and we need feel no compunction or hesitation on the subject, if we simply fulfil upon the criminal, our own plain duty to society and posterity; confident that our criminal will infallibly receive the exact balance of good or evil which may be his due, as soon as we shall have done so. It is evident further that on the same principle we need not fear error on the side of severity in *doubtful* cases; but may confidently act for the good of society, even at the otherwise possible risk of sacrificing an innocent person. And we should thus abolish an admittedly most prolific source of the miscarriage of justice, and of the encouragement of crime; and at once explode that really stupid saying, that it is better that ten guilty should escape, than that one innocent should suffer. The fact is, that death being inevitable, the suffering is altogether assumed, being far less than that endured by the majority of honest men who die in their beds; and that it is clearly better for society and morality, that ten innocent persons should suffer, if only *apparently* guilty, than that one guilty one should escape. For the execution of a supposed guilty person—though innocent—should deter others as much as if he were really guilty, and is therefore good for society; while to let one guilty man escape is to teach possible impunity and immorality to all. To those who demur to this conclusion, I will merely propose a comparison of the popular penal system, which, as I have represented it, implies that it is good that many innocent should suffer for the benefit of one guilty,—with a fundamental principle of the popular religion, which implies that it is good that one innocent should suffer for the benefit of many guilty,—and with my conclusion that it is good that one guilty should suffer for the benefit of many innocent; and I challenge a candid and thoughtful decision.

These reasons are of course superfluous for those who recognise the clear right of society to dispose of criminals with sole regard to its own purification and good; and in fact for all but those to whose objections they specially apply. But it is necessary to meet, by anticipation, every objection which it seems likely will be made.

The first advantage arising from my proposal, is, that it is *eminently*, nay, *pre-eminently calculated to operate as a deterrent*. If those who are *least* likely *themselves* ever to become *subjects* to it, view my plan with horror—which I am prepared to believe—how much more will those do so who are the special objects of it? From my own knowledge of the criminal class, I suspect that this horror is likely to be enormously exaggerated. But I think the prospect of being made really and specially useful to society, would appal the worst of them quite as much.

Secondly. By never releasing a convict, which is a part of my proposal, the *reproduction* of criminals, either by *association* and *example*, or by *direct propagation*, *would be prevented*. This is, I think, no more than

the plain duty of Society towards its as yet uncontaminated but weak members. But the non-production of evil children—not so much for their own sakes (though that good should not be overlooked) as for the general improvement of the race and the security of the great body of society—is a good which can scarcely be over-estimated, and is beyond calculation, extending as it would into the remotest future.

Thirdly. These objects, important as they are, scarcely, if at all, surpass the incalculable benefits which would accrue to the human race by the great, and perhaps, first impetus to medical and physiological knowledge which would be the direct result. The present condition of medical knowledge is notoriously miserably deficient, and it is no compliment to the profession to say that people outside it know less. It has been, I think, an entirely mistaken policy of the profession, how much so ever forced upon it by circumstances, to shelter its own ignorance behind a technical terminology, and otherwise to maintain the monopoly of its poor apology for knowledge. By keeping patients, and thousands who otherwise *would* be patients, in such outer darkness, I believe that it has narrowed its own sphere of observation and research to the smallest limits, and deprived itself of much of that knowledge which is its greatest want. Had it not always as a body persisted in this suicidal course, originally adopted, doubtless, solely in self-defence, it might not have suffered as it has under prohibitions and disabilities which from time immemorial have been legally and conventionally imposed upon its education. Had legislators and others been aware that their own comfort, health, and longevity lost enormously by the professional ignorance of medicine and physiology, they would, perhaps, have discerned the absurdity and self-destruction involved in making it penal for a doctor to have a human body in his possession for purposes of experiment, while also making it penal that he should not understand his business. Yet such was, I believe, the case till within the last 40 years.

See *English Cyclopaedia, Art. Anatomy.*

Did men ever yet obtain real systematic knowledge otherwise than by experiment? Yet doctors are, and always have been, specially debarred from that best means of learning their business, and of benefitting the world; and it has only been by stealth, at considerable personal risk, and by circumventing the laws and Society itself, that some indomitable earnest workers have learned the very little that is known. The existence of homoeopathy in the face of allopathy demonstrates that the fundamental principles of medicine are in doubt and uncertainty, to say nothing of the thousand points of detail upon which opinions are divided. The notorious fact, also, that leading allopathists of Melbourne actually practice, by means of spiritual mediums and clairvoyants, is a sad proof of the insufficiency of ordinary means of diagnosis and methods of treatment. It is, I think, impossible to estimate the nevertheless certain prospective benefits, or to exaggerate the value to humanity of the scientific experiments which I propose—whether for acquiring accurate knowledge of the more obscure functions of the human body, the perfecting of capital surgical operations, the discovery, testing, and utilization of drugs of every description, or the solution of various most important physiological problems. Several of the most eminent members of the medical profession here fully endorse my views on this point. The popular mind will probably best recognise the importance of the proposal, in considering the instance that I have quoted in which it has already been practised in England. Inoculation was the first check to the then appalling ravages of small-pox, and prepared the way for the discovery of vaccination, which has since superseded it. The historical fact that the popular mind was at once convinced and satisfied by the experiment in that case is my ground of encouragement in reviving the proposal after a dormancy of 150 years, and advocating its wide extension. It is to me a guarantee that my recommendation will yet commend itself to the common sense of the people, and that it has only to be fairly tried once, to ensure its ultimate and permanent adoption throughout the world.

It is almost amusing to think how very foolishly Society defeats its own purposes in its conduct towards the medical profession. It lays down that *doctors shall not experiment*. If any ordinary person suspected for a moment that his medical attendant was *experimenting* upon Him, he would never see his face again. With what difficulty has the comparatively worthless privilege of obtaining a dead body for dissection, to learn scarcely anything beyond mere anatomy, been wrung from the stupid prejudices and superstitions of the people? How can the living expect to benefit by experiments, unless upon the living? It should surely be obvious that to learn with certainty the effects of drugs upon the living body, experiments with them upon the living body are indispensable. But that would be too shocking! And what is the result? That every one of us who employs a doctor to attend himself, his wife, or his child, actually furnishes a subject, and *too often a victim*, of ignorant, blind, and uninformative experiment in his own person or that of one of his family! Instead of enabling certain knowledge to be acquired as I suggest, by careful and conclusive experiment upon persons who *voluntarily* (when they know it as the legal penalty of crime) offer themselves for it! For a doctor cannot experiment profitably upon his ordinary patients, because he cannot be sure that the conditions he prescribes are carried into effect; he generally has reason to suspect that they are not. Even in a hospital (his only school at present) experiments must be strictly limited to the demands of the cases before him, and are so slightly more profitable than ordinary practice, that almost the sole advantage is, that he *can* have some certainty as to the conditions under which they are made. But in practice, because we stupidly prohibit perfect experiments upon persons who

are good for nothing else, we *actually subject ourselves* to experiments of an *imperfect, unprofitable, and even dangerous* description!

Although experiments upon animals may have been useful, they are well known to be wholly inadequate to secure reliable knowledge of the susceptibilities of the human subject. In fact, it is fortunate that this *is* known. For as it is now certain that doses of various drugs, which would kill a man, are perfectly innocuous to many animals, it would obviously be dangerous and foolish to rely upon any experiments, but those made upon the human subject. There can be no doubt that innumerable and perhaps valuable lives have been sacrificed for want of them. The value of true experiments for the purpose of understanding the nature of epidemics and checking their progress is so obvious, that as I have said, resort has already been had to them; but unfortunately with a halting doubt that it was right to do so, instead of with full confidence in it as the wisest measure that ever was adopted. But I confidently appeal to the profession to testify to the inestimable value of such experiments.

A fourth advantage is the enormous reduction of cost in the final disposal of criminals which would obviously result; as all the worst criminals would be utilised for experiments, involving so much risk or certainty of death, as would speedily reduce their numbers. I believe that the present cost of disposing of criminals would be reduced far more than fifty per cent., and that the supply of subjects for experiment would soon fall far short of the demand.

It has occurred to me that it may be thought that I have neglected or overlooked the question of Reform of Criminals, but I *have* touched upon it; and I admit that, just after reading the accounts of the noble institutions for that purpose at Munich, Valencia, &c., any proposition in which they are entirely ignored must appear cruel and unjust. But the fact is, that greater cruelty and flagrant wrong are unintentionally done by those very institutions; and not to persons who deserve evil at our hands, but to innocent stragglers who are entitled to protection from contamination and encouragement in virtue. The honest poor have in the first place a preferent claim to the expenditure itself. They have another, *not* to be exposed to the competition of prison labour. They have also a claim *not* to be taught that crime is rewarded with large expenditure, good food, lodging, and attendance, with freedom from care; while struggling poverty meets not only with anxiety, misery, and starvation; but with demonstration that by depredation and violence they may reverse their evil condition. It is as if you gave to the burglar the wages due to your honest servant, and informed your servant that he and his family *must want*, because what was *his due* might be the means of reforming the burglar, adding that he should follow the burglar's example. But, as I have said, the estimates of reformation have been proved to be altogether fallacious; and it is a demonstrated fact that those who appear, when under control, the most reformed, are, when beyond it, often the worst offenders. But whether you release them or not, while you thus spend thousands upon thieves and felons,—men, women, and children are literally worked to starvation in the next street, and *die* of want and disease, *because* they do not rob and murder! But even all this is nothing to the cruel wrong involved in the immoral lesson thus deliberately taught, that vice meets with the reward of virtue, and virtue, with what should be that of vice.

I believe I have now shown that the ideas of justice and punishment should both be discarded as futile and worse than useless in dealing with this question; and that reformation is, if not impossible, at least rare and incapable of timely test or proof; that the permanent incarceration of criminals would be a far better protection to society, present and future, than the current penal system; that it must necessarily tend to reduce crime to a minimum; that the cost would probably be much less than might be supposed; and that it would even furnish the means of effecting a direct and certain moral improvement in the human race. And I trust that I have also shown that the utilisation of criminals for scientific experiments would reduce the cost of perpetual incarceration of all criminals to a smaller amount than any other plan without exception; that it would operate as the most powerful of all deterrents from crime, and thus obviate the principal objection to all self-supporting or life imprisonments; that it would give an impetus to medical science which must speedily have a beneficent effect upon the health, comfort, longevity, and, still better, the morals of mankind; that it satisfies every want, extinguishes every anomaly, and solves every difficulty in the great problem of the disposal of criminals; and finally, that the charge of inhumanity recoils at once upon those who raise that objection, as their sympathies should be with—not the criminal—but his innocent victim.

Stilwell and Knight. Printers. Melbourne.

Essay on Suicide.

BY H. K. R.

Read before the Eclectic Association of Melbourne.

Melbourne: PRINTED BY ROBERT BELL, 97 LITTLE COLLINS STREET EAST.

Suicide.

IN this paper I propose to consider, not so much suicide itself, as the judgment of it, and of those who commit it, which is commonly formed; and how far that judgment is logical and true. To do this it will be necessary to consider suicide itself to a certain extent, as the object of that judgment. But suicide itself can possess but slight interest for those who are not tempted to commit it; which I trust will always be our own case. For it is certain that no one ever committed or was tempted to commit suicide, unless under circumstances of acute painfulness, or in a state of morbid excitation almost equivalent. But we judge our neighbours every minute in the day, and almost mechanically. That is, we condemn or approve without subjecting every decision to the rigid scrutiny of reason; but our ordinary hasty judgments are unconsciously determined in accordance with principles arrived at when we *do* trouble ourselves to consider particular cases carefully. Of so much the more importance is it then to do so correctly. It is my own impression that there is no point on which the popular judgment is more fallacious and less digested than on that of suicide and its victims; and I think that the fallacy which underlies the matter commonly misleads men in such a multiplicity of other instances, but is so much more susceptible of clear exposure in this than in *them*, that time and attention bestowed upon the careful consideration of this topic may be attended with particularly beneficial results.

Let us begin at the beginning: what is the cause not only of suicide, but of all men's acts? Indisputably pleasure and pain; and of these pain is chief. For pleasurable conditions are often enhanced by passivity, but pain is urgent and will not be denied;—action is imperative. All man's natural exterior covering is more or less delicately sensitive to impressions, which produce sensations painful or pleasant, and thus constitute his motives to action. It is indeed difficult to conceive how without a sensation he could acquire a motive to action at all. In fact, he has no other way of receiving impulses to action. By his sensations only does he learn what is hurtful, and what is beneficial to his system. How else could he know that fire burns, or that blows bruise? or what is good or bad for food or life? Why do we like people of what we call *good feeling*, but because we feel and know that those feelings produce corresponding actions?

But not only do we thus recognise what is good or bad for us, but we thus, and thus only learn how to act. Having thus been taught what is painful and pleasurable, we thus, and thus only learn how to reproduce the pleasure, and how to elude the pain. This is our only warranty for any action. Why do we eat or drink? We feel the sensation of hunger or thirst; we distinguish by experience the appropriate aliment; we seize it, and call it good if it answer to our anticipations. And "To enjoy is to obey," says Pope. If cold, we light a fire; if too hot, we seek the shade. In every case the pleasure realised or the pain avoided, is not only the *reason* of the act, but its *justification*. Existence is itself almost unexceptionally a pleasure, and to the sum; extent how tenacious are we of existence! How inestimable a good it is regarded, may be judged from the amount of pain which it will outweigh.

But in some rare instances we find that these infallible monitors, our sensations, advertise us that existence (the balance of pain over pleasure being overwhelming) is an evil, and non-existence a good; and if we act then, otherwise than in accordance with our feelings and convictions, do we not do violence to our nature? What do I say? Is it *possible* for us to act otherwise than as our sensations indicate to us the best course to avoid the pain and secure the pleasure? Certainly not. It is *not competent* for us to act otherwise than as our nature prompts and impels. And if there be any truth or significance in the principle that "*to enjoy is to obey*" it must be applicable to all cases; and when our enjoyment is to be found only in non-existence, our obedience must inevitably be involved in it also. Indeed, if anything more so:—for our existence is to a great extent involuntary; and the term obedience is indisputably more applicable to a voluntary than an involuntary act, whether the object be the maintenance or the destruction of our life.

The same argument has been well applied by Rousseau to the theological aspect of the question; and as the principal objections to suicide are generally advanced on theological grounds, I may not pass them over.

First then, there is no prohibition of suicide from Genesis to Revelations. Was this because it was a *sore subject* with the author? Pliny says that there is one invaluable privilege which man has, but God has not; that of terminating his own existence. I think if any being should hate his life, it should be the creator of a hell, and of evil. If he hates it, and cannot get rid of it, how awful is his punishment! The Bible however does not forbid suicide. "Thou shalt not kill" was evidently intended to prohibit encroachment on the rights of others; the taking from them their existence, their highest good. And when the destruction of another is considered a good for the social body, both nature and law not only justify, but command it.

But it is said, we have no right—it is a crime—to quit the post assigned us by Providence. On exactly the same principle we can have no right, and it should be equally a crime, to leave the country or the spot where we were born, or where we find ourselves at any time. We have no justification for doing so, but the very one I at

first adduced:—that our sensations and experience lead us to deem it best for us to do so. To say that Providence placed us here, is only a mysterious and irrelevant way of saying "we *are* here as we say" God knows," when we merely mean "me *don't* know." And those who say so will surely not demur to say that our sensations are equally bestowed by Providence. Then as Providence notifies to us the propriety of our going or staying, solely through the sensations by which alone we can discover it—when we are similarly convinced that non-existence is preferable to existence—on what ground can it be maintained that suicide is not the will of Providence? In fact, if Providence governs all, the success of a suicide proves decisively that his act was as much the dispensation of Providence as his any other act, or his death by lightning. But, as Rousseau points out, if Providence sends you a plague or a famine, or any ordinary death, you resist the dispensation with all your force, and elude it if you can. The suicide has the evidence of the like senses that it is the apparent wish of Providence that he should cease to exist; but *he* possesses the superior merit of obedience. Rousseau also shows how unreasonable it is to accuse the suicide of a desire to withdraw himself from a post of duty and from the governance of God. For on the theory of a God and a future life is it not impossible for him to do so? He simply steps into another post, as much or more under the government of God; by many supposed to involve greater, instead of less capacity and scope, and therefore more responsibility. What is death on this theory? Merely passing from one room to another—from a scene where circumstances indicate, in the only way in which we can receive such an intimation, that we are no longer required, to another to which we appear to be invited, and where therefore we may confidently hope to be enabled to act with better effect. If Providence gives us an appetite and food, and we consider that that justifies our using both,—if when Providence causes the sun to heat our heads we consider ourselves justified in interposing an umbrella to stop the inconvenience,—or if we scruple not but hasten to sacrifice a gangrenous limb for the sake of preserving the life we value more:—why, when life becomes painful, should we not recognise it as an intimation to move to a more favorable field of exertion, and why hesitate to use the means which a careful Providence has placed within our reach?

It is however, obvious that suicides are caused by the overwhelming pressure of circumstances, and the imagined impossibility of coping with or improving them. In every case dissatisfaction with existence is the reason for the act; and if it were in the conscious power of the unfortunate victim to make his existence agreeable, or tolerable otherwise, we may safely assume that that alternative would be preferred. Knowing as we do, and feeling the almost inexhaustible power and elasticity of the love of life, it is difficult if not impossible to realise the appalling load of hopeless despair which must oppress and excruciate the sensibilities of a sane suicide, before that energy by which alone the human race is maintained and continued, can in him find no employment so tolerable as its own destruction. How all the sweets and delights of life, which make the love of it so strong in all animated nature, must be converted into gall and wormwood! Is there anything so calculated to arouse the liveliest pity, the most compassionate sympathy? For who can assure himself against similar conditions?

Yet human *ill nature* has stigmatised the act as a voluntary crime of the deepest dye! It has been imagined not only to blacken the memory of the unfortunate victim himself, but also, by an excess of illogical stupidity, to injure the fame of those relatives who would have done all in their power to prevent it! This happily has not been general. Thus to impute turpitude to unfortunate misery, is pre-eminently a blot on Anglo-Saxon institutions. To the disgrace of England be it said that she was among the last of the nations of Europe to relax the savage severity of the laws on this point. Suicide has not been the subject of legislation in France or in most other states for nearly a century. How is it that in England such a stultification should have been maintained until 1824? For there, till then, it was actually attempted with impotent spite to punish the poor victim after he was dead, by burying him at a cross road with a stake driven through his body; but malice, not being satiated by that, was vented upon his *sorrowing relatives* by confiscating his property!

Surely it must be obvious that punishments of *unsuccessful* suicides can have but one tendency:—that of making them more careful to avoid failure on the next occasion. It is self-evident that nothing could be more fatuitously absurd than to endeavor to punish abortive suicidal attempts. It is like telling a prisoner that if he escape, you will punish him for doing so, *if you don't catch him!* In every way the conventional judgment in such cases seems to be diametrically opposed to the most fundamental principles of humanity and common sense.

What can be the cause of all this unreason, contradiction, and cruel illiberality? It seems to me that it is entirely attributable to that abominable *spirit of intolerance* which will not permit our neighbours to act, speak, or think otherwise than as *we* approve. For that intolerant spirit it appears to me that Christianity, that essentially intolerant religion, is mainly responsible. But this should not be carelessly stated without reasons given, for intolerance is not overtly taught by Christianity. The true cause of Christian intolerance seems clearly chargeable to *monotheism*. For when people cheerfully allowed their neighbours to have various gods of their own, there was no ground for intolerance of their religions. But when once a man feels bound to assert that his god, and therefore his religion, is the only true one, and that he and his god are *jealous* of all others, intolerance

obviously becomes the mainspring of his conduct, so far as he is pious. This is corroborated by the fact that the other monotheistic religions, the Jewish and the Mahometan, are as intolerant as the Christian.

Religion is notoriously a common cause of insanity, as well as of suicide. The reason is plain. Instead of learning from experience and reason that his happiness depends solely on the practice of virtue—which consists in understanding and utilising to his utmost the circumstances in which he is placed, and resolutely appropriating knowledge and its advantages wherever he may find them—man is too early taught to distrust and repudiate his most valuable faculties and important privileges, and to rely for guidance and strength upon an imaginary power, which of course fails him entirely whenever it is put to the test. If favorably circumstanced, or blessed with a naturally resolute temperament, he may get through life without a very serious mishap; but too often under less fortunate conditions, repeated failure confirms his fatal distrust of himself, produces despair; and he is driven and tossed like a rudderless ship upon the waves of life, and is ultimately lost in the storms of insanity or the whirlpool of self-destruction.

In what is England behind the foremost nations of Europe? Is it in energy, intelligence, or wealth? No. But *she is pious*. Though her national institutions are free, in conventional opinion the bulk of her people are slaves. The personal and social freedom of action of individuals doubtless leads them to criticise their neighbours, and to repel interference with their own opinions and prejudices; but it is their intolerant religion, based upon the absurd notion of the freedom of the will, which leads them to condemn as intentionally immoral, what is simply produced by the pressure of inflexible circumstances.

It is surely contrary to English, or any principles of justice, to condemn any man unheard. Could we only hear and realise the history of a poor suicide, could we know and understand *all* the cruel circumstances which inevitably caused his act, I imagine that nothing further would be necessary to induce us to retract our condemnation; particularly when we reflect how little our own circumstances are within our choice. When once the causes of all human action are discerned to be *necessary* in their operation, no room is left for blame. It is inapplicable. For it essentially implies that error is *not necessary*, but is avoidable under identical antecedent conditions.

We naturally and instinctively *hate* death; and if we hate and recoil from misery less, it is simply because it is generally the lesser evil. But surely the unfortunate, unwilling victim of misery—aggravated to such a degree of torture that even hateful death appears comparatively a blessing—should be the object rather of sympathy and compassion than of blame. It should require no further argument to prove that to blame or to hate a poor suicide involves a total misconception and confusion of ideas.

The only plausible argument for endeavoring to discourage, or even deprecating suicide, seems to me to be, that were it to become prevalent population would decrease; and the race must become extinct if the practice were to become general. But apprehensions on this score are utterly idle and baseless. The natural inevitable law of demand and supply amply guarantees us against such a contingency. Suicides have never been common except where population was condensed and misery great—where life, being redundant, possessed a smaller value, and was comparatively at a discount. It is unknown in sparsely peopled countries, while in China, Japan and India, and in large crowded cities, it is, I believe, prevalent in proportion more or less to the density and pressure of population. Other causes are of course operative. Intemperance I find causes (at Geneva for instance) one twelfth of recorded suicides. By far the greater numbers are attributed to disease. I presume that in most of *these* cases death is known to be inevitably near, when I think suicide, to avoid pain, is wise, rather than otherwise. The suicide of the Jews at York (said to have been 500 in number) in the reign of Richard the First, was in my opinion clearly an act of wisdom. For I imagine that the alternative would have been inevitably worse. It was *usual* then for *Christians* to *commence* intercourse with Jews under such circumstances, by drawing their teeth—not with chloroform or ether spray, not with skill or tenderness, but probably with a hammer and a cold chisel—the object being to *give*, not to relieve the toothache. This instance alone proves unanswerably that circumstances *can* justify suicide; and in my mind in *every case*, the *circumstances which cause, must therefore justify, suicide, or any other act*. The *consequences* alone of any act determine its goodness or badness. By men, of course, the consequences can only be divined from appearances. The wise foresee them best, but are frequently mistaken. All have to accept them, foreseen or not. It is clear, however, that *every man endeavors* to foresee them as accurately as possible, whatever object he may have in view. To offer arguments for or against suicide to anyone not driven by exceptional circumstances to contemplate its execution seems utterly idle; and entirely presumptuous to those who are. For to have any weight, arguments must have special reference to the particular case; and even *then*, they can have no efficacy comparable to that of whatever 'distracts the mind from the subject; for all depends upon the state of mind of the man himself, which if he could, he would scarcely communicate. This is a conclusive reason why no other man is, or can be, competent to condemn the act, even as an error of judgment; for that state of mind can only be *guessed at* by others, *even by* the results.

As in the debate I was accused of advocating suicide, I would say that if asked 'whether I advocate or

deprecate it, I reply "Never be miserable if you can help it, still less commit suicide;" but I think it just as idle and impertinent to urge upon the miserable, as upon the happy, any arguments for or against it.

My only object in considering this subject was to seize a favorable opportunity of deprecating that pernicious spirit of intolerance which leads men to presume to judge and blame their neighbours; causes hatred and all uncharitableness; intimidates and fetters thus the human mind; and is the greatest obstacle to its development and improvement. For *activity* is the one thing needful, even when erroneously applied. We learn most from our errors. New truths scarcely strike us, unless they explain and teach the remedy for former faults. Even the greatest and most fatal errors, involving the destruction of those who commit them, are of more inestimable value to others who are active-minded enough to profit by them, than perhaps even their own. Mental activity should be promoted and encouraged to the utmost. Happy those who are so constituted and circumstanced that their activity is always in the best direction! Let us pity and be grateful to those who are less fortunate; by whose errors we profit; who are sacrificed to the general good. If they deserve no credit, because their sacrifice was involuntary, they are clearly not proper objects of blame for missing the mark which we, by better fortune, may have hit. Inactivity is the only thing really to be deprecated; for by inactivity no good can accrue to anyone.

And let us remember always that charity and reason are thus *at last* in harmony. It marks an important step in the history of the progress of the human mind, when it is discerned that charity and blame (or condemnation of others) are essentially incompatible. There is no place or ground for uncharitableness with those who have once comprehensively grasped the idea of causation; who apprehend that men's actions, being necessitated, must be blameless; that activity is virtue, and that reason is its highest form.

R. Bell, Steam Printer, 97 Little Collins Street East, Melbourne.

Science and Religion

Or *The Relations of Modern Science with the Christian Churches*

A Lecture

By George Higinbotham

Judge of the Supreme Court of Victoria

Delivered in the Scots Church, Melbourne Under the auspices of the Scots Church Literary Association August 1st, 1883

Melbourne Samuel Mullen, Collins Street East 1883.

Science and Religion.

This Lecture, delivered before the Scots Church Literary Association in Melbourne, has been reprinted from *The Argus* at the request of several gentlemen, and with Mr. Justice Higinbotham's kind consent.

Lecture by MR. JUSTICE HIGINBOTHAM.

MR. CHAIRMAN, LADIES, AND GENTLEMEN,—

I am to address you this evening on a subject which I may not so much as attempt to make entertaining. What I shall say will, I fear, be in part unwelcome and probably displeasing to some of you. I should deeply regret if I were supposed by you to be capable of seizing the opportunity to respond rudely and ungraciously to the honour which has been conferred upon me in being invited to deliver a lecture in this place. I desire, therefore at once to inform you that I am not responsible for the subject of this lecture, nor, indeed, for the manner in which I shall treat that subject.

When the invitation was given to me to lecture before the Scots Church Literary Association, the Rev. Charles Strong requested me to select a particular subject, and he assigned a reason for his request. The position of the Christian churches in the world at the present day; their relations to mankind and to one another; the relations of the clergy and the laity to each other in the several churches; the effects of existing disunion between the churches; and the prospect and the means, if any exist, of a return to unity; all these aspects of one most difficult and thorny subject are, we know, often present, and suggest disquieting and desponding thoughts to a large and increasing number of educated minds, both lay and clerical, in this day. But such thoughts rarely find adequate and complete expression; they never form the subject of friendly discussion or of deliberation with a view to active effort of any kind. "The disease requireth rest rather than any other cure" was the judgment of Bacon in reference to the internal causes of dispute about matters "not of the highest nature" in one of the churches. The indolence or hopelessness of educated men has led them tacitly to extend this judgment to

"the high mysteries of faith," and "the great parts of the worship of God," to which its author intimates that he did not intend to apply it.

Most thinking men would agree that controversy, unfruitful at all times, could not be productive of any but mischievous consequences upon these the highest subjects. But may there not be free and also peaceful discussion without controversy? You may be of opinion, perhaps, that a young poet has spoken the word of practical wisdom upon this matter. "Men," said Keats, "ought not to debate or dispute about truth; but they ought to whisper results to one another." The Rev. Charles Strong thinks, as I understood him, that laymen should now whisper their thoughts to one another about the present state of the Christian churches; he is of opinion that the time has come when the laymen should confer together with freedom upon questions which affect the very existence for any useful purpose of one and all of the churches. Now, I am one of not a few laymen who believe that the Rev. Charles Strong has placed all laymen in this community under obligations to him, that his manifest sympathy with our difficulties as laymen commands our gratitude, and that his powerful, and, at the same time, highly courageous advocacy of the layman's right of free thought within the limits of the law binding on us all, entitles him to the united support of every one of us. And so when Mr. Strong expressed a desire that I should tell you, the lay members of this Society, my thoughts, as a layman, upon some one or another portion of this large subject, I felt it to be a duty to comply with his request, without considering my own inclinations. I need not tell you that Mr. Strong, although he has brought me here, is not responsible for a word that I shall utter. Neither, indeed, do I hold myself responsible, for having accepted this task I have conceived it to be my sole duty to endeavour to place before you in plain speech my real thoughts, whether they be deemed by you to be right or wrong, and whether they be welcome or displeasing to you, without intentional reserve or suppression of my personal opinions and convictions. And if I succeed in doing this I know that I shall give voice and expression to the silent reflections of other laymen also. There is a certain kind of freemasonry between laymen upon these burning questions of religious thought. I believe that we all, or the majority of us, think and feel very much alike about them, and we dimly know it; but we shrink from outward acknowledgment of the fact. My belief is that I have no thoughts to submit to you to-night but such as have in one form or another passed through the minds of scores of the educated laymen whom I address, and are now seething and breeding anxiety, and even despair, in the minds of thousands of thinkers amongst both the clergy and the laity in the old land, to which we still find ourselves ever turning for intellectual companionship, and whence, too, we would fain draw light and leading, but they do not come to us.

Decline of the Influence of the Pulpit with Educated Laymen.

I heard a sermon preached in a church in Victoria some time ago, which seemed to me to touch the heart of the particular question—namely, the growing division between the minds of the clergy and of the educated thinking laity in the Christian churches, its origin, and the means of restoring union, to which I desire to invite your attention this evening. The preacher was addressing himself to the different sections of a mixed congregation, and when he came to the adult males he spoke to this effect, "Which of you, I ask, has received our report? I fear if the truth were told that the answer must be very few of you. The adult laymen of Christian congregations appear to me to think that the teaching of Christ's ministers is something that may possibly be of use to women and children, but that it has nothing whatever to do with them. They scarcely pay to it the respect of formal and decorous attention." These remarkable words, addressed to a strange congregation, were uttered with emotion, as though the preacher keenly felt the slight to his order of which he was complaining as an affront offered to himself. At the time I heard them they appeared to me to convey bitter reproach, and also to express with exact truth a momentous fact. There are, of course, many exceptions in every church, and in every congregation of every church; but I take it to be certainly true that the intellects of the great majority of educated and thinking laymen at this day lie wholly outside the influence of the intellectual teaching of the Christian clergy.

The observation is true, we have good reason to believe, of all the Christian churches and in all countries of Christendom. It is true of the Greek Church in Russia: we are told by the author of a remarkable book lately published—*Underground, Russia*—that the whole of the educated classes in Russia are materialists. It is true of the Roman Catholic Church in Italy and the other countries of Europe where that church prevails. It is true, though the fact may be less obvious and there may be a larger number of exceptions, of one and all of the Protestant churches of Germany, Great Britain, America, and these Australian communities. In all countries professedly Christian the laity evince by their conduct in reference to great public questions such as education and the relations of the State to the churches a growing and profound distrust of all church systems of religious and moral belief. In all the churches the clergy display more and more unwillingness even to allude in their addresses to the laity to the intellectual bases of religious truth and of moral obligation. In all the churches in all Christian countries the adult male laity, by whom the affairs of the world are managed, on whose judgment and

mind and character the highest interests of mankind in the present and in future generations mainly depend, remain intellectually untaught by those whose mission, if they have any mission, it is to teach. And to teach adult thinking laymen, I will add, rather than women and children. For is it not a keen and yet a most just reproach to all adult laymen that we have abandoned to other and strange hands the duty of teaching wives and children, which plainly devolves by natural obligation on ourselves? We have an excuse indeed; I do not mean to say that it is a justification. We ourselves are untaught, and we are consequently incapable of performing a duty which demands a knowledge of the most difficult of the sciences and the most delicate of arts, I mean the science and the art of educating and training the undeveloped mind of the child and the receptive and dependent mind of the woman. But where shall the responsibility be laid for the uneducated and untrained condition of the layman's mind with respect to the highest truths?

Present State of Religious Organisations.

The late Rev. Professor Dinan, in an able article on "Religion in America," written in 1876, describes the most recent phase of American religious culture as "the æsthetic phase," in contradistinction to the ethical and the theological phases which preceded it. He observes that the present tendency of American Christianity is to assign to "sentiment" a more prominent function in religion; that a wide-spread reaction has set in, not so much against any particular tenet of the old theology as against the whole dogmatic apprehension of Christianity, while at the same time, owing the quickening of ecclesiastical activity and the impulse to ecclesiastical development, there exists a strong conservative preference for stable ecclesiastical order and a decided tendency to aggregation in a few great denominational types.

This description may be extended to Great Britain and to these colonies of Australia, and it will represent with tolerable accuracy, I think, the present state of religious organisations in the mother country and amongst ourselves. Everywhere, in all Protestant churches, dogmatic truth is either not presented at all to the intellects of educated laymen, or it is presented in such a manner as that the large majority cannot understand it, and will not accept it. The reasoning intellect of man demands ideas as its needful and sole proper aliment. It is only through ideas that the human intellect can be enabled to render that service which the religion professed by all the Christian churches claims from the intellect as well as from the affections of our human nature.

Sentiment and Art in Religion.

But the clergy of the Christian churches, abandoning the attempt to educate the layman's intellect, appeal to human sentiment, and employ art in various forms to evoke sentiment and to attract and influence the feelings by pleasing the senses. Let me not be supposed even to think disparagingly of any human sentiment that is true, or of art that is genuine; but I venture to affirm that neither the best and the noblest sentiment nor art when it is most pure and refined can be a substitute for the verities of religion—if religion have any verities. What is sentiment at its best? "How beautiful is noble sentiment," exclaimed Carlyle, without any touch of scorn, I think, but taking a just measure of its slight and fleeting value in the serious concerns of politics and religion. "How beautiful is noble sentiment! Like gossamer gauze, beautiful and cheap, which will not stand any tear or wear! Beautiful and cheap gossamer gauze, thou film shadow of the raw material of virtue, which art not woven, nor likely to be, into duty; thou art better than nothing and also worse."

And of art, when it is employed in a church as a substitute for intelligent religious thought, hear the opinion of the greatest living master of art, Mr. Ruskin, whose supremacy, I think, is most clearly proved by his constant reference of even true art to a second place only in human esteem. He ranks music, the purest of all the fine arts, and unquestionably the most rational as well as the most attractive art element in our church services, on the same level with tangible idols or images, and other sources of influences which address themselves to the commonest instincts of the human mind; and of all I of them, as used for ecclesiastical purposes to an unexampled degree in the Church of St. Mark's, Venice, he observes that they are "The stage properties of superstition, employed to produce a false emotion in minds incapable of apprehending the true nature of the Deity." Must not the same observation be applied to every Protestant church in the Christian world in which art is present and is used for the sake of its attractive influence, and from which religious and moral teaching, which the intellects of rational plain men can understand and accept, is continuously absent?

Waning Influence of the Churches as a Teaching Power.

Now what is the cause of this waning influence as a teaching power of all the Christian churches? What is it that has created the wide and ever-deepening chasm between the intellect and the intellectual judgments of the educated Christian clergy, in their capacity as teachers, and the intellect and the intellectual judgments of the educated laymen? This inquiry is one of the very highest interest, and it has not received, I think, its due share

of consideration either from clergymen or laymen. I do not think that we should be justified in tracing this fact to any deterioration in the general body of the clergy. So far as the Protestant churches are concerned—and it is with respect to them only that we have information on which an opinion could be founded—it may be affirmed, I think, that at no time previous to the present has more care been bestowed by all the churches upon the preparation and training of candidates for the duties of their office. And it may be affirmed with even more confidence, that at no period since the Reformation have the clergy of all the churches alike displayed so much zeal and devotion in the discharge of their allotted duties, or earned so generally and with so few exceptions a title to the personal influence which naturally and most justly belongs to consistent conduct and a blameless life. Neither should we be at liberty to conclude I think, that the clergy do not and cannot teach the laity, because laymen generally are at this day indifferent to religious truth, and refuse to be taught. The growing interest which the general body of educated laymen take in the highest and largest questions of religion and morals is certainly one of the most marked features of the present intellectual life of the world. At no time during the last 200 years have so many persons been engaged, fitfully and unmethodically it must be admitted, yet anxiously and eagerly, in the search for truth. Ideas, "the natural home and resting-place of the human mind," as they are fitly termed by Coleridge, are sought for with more or less earnestness by the great majority of educated thinking laymen in the present day.

If we look to the history of this city of Melbourne alone, we shall find that at any time during the last ten years any one who has professed to be able to communicate anything to his fellow men on the subjects of religion and philosophy has been able to secure a numerous, earnest, and attentive audience of thoughtful men, provided only that his hearers were not invited to assemble within the walls of a Christian church, and that the preacher has not founded his teaching upon the lines of any of the Christian creeds. What, then, is the cause?

Influence of Modern Science.

I believe that the best answer to this question will be found in the additions that have been made by modern science to human knowledge, and in the change or rather the revolution which those additions have made in the mind and its judgments with reference to subjects of religious speculative thought. I do not allude to the numerous great practical discoveries of recent science. Of the two classes into which the sciences may be divided, founded upon what Bacon calls "the last or farthest twofold end of knowledge," namely, those sciences which tend "to the glory of the Creator," and those which tend "to the relief of man's estate," the latter class appear to leave no special enduring mark upon the minds of successive generations of students.

On the other hand, the two great sciences of astronomy and geology, which have gradually raised and expanded the human intelligence more than all other influences put together, have done very little to help man in his contest with material nature. A learned and very practical thinker, Sir George Cornwall Lewis, startled the scientific world half a century ago by the proposition that the discovery of Copernicus had been of little or no benefit to man for any practical purpose, but he proved his proposition as he stated it by showing that almost all the requirements of navigation, the art which more than any other derives assistance from astronomy, might have been supplied by the Ptolemaic system of astronomy if that system had not been supplanted. The science of geology, in like manner, during its briefer history has done comparatively little towards giving effectual practical aid to man in his search for mineral wealth. But astronomy and geology, each exerting a wide and indirect influence, have enormously extended man's conceptions of space and of time in the minds even of persons who know little or nothing of either science, and in doing this they have changed the whole character of human thought upon the highest subjects of speculative inquiry.

The extent of this change may perhaps be best understood by comparing, or rather contrasting, the state of two minds, before and since the time of Copernicus. Let us take the case of a European, an educated and learned man, at any period between the second and the sixteenth centuries. What were his thoughts about Nature and God? He could see, as we now do, that man was at the head of the animal world. But he believed, in accordance with ancient tradition, that all animal and plant life had been called into existence about the same time as man, and that they had been created for the use and benefit of man. He looked up from the earth, whose shape he did not know, and saw that the heavenly bodies appeared to revolve round it at uncertain but small distances, and he naturally concluded that they, too, like everything else on the surface of this planet, existed for man and to supply his needs, that the sun ruled by day and the moon and the stars governed by night in subservience to man's convenience and wants. He would necessarily infer that man was the centre of the universe, and that all things existed for him. The Creator of the Universe could not, in the estimate of such a mind, be other than a magnified man, not free from the prejudices and caprices, and even the passions, of men of smaller growth. How profoundly erroneous do all such conceptions now appear to us?

Scientific Revelations.

Let me ask you to make the effort that is necessary in order to form an idea, inadequate though it must be, of the universe as it presents itself to the student of science in the last quarter of the nineteenth century. Astronomical spaces and geological times are so vast that without some artificial aids the mind fails to apprehend them. The phrase "a million of miles" or "a million of years" conveys no definite conception of distance or of time to a mind of ordinary capacity, and yet it is in such conceptions that the chief value of both sciences consists. I will use, with your permission, a measure of space which most of us can grasp, and I will invite you by its aid to try to get a distinct idea of interplanetary and interstellar spaces.

Those of us who have come to Australia from Great Britain have a tolerably definite idea of half the compass of the globe we inhabit, and thereby of its whole circumference. Now, think of this fact—a ray of light will travel a distance of nearly eight times round the earth in a second of time; it will take more than eight minutes, or four hundred and eighty seconds, to pass from the sun to the earth; that is to say the distance of the earth from the sun is something more than three thousand eight hundred times the length of a girdle round the earth. If we pause to reflect on this we shall get some idea of the enormous distance of our planet from the sun. Now, let us take in this further fact, that the planet Neptune, the most distant from the sun of all the planets, is more than thirty times further from the sun than is the earth. It taxes severely our powers of thought to stretch the mind so as to be able to conceive this idea of the magnitude of the space occupied by the sun and its attendant planets, and yet this idea, when it has been reached by a great effort, is only preparatory to the apprehension of the infinitely vaster spaces beyond the limits of the solar system.

To get a notion of these spaces I must ask you to make another effort of thought. One of the two stars called the Pointers, the farthest from the Southern Cross, is the nearest to our sun of all the fixed stars. Now let us reflect on this fact which comparatively recent science tells us. The light which enters our eyes as we look at this star on any night, although it has travelled during every second of time at the rate of nearly eight times the earth's circumference, has taken three and a-half years to come to us from this star. Here is another and perhaps a better mode of getting a conception of the distances of the fixed stars. It consists in reducing in imagination the vast size of our solar system to some very small space with which we are quite familiar. Let us, for example, assume in imagination that the 5,700,000,000 miles, which is nearly the length of the greater axis of the orbit of the planet Neptune, is compressed into that small part of Collins-street that lies between Swanston-street and Elizabeth-street, or say about five hundred and twenty feet, and then let us consider what lies outside our solar system so reduced. The nearest of all the fixed stars, the Pointer α Centauri, will then be seen at a distance of nearly three hundred and fifty miles from our sun; another of the few fixed stars whose distance can be measured, Sirius, will be seen at a distance of about fourteen hundred miles; while extending beyond and beyond, upon all sides, and, so far as we can judge, at corresponding vast distances from each other, three hundred and twenty-four thousand fixed stars have had their places mapped out in the heavens by the astronomer, and, as Mr. Proctor told us when he visited Melbourne some years ago, not less than one hundred millions of such suns or solar systems have been revealed to our eyes by Lord Ross's telescope.

These stupendous discoveries of modern science, in regard to space, have been accompanied during the last century by discoveries equally stupendous, though not by any means so certain or precise in regard to time. The evidence yielded by the earth's strata points with reasonable certainty to the conclusion that man has existed on the earth during a period anterior to history of about two hundred thousand years, and that the age of the earth itself must be measured, not by thousands of years, but by scores, and even by hundreds of millions of years.

Both astronomy and geology have surely revealed to us clear proofs of ascertained and unchangeable law, of design and increasing purpose, of slow and steady progress, and also, I think, in animated nature, of benevolent if stern discipline. The earth and all the other planets revolve, and have revolved for millions of years, round the sun in the same direction, in similar elliptic orbits, at rates of progress that vary in accordance with unvarying laws, and in periods related to each other by a fixed proportion of times and distances. Kepler's great discoveries are known to us by long verified experience, and are held by us with a minutely accurate certainty, far transcending the certainty we can feel with regard to anything under the immediate cognisance of our senses; and hence we necessarily feel an undoubting confidence in scientific predictions of events still in the future, and in scientific generalisations which may be as yet only highly probable.

In illustration of this, consider the instance of a verified and of an unverified scientific prophecy that occurred quite recently. It was announced many years ago that the planet Venus would begin to pass between the earth and the sun on the 8th day of December, 1874, at 14 h. 45 m. 57 s. Greenwich mean time, and preparations were made, as you will remember, by the Governments of several European countries, in reliance on this exact prediction, to take observations in different places, with the view of ascertaining more accurately the earth's distance from the sun. On the day and at the hour and the minute and the second foretold the transit commenced. Again, the same event was predicted to occur on the 6th day of last December, and again the prediction was exactly fulfilled. And now, when we are told by astronomers that another, and the next, transit of Venus will take place 121 years hence, in the year 2,004, on the 7th day of June, beginning at 17 h. 3 m. and 43

s. Greenwich mean time, can we have any doubt that, supposing no catastrophe occurs in the meantime to either planet, our children in the fourth or fifth generation will see the same phenomenon that we have seen, on the day and at the minute and the second of time foretold?

The same order, the same unvarying action, the like steadfast purpose and constant exercise of developing power are observable in the history of plant and animal life upon this planet, as revealed by geology; formless matter changing into crystallised inorganic matter, inorganic matter developing into organic matter instinct with life, plants, and animals of various degrees of complex structure with corresponding degrees of internal life, following one another in ascending scale, until now, in these latest days, man, God's last, and undoubtedly His greatest work on this earth, has been reached—

*"One first matter all,
Endued with various forms, various degrees
Of substance, and in things that live, of life
But more refined, more spirituous, and pure,
As nearer to Him placed, or nearer tending,
Each in their several active spheres assigned,
Till body up to spirit work, in bounds
Proportioned to each kind."*

The student who at present contemplates these vast results of modern science is another and a totally different man from the mediaeval student. It is not so much a change as a revolution that his mind and its concepts have undergone. To him man no longer appears to be the centre of all things, but one of the smallest of the works of God, although also the most wonderful and the grandest of those that are known to us, as is shown by the marvellous capacity displayed by him in the act of discovering his littleness. To the same student God also is presented in an entirely new and inexpressibly grander form of conception; anthropomorphism, or the representation of God in the likeness of man, is no longer possible in any shape; arbitrary dealing, capricious favour, vengeful punishment, sudden passionate change, are attributes that are wholly unthinkable in regard to the Creator by an educated layman in the present day, who sees with open eyes and ponders upon the vastness and the duration of the works of God, and the majestic simplicity of His unvarying action.

Science Not Opposed to Religion.

There is, of course, no opposition or conflict between modern science, with its great results and the enlarged conceptions which it has evolved in the human mind, and religion, using this last word in the sense that points to the existence of the supreme mind and the relations existing between that mind and the derived mind of man. So much was recently demonstrated with rare eloquence, and also with the utmost ease, by one to whom also, as a clergyman, we laymen of all denominations are deeply indebted for the sympathetic and helpful interest he has shown in some of our lay difficulties, and for the broader and more tolerant tone that has been communicated by him to the discussion of many public questions—I mean the Bishop of Melbourne.

At present no more can be said than this, that there exists no opposition between religion and modern science. Considerable advances have been made by science in our own day in the direction of the probable unity of the elements of matter and the probable unity of the originating causes of matter and motion. But science retains an attitude of reserve, and still refuses to speculate. This attitude, however, cannot in all probability, long be maintained.

It is not merely the right; it is a necessity for science to speculate upon, to inquire into all phenomena, mental as well as material. But science, affrighted by ecclesiasticism and its not yet exhausted terrors, has for a long time almost wholly abandoned the field of highest speculation to the Christian churches, and they in turn do not care to occupy it. "*Non Jingo hypotheses*, I do not frame hypotheses," exclaimed, in the early days of modern science, the illustrious but timid English philosopher, Sir Isaac Newton, alarmed at the consequences that were to follow from his formula of universal gravitation—the grandest generalisation in physical science ever propounded by the human intellect. He wished, if it were possible, to confine his formula to the bare statement of the terms of a mathematical proposition. But Euler, not less distinguished as a mathematician than Newton, declared that gravity must be caused either by a spirit in the particles of matter, like "the directing angel," supposed by Kepler to reside in and to regulate the movements of the planets, or by some subtle material medium. Euler accepted the latter hypothesis, and this is still adopted and applied by science in the present day to explain the operation of particular modes of motion, light and heat, as well as of gravity; although its sufficiency, even for this purpose, is undemonstrated, while its insufficiency to account for other

modes of motion, as well as for any vital or mental phenomena, is admitted.

But a great and a most happy change has begun, and has made rapid progress within our own time. Ecclesiasticism has become far less aggressive and violent than it was even a quarter of a century ago, while science, on the other hand, has gained confidence and courage in a proportional degree. We can measure the extent of this change by a comparison of two events, both of them within the recollection of some whom I now address. In the year 1859 Mr. Darwin's book *On the Origin of Species by Means of Natural Selection* made its appearance, and instantly there rose from scores of English pulpits, and through a hundred channels in the English press, cries of indignation and scorn, and also, it must be said, of fierce personal vituperation, directed against the blameless author of that book. In the early part of last year (1882), when Mr. Darwin died, the English press was unanimous in its eulogies of his life and labours, and sermons were actually preached in Westminster Abbey and in St. Paul's Cathedral, by two most distinguished clergymen, in which not only did the simple character of the illustrious student receive due commendation, but his great speculations and their results upon the thought of the age were referred to in terms of respect.

The Future Problem of Science.

As soon as science shall be completely set free from its lingering fears it must return, we may expect, as an inquirer and a learner, to the field of deductive speculation and hypothesis. Even now the old and inevitable questions "Whence" and "Why," the questions which every human intellect that really lives at some time puts to itself, and must either find some answer to them or perish in the attempt, again begin to be heard. Whence comes matter? And whence comes motion, or rather the force or forces which first originated, or which is, or which are, ever originating motion? And seeing that, as Sir John Herschel has observed, mere force may produce chaos, but never a cosmos, whence comes the ordered, regulated, directed force, which, never changing, never failing, has produced and still sustains the motions of the planets and all the complex phenomena of life upon this planet?

Such is the form which this Sphinx's riddle has now assumed, and science cannot rationally refuse either to accept the only hypothesis that has ever been proposed which pretends to explain all phenomena, or to suggest another equally comprehensive and equally consistent with ascertained facts. I mean the hypothesis which supposes that matter was originally created, and that every movement of every particle of matter has been in all time and now is impelled and directed by a supreme mind or will, ever and in every part of every natural phenomenon exerting a force analogous to that by which the derived mind in animals and man creates and directs motion in matter.

According to this ancient hypothesis; as applied to the facts of modern science, the world is but "manifested deity," or, as Agassiz has expressed it, "the whole creation is the expression of a thought, and not the product of physical agents;" every so-called "law of nature" is merely the continuous action of the Supreme Mind; every movement of matter is the act either of Deity or of some one of the infinite number of derived minds which have been invested with a delegated and like power; and evolution, of which progressive improvement is the unvarying mark and ideal perfection the ultimate end, is the visible operation of the Supreme invisible mind.

Nowhere has this hypothesis been more accurately or better stilted than by our English poet, Pope:—

*"All are but parts of one stupendous whole,
Whose body nature is, and God the soul;
That, changed through all, and yet in all the same,
Great in the earth as in the ethereal frame,
Glow in the stars, refreshes in the breeze,
Warms in the sun, and blossoms in the trees,
Lives through all life, extends through all extent,
Spreads undivided, operates unspent;
To Him no high, no low, no great, no small;
He fills, He bounds, connects, and equals all."*

This hypothesis has been declared by one acute thinker of the present day to be "unthinkable," and it cannot, of course, be entertained by those who so regard it. To my mind it appears to be as thinkable—not more so, and not less—as the fact, of which I am conscious, that my mind possesses the power of moving a finger or a limb. Each of us is conscious of this power, and he cannot rationally refuse to believe in the fact of its existence merely because he knows nothing either of the essential nature of the mind in which the power is lodged, or of the relations between the mind and the body on which the power is exerted.

To those minds that can apprehend it, this hypothesis yields the only satisfactory explanation of the innumerable and complex facts that go to make up "the burden and the mystery of this entire " (otherwise)" unintelligible world." It is the only hypothesis which even pretends to account for all phenomena, mental as well as physical. If it should ever become a theory or even a "working hypothesis "of science, in the same way that the purely hypothetical existence of ether is now necessarily assumed for the purpose of explaining gravity and light, and the nomenclature of science be varied and adjusted to the theory, it can hardly be doubted that the separation (not opposition) that now exists between religion and science will disappear, and that science and religion combined will exercise a most powerful and enduring, as well as beneficial, influence over all educated minds, and through them will transform the world.

Science Not Opposed to Christ's System of Religion.

My mind has been led to a further conclusion. I believe—and I conceive that in the circumstances under which I am addressing you, I am called on to state to you my belief—that not only is there no opposition between modern science and religion, or natural religion, as it is sometimes vaguely and inaccurately called, but that there is no opposition between modern science and that system of religion which was communicated to the world by the founder of Christianity.

What was that system? What was the truth which He, whom we heedlessly call the Great Teacher, diligently sought for and discovered for himself, and which He desired to communicate as the most, precious gift that mind can give to mind to every member of the human race? Is it presumption in a laymen to ask this question? I fear that many who aspire to control the mind of the laymen, while they are unable to teach or persuade it, really think that it is.

Now, I am very sensible that with regard to questions of this nature, I, and you also, my brother laymen, are unlearned and ignorant men, and extremely liable in consequence of our ignorance to fall into grave error. But why are we ignorant? I say that it is because the chaos of creeds and the babel of striving tongues in the Christian churches leave us ignorant and untaught, and compel every thinking layman to set out alone and unaided on the perilous path of inquiry.

And what shall a rational man who is constrained to seek truth for himself upon this subject do other than this, to close his ears resolutely against all others sounds and voices, and try to catch the sound of that one voice which alone above the din of nineteen centuries still makes itself heard as the voice of one that has authority? That it is more profitable to seek the fountain-heads than to follow the course of the rivulets is a canon of critical research peculiarly applicable to this inquiry. The precise words employed by a teacher are almost invariably the best exponent of his meaning; they acquire a supreme and exclusive value when differences arise as to what the scope and the effect of his teaching were, and when those who had the privilege of hearing him, and who might be expected therefore to be competent and concordant interpreters, have admittedly failed to comprehend his meaning and his mission, and do not agree with one another as to several particulars as well as to the general spirit of his doctrine.

The words of the Great Teacher of which the gospels are not the exclusive depositories have come down to us by tradition only. No contemporary record of them exists, or has ever existed. Not more than two of His immediate followers committed to writing His remembered words, and the Gospel of St. John—assuming as I do that it is genuine—was not written until more than thirty years, or, according to another authority, more than fifty years after his Master's last words had been spoken. The general accuracy of His reported utterances, spoken in one language and recorded in another and a very different language, depends largely in respect to both form and substance on what has been called "the uncertain testimony of slippery memory." But an answer conveyed almost wholly in a quotation from an old and still existing book has a very special claim to be regarded as an authentic and probably accurate report of His actual words. Such an answer we find in a passage that occurs in all the three synoptic gospels, with some unimportant differences in each. The full meaning and force of this passage—the most weighty and significant, I think, that is to be found in all Jewish and Christian literature—will be apparent if we remember the main tendency of Jewish philosophy during all periods of the history of that people.

The highest philosophy amongst the Jews appears to have consisted in the search for a comprehensive rule of life and conduct, founded upon and capable of being traced to a principle or a fact accepted by the understanding. That this thought pervaded Jewish literature and is a key to its historical meaning is shown by a curious and instructive passage quoted from the Talmud by Emile Deutsch, which with your permission I will read to you:—

Six hundred and thirteen injunctions was Moses instructed to give to the people. David reduced them to 11 in the 15th psalm. The prophet Isaiah reduced them to six (c. 33, v. 15); the prophet Micah reduced them to three (c. G, v. 8); Isaiah once more reduced them to two (c. 5G, v. 1); Amos reduced them to one (c. 5, v. 4); but

lest it might be supposed that God could be found in the fulfilment of His holy law, Habbakuk said (c. 2, v. 1), "The just shall live by his faith."

"What is your doctrine? What is the truth sufficient, according to your teaching, for the guidance of the life of man?" This was in effect the question put by the jurist or scribe to Him who as a boy appears to have proposed questions of a like nature to the learned doctors of the Jewish law. You know the answer that was promptly given to the question. It was quoted from the early records of Jewish history, where it had lain neglected for fourteen centuries, buried under heaps of ecclesiastical traditions and forms. It states the central principle or dogma of the existence of one God and His relationship to man, together with the primary and secondary rules of human conduct founded on and springing out of that relationship. And on these rules, the answer proceeds to state, "hang all the law and the prophets;" they contain the whole practice and theory of the universal religion which the Teacher had himself sought for and had found; none more comprehensive than these exist.

With the exception of a few, a very few, discordant notes, which a just and fearless criticism may and must either moderate or reject, all His other utterances are in complete harmony with and merely elucidate this one. I believe that no student who reads with an unpreoccupied mind the records of the sayings of Christ can doubt that it was this simple and sublime idea, realised in his life as an idea never before or since has been realised, that possessed, controlled, and animated it all; that it was this that gave great and enduring authority to His words, and has gained for his person the tender reverence of millions of men who have never accepted only because they have never been enabled to understand His doctrine; that this was the good news which he wished to extend from the Semitic to the other races of mankind; and that the transmission and the teaching of this truth, and the application of it to all the varying circumstances of civilisation in the course of its development was the wise purpose of the commission which He gave to His church.

If my inquiries upon this subject have led me to conclusions not wholly erroneous, it will be evident that there is no opposition or conflict between the religion of Christ and modern science. The resulting conception of both is the same. "God is a Spirit" is the single central dogma of the first; it is the highest generalisation towards which the latest and grandest discoveries of the second seem to be conducting the human mind.

"When we have really penetrated," a recent writer, Mr. Greg, observes, "to the actual teaching of Christ, and fairly disinterred that religion of Jesus which preceded all creeds and schemes and formulas, and which we trust will survive them all, we shall find that so far from this, the true essence of Christianity, being renounced or outgrown by the progressive intelligence of the age, its rescue, re-discovery, purification, and re-inthronement as a guide of life, a fountain of truth, an object of faith, a law written on the heart, will be recognised as the grandest and most beneficial achievement of that intelligence."

The Christian Religion not the Religion of Christ.

"The Christian religion has existed for more than eighteen hundred years. The religion of Christ has yet to be tried. The contest lies between the Christian religion and the religion of Jesus Christ; the religion of which Jesus is the object, or that of which Christ is the subject." The contrast which these words of Lessing vividly express brings us into the presence of the most portentous fact, as it appears to me, of this age of the world—a fact so fraught with pain and perplexity that I should be glad if I were able to pass it by. But I cannot do so, for it contains in itself the answer to the question which I have undertaken the attempt to solve.

I assume that the founder of Christianity intended to establish a church, an organisation which should propagate and should for ever maintain His doctrine throughout the world. The positive evidence of such intention is slight; the antecedent probability in favour of it is strong. The best and the most fruitful thoughts are usually the most evanescent, and when they are lost it is difficult to regain them. The saying of Wordsworth,

*"'Tis hard to keep
Heights which the soul is competent to gain,*

"is proved by the history of systems of religious thought to be equally true as applied to communities and to individuals. And the higher the ideal, the more difficult it is to propagate; the broader and more comprehensive the principle, the harder it is to apply it to the minute and ever-varying circumstances of practical life. It is unquestionably true that the religion taught by the founder of Christianity avowedly claims a right to hold absolute and exclusive control over all the faculties of the human mind, and to employ them continually in their fullest energy. To communicate a religion of so exalted and exacting a character to nations who were ignorant of it, and afterwards to keep its claims constantly before the minds of those who should adopt it, as well as to supply the means of applying its principles to the new and more complex events and circumstances of

advancing civilisation, might well be supposed to require a permanent teaching organisation of some kind.

Of the intended form of the church, whether it was to be art independent and separate body, or whether it was to be identical with the State, the civil head of the community presumed to be united by the bond of a common faith, we have no knowledge. Certainly no system of government was fixed by the founder of the church, no ritual was prescribed, no form of common prayer was directed, but only a closet prayer, constructed, according to Wetstein, almost *verbatim* out of the Talmud. Everything except the central dogma and the rules of life dependent on it was left at large, and free to adjust itself to the different characters and habits and the varying conditions of each nationality and age. How instructive is this majestic silence in the Founder of a religion that was to affect so largely the destinies of mankind! How deep the debt of gratitude due from all who acknowledge His authority for the liberty with which He intended to make and to keep them free!

Church Organisations.

Christianity is, and always has been, represented in the world by the Christian churches. The churches are organisations, distinguished by different forms of government, by different rituals and forms of worship, and chiefly by different and conflicting systems of religious belief, contained in hostile creeds, articles, confessions, and standards of faith. This last fact is that which appears to me to carry with it the final condemnation of all Christian churches alike as they exist down to the present day. All other differences may be necessary, or if not necessary, may be expedient, and therefore lawful. But unity in the object of worship and in the fundamental principles of belief and practice must be the essential and distinguishing mark of the one Church founded by Him who restored and announced to the whole world the obscured faith in one living and true God.

I assume, of course, that not one of the Christian churches can successfully set up so much as a shadow of a rational claim to regard itself, or to be regarded by others, as being itself the sole Church of Christ.

Creeds of the Churches.

A protestant, and addressing the members of a protestant church, I will now further assume that no man and no council or church has had authority given to it to alter or to add to, in anything great or small, by way of development or otherwise, the doctrine of the Founder of Christianity, or to impose the profession of belief in any added doctrine or practice upon the human mind and conscience as a condition of membership of the Church of Christ. But the great bulk of the propositions of fact and of belief in even the earliest creeds and in all the later articles, confessions, and standards of faith, are undoubtedly additions to the primitive doctrine. If we except the first article in the earliest and the least exacting creed, the Apostles' Creed, which is a superfluous repetition, we shall find scarcely anything in any of the creeds and standards, increasing as they multiply in the number and oppressiveness of their arbitrary dogmas, that is not an unauthorised addition to the primitive simple doctrines.

Again, some of those dogmas which the churches have superadded to the doctrine of Christ without His authority, and which they endeavour pertinaciously to force upon the clergy and the laity, are dogmas which, as some of you, I doubt now, know from bitter personal experience, are revolting and odious to the natural conscience and to the understanding of man. I am well aware that at this point I stand on the borders of the deepest mysteries of being and of Providence. Such mysteries, painful and full of perplexity as are many that the course of nature and the constitution of the human mind present to us, must be endured. Faith reposes in the assurance that they all admit of, and that they will yet receive, explanation—

*We trust that somehow good
Will be the final goal of ill."*

But while the human understanding bows before the mysteries of God, and awaits His solution of them, may we not, ought we not, to resent the attempts made by men like ourselves, only far more ignorant—to represent the hideous dreams that our interpretation, no doubt faulty, of those mysteries sometimes suggests, as articles of Christian faith, and the acceptance of such articles as a condition of salvation?

I observe, lastly, that some of the articles, and not the least opposed to reason and conscience, of these unauthorised creeds, have been undermined by recent science. The ancient tradition that man was created perfect, that the first man so created fell by his own act, and thereby introduced death for the first time into the world, and entailed hereditary guilt and moral ruin upon all his posterity, appears to have taken some hold upon the Jewish mind. The alleged historical fact, and the dogma of hereditary guilt founded upon it, are not so much as mentioned once by the Founder of Christianity; possibly they were included by Him amongst the traditions

which had been the means, He said, of making the commandment of God of none effect. But both have found their way into the majority of the Christian churches, and have lent a distinct colour to most of the Christian creeds.

Now, if there be any general conclusions to which recent geological science has forcibly drawn the human mind, and to which, although they may not be established by inductive proof, laymen cannot, if they would, refuse to accord belief, they are these—That man at the first did not fall from a higher state of existence, but that he rose from a lower; and that what we call death, or the change and dissolution of the organic form in which life temporarily resides, existed on this planet from the time that life first appeared upon it, and millions of years before the comparatively recent date when man first came into being. There is here irreconcilable variance between modern science and the doctrine of the Christian churches.

And now we are brought to the point at which we find the answer to the question—What is the cause of the failing influence as a teaching power of the clergy of all the Christian churches over the minds of educated, thinking laymen? Science in its modern, enlarged, and generalising spirit, and also in some of its recent conclusions, is opposed, not indeed to religion, but to the creeds of the churches, all of which urge an unfounded claim to infallible authority. The laity are habitually and of necessity influenced, though they do not always know it, by the broad conceptions of nature and of God which science imperceptibly but irresistibly conveys to their minds. Thinking laymen cannot reconcile these conceptions with the doctrines of the creeds; they have ceased even to make an effort to reconcile them. They yield an indolent assent, indeed, to the creeds, as they do to every part of the particular church system with which they are connected by birth, but in fact and actual practice they totally disregard them.

The clergy of all the churches, on the other hand, occupy a very different position. The clergyman is selected for his office while he is very young, and long before he has had time or has acquired sufficient intellectual expansion to be able to comprehend the nature and scope of the great subject to which his life is to be devoted. His mind is carefully trained to believe the tenets of a particular church, to defend and to teach them and them alone, and to carry on ceaseless war against the opposing tenets of other churches; and the fulfilment of these narrow functions during the whole of his professional life is attempted to lie enforced by sanctions highly penal in their personal, social, and professional consequences. How can a mind so trained, and harshly compelled to submit to such discipline, exercise the commanding power of a real teacher over the intellect, differently constituted, ever otherwise occupied, and constantly subject to influences so wholly diverse, of the educated, thinking layman at this day? The thoughts of the two men are not in unison; there is no intellectual sympathy, no common intellectual interest between them in regard to a large number of the topics and arguments which the clergyman is constrained to select for his pulpit utterances.

I must use all brevity in stating to you, the lay members of this Society, the practical conclusions upon this subject at which I, a layman born into another church, have arrived.

Practical Conclusions.

They follow from the belief I hold, that the creeds of the Christian churches, while they have been by far the most potent engine of ecclesiastical power, have also been the most dangerous and insidious enemies of the religion of Christ—that so far as they have expressed his doctrine, they are merely an unauthoritative and superfluous repetition of that doctrine; while so far as they have pretended to add to it, they have either obscured or falsified it, and in either case have imposed a burden on the intellect and the conscience of the Christian world which is now becoming wholly intolerable. If this belief be not quite erroneous, it must be clear that the Christian churches, above all other human institutions at this day, need "the blessed amending hand" of radical reform.

The laity are the only instrument by which reform can be effected. They are not free from a share of responsibility for the evils that exist. In Protestant churches they undoubtedly possess the power to remove them. The aid of the clergy cannot be expected; it ought not in fairness to be asked; the opposition of the clergy must be overcome.

The means of reform apparently available are suggested by the proposals that were made at the time of the Reformation to abolish the creeds. These proposals were not accepted. The conduct of the Reformation, which in the earlier days of Wyclif and Huss was in the hands of the laity, and aimed at a lay reform of ecclesiastical abuses, passed at a later period into the hands of the clergy and of politicians, and it is to them rather than to the general body of the laity that the Church of England owes the added burden of her Articles of Religion, and the Church of Scotland that of the Westminster Confession of Faith.

If the compulsory subscription by the clergy of all creeds, articles, and standards were abolished through the united action of the laity in only one of the older Protestant churches, consequences most momentous and beneficial might be expected, I think, to follow. The example would be catching, and would probably extend

quickly to all the Protestant churches. The intellectual division between the clergy and the laity would soon be removed, for both would rejoice speedily to forget the systems of dogma that now, like a nightmare, oppress them both. Alterations in ritual necessary for the purpose of consigning those systems to complete oblivion would then be readily made. Science and the churches would be no longer alienated, and the unworthy jealousy and emulation between the various churches, of which their rival creeds are the constant and by far the most effective cause, would cease. A real union, founded upon an enlarged basis of belief, would gradually be established, and formal union would not long loiter behind the removal of every cause of disunion. And when the Protestant Christian world is united, and all its churches combined in one, the open abandonment by the educated laity of the Catholic and the Greek churches, and the final absorption or total decay of both of those churches, would only be questions of time and education. Do not suppose that I am speaking of results which I believe to be at present possible or near. That abolition of subscription by the clergy in any one or more of the churches would be immediately productive of great results, and would probably lead ultimately to the further results I have indicated, I do believe. But before the initial step of practical church reform can be taken, it is necessary that a spirit which shall point to and demand reform shall first be created in the minds of the laity, and I am bound to admit that I do not perceive at present any indication whatever of such a spirit in any one of the churches.

I am aware that I have already exceeded the limit of time which a lecturer is entitled to ask from the most liberal and indulgent audience; and yet I will crave your permission to add another word. I would ask you, my brother laymen, are you entirely satisfied and contented with the state of things now existing in your own and in the other Christian churches 1

Responsibilities of the Laity.

Do you think that we, the laity generally, can view our own conduct and position in respect to the churches with unmixed gratification? We criticise the clergy with unbounded freedom—usually, as it appears to me, with cruel injustice, and often in profound forgetfulness that our criticism reacts upon ourselves—for their alleged illiberal and narrow views, and for irrational, unpractical, and ineffectual teaching. But may we not be reminded that the views and the teaching of the clergy are the direct and the necessary result of the church systems which we, the laity, have helped to form, and which we continue to support, and to guard jealously against all change, even after we have ceased to entirely believe in them?

We imagine that we ourselves are free; and in a certain sense we are. We are not bound by subscription to any church; each of us is free to leave the church in which he was born, and to go anywhere or nowhere. But should we not greatly en if we imagine that we are free from the influence of creeds to which we pay the observance of outward adhesion, but which do not govern our thoughts and convictions? There is not one of us who does not yield apparent assent to much that he does not and cannot really believe. Is it possible that assent without belief shall continue for an indefinite time without affecting the natural vigour of a man's intellect, and even the integrity and straightforwardness of a manly character?

Every day these burning questions of religious thought in connection with their general tendencies, and also with the personal applications they suggest, are brought nearer and nearer to us, and they naturally inspire an increasing number of us with uneasiness, and even with vague and terrible apprehensions. The state of the world as it now presents itself to our observation cannot, we may be sure, long tolerate the continued treatment by the laity of these questions with careless levity, or with self-isolating reserve, or with the boastful incapacity of honest agnosticism.

Perplexity of Modern Thought.

Is it not an astounding fact—I take it to be an indisputable fact—that at the end of the nineteenth century of the so-called Christian dispensation a very large number of the most cultivated, the most thoughtful, the most sober-minded, and the most upright men in all the civilised and Christian countries of the world, are really unable to determine whether good and sufficient reasons can be found for belief in the existence of God, and whether there is any basis for morality other than supposed personal interest or utility? We cannot wonder, though we may well be appalled to observe, that this mental paralysis of a large number of the leaders of men in every country is extending rapidly to all classes, and is plainly disturbing the springs of action in almost every department of human activity, and in every region of human thought. In religion, in politics, in literature, in art, in the social relations, in scientific research itself, the human mind at this day is divided, weak, irresolute, perplexed, unregulated by a single ascertained and unquestioned law. And this, too, at a time when civilisation is threatened in some countries by new and hitherto unknown perils. Never before in the history of the world have the elements of evil and of danger to human society confederated on a scale so vast, and with purposes so

deadly, as at present. Never before have the elements of good appeared to be so incapable of combining against the enemies of all. It seems as if the world were hurrying towards the realisation of that picture of universal intellectual and moral anarchy in which the human mind is seen to perish, while the animal life of man, and even the material civilisation of the race, survive—one of the most terrible pictures ever painted by a poet's imagination, and which we are told the painter himself could not to the end of his life ever look at without being moved to tears.

*"She comes! she comes! the sable throne behold
Of night primeval and of Chaos old!
Before her, Fancy's gilded clouds decay,
And all its varying rainbows die away.
Wit shoots in vain its momentary fires,
The meteor drops, and in a flash expires.
As one by one, at dread Medea's strain,
The sick'ning stars fade off th' ethereal plain;
As Argus' eyes by Hermes' wand opprest,
Closed one by one to everlasting rest;
Tims at her felt approach and secret might
Art after Art goes out, and all is night.
See skulking Truth to her old cavern fled,
Mountains of casuistry heaped o'er her head!
Philosophy, that leaned on Heaven before.
Shrinks to her second cause, and is no more.
Religion blushing veils her sacred fires,
And, unawares, Morality expires.
Nor public flame, nor private dares to shine,
Nor human spark is left, nor glimpse divine.
Lo! thy dread empire, Chaos, is restored,
Light (lies before thy uncreating word.
Thy hand, great Anarch, lets the curtain fall,
And universal darkness buries all."*

We do not, of course, believe that this catastrophe imagined by Pope will finally overtake and overwhelm the human mind, though as yet the way of escape may not be apparent. Science itself seems to forbid that thought of utter despair. It is a wholly incredible supposition that the light which has guided humanity so far in its painful but inevitable struggle upwards on the eternal hills to the point that it has already reached will be suddenly and finally withdrawn. The power which has been man's help in the ages that are past is, and must be, a rational ground of his hope in years to come. But let us not forget that dangers that have been created by human ignorance and causeless dissensions will certainly be averted only by the instrumentality of wise and united human efforts. The salvation of the mind of Christendom at present appears to depend, so far as we can venture to hazard an opinion, upon union amongst laymen of all churches, who still retain an intelligent hold upon the ultimate object of faith, and who will combine to cast out from their own minds and from the Christian churches the spectres of old and now discredited fallacies.

For my part, I believe—and this, my deep conviction, is the last result of my reflections, which I shall "whisper" to you, my brother laymen, to-night—that it were the part of highest wisdom for you and for me, and for all thinkers everywhere, in this day of rising floods and beating wind, to withdraw resolutely and with all speed from all the lower standpoints of thought that are now no longer tenable, and to meet on the high central platform of thought—the rock of all ages, whereon every human mind may, if it will, build for itself a secure and indestructible abode—God, "the living Will that shall endure when all that seems shall suffer shock"—God, revealed to the intellect in every minute movement of matter, and in all the phenomena of this vast universe—God, revealed anew to the intellect, and also to the responsive human heart, as the Father, the Friend, the Guide, and the Support of our race, and of every member of it, in the simple but profound philosophy, and also in the sublimest life, of Jesus of Nazareth, the Light of the World.

Stillwell and Co., Printers Melbourne
Science and Religion.
A Review of Judge Higinbotham's Lecture
(Delivered before the Dunedin Freethought Association),

By T. Cheyne Farnie, M.A.

Price Sixpence.

Dunedin: Joseph Braithwaite, BOOKSELLER AND STATIONER. CORNER ARCADE AND HIGH STREET 1883.

Science and Religion.

WHEN we compare the present with the past, we are apt at times to feel a little startled by the discovery that this nineteenth century of ours, about whose enlightenment we pride ourselves, is not quite so superior in all respects to other eras in the world's history as we were inclined to suppose. If we take the average intelligence of the people of any nation of today. We are surprised to find that it does not seem to occupy a very much higher position than that of some of the nations of days gone by. If we take Athens, for instance, in the time of Pericles—"Athens the eye of Greece, mother of arts and eloquence"—we should find that her citizens at that time were not at all inferior to those of to-day. The thought might indeed be forced upon us, that in general intelligence, in quick-witted sensibilities, in the spirit of inquiry, in questioning subtlety, in the desire and absorbing passion for beauty and for truth, the Athenian citizen stood far ahead of the average citizen of to-day. The Greek was a born lover of art, and a born critic. He was a subtle philosopher, and an enquiring statesman. He could look back upon the traditions of the past with joy, he loved the myths and legends that were interwoven with the history of his country, and that were hymned in the songs of his greatest poets, but he did not allow these beautiful apparitions to influence his judgment in matters of speculative research. In Democritus and Heraclitus, in Plato and Aristotle, we find the germs of speculative doctrines that are only new beginning to put forth their tender leaves of hope. Never was the pursuit of truth more eagerly followed than in the Greece of old time—never was the private judgment of the individual at a higher flood. And yet when we consider the high intellectual standard of each individual member of the Athenian community 2000 years ago, when we contrast it with the questioning unrest of Florence at the time of the Medici, or of Europe during the Renaissance, and gaze with pride on our own century with its advanced scientists, its great mechanics, and its social reformers, are we not appalled to find that the average individual does not appear to have benefited to the extent that might have been expected from his 2000 extra years of training? That this is the case appears probable from the fact that, notwithstanding the glorious blaze of science which illumines the world of today, strong men and strong women may still be seen sitting on the grass-grown steps of ruined thoughts, gnawing at the dry bones and husks of old, bespattered, but still unburied religions. And when one who is a member of a Church, but whose opinions are not in harmony with its doctrines, has the courage and the address to point out what a grinning skeleton these dry bones form, is he not entitled to the gratitude and the respect of all right-thinking men? And even if the opinions which he utters do not commend themselves in their entirety to our own minds, we are none the less bound to acknowledge their worth, and to recognise the good they are likely to do; and while we can appreciate and respect the utterances of such a one, it is none the less our duty to show wherein we differ from them, or wherein they appear defective to us. We may not be satisfied with these opinions—they may not seem to go far enough or deep enough for us; but in any criticisms we may make upon them we are bound to exemplify that spirit of fairness, of candour, of deference, and of respect, which ought to characterise all controversial utterances.

The now famous lecture recently delivered by Judge Higinbotham, on "The Relations of Modern Science with the Christian Churches," is the lecture of such a one as I have described. It is a lecture which ought to be welcomed alike by Churchman and by Freethinker. To the Churchman it should show the weakness of Christian creeds, and the inadequacy of theologic conceptions to meet the requirements of modern thought; while to the Freethinker, if he takes the lecture as the literal expression of the Judge's opinions, it should show the inherent frailty of even the most advanced view of orthodoxy, when looked at from the social and scientific vantage ground of to-day. By Freethinkers it has not yet publicly received that attention which the merits of the lecture and the well-known ability of the lecturer deserve. By the generality of the Churches, on the other hand, it has been received with a storm of indignation, and by a plethora of that remarkable kind of criticism which is usually employed by the clerical mind when it feels called upon to attack aggressive infidelity. I do not think the Church is ever so pitifully weak as when it marshals its forces, sets up in battle array its ghastly skeletons, dead puppets, and withered dogmas, with the faint hope of routing the well-drilled, well-disciplined, keen, cutting, arguments of the man of science. The spectacle is similar to that of an army of Chinamen of old time, unarmed except with unmusical instruments, marching onward in battle array, with clashing of cymbals and rolling of drums, in the hopes of frightening away a squadron of British redcoats, armed with the bayonet and rifle. But not only has the Church on this occasion confined itself to puerile attempts at criticism. It has even stooped to call in question the action of a member of its own body—the Rev. Charles Strong—by whose

instrumentality Judge Higinbotham had been prevailed upon to deliver his lecture. Mr. Strong is known throughout the Australian colonies as a man of liberal ideas and of culture, and as big action in the present case shows, a man desirous of initiating those reforms which he deems to be necessary in the Church, and which he thinks will tend to place it on a broader foundation than that on which it now rests. The resignation of Mr. Strong cannot fail to weaken the Church, and everything which tends to weaken the power of the Churches helps to strengthen the cause of Freethought. If the tendency of the Church is to excommunicate and cut adrift her strongest sons, how can she expect to preserve her ascendancy when she has only the weak to trust to? I understand that although Mr. Strong has resigned his position as a member of the Melbourne Presbytery, and has vacated his church, that his congregation does not intend to desert him. This congregation is the wealthiest and the most influential in Melbourne, and if what is above stated be correct, what good may we expect from a man of his advanced views, untrammelled by an hereditary governing body, presiding over a congregation enlightened enough to follow him in spite of his doubtful orthodoxy. I think if no other instance were possible, the case of the Rev. Charles Strong would be sufficient to show the good that Judge Higinbotham's lecture has already done; while the attitude of the clergy towards it, both in Victoria and in this Colony, clearly shows how telling were those of the Judge's criticisms that were applicable to that body. It is not because the Judge attacks the foundations of religion, that the clergy are up in arms against him, for this he most assuredly does not do; but because he disturbs the crumbling dust of Christian creeds and Christian Churches as at present constituted, because he indicates a reform which might be productive of good. And the Church is now, and ever has been, the arch-enemy of reform. Instead of being hostile to theology, the Judge in his lecture even attempts to prove the existence of God, the existence of one supreme Power possessing some human attributes, and to show that there is no necessarily real conflict between religion and modern science.

Theology and Religion.

It is these points in the Judge's lecture which I intend more particularly discussing this evening; and in order to prevent verbal confusion, I would like in the first place to distinguish between theology and religion. To me it seems, however paradoxical it may sound, that there is no necessary connection between religion and theology; and in any lectures I have had the honour of delivering from this platform. I have always studiously endeavoured to refrain from confounding the two. Perhaps it would be more correct to say that theology and religion are not in any way convertible terms; and that any points of agreement there may be between them (all except one) are accidental and not necessary. And this lies in the fact that theology *has been* a religion, but it has now fallen from that high pedestal. The one point of community between the two is that both entail the idea of worship. With modern theology, however, worship has sunk into an accident, a second place, while belief is tie essential element—belief in the existence of a divine architect and ruler of the universe, belief in the excellencies of creed and dogma pertaining to the antique-modern churches. Theology has faded from the rank of a religion, and fallen into that of a superstition. Vanished is the principle that ministered to her early welfare, and made her a power among men. That power she in part still jealously clings to, but the worship and devotion to a power higher and more noble than her devotees, that grand principle she has lost, and in its place can only be seen the stalking shadows, the ghostly mummies, the empty forms and hollow ceremonies that show that a religion was once there.

And, religion; what, then, is religion, and wherein does it differ from theology? Religion is the worship of ideals. "Worship" and "ideal" are both essentials of religion. When this proposition is clearly understood it will be seen that true religion, or what the distinguished author of *Ecce Homo* has called "natural religion," has the very closest connection with man's individual and social welfare. Our shattered ideals mark the faltering footsteps of the world's progress. What would we be without them these ever-to-be-ruined idols, that are seen glittering on the horizon of hope? and even if when grasped they stand before us reft of their loveliness, unadorned with the glamour of longing, what then? If they have beckoned us onwards they have served their ends. Ideals must be set before us. Ideals must be shattered and replaced by higher ones, if we wish to progress. The very possession of an ideal indicates the desire to rise to something higher—shows the desire to excel—shows dissatisfaction with present surroundings, the first element of success. Ideals indicate the intelligent recognition of a higher life. And worship is no less a necessity of the social medium. True worship is based upon the fundamental principle of sympathy, and entails the idea of love and affection. We love the bright visions that haunt us in our waking dreams. This worship, this sympathy, this love and affection, entail the idea of something not ourselves—something with which we must strive to bring ourselves into harmony. This desire for harmony, this link of feeling between the *me* and the *not-me* between our grosser selves and what we may reach by striving, between the individual unit and the social medium that surrounds him, this is religion. And worship is the recognition of that feeling. Whenever this feeling is recognised, and that recognition influences the life of a man, there is religion; that man is a religious man, even although he has

kicked off the traces of theology, and disbelieved all the miracles that were ever packed into a superstitious world.

The shoemaker who, in spite of the frownings of fortune, manfully sticks to his last, and desires and endeavours to turn out good work, shows by his very endeavour that he has the element of religion in him. The desire of doing good work, in whatever department of life our sphere may be placed, is an ideal, and exemplifies the striving after that never-to-be-reached perfection, to which all our aims tend, and which forms the essence of religion. The ideal of the artist is beauty, and in the worship of beauty, and the burning ambition to portray her ever vanishing forms, is the delight and the absorbing passion of his life. *There* are ideals, *there* is worship — a worship no less pure and unselfish—no less lovely in its strength than the ideal of worship itself. The man of science too has his ideal—an ideal it may be, cold and impassive like a marble statue, not quivering with life and motion and feeling like that of the artist's. The Goddess of Truth uses no blandishments like the Goddess of Beauty: her eyes do not sparkle, nor her red lips quiver, nor her smile fascinate, nor her hair shimmer in the sunlight. like those of Beauty's Queen; but she allures, and enchants, and enraptures her devotees by the charm of her voice, by the sweet siren song she sings telling of the mystery of the world, and of how men may learn her secrets. And so we might go on to exhaust the different departments of life, and point out that in each there could and ought to be worship and therefore religion. The doctor, the lawyer, the schoolmaster, the mechanic, the tradesman, the labourer as well as the minister of a church, may each have his ideal; and in so far as he worships it and endeavours to act up to it, he is a religious man. But this worship of ideals, which you call religion," remarks an objector, "is too exclusive, it does not bring men together like the system of religion which you call theology does. It does not indicate any community between man and man, or between man and society—it is not religion, it is religions." This objection at first sight seems a grave one, but I hope to show you before this paper is brought to a close that it is in that direction that theology so conspicuously fails, and it is from that aspect we can see that a true or natural religion is absolutely necessary for the welfare of man and society.

From the distinction here drawn between theology and religion, it will be seen that there is no necessary connection between religion and any system that professes to account for and explain the origin and harmony of the universe. A disbelief in the existence of God, or in the excellence of the creeds and doctrines inculcated by the Churches, does not prevent a man from being religious; while on the other hand a man may be religious who does believe in these same creeds and doctrines; but if his only worship consists in the worship of these and their belongings, his religion will be of a much lower form than that of the other.

Waning Influence of the Churches.

I have thought it necessary to indicate the distinction between religion and theology at some length, as I think it furnishes a fundamental principle in accounting for the anomalous position of the Church of today, and affords a genuine criticism on that part of Judge Higinbotham's lecture which deals with the "Waning Influence of the Church." In fact I think that there are signs in the lecture which would make it seem probable that this is the position which Judge Higinbotham would himself have taken, had his judgment not been warped by a still lurking shadow of theology—namely, a belief in the divine government of the universe. It seems to me that the worship of ideals is the only religion compatible with a theory of universal development; and the principles assigned by the lecturer as causes of the waning power of the Churches, I would consider not to be fundamental causes at all, although they might help, but to be merely signs of that waning influence. The anthropomorphic conceptions of the deity conflicting with the results of modern science, the conflict of creeds and their superposition on the purer doctrines of the founder of Christianity, and the incompetence of the Christian clergy, assigned by the lecturer as reasons to account for the anomalous position of the Church, are as I have said, rather signs than causes of its degeneracy. The real cause seems to me to lie in the fact that theology is a shattered ideal—that since the time when Christianity was a genuine religion, men's minds, men's emotions and aspirations have developed into something higher and nobler, society has reached a higher groove in the scale of progress and can no longer be satisfied with the old apparitions. It requires some higher ideal to strive after—a religion which will again minister to its welfare and its wants, one that will be in harmony with its higher stage of development.

Progressive Development.

Society is an organism—is a development from a lower to a higher form. This development, it is true, has been of gradual accomplishment, but it is none the less sure, as we may see by comparing the present with the past. The institutions of society are a part of society, and if they are to be retained they must develop along with society. If they remain stagnant, incapable of reform, incapable of change, incapable of adapting themselves to

the changing needs of society, society leaves them behind, and they become rudimentary, effete, worthless, dead injurious, in fact, to the growth of society, and hostile to its best interests. I do not think that any truth can be plainer than this. The butterfly does not incommode itself with the cast of shell of its mundane life, and why should society impede its progress by clinging to the hollow husks of institutions, merely because these have been of service to it in the past. Take any of the institutions that are of genuine utility to us to-day, and you will see that they all evidence this law of progressive development—a law which is the grandest generalisation of our own or any time. Our Parliament, for instance, the English Parliament, is the result of ages of growth. At first a collection of the freemen of the tribe, it was gradually and at the same time unconsciously remodelled to meet the requirements of a nation. And throughout the history of the English nation, how often has its Parliament suffered change in order that it might be brought into harmony with the advancing views of the people? It is not 50 years ago since the Reform Bill was passed, and the day is not far off when a higher point of development will be reached—namely, the day when the English people feel that it will be to their interests to obtain manhood suffrage. The laws of a country present the same phase of development. At first they are crude and imperfect and ill-adapted to the meagre requirements of a primitive state of civilisation. As the society grows, however, the relations of its members to the community and to each other become more complex, and an ever-developing system of rules is required and is obtained to deal with the ever-increasing complexity of these relations. New arts, new industries, new modes of life are ever being brought into being, and the old ones that have proved unsuitable are discarded by the ever-widening sphere of civilisation. The wooden plough of our ancestors is discarded for an iron one, the wagon gives place to the locomotive, the scythe to the reaper and binder—it is thus society progresses. All her parts obey the law of progressive development—all except one of her institutions. The Church alone undergoes no change, no reform, makes no effort to look forward with humanity, to bring itself into harmony with modern thought. It still worships the wooden plough; it still exalts the wagon and the scythe. Stationary it looks wistfully back to the past, and with its old prophetic spirit gone, it gazes with horror on the advancing sea of human life. Was it always thus? Did the Church always present the same barrier to progress as it does today? Was it always out of harmony with the requirements of the time? In the old Jewish days the Church was a necessity of the State and its very life. Its functions were statecraft rather than priestcraft. It helped to knit man more closely to the community of which he was a member, and preferred to consult the interests of the nation rather than of the chosen few. Its power seemed to wane, and a new departure was taken at the rise of Christianity. Pauline Christianity flourished, and under the dominance of the Catholic Church the nations of Europe were partially confederated. The revival of learning forced another change, and the Reformation was the result. Since then English-speaking countries especially have been noted for religious revivals; a new sect has sprung up, or the colour of a surplice has been changed, but where have been the reforms to bring the spirit of the Church into harmony with the spirit of the times, to change its skeleton thoughts into the living ideas of the present? The Church is the same in spirit to-day, evidences the same intolerance to opposing opinions, is based on the same principles, cherishes the same legends, accepts the same explanation of things, teaches the same false ethics as it did centuries ago. Its development has been arrested, it has ceased to be governed by the law of Evolution; and to bring it into harmony with modern thought, into harmony with the complexity of modern relations will require something more than mere reform. Utter regeneration alone can save it.

Pauline Christianity Swept Away.

This is the great truth that Judge Higinbotham has emphasised, this is the one principle that makes his famous lecture so valuable; and although the manner in which he has reached that central truth may not appear quite satisfactory to us, although we may not entirely agree with the conclusion he draws from that premise, and although the remaining portions of his lecture may seem faulty, we cannot but rejoice at the success that seems to have attended his effort—a success all the more pleasing to us when we remember that it is this very point that Freethinkers have so frequently emphasised. The Judge's utterance on this subject has fallen like a bombshell in the citadel of the Church. He has shown that utter regeneration is necessary to bring the Church into harmony with the social requirements of this century. He has exorcised creed-divinity from the Scriptures. He has cut away the foundations of the Christian Churches. The Christianity of the Churches is Pauline Christianity—and the central principle of that system is original sin and the redemption of the world through the mediation of Christ. Christianity was but the welding together of the old and the new. It teaches that man was born in sin and could only be purified by divine interference. The fall of man from his high estate, is as essential a part of Christianity as is the resurrection itself. Listen to what Paul himself says:—

"As in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive."—(I. Cor. xv., 22.) "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned."—(Rom. v., 12.) "Therefore as by the offence of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation; even so by

the righteousness of one the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life. For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."— (Rom. v., 18,19.)

This is the cardinal doctrine of orthodox Christianity. If you take away the doctrine of the fall of man, if you show that man has not fallen from perfection to imperfection, but has been progressing from a lower to a higher form of life, you take away the connecting link between the Old and the New Testaments, you cut away the ground from Christianity and leave no necessity for its existence. If man did not fall then there is no need for the system of the Christian Churches—that system topples over as soon as this is shown.

Anthropomorphism.

It is for the clear exposition of this point that we ought to feel indebted to Judge Higinbotham but before I proceed to discuss the remaining portions of his lecture let me draw your attention for a moment to the question of anthropomorphism. Anthropomorphic conceptions of the Deity prevailing in the doctrines and teachings of the Church, you will remember, was one of the reasons assigned by the Judge to account for the waning power of the Churches, for he rightly pointed out that such conceptions were not in harmony with the teachings of modern science. One clergyman, at least, who has attempted to criticise the Judge's lecture, has had the temerity to assert that anthropomorphism does not prevail amongst the educated clergy of the Church. I think it can be shown that the conceptions of the Church concerning Deity are necessarily anthropomorphic, and that the Judge himself, holding the opinions that he does, cannot escape the taint that his lecture professes to condemn. Anthropomorphism, as you are aware, is the system that endows the supreme power that is assumed to govern the universe, with human attributes—it conceives God in the likeness of a man. The clergyman to whom I have referred, while denying that anthropomorphism prevails in the Churches, asserts that it is merely owing to the imperfections of language that we are compelled to speak as if we believed that God possessed human attributes. It seems to me, on the other hand, that if we admit the idea of God at all, and at the same time make any predication whatever about him, we are compelled to speak of him as possessing some attributes of humanity, not from the mere imperfections of language, but from the imperfection of thought. It is perfectly logical, in fact it seem a necessity of thought, to admit the existence of a something underlying the world of phenomena in which we live and of which we are a part. But when we go so far as even to predicate that that something, power, call it what you will, is an intelligent power you at once fall into anthropomorphism. You cannot make the smallest predication about it without picturing it to the mind in terms of something seen or touched, and in doing so you are going beyond the limits of possibilities of experience. This is a necessity of thought. Even to think about a thing you must think about its parts. If anyone can picture something to his mind, without picturing some attributes also, he must have a mind that is more than human. It is absolutely unthinkable, it is absolutely impossible, to make a synthetic proposition concerning Deity or anything else without at the same time predicating attributes of it. And so I say that anyone who makes any predication whatever concerning Deity must necessarily endow that Deity with some qualities, must in some manner or other picture him to the mind (if he does not do this his predication means nothing), and, therefore, he necessarily falls into anthropomorphism, for he cannot do less than endow that Deity with the highest qualities he is capable of imagining. These qualities are necessarily human, as human attributes are the highest known to man. That the clergy and the Church itself do endeavour to do this is a matter of certainty, not of doubt. They believe in an intelligent power, and so does Judge Higinbotham. This is quite sufficient to fix the taint of anthropomorphism on to them and him. Judge Higinbotham talks of "God revealed anew to the intellect and to the responsive human heart, as the *Father* the, *Friend*, the *Guide*, and the *Support* of our race, and of every member of it." If this is not anthropomorphism then I do not know what that term means; and although I think that the Judge is perfectly right in condemning the anthropomorphic conceptions prevailing in the Church, and in pointing out that such are not in harmony with the teachings of modern science, but on the other hand, that they are grossly fallacious and greatly to be reprobated, yet I do think that the Judge is hardly logical in condemning a system which he has failed to eradicate from his own opinions. But although the Judge appears at times to be extremely illogical, I do not think that this at all deteriorates from the service he has done in indicating so clearly and so strikingly the discord existing between the stereotyped character of the Church and the requirements of modern thought.

Theology and Science.

If any system of theology is necessarily anthropomorphic, if any system that postulates Deity and at the same time makes predications concerning it evidences the same flaw, wherein do views such as these conflict with the teachings of modern science? Does science point to the existence of a power underlying phenomena?

and if so, in what manner does her indication differ from the assumption of the theologian or the Deist? These are questions of the highest moment to us. There can be no question that science does most unmistakably point to a something—I will not call it a power—a something not ourselves, underlying the world of sense. This, however, forms a psychological rather than a physical puzzle. It seems to be a necessity of thought to conceive of noumena as distinguished from phenomena, to conceive of something in which qualities coin - here and are grouped together so as to form what we call a thing. This conception may or may not be true, but the only thing we can be sure of is that the truth of that conception we can never verify, and therefore can never know. Take an apple, for instance, and see if you can think away any one of its qualities, and you will find as a matter of fact that you cannot. If you could do this, you can readily conceive that what would remain would not be an apple at all. An apple is of a certain colour, of a certain shape, and of a certain taste. This knowledge we get from the eye, touch and the muscular sense, and the organs of taste, respectively. These sense qualities, colour, shape, taste, are grouped together by the mind, and to the thing before us we give the name "apple." The process of grouping qualities together so as to form a thing is said to be due to the synthetic power of the mind; and it seems to be a necessity of thought, as I have said, to conceive of something outside of us giving rise to the changes in our sense organs which we call qualities, something in which these qualities co-inhere. And although when we analyse our groups of sensations we know that the odour is not in the rose, nor the colour in the violet, but that these are subjective and not objective, yet we are compelled to imagine an objective something which gives rise to these impressions of sense. And yet all that we know is that an apple is a group of sense impressions objectified by the mind. You cannot think away one of the qualities of a thing. An apple must be of some colour. It is inconceivable, it is unthinkable, to have a visible thing without colour. You may think of a change of colour, but you cannot think of absence of colour. Similarly you may think the shape of the apple changed, but you cannot think of it having no shape. Nor can you think of it without taste, although you can readily conceive the taste changed. Now, if you could picture to the mind (which of course you cannot do) a thing without shape and without colour, that thing would most assuredly not convey to your mind the idea of an apple; it would not be an apple, nor would it be anything else that we are capable of thinking about. It is beyond our capacity of thought, and therefore totally beyond our knowledge; and what a thing is outside of its qualities, what it is that underlies the world of phenomena, that we can never know, in spite of Schelling's abortive attempt to get over the difficulty by postulating an intellectual sense. It has been urged, and it is quite true, that had we ten senses instead of six, our sensible world would be larger than it is, things which are now beyond our ken would come into being. Unfortunately, however, the number of our senses is limited to six, nor do we know of any indication that would warrant us in believing that we are likely to develop any others. We cannot conceive of another sense, but if we had ten thousand senses the mystery of existence would still be the same, our world would still be a world of phenomena, and the reality underlying phenomena we would still be unable to grasp. This, it seems to me, is the farthest point to which science can go. Science, therefore, does most unmistakably point to a something not ourselves underlying the world of phenomena, but about that something she is dumb, and she knows that she must ever remain so. She does not say that such a thing exists, but she says that we cannot think of it not existing, and that is the sum of her predication about the matter. If she were asked to formulate a proposition embodying that view she might possibly say that what the mind is compelled to think as underlying the world of sensible things is *the sum of the negation of things*. Further than this she could not go. Therefore it is that the teachings of science are directly opposed to the fundamental principles of any system of theology. The idea of a first cause, she does not tolerate, because she knows that that idea is absolutely unthinkable. Science only deals with the world of phenomena—her researches do not extend beyond that sphere because she knows, and inferentially asserts, that such research must ever be in vain. To her there is no knowledge outside of experience. Her position is purely and simply that of the Agnostic, and from her teachings we learn that the position of the Agnostic is the only logical one possible.

I notice that the Bishop of Melbourne has recently seen occasion to refer to the Agnostic in terms of severe disparagement. It is not worth an Agnostic's while, however, to notice the arguments which the learned bishop uses to support his position, for argum at there is none. In its place there is a little gentlemanly abuse, which the Agnostic, or any other searcher after truth, can afford to despise, for abuse, even of a gentlemanly kind, and even when made use of by a bishop, is of no avail when it has the stern logic of the sciences to deal with. The man who is eager in the search for truth is prepared to welcome her whenever her fair form appears, no matter if her trailing garments sweep away his most cherished ideals; and he can afford to abide the jeers and scoffs of those who heap contumely on him, well knowing that they sin through ignorance, and cry out because they are weak. Such truth-seekers are Herbert Spencer, Tyndall. and Huxley—the latter two of whom the bishop curiously enough seems to rank in the category of Materialists. Anyone who is acquainted with Tyndall's writings should know that Tyndall's position is purely Agnostic; while it is Huxley himself who says that the only escape from Materialism is Agnosticism. Is it not startling to find such sparsity of knowledge on the part of those who pretend to criticise the positions of the leading men of thought? And while I am digressing let me

draw attention to the looseness of phraseology which again and again characterises the writings of some when dealing with technical words. In a leading article of the *Australasian* condemning the position taken up by the opponents of the Rev. Charles Strong, I find this remarkable sentence, "The Science of Theology is no less progressive than the Natural Sciences." To hear Theology dignified by the name of science is enough to make us wonder if we live in the nineteenth century, and to be told it is a progressive science is almost sufficient to make us doubt the fact of our existence when we consider that theology has not given birth to one single new idea for hundreds of years. I only mention this as an instance of the muddiness of thought that is apt to characterise many of those who write about theology, for I take it that obscurity of language is the great concomitant of obscurity or absence of thought.

To return, I say then that science dumbly points to a something behind existence, but whether that something is a fiction of the mind, or a something real she cannot and never can know. But she does know that the God of the theologian is a fiction of the mind, for, by analyzing this idea of God and divesting it of its human attributes, she can show that instead of God creating the world it is the world that has created God. When, however, the man of science strips the false conceptions and human qualities from off the God of the theologian the residuum is his own unknown and unknowable power. Unknown and unknowable, these are the final dicta of science. When, therefore, theology asserts that this unknowable is known, calls it God, asserts that the world was created by it, that God is an intelligent power, and is the *father*, the *friend*, the *guide*, and the *support* of our race,—how can there be anything else than conflict between theology and science. And yet Judge Higinbotham tells us that there is no opposition between modern science and religion—using religion in the sense that points to the existence of a supreme mind, and the relation existing between that mind and the derived mind of man. Those of you who have followed me thus far will see that there is the most direct opposition. Science as I have said deals with the known, and the unknown that is nevertheless knowable. Religion—theology—deals with the unknowable and illogically asserts that it is known. To understand the former proposition aright it is necessary to remember that science draws a limit round thought, and asserts that outside of that limit knowledge cannot go. Inside lies the domain of possible truth. If anyone, fifty years ago, had asserted that he knew there were metals in the sun similar to those on our planet, he would probably have been considered insane. But now, by the aid of photography and the spectroscope we are enabled to detect the presence of these metals with as much certainty as we know that two and two make four, or that two straight lines cannot enclose a space. Fifty years ago, then, this fact was unknown and would have been considered absurd, but the result has proved that it was knowable for it is now actually known. And it is with equal certainty known that we cannot know a thing apart from its attributes, apart from the forms which the mind gives it. That we cannot know things in themselves is of the highest certainty possible. Our knowledge is limited to the capacities of our organisms to the conditions of thought, and a man cannot, go beyond that limit, any more than he can climb up his own back. Science, then, indicates what can and what cannot be known, and limits herself to experience and to possibilities of experience. Theology is not based upon knowledge at all, but upon faith, belief. She calmly postulates a deity and asks her votaries to believe in that deity. If she asserts the credibility and truth of an absurdity how can her doctrines be in harmony with the truths of science.

In dealing with the origin of matter too, the Judge wants to know the whence? and the why? and his answer thereto evidences a strange want of logical acumen: He makes the remarkable statement that science cannot rationally refuse to accept the only hypothesis pretending to explain all phenomena, and therefore to account for their origin (the creation hypothesis) or to suggest another more suitable one. This amounts to the startling assertion that out of two explanations given of a thing, that which seems the more probable is the true one. For instance, Laplace's Nebular Hypothesis is the one which perhaps better explains the phenomena of the universe than any other which has yet been advanced, but because no other is forthcoming that is no reason why we should accept Laplace's theory. As a matter of fact Science does not accept it or any other yet given, because she deems the evidence quite insufficient, consequently she merely waits in a state of passivity until some explanation is given which is deemed quite satisfactory. Besides with reference to the divinity hypothesis Science asserts that she can show that it is totally erroneous; strange would be her position, therefore, if she accepted it as true. She says that the idea of beginning is unthinkable, that the laws of our being really forbid us from forming any idea about beginning, and therefore that she has nothing to do with either accepting or rejecting any theory that professes to account for an absolute origin of things, because she deems such a question an absurd one. The whence? and the why? are not questions that we need to trouble ourselves about. All that we need to consider is that we *are here*, and remembering that to endeavour to find out what we should do—and do it. That is our duty. The question of whence? must forever remain in darkness as well as the question whither? "Where do we find ourselves?" says Emerson, "In a series of which we do not know the extremes, and believe it has none. We wake and find ourselves on a stair; there are stairs below us, which we seem to have ascended; there are stairs above us, many a one, which go upward and out of sight. But the genius which, according to the old belief, stands at the door by which we enter, and gives us the lethe to drink, that we

may tell no tales, mixed the cup too strongly, and we cannot shake off the lethargy now at noonday. Sleep lingers all our lifetimes about our eyes, as night hovers all day about the boughs of the fir tree. All things swim and glitter. Our life is not so much threatened as our perception. Ghostlike we glide through nature and would not know our place again."

The Judge's belief, then, in a divine government and origin of things, must be accounted for from the fact that he does not recognise the strength of the Agnostic's impregnable position, and has overlooked the teachings of modern metaphysics and ethics. He thinks that it is very astounding that we are unable to determine whether there are sufficient reasons to necessitate a belief in the existence of God, and whether there is any basis for morality other than supposed personal interest or utility. I have tried very briefly, and perhaps very imperfectly, to show in this paper that quite sufficient reason can be shown to necessitate a disbelief in the accuracy of the Deist's or the theologian's conception concerning God. Belief is a very different thing from knowledge. We may believe in the existence of a supreme power underlying phenomena; but we are not warranted in making any predication whatever about such a power, for it, if such there be, is wholly without our experience. All we can say is "*there may be*" but

— "*We cannot know,*

For knowledge is of things we see."

Whether there is any basis for morality beyond utility is an ethical, not a theological question, and must be determined on sociological ground. And the theory of divine government, however, it would appear, seems to exercise very little influence on the lives and characters of the majority of men. The basis of morality is to be found in the sociological medium, and must be sought for there and not in any theory of divine influence. Duty is a social, not a theological question.

The Judge's Church.

And, now, having drawn attention to what we consider to be the excellencies and principal defects of the Judge's treatment of the relations between science and religion, are we in a position to accept his final conclusion—viz, the change which he deems necessary to bring the Church into harmony with the requirements of modern thought? I think that we cannot at all events entirely agree with his final conclusion. He advocates a change from the Christian religion to what he calls the religion of Christ. But what this religion of Christ is to be we nowhere get any clear indications either from his lecture, or from the traditional opinions of Christ himself, which have been handed down to us from his own time. It seems to me that what Judge Higinbotham calls the religion of Christ may be divided into two portions, one of which we may accept as true or as partly true, but the other we cannot help rejecting as false. These two portions I consider to be Christ's system of theology and Christ's system of morality. Judge Higinbotham himself indicates the division when he says that Christ's system "states the central principle or dogma of the existence of one God and his relationship to man, together with the primary and secondary rules of human conduct on and springing out of that relationship." And he further says that the proposition, "God is a spirit, is the single central dogma of Christ's theology," and this proposition he further tells us is also the highest generalisation towards which the latest and grandest discoveries of science seem to be conducting the human mind" Those of you who agree with the opinions expressed in this review, will deny that science points to any such thing, but will say that the old twist still distorts the Judge's opinions. This is the vitiating point of his system. If he had thrown overboard Christ's theology, and merely accepted the moral teachings of Christ as the basis of his religion we should have been more inclined to agree with him. With the existence of God and his relationship to man, science and therefore morality—morality at the same time the guide and the outcome of society—has nothing whatever to do. I conceive that a religion, to be a true religion, must contain no elements of error. All that the Judge's system means is, that he endeavours to expunge creeds, forms, and ceremonies from the Christian Churches, assuredly a great work, but at the same time he endeavours to preserve the false principle that underlies the system of theology—namely, belief in an intelligent Supreme Being, and a belief in our responsibility to Him. This is sufficient to prevent us from giving our entire approval to the Judge's proposed reform—but even through our disapproval we see a glimmer of hope. It is the practical part of Christ's system that is the important part to us—the portion which extols the dignity of man. It is this part that has preserved its ascendancy, although unconsciously, because it is the portion that is true. I do not think that theology would have flourished for a single century, if it had not been for the human part of Christ's religion. It is society and man's relation to society that is the all important principle for man to consider; and it is because the religion of Jesus Christ contains the adumbrations of this doctrine that it has stood so long in its position of pre-eminence before the world. And when we consider that it was this doctrine that found expression in the life of Jesus, if not in his opinions, surely we can appreciate the greatness of the man.

The Need of a True Religion.

But I conceive that a higher ideal is being gradually placed before the world than that worshipped by Judge Higginbotham; and this ideal is foreshadowed in the knowledge that we have only ourselves to trust to. Which do you consider the more moral man, the man that is likely to be of most benefit to society? Is it the man who, even if he desires to do what he conceives to be the right, does not act upon his own responsibility, but prefers rather to accept the guidance of his stronger neighbour? Or is it the man who has used his best endeavours to find out the right, to discover what his duty is? who feels strong enough to believe that he has only himself to trust to, and knows that by trusting to himself he thus benefits society; who says that society progresses along with the progression of the intellectual and moral worth of its individuals? Who is the more successful mariner? Is it the man who has no confidence in his own powers and his own resources, who distrusts his capabilities as a navigator and who, fearing to venture on the open sea, hugs the land closely during his journey, trusting merely to the beacon that flames on the headland, or the sight and the sound of the breakers as they dash their carded waters on the shore? Or is it the man who knows that he has mastered his art, and fearlessly sets sail for the deep blue waters of the boundless sea, knowing that though the winds blow, and the rain pours in torrents, and the clouds obscure the sun, and the stars fail to peer through the shrouded vault, still he can bring his vessel safely into port? for well he know? there is more safety on the boundless deep than amidst the shoals and quicksands of the shore. The man who recognises that his success, if it is to be worth anything, must depend on his own endeavours, is he not the man whom we are accustomed to regard as truly great, and whom we weaker sons of clay feel inclined to honour because of his greatness? Is it not these men who have been the guiding stars of humanity? Is it not therefore a greater thought, a more praiseworthy ideal, a more highly moral idea, to consider that we must do our duty here, not because we owe any responsibility to a divine being, but that we do it because it is our duty, because we know that duty is the central preserving principle of society, and society is our mother, our salvation and our god. There is in society, Mathew Arnold tells us, a power which makes for righteousness. Without it society would cease to exist, and it is better, therefore, to trust to one another than to believe in the efficacy and the power of that fiction of the mind which the theologian calls God. Listen to the opinion of one of the foremost men of thought of this century, listen to this account of the inefficiency of the religion of Christ and the need of a new religion, which Mathew Arnold gives us in his poem of "Obermann Once More " :—

Ay, ages long endured his span
Of life - 'tis hero received—
That gracious Child, that thorn-crown'd Man! He lived while we believed.
While we believed, on earth he went, And open stood his grave,
Men call'd from chamber, church, and tent, And Christ was by to save.

Now he is dead! Far hence he lies
In the lone Syrian town;
And on his grave, with shining eyes,
The Syrian stars look down.

In vain men still, with hoping new,
Regard his death-place dumb,
And say the stone is not yet to,
And wait for words to come.

Ah. from that silent sacred land,
Of sun, and arid stone,
And crumbling wall, and sultry sand,

Comes now one word alone!

From David's lips that word did roll,
'Tis true and living yet:
*No man (an save his brothers soul,
Nor pay his brother's debt.*

Alone, self-poised, henceforward man
Must labour!—must resign
His all too human creeds, and scan
Simply the way divine!

But slow that tide of common thought,
Which bathed our life, retired.
Slow, slow the old world wore to nought,
And pulse by pulse expired.

Its frame yet stood without a breach.
When blood and warmth were fled;
And still it spake its wonted speech,
But every word was dead.

And, oh, we cried, that on this case
Might fall a freshening storm I
Rive its dry bones, and with new face
A new-sprung world inform!

* * * * *

Your creeds are dead; your rites are dead,
Your social order, too!
Where tarries he, the Power who said:
See, I make all things new?

The millions suffer still, and grieve.
And what can helpers heal
With old-world cures men half believe
For woes they wholly feel?

And yet men have such need of joy!

*But joy whose grounds are true
And joy that should all hearts employ
As when the past was new.*

Ah, not the emotions of the past,
Its common hopes, were vain!
Some new such hope must dawn at last,
Or man must toss in pain.

But now the old is out of date,
The new is not yet born.
And who can be alone elate,
While the world lies forlorn?

* * * * *

What still of strength is left, employ,
This end to help attain:
*One common wave of thought and joy
Lifting mankind again.*

And returning again, for the last time to our system of ideals. I conceive that a true religion must be a social religion, must be a religion of society—it must be one that recognizes to the full, that emphasises and extols the sacredness of the tie that links man to his mother society. Hence it is that I consider that true religion is a necessity if society desires to progress. For I believe that art itself and science and all the divided interests of mankind may even be of danger to society unless there is some common ideal, some common recognition of the dignity of the world, something that will cause men to have more regard for the interests of one another. As it is our ideals are isolated. And isolation of ideals tends to isolation of individuals and isolation of individuals means a frigid world—a loosening of the linking tie. The artist works solitary in his studio; the chemist absorbs himself in his laboratory; the biologist dissects his insects; the gardener gloats over his orchids and ferns; but no matter however earnestly and reverently each worships his ideal, how self-sacrificingly and devotedly each does his work and endeavours to promote its interests, there is little in all this which brings before each and all the idea of *one another*. That idea, the idea that there are others besides ourselves, others just as important as ourselves, and for the sake of whom we must pare away our rough corner, must tone down our fiercer thoughts, others, for whose sake and for the sake of us all we must wear smiling faces and generous hearts, others, whom we must strive to help and allow ourselves to be helped by,—from whose eyes we must clear away the mists of error that the sunlight may smile on their faces, and the winds of heaven breathe sweet music in their ears—others, whom we should cherish and revere — this idea, I say, and the full consciousness of it, must abide with those who rightly conceive that a true religion is an essential part of the social organism, if that organism is to go on progressing; must abide with those who desire to see that true religion established. And let our religion be such a one. and let us so act up to it, that it cannot be said of us that "We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts, we have done those things which we ought not to have done, and we have left undone those things which we ought to have done, and there is no health in us,"—let it be such that those who come after us cannot say, as Christ so pointedly and so truly said of the Church of his time, in words that seem peculiarly applicable to the Christian Churches to-day.

"Woe unto you for ye make clean the outside of the cup and the platter, but within they are full of extortion and excess." "Clean first that which is within the cup and the platter, that, the outside of them may be clean also."

"Woe unto you for ye are like unto whited sepulches, which indeed appear beautiful outward, but are within full of dead men's bones, and of all uncleanness."

Politics & Poverty.

decorative feature

Mr Robert Stout, on the 13th April, gave a lecture on the above subject, in the Lyceum Hall, which was crowded in every part. The Mayor of Dunedin occupied the chair, and on the platform were Messrs H. S. Fish (M.H.R.), M.W. Green (M.H.R.), T. Bracken (M.H.R.), W. D. Stewart, J. W. Jago, A. H. Ross, J. Robin, W. M. Bolt, and J. Braithwaite.

His Worship the MAYOR, in introducing Mr Stout, said: Ladies and gentlemen, I have to introduce to you to-night a gentleman who has been so long and favourably known to a Dunedin audience that I do not need to say one word to you about him. He has always taken a lively interest, both by his action on the platform and by his pen, in everything affecting, not only Dunedin, but the Colony at large. He has been known as a politician, as a Minister of the Crown, and probably as legal adviser to most of you here present.— (Laughter.) The only difference between his meeting you in the latter capacity and his meeting you here to-night is a difference against himself, inasmuch as he cannot charge you for the advice he is about to give.— (Laughter.) I don't need, however, to ask from you a patient hearing for him; and therefore, without further remark, I will introduce Mr Stout to you.

Mr STOUT spoke as follows: Mr Mayor, ladies and gentlemen, if it has been recently admitted that there can be no good government, no progress nor reform, without political life, and if it has also been admitted that this political life can best be stimulated by public discussion, and by the public meeting of citizens, I need not apologise for addressing you. I congratulate Major Atkinson on the admission which he has made that political life is necessary and that it must be diffused throughout the Colony, and not confined to its capital. I also congratulate the party of which he is one of the leaders on their leader making such an admission. When I think how Sir George Grey was abused, and how he was denounced for meeting the citizens of this Colony in public meeting, and for discussing with them vital political questions, I recognise that we have made a great advance in our political education.— (Applause.) I think that this admission having been made, it nerves us all to publicly discuss public questions, for I believe that on their proper decision depends the future well-being of our Colony. In what attitude and in what position, it may be asked, did Major Atkinson address us? I recognise to the fullest extent that he did not make a party speech. I recognise also to the fullest extent that his speech was free from the personal criticisms that often form the staple of political utterances in this Colony.— (Applause.) I recognise, further, that his speeches are free from party bias. But he is a party man, he is Colonial Treasurer, and he is the leader of the Ministry in the House of Representatives. Therefore he is not an ordinary lecturer giving utterance to his political views. He is a political leader, and we must assume and believe that he thinks that these political doctrines which he has enunciated are necessary for our welfare. And then, what is our duty? I apprehend that our duty is to carefully criticise every portion of his speech, and see whether it is politically sound or not. If we fail to do so, we are not doing our duty as citizens. We have no right to take the views of any man, or to accept any political doctrines, without careful criticism — without turning them over, and looking at them from all points of view.— (Applause.) I therefore propose to-night to deal with the several political questions on which he has touched, and to see whether the positions he takes up are politically sound. He dealt in the main with six questions,—viz., with our Constitution, with our Legislative Council, with the functions of Government, with taxation, with land tenure, and with pauperism; and to-night I wish to say a few words under each of these heads. He says of our Constitution that it is almost perfect, and the only alteration which he might make is the introduction of what is termed

Hare's Scheme of Representation.

It would take a lecture in itself were I to endeavour to explain Hare's scheme to you; but I may say that the scheme which we now have is the very antipodes of Hare's scheme. Hare's scheme consists in this: that instead of confining the constituency to one small district, the electors are to have a wide choice, and minorities are to be allowed to join together; so that the minority, say, in Dunedin, Christchurch, or Auckland may be able to send one man to represent them. Our present idea is this: that there shall be single electorates, and that each electoral district shall only return one man. This is the very opposite of Hare's scheme: it almost deprives any minority of the power of sending a representative to Parliament. I ask, and I think you have a right to ask, that if it is proper to have the representation of minorities, how comes it that the system that had existed in New Zealand for many years should have been altered by Major Atkinson's Ministry? We had, for example, the towns united as one electoral district. We had several electoral districts in the Colony—like Franklin,

Wanganui, and other places - returning two members. Why was it that the single-electorate system was introduced into this Colony? And I ask if, as we learn from him, there was a great danger of the centres of population ruling, how does it happen that under his system the centres of population have further representation given to them? Dunedin, under the old system, had only three members, and now we have four. I say that the sole reason for the introduction of this single-electorate system was an attempt by the Conservatives of the House of Representatives to stem the growth of democracy.— (Applause.) Their hopes were just the same as the hopes of the Conservatives in France, as those 'of the Conservatives in Italy—because this question is not being fought out in our Colony for the first time. We have only to read what has been done in France during the last few years, or in Italy, and what do we find? We find the Conservatives in France determined to get what might be termed the single-electorate system. We find that the Conservatives in Italy fought for the same thing. They do not want to see large masses of men sending in one or more members. They trusted to local questions engaging the people's mind, so that the large democratic questions which they are called upon as a nation to solve would be kept away from them. They relied upon their attention being bestowed upon little peddling things—a road here, a bridge there, and a railway in another place. Therefore, if Hare's system is one which gives a representation to minorities, and is a good system, we had no business to introduce this single-electorate system, which has a tendency to keep the minds of the people in a narrow groove, and to stop them from discussing political questions from a wide standpoint. But I must say—and I here agree with Major Atkinson -that I do not think Hare's system would work. If we would introduce proportional representation, there are many systems better than Hare's. We may take Baily's, or a well worked out system recently referred to by Professor Nanson, of Melbourne, in a paper read before the Victorian Royal Society a few months ago. The latter allows a man to do this sort of thing: Suppose there are three candidates to be elected, a man may say, "We will vote for two or three, and if these are not successful we prefer two farther down the list"; so that he is given a chance, if one candidate does not go in, of putting in another. The maintenance of the large electoral district system was the only hope of New Zealand getting rid of the petty local questions that monopolise our House of Representatives, and I charge Major Atkinson's Government—I do not charge him, but it was well known that some of the members introduced this single - electorate system — saying: "If this is introduced the towns will be split up, so that a democracy will not be able to voice itself." I now pass to what he said in reference to the

Legislative Council.

I understand from him that he is in favour of the constitution of the Legislative Council being altered, and I here ask. Why alter it? Does he want the Legislative Council stronger than it is? If he wants that it will mean, I presume, that the Council shall oppose more vigorously than in the past the legislation that is proposed by the House of Representatives—in fact, that though our machinery has worked smoothly in the past, the Legislative Council shall be made so strong that we shall have an era of deadlocks. Does anyone want the Legislative Council any stronger? If not stronger, does he want it made weaker? If he wishes that, what does he mean? That there is to be less control over the legislation of New Zealand by this second Chamber than there has been in the past? If you will read what took place during last session of Parliament, you will find that the Legislative Council, while considering bills, never took the trouble to dispose of one clause at a time, but in Committee they actually voted for 100 clauses of bills at a time without a reading. It cannot be very well made weaker than it now is.— (Applause.) Why, then, is the Legislative Council to be altered? I ask Major Atkinson, or anyone who desires an alteration in the constitution of that body, to say what he means, and whether the people of New Zealand are to allow a second Chamber to grow stronger, so that we shall have those ruinous deadlocks we saw occur in the neighbouring Colony of Victoria. Here I ask, Is a second Chamber necessary at all— (A VOICE: "No.") I assert it is not necessary.— (Applause.) I apprehend the only necessity of a second Chamber is to supervise and provide against hasty legislation. Now we can only judge of the good that our second Chamber has done by tracing its history, and I tell you that every vital bill—every bill that really touched our Constitution on a vital point, which was really a political bill — has never been checked, however crude. One has only to look at the Abolition of Provinces Bill—one on which the people had not been consulted, and one which, I believe, worked a great deal of harm to this Colony. What did the Legislative Council do with that bill? Only two or three members out of the whole of the Council saw fit to criticise it, far less to oppose it. If you look at the record of bills passed in New Zealand you will find that the only bill in reference to which the Legislative Council seemed to take up a determined position was the Deceased Wife's Sister Bill — a bill nobody cared anything about— (laughter)—and at last they passed it. What good, I ask, has our second Chamber done? It has never taken up the position of saying in regard to a bill, "The people have not been consulted, and you must defer it until they can be consulted." There has been no bill altering a policy which has not at once been accepted. How are we to test its usefulness? I appeal to you to look at its past history, and you

will find that in only two or three cases was any good done by its refusal to pass bills. And one has only to remember the history of second Chambers. How did they arise? Why, we well know from history that it was the House of Commons that was the second Chamber, and that it was given to the people by the Lords, in order that there might be some re-presentation of the common people in England, and consequently the second Chamber grew in England out of political exigencies that we have not had in New Zealand. But we have had in New Zealand a legislative body that had no second Chamber. We had our Provincial Councils, that had power to tax us — that had power to pass laws creating offences — power to deal with our whole social economy. They passed laws without any supervision from a second Chamber, and I say that if you weigh the laws they have passed they will stand just as careful criticism as any that have been passed by the two Chambers.— (Applause.) We therefore have tried the experiment, and I say that if there is any alteration whatever of the Legislative Council it will be an alteration that will cast greater power into the hands of the property-holders—it will be an alteration that will give property greater weight and power than it now has, and if we are to alter it at all, the alteration I should suggest is that it be done without.— (Applause.) Now I come to the other point—"The Functions of Government," and I regret that here we are now getting on to the twentieth century, and, according to Major Atkinson's speech, after all our political training, after all the books on political science that have been published, after all the experiments in government we have had, extending back for thousands of years, we are reduced to this chaotic position. He says that what the duty or function of the Government is, nobody knows.— (Laughter.) Certainly, if that is so, we are in a very lamentable plight. He says that the only thing that is to guide us is this: that we are to determine from time to time what it is for the advantage of the people that the Government should do. That is, a chance majority in the House is to determine what the functions of the Government are. I deny that that is so. I say that the function of Government, if we are to have true liberty in any State, must be limited, and that it must not depend upon a chance majority. Why, ladies and gentlemen, if the functions of the Government are to be determined by a chance majority, what will you say has been right or wrong in the past? A majority of people in England, and perhaps a majority of the people in Scotland, say that a State Church is right, and if you put the question to the people of Ireland, I have no doubt that a majority of the people would say that it is the duty of the State to support the Roman Catholic Church. I ask, If this is to be our test of the functions of Government, where is the true liberty for the individual—for the minority? I say that the whole function of Government is this: not merely to recognise the rights of the minority, but to recognise individual liberty; to so pass laws, to so manage its affairs, and to so administer the State, that there shall be given to every individual man the fullest liberty, subject to the like liberty to everyone else in the community.— (Applause.) I say that wherever the functions of Government tread on that liberty that Government is a usurper—that Government is becoming a despotism. I admit, however, to the full that in new countries—through want of historical associations, through want of the habit of organisation amongst residents in new colonies—the State may have to step in and do things that it is not necessary in old countries that Governments should undertake; but I say it is our duty to watch closely the inroads of the State on the individuality of the people. If we ever choose to say that the only limit of the State's functions are the views of a chance majority, we are laying the foundation for a despotism, the end of which we cannot now see; and I say that this theory of Major Atkinson's, that there is no limit of the State functions but what a chance majority may decide is the fallacy underlying the whole of his proposed political changes, with which I shall deal presently. And now I may say one or two words on taxation. He told us that Adam Smith's four canons of taxation were yet recognised as correct, and I may say this: it is almost marvellous, when one comes to read recent writers on political economy, to find how little they have yet done on this great question of taxation, and how little advance they have made beyond Adam Smith's four canons—"equality, certainty, convenience, and economy." The last three no one ever questioned; it is only when one comes to deal with the question of equality that any differences of opinion arise. I do not intend to go into Major Atkinson's figures I have not time to do so—but I wish to say something about the question of the relative fairness of a

Land and Property Tax.

Those in this meeting who were in the Colony in 1878 know that I then advocated the land tax, and I may say that I have not seen any reason to change my mind.— (Applause.) The question is, whether a land tax or a property tax is the fairer tax. Let us test it. Major Atkinson told us that if a man had £1200 worth of land, and the State demanded £2 10s per year from him, that he would term "confiscation." It is an ugly word, "confiscation and it is said that to take £2 10s a year from a landowner who holds a monopoly over that which he never made and never created is "confiscation." Let us see: If I come to this Colony with £1200 worth of goods—we shall say jewellery,—what does the State officer demand from me before I land them? The demand on the goods is 15 per cent, of their value—a very different thing from the £2 10s on the £1200 worth of land. I ask what would you call that tax which says to a man with £1200 worth of goods, You must pay me 15 per

cent, on their value? Would "confiscation" be too ugly a word to use? But that is not all. He has paid the 15 per cent, on the jewellery, and he may be told by the Major, "You have paid the duty, and it is now in the Colony, and you can put that 15 per cent, on and charge it to the person who is buying it from you." Well, let us see how that works. We will now take the property tax. The property tax is a tax on what the thing is worth. Then he has to pay this halfpenny in the pound on the £1200 worth of jewellery, and he has to pay the halfpenny in the pound on the 15 per cent, he has paid the Government; so that he is taxed on the tax he has paid. What would you call that? Would confiscation be an ugly word for it? And then I ask you, in dealing with this question of property tax and land tax, to look at the great distinction between the two. If you have land you have the producer. It is land that is the producer of everything we possess. If you have £1200 worth of land it will produce something: it will produce grass; it will produce grain; it may produce coal or various other things, and without any effort from you it may produce a great many things. But keep the £1200 worth of jewellery, and the longer you keep it the less valuable it becomes. It is giving you no return. It is not producing anything. Yet a charge of a halfpenny on the land, which is the producer—which is a monopoly—is confiscation; but a charge of a halfpenny on jewellery; which has already been taxed 15 percent is a fair and equal tax— (Laughter.) ask further, in dealing with this question of a land and property tax, that we should look at what is the tendency of either tax. If it is said that the tendency of the land tax is to diminish the value of land, I apprehend that the same tax put on personal property cannot increase its value. Surely that is self-evident. But I ask you, how does the property tax act? We shall say, for example, that here is machinery. Here is a man who wishes to start a new industry. He puts all his money into the machinery. He knows that perhaps for several years he cannot possibly get interest on his money. In starting that new industry he has to work under great difficulties—he has to work under great disadvantages. He has not only to train workmen who will be able to manufacture for him, but he has actually to cultivate a market, so that the colonists may accept his goods rather than prefer the articles they have been accustomed to. During this time he will necessarily lose money; yet upon all his machinery he has to pay a tax to the Government. Is that a way of encouraging production? I apprehend that the object of the State should be to keep two things in view in dealing with taxation. The State ought to see, first that it encourages production, because that is the only means of making the citizens wealthy. Second, it ought to see that its taxation tends to encourage thrift. That is what we have heard spoken of a good deal lately. I ask you how does the property tax act, say, on two men, both getting the same income, both having the same sized families? One man saves a hundred pounds; the other man saves nothing. The one man at once, after the limit of £500 is reached, begins to pay a tax on his savings to the Government; while the person who spends all his money escapes all taxation. Is that encouragement of thrift? But we may be told: "Oh, but the property tax, you know, will stop people from having unused capital that is not productive." I ask, are there a dozen people in this Colony who keep their money in a stocking? And I say if you put your money in a bank it is not unproductive. Every person who knows anything about commerce knows that just as deposits in the banks increase, the facilities for commerce increase. The banks, as they get larger deposits, will lend money out cheaper; and if so, there will be more industries started, more workmen employed, and the capital will be circulating throughout the Colony. There is therefore no such thing as capital unused in this Colony. There are perhaps two ways in which capital may not be reproductive. We have heard something about pictures, and also about furniture. Well, I do not think all the pictures and furniture in New Zealand are of such immense value as to require the Treasurer to insist on taxing them specially. But I say further, it should not ever be the duty of the State to discourage the possession of pictures. If they have been imported they have already paid 15 per cent., and Picture-frames have to pay 15 per cent.; and I say if there is one thing the Colony requires to encourage it is the fine arts.— (Cheers.) In order to create true humanity in this Colony, we must have culture; and I say there will be no proper culture—I do not mean culture for the few, but for the many—until we have in all centres of population large picture-galleries, so that the minds of the people can be continually elevated.— (Cheers.) Therefore, if it is only for the sake of getting at pictures, surely the Government, instead of trying to discourage the fine arts, should do its best to encourage them. Where you have a love of the beautiful you will necessarily have a dislike of vice.— (Cheers.) Another thing said about the land tax is, Why tax land, and not other property? Let me give some reasons. First, I tell you that the tax we put on land, and that is proposed to be put on land, was of the smallest possible amount. What do you think was the total amount estimated to come from the land tax first put on, for the whole Colony of New Zealand? It was only £100,000 for the whole Colony. Was that a large tax to put on the landowners when one considers the millions of money that have been borrowed to make land more valuable. I will tell you

Why the Land Tax was First Put on.

What did we see? We saw this Colony had expended not one million, not two millions, not ten millions, but nearly double that in improving the lands of this Colony. We saw that the lands of this Colony had increased in

value; and this increase in value had not been caused by the landowners, but by the State. It had been caused by the increase of population and by their industry. We said: Is it fair that all these railways should be made, that all these bridges should be built, that all these roads should be constructed, and that all the interest for these vast sums of money should come from the Consolidated Revenue—from those who are perhaps landless—and that the landowner should escape free of taxation— (Cheers.) We said, This is not fair, and it is our duty to put on a land tax. And how did we put it on? We said it was our duty, if we could do so by a tax, to encourage thrift; and hence we provided that for every acre a man tilled, for every improvement, for every house, for every fence he put up, no tax should be charged. We encouraged him to improve his land by exempting all improvements from taxation. We taxed the bare land on its value, exempting all improvements, so that he might be encouraged to improve his land and make it most productive for the benefit of the State.— (Cheers.) I ask whether that was not fairer than putting on a property tax? I ask you to note, in regard to the property tax, this distinction. We find that as the Colony advanced land went up and up in price, while money or personal property gradually cheapened. I remember that when I came to the Colony first in the gold-digging days, interest on mortgages was often 15 per cent., and in very few cases was it 12 ½ per cent.; but as the millions began to flow in freely, and the Public Works scheme progressed, and after people began to save, money went down in price. People could only get 10, 8, 7, perhaps only 6 per cent, for their money. So you will see that while the land all the while was mounting in value, personal property was practically decreasing in value. I ask, therefore, was there anything wrong in determining that the land, when it was gradually increasing in value, should pay a small proportion—a very small proportion—of the burdens imposed on the people, in order to make it more valuable? That is the theory of a land tax as opposed to the theory of a property tax. I will say one word more about taxation. I say that a land tax is defensible on another ground; I say that it is defensible, even if the State did not make a single railway, road, or bridge. I will tell you why.

Land, A Monopoly.

Land is a monopoly, and it will always remain a monopoly. I, however, believe that the land should belong to the State, and not to individuals.— (Applause) The only reason why land is given to an individual is that it may be made most productive; and it is contended by Mill and various other writers that taxes may be specially put on it. We may get at its value now, and if it is found at the end of 10 or 20 years that a man's land has increased in value, this tax is put on in order to get (Mill says) some portion—not all—of that unearned increase in the value of the land which is continually going on all over the world. I say, therefore, that a land tax is a fair and equitable tax compared with a property tax. I ask you to remember what has been done by the present Ministry in reference to the property tax. Unless the property tax produces something, the whole burdens of the country are cast on the customs revenue, while the property tax produces a miserable pittance. While the Treasurer says that the Colony is worth many millions, the sum paid annually into the Treasury under the property tax amounts to £156,000. That is the great good which has been done under the present Government in taxing the propertied classes, who, owning hundreds of millions' worth of property within the Colony, are only asked to pay £150,000 a year into the State Treasury. But the radical distinction between a land and a property tax hangs upon

Land Tenure.

Here I may say that I am quite at a loss to understand what views are held by Major Atkinson on this question of land tenure. He says that he is favour of free-trade in land. When did free trade in land ever answer, and what does it mean? It means that a person who owns land can do with it what he likes. It means that if one person owned Dunedin he could say to the people of Dunedin, "Clear out. The land is mine." It reminded him of what a Maori member once said in the House. The Maori was objecting to the form of fee simple, as their lands were going away under it. He believed in communal rights. He said that if this mode of depriving the Maoris of their land was not stopped, the only thing left for them would be the main roads on which to stand and view their former possessions. If you once admit that there is to be free trade in land, then the State has no right to control contracts relating to land. In Ireland it has been found necessary to pass a law which says that the landlord shall not fix what rent he likes. There the State has said: "We will not recognise free trade in land. We appoint Government officers, who will step in between you and the tenant and fix what a fair rent shall be." In order to meet the difficulty in another way, what did they do in France? There the State has said: "You have no right to dispose of your land on your death as you please; but the State will step in and dispose of it for you." Major Atkinson says that after next session there will be free trade in land in this Colony, but this will simply be the beginning of our difficulties. Until this question of land tenure is faced—until Major Atkinson understands the difference between free trade in land and the nationalisation of the land,—we cannot hope for

any wise land laws. Now I come to deal with the Major's scheme of

National Insurance.

Here, I may say, I recognise that we ought to thank him sincerely for the effort he has made to solve this problem— (hear); but I wish to find out first what solution he proposes. His solution is that there should be a poll tax on all people between the ages of 16 and 23 or 18 and 23 years; and those between 23 and 48, in order that they may reap the advantages of the system, have also to pay for five or seven years. I want you to know what this money amounts to—what this poll tax which the Major proposes will produce. I find that there are in this Colony about 61,000 people between the ages of 16 and 23. There are really over 62,000 persons; but I have left out, in order that the Major may have the benefit, those in hospitals, criminals, and others from whom the tax cannot be collected. If you take the average payment to be nearly £6—£5 17s is the sum—the poll tax will produce during the first year £366,000, which is more than double what the property tax yields. Then these payments go on increasing for seven years, because there are about 12,000 people between 16 and 18 years coming in. There are probably more than that; but here we can knock off 2000 or 3000, because the excess of births over deaths is about 13,000 or 14,000 in this Colony. We have also, immigrants coming in, some between these ages; so that, even at the lowest calculation, I believe about 12,000 or 13,000 are coming up each year. But in order to do absolute fairness to Major Atkinson's scheme, I have, as before stated, struck off 3000; so that it cannot be said I am over the mark when I say that, excluding those in the hospitals, lunatic asylums, and gaols, who will not require to pay, there will be at the seven years at least another 10,000 persons between the ages of 16 and 23 years coming in annually. Thus, at the seventh year there will be actually £726,000 coming from this poll tax. But there is to be provision made for the widows and orphans, and consequently persons above 23 years have got to pay two shillings a week each for five years longer in order to provide for these widows and orphans. And those now above 23 and under 48 have to pay from £6 to £8 for five or seven years. Let us again be generous. There are in the Colony 106,000 male persons between the ages of 20 and 45. I am quoting from the census of 1881. Assuming that there are 100,000 males between the ages of 23 and 48; and again, taking the lowest contribution—£6 each—you will have £600,000 contributed by this poll tax during the first year, so that under this scheme the people would be called on to pay into the State Treasury for pauperism £966,000, and the propertied class are paying £156,000. This proposed poll tax will thus produce nearly a million of money during the first year, and if it goes on increasing it will amount in the seventh year to nearly £1,250,000. Why, our customs revenue amounts only to £1,500,000; and this poll tax that the Government are going to give us will put into the State Treasury more than all the other taxes put together—I don't consider railway revenue in the nature of a tax—with the exception of our customs revenue, and it will nearly equal that. Now I assume in this calculation that the immigration will at least equal the deaths. I submit to you that this is a very big scheme, and ask you to notice what this big scheme means. We are to have a fund for the relief of pauperism, which will provide for the giving of 15s a week to sick people, without the attendance of a doctor; and for an annuity of 10s for those over 65. and also for an allowance to widows and orphans. Now, first, I call this taxation on two grounds—because it is a payment in return for services rendered by the State, and it is compulsory. If you join a friendly society or an insurance company. you have not got to pay for sick people. No persons are admitted to a friendly society or an insurance company without undergoing medical examination, and it is only those in good health and who are thrifty that are admitted. But under this system the thrifty are to pay for the unthrifty, and the healthy for the sick. Now I ask you where is the money to come from? It must come either from our savings or our present expenditure—that is, the money must come out of the savings of the people, or else they must lessen their expenditure; and I ask you, is it likely that any unthrifty person will lessen the expenditure of his money merely because the State levies a tax? I would like to know of any instance of a man voluntarily doing anything of the sort. It has been said by Major Atkinson we must not discuss the scheme. He practically says that, because at the meeting at which he spoke after Mr Green he said, "We do not want declamation: show us a better scheme"; and I have heard several people say, "We do not want criticism of this scheme. What is your scheme?" Well, ladies and gentlemen, that puts me in mind of an anecdote. I have known men who have what are termed "fads." If you go to a patent office, why you find half the ideas registered are useless, and yet men have spent an enormous amount of time and labour on them. Well, I knew a man who fancied he could make a flying-machine, and he constructed one on a very elaborate plan, and undertook to demonstrate that he could fly with it. At the trial he turned round and said, "It is all very well for you to criticise, but show me a better machine."— (Laughter.) I say we have a right, in discussing this scheme, to say to Major Atkinson: Pauperism is a very bad thing; it is a terrible evil, and perhaps by discussing the means proposed to meet it, we shall learn, how the happiness of every individual can be secured." This question of poverty has been discussed long before flying-machines, and we are no nearer a solution than before. This scheme of Major Atkinson's is one to stop poverty, but I say it does not strike at the root of poverty

at all. Does any man say that giving 15s a week to a sick person will stop poverty, and 10s to a person over 65? We know people have been poor who were never sick, and who never lived till 65 to receive this 10s annuity. I will illustrate what I say. We see in some countries men stricken down yearly with malaria, and quinine becomes of enormous importance to them. They say if they could only get quinine they would get rid of the fever. Major Atkinson's scheme is a quinine scheme. I say the proper scheme is to get rid of the fever, not to give quinine. I would say to the people of a city: Drain your marshes; look after your health, and you ought to have no fever." All that Major Atkinson desires is that the people should give him little bottles of quinine that he may distribute it when they take the chills. Now what is to be done with this vast sum of money? We are told by the Major and his supporters it must be invested in 4 per cents. What does it mean? It has been said in Parliament that if we got, say, a million a year to be expended on public works, that that would be sufficient for our requirements; the Major does not like to go into the Home market, and he says to the citizens throughout the Colony, I will utilise the money from this poll tax, giving a promise to pay for it into a fund, and go without loans. Now I come to what may be termed the root of this question, and I ask, is it the duty of the State to support the poor? Now I admit at once this is a much debated question. There are some able political economists who say it is not, and some who say it is. As I understand him, Major Atkinson says it is the duty of the State to support the poor. Let us assume that. Let us assume that everyone here grants it is the duty of the thrifty to support the unthrifty, the wise to support the imprudent, the sober to support the drunk; and look what follows. I presume the matter will have to be met by taxation. The four canons of taxation, as prescribed by Adam Smith, must be applied to the poor tax as well as to other things. What is the first? There must be an equality of sacrifice. If, then, there is a duty to support the poor by taxation, the taxation must not be per head, but in accordance with the property a man possesses.— (Applause.) If you admit it is the duty of the State to support the poor, you must necessarily admit that the taxation that is to go for the support of the poor must be a tax not per head, but according to the means of individual citizens. Why, our property-tax payers are only supposed to pay £156,000 a year, while you are to be called upon by this taxation per head to pay nearly a million. Is that fair? I say if you once admit that it is the duty of the State to support the poor, and if you once admit that Smith's canons of taxation are right—viz.. equality of taxation—then the Major's scheme is gone.— (Applause). But if it is said, on the other hand, that it is not the duty of the State to support the poor—supposing you take up that position, then the scheme is equally gone. What is the use of politicians bothering about the question at all? So that I do not care which view you take: if you say it is the duty of the State to support the poor, then it must be the duty of the State to tax equally, according to their means, the citizens for that purpose; but if you say it is not the duty of the State to support the poor, then, of course, there is no need of considering the scheme at all. But now I say further, look at what would be some of the effects of the scheme. And first, I say the main effect of the scheme would be to do that which in his first address Major Atkinson so much deprecated—namely, to direct the attention of the people to the Government for their every want. I say that this is the abiding political sin of Colonial people. Why, we cannot get a bit of a bridge at the North-East Valley built without a formal deputation—— (applause and laughter)—a little bit of a bridge that could be built in a week by the citizens working a day or two. But they got up a deputation: we must have a formal deputation, headed by M.H.R.'s: we can do nothing in this Colony without invoking the aid of the Government. I say that that is the besetting sin of Colonial people, and that if they do not guard against it they will soon lose their independence. What, I ask, should be our duty, living as we do in a freer state than at Home? It should be to do without State interference, except in regard to those things which individuals cannot manage. If we look at what the result has been in the past, we will see that whenever a State tends to interfere with a people in any degree it tends to weaken their individuality — it tends to make them slaves. Major Atkinson says the main aim of a democracy—the sole object of a democracy, as I understood he put it—was to work for the common good. I deny that that is the aim of a democracy. I say the aim of a democracy is to turn out perfect men and perfect women, and I say that any Government that does not aim at turning out perfect men and perfect women is doing an injury to the race, and I say that there can be no such improvement of the race if Government here, there, and everywhere interferes with our social affairs. Why, we must look forward to the time when instead of the Government's functions increasing they must decrease. We have always found in the past that as individual liberty has increased and Government interference decreased, nations have risen in the scale of existence. I ask you, what is the tendency of democracy? At one time it was said that all the world would come to naught if Governments did not have State churches. Is our world coming to naught because the Government does not vote sums for the church in Parliament? I say I look forward to the time when, instead of democracy doing more for the people, a true democracy will do less. I say that I look forward to the time when even in the matter of education the State will not interfere, but will leave it to the citizens. I think we should look to the State doing as little as possible of what the individual can do. This is most important. I could give illustrations by the hundred of its effects. Take this for example: About a month ago I met with the "Naval Magazine"—a magazine published in London, dealing mainly with nautical affairs. I opened it, and thought, "Well, one cannot

get much, surely, out of this: it deals with warships, seamen, how to have a proper navy—things out of my line"; but in reading it I came across a remarkable thing, and it shows how out of things that seem often out of one's road some facts may be got that are useful. I found that in an essay in it there was this marvellous thing—a thing the writer could not understand. If young people of good parentage were put on a proper training-ship, well fed, well clothed, and well housed, what sort of sailors, it was asked, would they make compared with the fisher lads, who were worse fed, worse housed, and had less training? And what did he say? Why, that a fisher lad, for ability to do seaman's work and for resource in danger, was worth two of the other lads. Providing you give full play to the individual, you will find great advance made. I ask you to inquire of those accustomed to the sea, and they will tell you that if you take a sailor who has been thoroughly trained in a merchant vessel, and another who has been thoroughly trained as a man-of-war's man, the man who will have most resource in time of danger will be the man who has been trained with less control—the man to whose individual character more scope has been given will turn out a better sailor than one who has always had some quartermaster over him. Then if you wish to take a national test, you will find the same result. Go to the Continent of Europe—to some of the nations where they cannot stir, cannot be married, cannot do anything without the Government interfering with them at every stage of existence, where from the cradle to the grave there is a Government officer looking after them—take one of these men, and take an Englishman—or, better still, because of the greater freedom of the individual—an American, and tee which on a desert island would make the better living first? So it is; you must give scope to the individual, and I believe the true aim of democracy is to make a man feel like a man, and not to bow before those in authority over him. If that is the true aim of a democracy, then I say the less interference of the State with the citizen the better.— (Applause.) Now I say, how will this affect the equal liberty of others? The Mayor gave us an illustration from the keeping of pigs. He said the State now interferes—you are not allowed to keep pigs in a town. That comes within the principle that you are to have liberty in everything, so long as you do not interfere with the liberty of your neighbour. If a man keeps pigs in the city, and causes stench, discomfort, and disease, he is interfering with my liberty. The highest ideal of a State is to prevent interference with liberty; and therefore it is invoking no extraneous aid from the State—it is simply asking the State to protect my liberty in the preservation of health. I will say one word more with reference to the question of equal liberty. I say—for the land problem is closely related to the poverty problem—we must lay down the same rule of equal liberty with reference to land, and if we lay down the same rule we must at once come to this conclusion—that the land is the State's, and that the State should only part with it for the State's benefit. Now I wish to say one or two words in reference to

How is Poverty to be Met?

First, I wish to say a few words in reference to some of Mr Green's remedies, because I wish to apply the same principle in dealing with Major Atkinson's or any other scheme. I do not believe in State interference in reference to becoming a publican any more than the State interfering in reference to dealing out sick-pay. I believe that if the State became the publican—the vendor of liquor—you would not stop drunkenness to any appreciable extent; and you would have other attendant evils, just the same as you have other attendant evils wherever the State interferes with what should be left to individual effort. In reference to a State paper issue, I will tell you what a paper issue means, or how far it could do any good. The only effect of a paper issue, supposing the Colony had a bank of issue, would be this: If instead of the banks issuing bank-notes, the Government did so, seeing that the banks issue only about a million a year, it would save £40,000 or £50,000 in interest. That is all that could be saved, because we have got to pay for things outside the Colony, and people outside the Colony will not take our banknotes except they can get them exchanged or recognised beyond our Colony. Therefore to issue more paper money in this Colony would have no effect further than bank-notes now have in the Colony—simply for the purpose of exchange. You would only save the interest on the money, which I believe would only amount to £40,000 or £50,000 a year. But you would have other attendant evils, because the tendency of every Colonial Treasurer in difficulties would be to use the printing-press, quite careless of the effect that would be produced a few months afterwards. I wish to point out, before I leave this question, two dangers in reference to Major Atkinson's scheme, one of which has been entirely overlooked in any criticism I have seen of it. One great evil would be that all our young people at 16 or 18—I mean those of the labouring classes who have not large means, and who could not pay those various sums to the Colonial Treasurer—would at once have to turn to some profitable employment. What does that mean? It means in one respect that no poor person's children would have a chance of higher education, because if they had at once to turn to work for their living they would be deprived of the chance of attending the higher schools. I say that is a danger existing even now in this Colony. As soon as youths come to the age of 16 they are removed from school and set to work. Some of the brightest boys who, if they were sent to the grammar schools and university, might become ornaments to the Colony, are sent to drudge for a living, and on account of the

poverty of their parents they have no chance of attaining to high distinction.— (Cheers.) If we have this evil at present among us, I say it would be intensified tenfold if the Major's scheme were carried out. Then, I say, the standard of living must be necessarily lowered. If you have the people living up to a certain standard, and if they get less money to live on, they must lower their standard of living. What does that mean? It means either worse lodging, or worse food, or worse clothing, or less amusement. You cannot, the Major says, get nothing out of nothing. Therefore, where is this money to come from? It must either come out of the savings of the people, or out of their expenditure. If it comes from the saving people, they would save their money in any case, and make a better use of it than by handing it over to the Colonial Treasurer, who will disburse it perhaps among those who are not provident. Now Major Atkinson gave us four causes of poverty—bad laws, want of thrift, over-population, and crime. I think the causes are different. I say the first cause is State interference with human rights.— (Cheers.) The second cause is physical weakness; third, mental weakness; fourth, moral weakness; and fifth, poverty—because I say that poverty produces poverty. Physical weakness is a cause of poverty when men cannot do the work that is obtainable; mental weakness may, perhaps, produce a want of ability to save, the person having no self-control; and that is included in moral weakness, such as giving way to drink and other vices. If you agree that these are the causes of poverty, I ask, how are they to be remedied? Will they be remedied by paying 15s a week to people when they are sick, and paying them 10s a week when they are over 65 years of age? The thing is perfectly ridiculous. First get at the causes. First remove bad laws. First have your land system changed; have your taxation system changed. And you must have your voting system changed to do that. Do not imagine that our Constitution is perfect. Do you call that a perfect Constitution which permits a man who has perhaps £25 worth of land in each ward in a city to vote for four members of Parliament, while a man with £5000 worth of property in one ward has only one vote? Do you think that a perfect system which gives encouragement to faggot votes? I don't. Again, do you consider it a perfect system of government—and here, I say, is an instance of bad laws interfering with human rights—where there is no attention paid to the laws of health, and where we have preventable diseases in all the large cities. I took up a Christchurch paper the other day and read a report of the medical officer of the Christchurch Board of Health. I do not know what our Mayor does with the Dunedin reports; they are very rarely published. I find that there were a vast number of preventable diseases in Christchurch—something like from 150 to 200 cases of actually preventable diseases; and the medical officer shows how they could be prevented. Through disregard of the first laws of health there had been typhoid fever, diphtheria, scarlet fever, and other fevers; and I say that in all our Colonial cities our attention as citizens has not been half devoted to this question. If we wish to get rid of the sickness we now suffer in this healthy clime, we must pay some attention to the laws of health; and that is one way of getting rid of poverty.— (Applause.) Further, we must pay attention in the education of the young to training them up to habits of thrift. I do not believe you can teach people thrift between the ages of 16 and 20 or 23 and 28. I say you must begin with the children. Some of those now present know that the late Mr Dalrymple, Miss Dalrymple, myself, and others fought to get savings banks established in the schools, so that children from the earliest ages might learn habits of thrift and self-reliance.— (Applause.) Yet what have we done in this respect? I believe that throughout the whole province there is hardly one savings bank yet established in connection with our schools. Then we must also have the children taught lessons of physiology, so that they may attend to their health; and if we wish also to see them well educated, and to get rid of one of the greatest vices of the Colony—drinking—we must teach them temperance. I fought, and others fought, to introduce into the schools temperance lesson-books, so as to teach the children in their earliest years—not to leave it until they are 16 or 23 years of age—the duty of abstaining from anything that will injure them physically, mentally, or morally.— (Cheers.) I believe that that is the only way in which social reform can be obtained. I ask you to cast your eyes on history, and see how social reform has been obtained in the past. As a race, what enormous advances we have made! If we go back, for example, to the time of the Plantagenets, and look at what even the king had to put up with: no glass in his windows, no paper on his walls. He had no fine Turkish carpets; he had no railroads, no telephones, no telegraphs. Why, he did not live half as well as a large merchant in our town. And if you go further back, just consider the Cave man—or what is termed by geologists the River Drift Man — and see what enormous advances humanity has made. I ask you, how have these advances been made? They have not been made by a short cut of 15s per week. They have been made by raising the standard of living, by training the individual, and they have not been obtained right away. I say to those who think that one or two generations, or three generations, will get rid of this question of poverty, which has existed for ages, or this question of intemperance, which has existed for ages, that they are trusting to a rope of sand.

Conclusion.

This is one of the social evils which it will take ages and ages to get rid of, and it will only be got rid of finally, not by trusting to legislative means, but by raising the standard of living of the people, by educating the

people, and by promoting culture amongst the people. Let us look to our Statute-book. It is enough to make us cease to believe that anything can come by merely passing laws. If you look at our Statute-book you will always find an amending Act the preamble of which says that all previous Acts have been failures. No great social reform can ever come from State interference. This I cannot better illustrate than by quoting a passage from one of the greatest of living men, who says: "You see that this wrought-iron plate is not quite flat; it sticks up a little here towards the left—'cockles,' as we say. How shall we flatten it? Obviously, you reply, by hitting down on the part that is prominent. Well, here is a hammer, and I give the plate a blow as you advise. 'Harder,' you say. Still no effect. 'Another stroke.' Well, there is one, and another, and another. The prominence remains, you see. The evil is as great as ever—greater, indeed. But this is not all. Look at the warp which the plate has got near the opposite edge. Where it was flat before it is now curved. A pretty bungle we have made of it. Instead of curing the original defect, we have produced a second. Had we asked an artisan practised in 'planishing,' as it is called, he would have told us that no good was to be done, but only mischief, by hitting down on the projecting point. He would have taught us how to give variously-directed and specially-adjusted blows with a hammer elsewhere—so attacking the evil not by direct, but by indirect actions. The required process is less simple than you thought. Even a sheet of metal is not to be successfully dealt with after those commonsense methods in which you have so much confidence. What, then, shall we say about a society? 'Do you think I am easier to be played on than a pipe?' asks Hamlet. Is humanity more readily straightened than an iron plate?" I say to those who imagine that pauperism and all other social evils are to be got rid of by putting an enormous amount of taxation on the people, that they are trusting to something which must end in utter failure. How, then, it may be said, are we to help forward this great movement? I believe we will help forward thrift, and get rid of poverty by means such as these: by educating the people up to this question, which demands solution from us; by expending our enthusiasm on this subject, and not on every subject; by recognising our responsibility as individuals? so that each one of us in the democracy recognises that he does not act for himself, but that it is his duty to act for others. If each one of us acted in the capacity of a moral guide, and adopted the maxim of Kant, and so acted that his actions might form a law unto humanity, what a different nation we would be! If we as a nation are ever to get rid of poverty, crime, and vice, we must not only incline to individualism, but we must each of us try to live his life so as to act as a guide to those among us who may be physically, mentally, and morally weak. Doing these things would do more to promote a true democracy and to raise humanity than to assist some in getting getting rid of the duties of property, and casting on the working men this enormous burden of taxation.— (Loud and continued applause.)

Mr J. W. Jago had had the honour and privilege of moving a few nights ago a vote of thanks to Major Atkinson for his discussion of this great and important question, in which the present and future welfare of this Colony is involved. He had been asked again by gentlemen upon the platform to do a like duty on this occasion, and he did it as freely and heartily as before. He would not say whether or not he agreed with Mr Stout, as in the case of Major Atkinson, but he thought both had done a great service to the community. The whole question was one of very great difficulty, and required much thought and serious discussion: and any gentleman who aided the ultimate solution of the matter, as he thought Mr Stout had done, deserved the thanks of the community. He would propose a vote of thanks to Mr Stout for his address.

Mr W. D. Stewart, in seconding the vote of thanks, said that everyone who contributed to the information of the people on the problem of poverty was entitled to thanks. He need scarcely say that he had given this matter some little consideration, and keenly appreciated its difficulties. The scheme propounded by Major Atkinson, to his (the speaker's) mind, would tend to foster poverty, and not to prevent it.— (Applause.) He thought that a great many of the suggestions and arguments advanced by Mr Stout were not only plausible, but well founded.— (Applause.)

The vote of thanks was carried unanimously.

Mr Stout said: I thank you very heartily for the vote which you have unanimously passed. I have to regret that in consequence of the number of the subjects I had to condense a great deal that I had to say. I will ask you now to join with me in a hearty vote of thanks to the Mayor for presiding over this meeting.

The vote was carried by acclamation, and the meeting dispersed.

Printed at the "Otago Daily Times" Office, Corner of High and Dowling Streets, Dunedin.
A Speech on The Possible Future Developments of Governments in Free States.
Delivered Before the "Union Debating Society"

At Wellington, N.Z.,

BY JAMES EDWARD FITZGERALD, C.M.G.,

Controller and Auditor General,

November 15, 1882.

Wellington: Edwards & Green, Printers, Brandon Street MDCCCLXXXII.

The Possible Future Developments of Governments in Free States.

decorative feature

I PROPOSE to speak to-night of certain possible future developments in the Governments of free States. Perhaps it may form the best introduction to such a subject if I glance very briefly at the growth of Governments in civilized countries up to the present time. In doing so I will occupy but a few minutes whilst I sketch in the rudest outline the main features of that history with which, no doubt, you are all well acquainted;—and that only for the purpose of contrasting the condition under which Governments of the present day exist, with those of earlier periods.

It may be assumed that all government had its origin in the physical conditions of our nature—in the government of the father over his children; that it expanded into the patriarchal—the government by the head of a cluster of related households; that it further developed into the tribal, under the headship of the chief; and lastly consolidated into the national—the community of race, under the authority of the king. Under the chief or king in early times, the decisions of the ruling power, so they affected the action of the community, were often submission to the assembled people, and were assented to or rejected by, acclamation: and thus a rude democracy restrained in some fashion the will of the monarch. Personal equality of right was the rule where all were equally warriors. In this, however, there was one wide exception: for slavery appears amongst the earliest communities of which we have cognizance; and slavery arose from the conquest of feebler by stronger races. Slaves were chattels, not citizens; they had no existence in the polity of the State. Thus, even when Athens was at its greatest, and possessed a definite political constitution, and was perhaps the most perfect specimen of a democracy in ancient history, the slaves constituted a body which is said by some to have included nearly two-thirds of the whole population. It was a democracy in which two-thirds of the people were no part of the Demos. The kingly power was sometimes hereditary, sometimes elective, as custom had grown up in different communities: and sometimes it partook of both characters, being elective within the limits of the ruling family; often subject to disruption by the appearance of some man towering above his fellows in wisdom, courage and physical strength,— in all those attributes by which men acquire, by their own inherent character, the power to dominate over wills inferior to their own. Dynasties were changed by the Napoleons amongst mankind. Side by side with the kingly office grew up that of subordinate princes, who ruled each in his own territory, with power similar to that of the monarch; not unfrequently disputing and restraining his authority, and sometimes overshadowing the throne itself. A later period saw the growth of the political influence of the middle classes through the growing wealth and power of the towns; and a still later, the fall of the great feudatories, and the absorption of their power into that of the king; and from that epoch we trace the long struggle between the middle classes and the throne, to restrain the despotic power of the king within the limits of settled constitutional law. I say between the middle classes, because at the commencement of this struggle, the great mass of the people were little considered. There had been from time to time great popular outbursts of the lowest stratum of society, such as that of the Jacquerie in France, and the rising headed by Jack Cade in England; but as a rule it may be said the mass of the people had as little influence on the Government as the slaves had in Athens. But the last chapter in the history of government—a chapter not yet closed in many civilized countries—records the gradual extension to all classes of the community of a share in the councils of the State, and of the right of all to be bound by no laws except those to which they had signified their assent by the voice of their representatives in the popular assemblies.

The machinery of representation is of modern growth. It has been remarked by writers that there is little or no trace of such a contrivance in classical history; as little is there amongst oriental nations, or amongst those northern races from whom the civilized world has mainly sprung. The personal appeal to an assembled people could have been possible only in comparatively small communities. The delegation of political power to representatives was therefore the natural result of the enlargement of nationalities, combined with the sentiment of personal freedom handed down from the earliest traditions of a race. There have, however, been occasions when the contrivances of modern civilization have been utilized to enable a direct appeal to the masses of the people, without the intervention of representatives. Such we saw upon two occasions, when the late emperor of the French appealed to the people by means of a plebiscite, to confirm his power, first as president, and then as emperor. The machinery of the ballot-box rendered such an appeal possible. But that mechanism pre-supposes conditions which would have precluded success in earlier times. It involves a capacity to read and write in the majority of the people, and it requires that speedy circulation of intelligence which modern facilities, such as printing and rapidity of communication, have alone afforded. It involves above all, to insure success, such a

standard of moral and political rectitude amongst the people, and such a submission to the requirements of the law, that the inviolability of the ballot-box shall be secured. We have introduced the same principle in this colony to a limited extent,—not indeed in the general Government, but in that of municipalities. We appeal by a plebiscite to the ratepayers, to sanction loans proposed to be raised by boroughs; and, more recently, we ascertain the wishes of the people on the subject of increasing or not increasing the number of public houses in a district.

It is clear that this extension of the principle of democracy is within the possibilities of the future in free Governments; and, in respect to one class of subjects, its utility and propriety will hardly be disputed. It has often been argued that the body entrusted with the duty of making laws for ordinary purposes of government is not necessarily clothed with the power of altering the fundamental principles of the Constitution. This position was taken by Mr. Grattan and those who opposed the union of Ireland with Great Britain; and constitutional lawyers of high position maintained the same view. The name of Lord Plunkett alone is sufficient authority for claiming great weight to the arguments adduced:—that a parliament elected by the people to make laws for their government cannot exceed the powers confided to it;—is incapable, morally and constitutionally, of putting an end to its own existence, and can, in the extreme case, but restore to the people the trust which the people confided to its hands. This important principle was asserted by the framers of the Constitution of the United States, the fifth article of which provides that any alteration in the Constitution shall be made only by a convention of the people, whose decisions become a part of the constitutional law, only after adoption by the legislatures of three-fourths of the States, or by conventions of three-fourth of the States, as Congress should determine; and the Constitution itself was only brought into force by being accepted by a convention in each of the thirteen States, elected for the sole purpose of determining, aye or no, the acceptance of the new Constitution. In England it has always been hold that in the king, lords and commons in parliament assembled are vested full power to alter the Constitution; but it has also been asserted that, where any fundamental alteration in the Constitution is proposed, parliament should be dissolved, and an election should take place with a special view to the determination of the question. Thus the people would, for all practical purposes, have been consulted, and legislation would proceed in compliance with their will. Still it can hardly be denied that a direct appeal to the people would be a more satisfactory method of asserting the principle, which is in fact admitted by the argument I have just noticed; and would relieve the Legislature from those long and violent discussions which always occur when any fundamental alteration in the Constitution of a State is proposed.

How far this process of appealing directly to the masses may become incorporated into the practice of Governments, it is impossible to speculate; still less to predicate what might be the results. I have gone no further than to indicate it as not undesirable, in questions where there are grounds for doubting whether the Legislature is not trenching on the limits of its Constitutional powers. But this at least may be said, that the modern contrivance of the vote by ballot renders that possible, which could not otherwise be obtained without the risk which always attends the assembly of great masses of the people in times of popular excitement, and the difficulty of ascertaining with accuracy, in the confusion of public meetings, the real voices of those entitled to vote.

I have occupied your time in this brief sketch of the growth of government for the purpose of calling attention to this fact: that the aspect of government in the present day is different from what it has ever been, so far as we know, at any previous period; that it is only within, comparatively speaking, the few past years that the mass of the people, without any underlying substratum such as slavery, have become a predominant power; and that by the machinery of election and representation that power is now exercised without turmoil or violence, but peaceably and effectively. Step by step franchises have been lowered, until manhood suffrage has been reached in some countries, and is rapidly approaching in others; and even universal suffrage, that is a suffrage including women, is largely and ably advocated.

The momentous question for the future is—now that power has passed or is passing into the hands of the masses,—What will they do with it?

The history of the present century has been one of what may be termed specially *political* strife; the main attention of statesmen has been given to questions relating to the re-distribution of the balance of political power between the different classes; and on this platform political parties, and their outcome, party government, have been formed. But with the final adjustment of that question, with a franchise enjoyed by all classes equally, political agitation must cease, and party government disappear. Other matters must occupy the arena. The power once securely lodged with the people, to what purpose will they use it? That is the problem of the future. Political power is not an end; it is only a means to an end. It needs little sagacity to predict that the improvement of the social and physical condition of the people will monopolise the thought and mould the action of the governments of the future. Social reform will take the place of political.

We may predicate so much, not only from forecasting the probabilities of the future, but from a survey of what has already taken place even in the few years of the present reign. Just as the increasing pressure of the

public mind has been felt on government, so has the spirit of administration changed its character, in the direction of ameliorating the conditions of life, and softening the asperity with which laws, framed in ruder stages of society, pressed upon the people. The alterations in the criminal law, the treatment of criminals, the spirit in which the law of libel is interpreted, the care of lunatics, the management of hospitals, the provisions for public health both in towns and in country districts, the drainage of unhealthy localities, the extension of popular education—all these are matters which have received an amount of attention in the last few years which has never before been accorded to them. And, in addition, the inventions of modern science, such as railroads and telegraphs, have forced upon Government new duties and responsibilities, all tending towards the same end,—the improvement in the physical and social conditions of life amongst the great masses of the population.

And this brings us to the question so often asked,—What are the limits within which the duties of Government lie? and what are those which ought to be left—to use a common expression—to private enterprise? A question never satisfactorily answered, because public opinion, reflected in or led by the views of statesmen, is undergoing a gradual but great change in this matter. It used to be thought that the only duty of Government was to collect the revenue required for the support of its power and dignity, to maintain order in the community, to provide for the due administration of the laws, to guide the nation in its action in relation to foreign States, and to maintain the national religious institutions of the country: that all interference with matters of a commercial character should be left to the private enterprise of its citizens. Nay further, it was argued that any interference by Government in other matters tended to impair the spirit of independence in a people, and to cripple the energy of individual exertion. No one will deny that there is a truth underlying this view. To have everything done for us by a sort of beneficent despotism, instead of being compelled to the wholesome exertion of doing it for ourselves, no doubt tends to emasculate the energy and to enfeeble the self-reliance of a people. But how if the people are themselves the Government, or the basis on which the Government rests, and in obedience to whose behests it lives and moves and has its being? It is clear that the old doctrine is one transmitted to us from ages, when Governments were regarded as something above and outside of, and often opposed to the people, instead of being in and of them. One of the most striking features of modern times is the extension of trade and manufactures by means of companies of shareholders. Do we consider that individual energy is repressed in shareholders, by their confiding the management of the concern for which they have associated themselves to directors whom they select for the purpose? Surely no one will say so.

The question then is,—Does not Government, exactly in proportion as it becomes more and more a reflection of the popular will, assume more and more the position of a directory of a company, in which every citizen is a shareholder? and if this is so, what then are the limits within which the action of Government should be confined? Let us consider for a moment the extent to which the old idea of Government has already been violated in all free States; that is to say, the matters in which Government engages, which might be left to private enterprise. Take the post office for example. There are companies for carrying goods and parcels and delivering them in towns and in the country. And what is the difference between a letter and a parcel? But no one will dispute that by the creation of a national organization for distributing letters, an immense benefit is conferred on the whole community. And yet can it be denied that Government not only interferes in this matter with private enterprise, but does so to the utmost extent, by vesting in itself a close monopoly, and debarring by penalties the competition of private persons? Take again the post office money order system, in which the Government competes with the bankers in the business of transmitting money; or the savings banks, in which it goes into the market against a multitude of private companies. I might also instance the case of railroads; which in this, as in many other countries, are Government monopolies; and are managed with at least as great satisfaction to the public as those which are still in the hands of private companies. Still more aptly may I quote the instance of telegraphs, which, in Great Britain, were bought by the State, after the experiment had been tried for some years of their management as private speculations; and it is, I believe, admitted that they are now managed by the Government with as much success and with as much benefit to the public as when they were in private hands. The Government Insurance Office, and the Public Trust Office are instances in which we in this colony have carried the same principle to a step further than has been elsewhere attempted, and, so far as I am aware, without any complaint against the establishment or the management of those institutions. And it is not only in the general government that this new principle has been asserted; for it has been still further extended in the subordinate or local governments; for instance, in the supply of gas, water, and tramways in towns, which are often provided by the municipality, the whole of the inhabitants being taxed for the purpose.

It is evident, then, that the old definition of the duty of Government fails to include much of what is now generally admitted to be within its proper functions:—that the realm of private enterprise has been invaded at many points; and *that* with the greatest benefit to the people. Take for example the supply of water. A private company would probably only supply it in such quarters as would prove remunerative. But in the hands of the governing body, it would be supplied equally to all classes; not only subserving the luxury of the rich, but

bringing to the poorest home that which is a necessary condition of health and comfort. Seeing then the extent to which Government has already intruded into the territory of private enterprise, the question forces itself upon all who speculate on the possibilities of the future, to what extent may not the citizens of each State be beneficially associated in a common organization for special purposes?

In the existing organization of society two great underlying principles are at work, pointing in opposite directions, and in distinct hostility the one to the other. I mean *competition* and *communism*. Competition claims that the interests of society are best subserved, by relying upon the instinct of human nature which impels each individual to acquire as much as possible for himself. It finds expression in the old proverbs "Self preservation is the first law of nature"—"Charity begins at home"—"God helps him most who helps himself" and such like. It regards success as the natural and predestinated reward of superior strength or skill, sagacity, foresight, or cunning; and in these days it appeals to a new sanction, derived from the all-pervading law of organic life, now generally accepted, that nature operates by "the survival of the fittest" and its advocates may well ask in the words of Scotland's bard,

*"Why then ask of silly man
To oppose great nature's plan."*

It asserts further, that, in the universal struggle of all for superiority, the self-reliance, endurance, skill, and prudence of every individual are sharpened and strengthened; that the result is a general increase in the products of human labour, and a necessary increase in the prosperity of the whole community; and it takes credit for a still further advantage, in that, by the competition between rival producers and distributors, articles of consumption are supplied to the people at a lower price than can be attained by any other method. Against this theory, communism wages perpetual war: and in using this ominous word, you will understand that I mean, not only or principally the ultimate development of the principle, which demands the abolition of all individual property—which says with Prudhomme "property is robbery," and claims that all wealth shall be held by the community at large, each individual enjoying an equal share of its use; but I embrace in the term all arrangements whereby men associate themselves for common objects, and to which the milder name of *co-operation* is applied. Co-operation is no more than a partial adoption by one section of the people, and for a special purpose, of that which communism would apply to the whole, and for every purpose in the organisation of society. Communism was attempted in the first formation of the Christian Church, and was adopted in supposed compliance with the will of its Founder. We all know how the experiment first displayed its inherent weakness, in the dishonesty of some of the members. And even those who have no hostility to the extreme doctrine in theory, can hardly fail to perceive how inapplicable it is to human nature in its existing phase. Surely all but the most visionary must admit, that community of goods can only exist in a people amongst whom coexists a corresponding community of character and feeling, of principle and of honor, of motives and impulses,—a people trained to an entire abnegation of self, and possessing an all pervading faith in one another. Some of us may indulge in the dream, that such may be the final consummation of human society; that to such an end the destinies of our race are surely though slowly tending; but we must also perceive that community of goods, as a universal rule, will be the *result* not the *cause* of that refinement and elevation in the moral condition of mankind, without which it cannot exist.

No sane thinker on these matters can believe that communism, in its furthest development, could be suddenly or violently imposed with any hope of practical success, upon men who have for long ages been trained in the opposite belief, and all whose conceptions have been moulded on other principles. Social systems are things of growth. They may be violently broken up by convulsions; but even then the new principles do not for a long time take abiding root in the national character. How soon did not England return from the republican to the old monarchical idea. It is now a century since the French Revolution, yet how recently have republican principles prevailed in that country. How short a time elapsed after the declaration of the rights of man, before France relapsed into the old forms under the new name of Empire; and distributed, as the prizes of successful conquest, the wealth and honors and titles, which it had destroyed as the possession of proscriptive right and ancient lineage. It was the old world story. The emancipated slaves, under the burden and hard training of unaccustomed freedom, sighed once more for the flesh pots of Egypt.

But what cannot be effected by sudden and violent change may be approached by the slow but irresistible growth of popular feeling, especially when awakened by the teaching of those who have applied great information and power of thought to the investigation of the causes of the unequal distribution of the comforts and conveniences, not to say the necessities of life, amongst different classes and individuals. And such is one remarkable feature of the literature of the present day. Such too is the tendency of those institutions of which so many have sprung up in the last twenty or thirty years, the co-operative clubs, and the still older Friendly Societies, and the older yet associations of Trades Unions. All these are separate and isolated endeavors, tending, in special spheres, to the same end as that which communism aims at applying to the entire organization of society; and they are based on the same great underlying principle which inspires the faith of

the communist. Under the influence of these institutions the public mind is being schooled and educated, no less by their failures than by their successes; is learning the true principles, so far as they can be said to be established, of political economy—of the laws which regulate the creation and distribution of wealth; is being taught, above all, how much it is possible to achieve, consistently with the existing moral and mental condition of men; and, at the same time, by the reaction which wholesome exertion exercises upon the human faculties rightly used, is being elevated and trained to an extent which may render it capable of wider and more beneficent applications of the principles which inspired its earliest efforts.

Let us clearly understand the difference between the two principles of which I am speaking. The doctrine of competition is based on the belief that the mainspring of human action is self-interest; communism, in the faith that it is, or ought to be, the subordination of self-interest to the sense of human brotherhood. Competition looks mainly to production; and, deeming it proved that the progress of society depends on the advance of its powers of production, infers that the national prosperity must be the inevitable result. Communism looks rather to distribution; and asserts that, whatever may be the power of production, where the results are monopolised by the few, whilst a large section of the mass is left in destitution, society on the whole is not progressing but retrograding. From the stand-point of the present, it may be difficult to gather from the observations we are able to make on the infinitely complicated machine of society moving around us, what may be the outcome of the opposing forces at work; but from a moral point of view, from the principles of eternal right and wrong which are implanted in the human breast, we may judge of the character of the two principles of which I am speaking, and may determine which ought to tend, and unless all social organization is a piece of disjointed and inharmonious mechanism, must tend, to the advancement, the happiness, and the prosperity of a nation.

Which, then, is the nobler instinct of the two,—the law of self-interest, or the law of brotherhood? Test it by an extreme case. Let us suppose that some of us are cast adrift upon a raft in mid ocean; that there is but a limited supply of food and water; that the only hope of safety lies in being picked up by some passing ship before our supplies are exhausted. Shall we deem that a fulfilment of the highest duty of man, which would impel the strong to cast the weak to the sharks, so that their own chances of life might thereby be prolonged? Or shall we be ashamed of the weakness under which our breasts have sometimes heaved with emotion and our eyes filled with tears, when hearing, as we have sometimes heard, bow the strongest and roughest seaman of the company has deprived himself of the portion which was his equal share, and waved from his burning lips the last drop of water, that he might alleviate in some measure the sufferings—perchance add something to the desperate chance of life—of the feeblest woman or the tenderest child with whom he was bound in a companionship of suffering. Shall we say that this is a strained or unfair test of what is noble or base in human action? Are we not all, each generation in its turn, adrift on the raft of time amidst the boundless ocean of eternity, with the same duty imposed on us, if not to share alike, at least to provide that the monopoly of comfort and luxury by the few does not condemn the many to suffering and destitution? How then can we refuse our admiration at the motives which have induced the Trades Unions to set their face against piece work or other means by which the stronger and more skilful workman can by working longer and more expeditiously, earn higher wages than his fellows? They may be wrong; it may be that the course they take would frustrate, not advance their object; but the impulse which moves them to determine that, where there is only a given amount of work to be done, and more men than are necessary to do it, they shall all share and share alike, this surely is dictated by a motive which appeals to the noblest and most heroic instincts of the human breast.

Among the manifold developments of the doctrine of competition, I will notice one, in the system of contracts, upon which the largest part of all undertakings, by private persons and companies, and also by Governments are carried on; until it has come to exercise a great influence on the organization of society. It has grown up out of the necessity, that, where works require the organized labor of large numbers of workmen, they should be directed and superintended by someone having skill and experience in the description of undertaking required. It is rightly assumed that such an overseer will apply the labor at his disposal in the most efficient manner. But it is further assumed that, by inviting public tenders, the work will be done in the cheapest manner for the employers if the lowest tender is taken. But what are the grounds for such an assumption? The cost of a work is a fact. With a known market price of materials, and of the current rate of wages at the time, a work will cost just the same, whether done by a contractor or by an employer. It is quite true that the employer has the advantage of knowing exactly, or thinks he knows exactly, what his utmost outlay will be; and, where he is ignorant of the mode of the execution himself, he thus insures himself against loss; but, as a matter of fact, the work costs the same. If the contract price is less than that, the contractor loses; if more, he gains, and often gains enormously, very much more than the fair value of his labor and skill in superintendence. That this is so the enormous fortunes made by many contractors in all countries clearly prove. The workmen do not work more skilfully or harder for the contractor than they would for the employer. Why should they do so? They have no motive that I can see. The laborer or mechanic works his best, in order, by acquiring a good character

in his trade, to secure constant employment and higher wages. Again, it is assumed that it is impossible to obtain the services of competent superintendents, who will honestly consult the employers' interests, at a fixed rate of wages; and that such men would display more skill and energy if working for their own pockets than if working for an employer. But surely the overseer has the same motive to establish a character for skill and management which the workman has, namely, the desire to prove himself the best man who can be found in his trade. It is idle to say that honest and skilful overseers are not to be procured for fair salaries, whilst we employ multitudes of superintendents in various classes of industry upon wages, not by contract. We do not let out our railways to be worked by a general manager by contract, or employ captains by contract to sail our ships; and yet in these and a thousand other cases, we require the experience and skill necessary in the application of organized labor; and the work in railway workshops, and in dockyards and arsenals is as well and as cheaply done as any that a contractor can produce. But the vice of the contract system is that it makes it the direct interest of the contractor to act unfairly by the employer. His profits depend upon the cheapness with which he can get the work done. If he can get inferior material at a lower price, or hire less skilful labour at a lower rate, that is so much in his pocket; and to prevent his doing so, we employ engineers, and architects, and clerks of the works, to see that we get the worth of our money; so that our protection, after all, is in the hired servant, not in the contractor. To put it broadly,—we make it the contractor's interest to cheat us. I am far from saying that he always does so. I willingly bear witness to the honesty and liberality of many contractors with whom I have been brought in contact. And the more honor to those who, in spite of the temptation to which the system exposes them, do really honestly carry out their contracts even at their own loss. But the frequent disputes which arise at the conclusion of contracts, evidence on the other hand the unsatisfactory character of the bargain. Again, such is the looseness of the terms in which contracts are often, and sometimes unavoidably, drawn up, that the contractor can generally speculate on necessary accessories to the work, for which he can charge as extras, and so supplement any deficiency in his tender for what is included in the specification. Singularly enough, in one large class of employment—I mean the collection of revenue—the practice of farming the revenues, that is of letting the collection of them out by contract, is an expedient which has long been abandoned by all but semi-barbarous States. In civilized countries it has been found that the system of employing paid servants in this branch of labor is, beyond all comparison, cheaper than the contract system.

I have taken this as one instance of the manner in which the application of the doctrine of competition operates to distribute the produce of labour with enormous inequality, and to produce a natural feeling of discontent amongst the masses. I am quite aware of the arguments put forward by modern writers, especially in that most remarkable work on "Progress and Poverty" by Mr. George, to prove that the possession of land by private individuals is the sole cause of the unequal distribution of wealth. But I confess myself to be unable to perceive why the monopoly of large estates in land should give one man the power to grasp an unfair proportion of the produce of labor, whilst the same evil should not arise from a similar monopoly of capital. It may be quite true, and no doubt is, that, in the war between labour and capital, the attention of those who are suffering from the existing condition of society has been mainly fixed on the monopoly of capital, and has overlooked the perhaps still greater evil caused by the monopoly of land; but to attribute no ill effect to the former seems to me to overstate the case as against land. The truth is that the monopoly of capital is a more patent fact presented to the view of the working classes. It is not unnatural that the labourer should regard the possession of great landed estate which has been handed down for generations as the heritage of a noble family, if not without a feeling of envy, still without active hostility; especially when relations of a kindly and beneficent character have existed between the fortunate possessor of wealth and the poor around him, which have been equally handed down from the ancestors on both sides; and the people may well fail to trace the cause of the increasing hardness of their lot, in arrangements which, so far as they can see, have been unchanged for generations. But far differently must they view the unequal division of the new wealth which is being daily created around them, by the labor of their own hands. When Tom and Harry, two stalwart youths, are working in a railway cutting at the age of eighteen, and twenty years after Tom is still using his pick and filling his barrow, whilst Harry drives by in his coach, and looks down on his former mate from the earthly paradise of half a million of money, can we be surprised that Tom and his friends should ask with some discontent,—why is this—what is the secret of this complex machine of society, with its sacred rights of property, and its hard maxims of political economy, which permits, nay encourages, the absorption of the produce of the labor of all, into the hands of the few;—too often into the hands of men in no way pre-eminent above their fellows in any of those qualities which he has been taught to respect as deserving the esteem and homage of mankind. Those who argue, as Mr. George does, that the real contest is not between labor and capital, but between labor and rent of land—that capital is not advanced by the capitalist to set labour in motion, but that it is really advanced by the labourer to the capitalist, because the former gives the produce of his labour to the latter, before he gets his wages,—have started a proposition which may or may not be theoretically true, but which does not, in its application, fit into or account for the phenomena of actual life. If a

large manufacturing establishment stops payment, and hundreds of men are suddenly thrown out of employment and their families are brought to the brink of starvation, how can you persuade those who are exposed to such suffering, that the withdrawal of the source of their weekly wages, that is of the capital which has been lost, is not the proximate cause of their distress? Or how can you expect them not to believe that the aggregation of vast capital in the hands of one man, does not invest the owner with an enormous power for weal or woe over the fortunes and lives of his fellow creatures? Practically it does so. The political economist may be right; on the whole and in the long run, the facts may fit themselves to the theory. But there is one all important fact which is left out of consideration; namely, that a man must have food to live, and that if for a very few days he is deprived of food he dies. The capital lost by one has only passed into other hands. The labor must, in some fashion or other, follow it. But the transition is only effected with great misery, and often with loss of life. Water, we know, always tends to assume a level surface. But the water at one bank of a river will often be found higher than at the opposite bank. Why? because the element of time intervenes; it has not had time to distribute itself, that is, to adjust the fact to the law. And so it is in human affairs; but with this difference, that if the water does not find its level in a given time it does not die, and the man does.

You perceive I am arguing that the doctrine of the older writers, from Adam Smith downwards is, in its practical application to the circumstances of society, not to be set aside; and that capital must be regarded as the agent for setting labor in motion; and hence that the popular view, that the accumulation of vast hords of capital in few hands, with all the incidental power with which it invests its possessor over the lives and happiness of a large part of his fellow creatures, is a great and patent evil in a State—that this view, I say, is one founded on a truth which cannot be set aside. This being so, the remedy seems to lie in the direction of a more even distribution of capital amongst the community; not by violent spoliation of the rich and division of existing wealth amongst the poor, which would effect no more than a temporary change without affecting the cause of the evil, but by such adjustments of the economical machinery, that is, of the artificial arrangements we have made as regards property, that wealth shall naturally tend to distribute itself, instead of to accumulate in heaps.

It is common to hear it said these things should be left to the free working of economical law;—that the State should not interfere. But the State has always interfered. It formerly allowed the combination of employers, whilst it made the combination of employed criminal. In a multitude of ways in olden time it tried, both directly and indirectly, to force down wages, and to encourage the monopoly of wealth. The spirit of legislation has, indeed, to a great extent changed. Trades union combinations are no longer illegal. Friendly Societies and Savings Banks are under the patronage of the State. The great question for the future is, in what way and to what extent can the State encourage and stimulate the movement by which working men may become shareholders in industrial enterprises, and so become the recipients both of wages and profits—to what extent can co-operation be aided by, or even be absorbed into the duties of Government—to what extent can the vast accretions of wealth arising from all that a nation annually produces over and above what it consumes, instead of being poured into private tanks, be conducted into one great national reservoir, and held in trust for the benefit of the people by whose labor it has been created?

In railways which belong to a Government, this is already done to the fullest extent. Every taxpayer in the country is a shareholder in the company by which they are managed. It is on the security of the taxpayers that the capital has been borrowed to construct them. If your railways do not produce, in net profits, enough to pay the interest on the debt, the balance has to be paid by taxation. If the net profits exceed that interest, the money goes directly into all our pockets; because taxation for other purposes of Government can be remitted to an equal amount. A Government railway system is, in fact, nothing more than a large co-operative society in which every taxpayer is a shareholder, and shares the profits, or has to pay the losses by calls under the name of taxes.

A Government Insurance office is a somewhat similar institution applied to one section of the community instead of the whole; that is, to those only who voluntarily associate themselves. But there is this distinction. In a State Insurance office on the mutual principle, the profits are periodically divided amongst the insurers, not amongst the taxpayers; whereas if the office is guaranteed by the State, any loss, were any possible, would have to be made up by the taxpayers, most of whom have no interest in the concern. In this respect the plan of compulsory insurance proposed by the Rev. Mr. Blackley, which has been submitted for the consideration of this colony by our Government, is devoid of the inconsistency I have just pointed out; because, all being insured alike, all would share equally the risks and profits;—the profits in this case, being the allowance in case of sickness or accident, and the annuity after a certain period of life. I can conceive no form of co-operation more sound in principle or more entirely beneficial to a community than such a scheme, if carefully adjusted to the circumstances of the people in which it was in force.

Another form in which capital is accumulated in few hands is in the business of banking. Might not banking be more usefully carried on by the State, that is by the whole community as a co-operative concern, than by private persons or companies? It is generally supposed that banking requires capital. This is a mistake.

Banks have been carried on successfully for long years without any capital. I can remember two instances in which, when failure having occurred in exceptionally hard times, it was proved that the bank had lost all its capital many years before. In fact, the dictum of an old country banker I remember was true, that if a man could not carry on a bank without capital, he did not understand his business. The simplest form of banking is where the banker invests the money placed in his hands in the public funds, retaining only so much in his safe as will meet the current calls over the counter. Thus, if his current deposits are £500,000, and £50,000 is sufficient for current demand, he can invest £450,000 in the funds, and live on the interest. The only capital he requires is to recoup any loss arising from a fall in Government stock if he is compelled to sell out; and even that a prudent banker would have provided for by saving a rest out of his income. The only difference in the modern process of banking is, that the banker lends the money to private persons, instead of to the State, in the form of bills and overdrafts for which he takes security. He only fails, where he invests his money on bad security or in forms in which it is not readily available for conversion in case of extraordinary current demands. When we read of such large dividends being paid on the shares in bank stock, it must be remembered that these dividends are not the produce of the bank's capital only, but of all the money lent to it by depositors. The capital may be only a million; the current deposits may be five millions. The produce of the latter, invested at small interest, will allow of a very large interest being paid on the former. But under a system of a State bank, the bank would be a co-operative society in which the profits would belong to all the depositors. I can see no reason why such a bank should not exist, in which all the depositors should be dealt with as shareholders, each being credited with interest on his daily balance, or his average daily balance at longer periods, the interest being altered from time to time as the necessities of the bank required, so that on the whole no profit to the bank should accrue. If at the accounting period the assets were in excess that would prove that a larger interest might safely have been credited to the depositors; if they were deficient, that interest had been fixed at too high a rate. An alteration in the rate of interest would adjust the account. The gain to the community would be,—first that the profits on the depositors' money would go to the depositors instead of to a body of shareholders; and secondly, that the wide-spread misery the disturbance of trade in all its ramifications, and the great incidental loss extending through remote classes and interests, which always follow a bank failure, would be rendered impossible. The wealth of the whole community would be the guarantee of the bank's safety, and capital in the ordinary sense would be unnecessary to the management of its affairs. And I have no doubt that under such an institution the facilities of banking would be vastly extended, and would be taken advantage of by a stratum of society to which they are not at present available;—to such an extent indeed that the necessity of savings banks would be altogether superseded. By the ordinary system of fixed deposits, the national bank would fulfil all the functions of the savings bank for the people.

Here again the old objection would start up,—There would be no security that the affairs of the bank would be conducted with prudence, sagacity and skill. But what security is there at present? We are told the motive of self interest: that the shareholders are certain to look after their money. But have we not recently had some startling examples of the contrary? The truth is that the shareholders rely on the directors; and the directors must rely on the fidelity and ability of the paid managers, who have no interest in the concern except their salaries, and their prospect of promotion by the exhibition of honesty and capability; and why those qualities should be found in the service of private persons only, and not in the service of the State, I am unable to see; the more so that I do see, as a fact, vast concerns conducted by all Governments, in which agents possessed of the necessary qualifications are not difficult to find. This, then, is only one of many directions in which it seems to me possible that Governments may aid in applying the principle of co-operation to embrace the whole community, and may impose a barrier in the way of a mischievous monopoly of wealth in private hands.

But here I must notice an objection not without weight. It is said that under our system of Government by representative chambers, and responsible ministers who are the organs of political parties, influences of a political character would be felt in the management of undertakings of a commercial nature, which would impair their utility. I do not deny it. Railways might possibly be managed, not for the interest of the railways or the public, but for party purposes. A State Bank might be converted into a most potent engine of party. I see the danger of this. But I see the remedy. It lies in a comprehension of the most ancient principles of the Constitution. What is usually called the *Government*, that is the ministry of the day, is not entrusted, according to our constitution, with more than a limited part of the powers of the State. The laws are not administered by the *political* Government, but by the judicial. And well did the great founders of the American Commonwealth comprehend the value of that principle, when they kept the judicial functions distinct from the political, and, in some respects, extended the powers of the former at the expense of the latter. For example, the Courts of law in England cannot set aside an Act of Parliament. They can only interpret it. But the Supreme Court of the United States can declare an Act of Congress null and void, as having been passed *ultra vires*. If, then, the administration of one large part of the functions and powers of the Government as a whole, are not entrusted to the administrative or political Government, where lies the difficulty in handing over the powers of the State, in

what may be called its commercial capacity, to bodies outside of, and beyond the influence of the political Government? If we hold, as we all do, that the great bulwark of our liberties lies even less in franchises and popular government, than in the independence of the Courts of law, both of the Crown on one hand and of the people on the other, would it not be equally not only wise but necessary, and equally in accordance with the whole spirit of the Constitution, that the administration of the Government in its commercial character should, in a similar way, be protected from influences which could not fail to be mischievous, and should be vested in independent authorities, specially adapted to secure the success of the undertakings committed to their charge?

The last subject to which I will call your attention is that of possible changes in the nature of landed property. It is very remarkable how clearly the evil of the monopoly of land was foreseen by the first Jewish law givers. In the code of law which we find in the book of Leviticus, the law of Jubilee enacted that all lands sold should revert to the original proprietors or their heirs on the day of Jubilee, which occurred every fifty years. Thus the owner could only dispose of his patrimony virtually by lease, for the unexpired term ending on the next Jubilee day. The tendency to the aggregation of large landed estates was no doubt as great then as now, and would have been more severely felt in a small country, little larger than the Canterbury plains in this colony; and the wise provision for the periodical re-distribution of the land may be looked on as one principal cause of the vast increase in the population and wealth of Palestine, which took place up to the time of Soloman; nor can it be regarded as fanciful to say that the neglect of this law may have been one of the causes of the gradual dissolution of the Hebrew Commonwealth. For when the prophet Jeremiah bought a piece of land just before the captivity, in order to prove his own conviction of the truth of his prophecy of the restoration of the Jews to their land after seventy years, whilst under the Mosaic law, the sale would have been by that time annulled, we must conclude that the law of Jubilee, as affecting land, had become obsolete.

That all lands were, in early times, held in commonalty as the property of the State is now sufficiently established. That, as settlement on land for agricultural uses took the place of nomadic habits and the pursuit of the chase, private and personal rights intruded themselves into the communistic title, there can be no doubt. Under the Feudal system the land was vested in the Crown, and was held by the tenant, originally for service, which was subsequently commuted into payment in money. But before many generations had passed away, the interest of the tenant gradually exterminated the communistic title of the State. The history of the law of real property is one of a persistent encroachment of private upon public right, until at length the right of private property in land acquired a sort of sanctity superior even to that which was attributed to personalty. But it is clear that the national title was never wholly abandoned, nor, had the monarch been in reality, as he was in theory, the trustee and guardian of the public estate for the benefit of the whole community, would, perhaps, such encroachments have been tolerated. But this great change in the idea of private property in land took place in ages when the interests of the great feudatories were paramount, and the mass of the people had but a feeble perception of their rights, and little or no influence on the action of the governing powers. The vast confiscations of lands which, in troublous times, extended over so large a part of England, and over the largest part of Ireland,—the resumption of the lands of the monasteries and abbeys by Henry VIII., and in our own time of the property of the Irish Church,—were all more or less assertions on the part of the State of the ancient right to deal with land as public property; and traces of the same doctrine still find,—or till very recently found, expression in existing law. That, in the case of intestacy without an heir, the land reverts to the Crown—that the same rule is applied to the estates of those convicted of certain crimes, and attainted in blood,—the laws of mortmain and entail—the inability to convey land to the subject of a foreign State,—all bear witness to the vitality of the ancient idea, that private property in land only exists subject to such conditions and restrictions as the State may think fit to impose. And within the present century States have begun to resume to a further extent their old rights, by asserting the power to take lands without the consent of the proprietors, for public purposes; especially for railways; paying, it is true, compensation, but still asserting the principle that the public right must overrule all private rights in the proprietorship of the soil. And writers have now appeared who advocate the exercise of the same right, on the same grounds, that is the public necessities, to the extent that the State should resume the ownership of the entire soil of the country, and hold it in trust for the people at large. Some, such as Mr. George, to whose work I have already alluded, deny all claim to compensation on the part of the present owners; some, as Mr. Wallace, admit a claim for compensation, and would satisfy it in the form of a life annuity to the existing proprietors, and their immediate heirs, and, if necessary would extend it to a third generation. All writers agree that the improvements on land made by occupiers should belong to the tenant; but whilst some maintain that the State should resume the land itself, that is to say, the rent of the unimproved value, others go only so far as to claim for the State the unearned increment, that is to say, that part of the value which has arisen from the general progress and prosperity of the community, over and above the original or natural value which it may be supposed to have been worth.

But whatever view we take as to the right of the State to resume the ownership of the soil, there remains the question of its expediency. Will such a policy produce the beneficial results promised? And again, are the evils

such as to justify the application of so drastic a remedy! I confess myself unable to accept Mr. George's conclusion, so far at least as I have been able to consider the subject, that all the ills arising from the vast inequality in the distribution of wealth would be at once remedied by a resumption of the ownership of the land by the State; or to perceive the justice of the distinction he draws between the monopoly of land and of other forms of wealth as the only cause of those evils. For the purpose of this argument, land appears to me to have the same effect on the social system as any other form of wealth; and, if I assented to the doctrine of the abolition of private ownership, it would be because the more equal distribution of wealth amongst the different sections and individuals of society, appears a result which must in some fashion be achieved, unless the whole fabric of modern civilization is to be permitted to crumble into the dust. In this view the aggregation of large tracts of country in private hands should be subjected to the same restrictions which should be applied to wealth of whatever kind. I have only called your attention to this as one amongst the other burning questions which must before long occupy the minds of statesmen during the next generation. But I may point out that the recent legislation on the subject of the land in Ireland has greatly hastened the period when the question must be brought to a practical issue. That measure seems to me to be a final abandonment on the part of the British Government of the doctrine hitherto thought to be beyond the pale of discussion—the inviolability of the right of private property in land. The new land law for Ireland does without question admit the principle that it is within the power of the Legislature to partition the property in the soil between the landlord and the tenant, that it takes the land out of the category of those things which are the subject of free bargain, regulated by the ordinary law of supply and demand; and, more than all, that it does this without recognising any claim to compensation on the part of the landlord. Confiscation has been for ages the basis of title to a great part of the soil of Ireland; but it has been the confiscation of the property of the rich to give to the rich: now for the first time it is the confiscation of part of the property of the rich to bestow it on the poor. Idle indeed it is not to foresee the influence which the principle asserted by this law must have in the future discussion of this important question.

In conclusion, I have endeavoured to call your attention to some of the demands which may possibly be made on future Governments, because the phenomena of the present day indicate the approach of an epoch, which may be one of momentous consequence to the civilized world; phenomena which force on us the question— In what direction are we really moving? I have read that in one attempt which was made by the late Sir Edward Tarry to reach the North Pole, by means of boats, used as sledges where no open water was to be found, as the seamen were toiling over the icefields; and dragging the boats at a rate which seemed to promise a successful termination to the expedition, the observation of the Commander shewed that their real position was, day by day, further south than on the day before. To the superficial view of the seaman he was travelling to the north; the higher knowledge disclosed the truth that the whole icefield was bearing him to the southward, faster than his wearied footsteps traversed its surface to the north. And may not this be our own case; May it not be that, dazzled by the glitter of the enormous wealth which is increasing with such amazing rapidity around us,—ministered to in every want by the stupendous powers of nature, which are being evoked from their secret recesses to be chained to our chariot wheels—may not we blindly fancy that we are building up an enduring structure of imperishable prosperity, whilst we are really underlaying the foundations with subterranean forces, which, sooner or later, may shatter our palaces to atoms? How can we close our ears to the warning voices which, like the unheeded utterances of the prophets of old, tell us that our civilisation is rotten to the core; that its only result is, that whilst the rich are growing ever richer the poor are growing ever poorer? What can we say of a social system which is powerless to solve an economical problem except by the inhuman machinery of *the strike*; a machinery which at once paralyses "the might that slumbers in the peasant's arm," and crushes, with equal and pitiless cruelty, the tenderness of maternity and the innocence of childhood? What shall we say to the incomprehensible phenomenon, that the Irish peasantry, with a population of five millions, are in the same state of misery and destitution as they were thirty or forty years ago, with a population of eight millions, whilst the wealth of the country has more than doubled? How do we explain the fact that whole districts in Scotland which were once the home of a strong and well fed race of hardy mountaineers, are now only the haunts of the wild deer and game which minister to the sport and luxury of the rich—forgetful of the truth which revealed itself to the poet, though ignored by the economist,

"'Till fares the land to hastening ills a prey,

Where wealth accumulates, while men decay."

Or what, again, is the solution of the mystery that, after so many years of the boasted beneficence of our rule over India—the rule of the mightiest and wealthiest nation on the earth—periodical famine still stalks over the rice fields of Hindostan, mowing down in its ghastly stride more human victims than the car of Juggernaut or the sword of the ruthless despots whose rule we have replaced?

What well grounded belief have we that this stupendous fabric of modern civilization of which we boast is destined to be more enduring than those of which the shattered monuments alone tell us of their existence and

their extermination? They fell—some we know—all we may confidently believe, because, in the fierce competition for wealth, and the insatiable lust for power, the moral elements which knit together all human society were dissolved; the luxury of the rich became licentiousness; the degradation of the poor wrought crime and lawlessness; wealth became the agent, and poverty the victim of corruption; the ties of home and the fires of patriotism were drowned in the rising flood of anarchy, and the seething mass preyed on itself until swept away by some stronger race;—some race which, though apparently of ruder and less matured social organization, was yet closely united by the strong affinity of its individual atoms; compact by the love of kindred and the pride of race; strong in the instinct of brotherhood and faith in one another, in all the true and only elements of enduring national greatness. And it is not enough to tell us that the poor are better off than they were, because the rate of wages is higher, and the price of food and clothing lower than formerly. You can measure lengths by a two-foot rule if you know that your two-foot rule remains unchanged; but to measure things in different ages by a standard which is itself constantly fluctuating from age to age, this is but a deceptive process. No one who knows anything of the history of the English people can believe that there was anything like the distinction, in bed and in board, between the Saxon Thane and the Saxon Churl, aye, or between the Saxon Thane and his British Slave, that there is at the present day between the millionaire and the peasant. But even were it so, were it true that the lower orders of civilized States are physically better off than of old, that is not enough. The question they ask you is—Are we better off in proportion to the enormous increase in the wealth and prosperity of our common country? If it be true that the whole standard, that the possibilities of comfort are raised, the supply of a lower is surely a cause for discontent. It is not absolute want only that is felt; it is relative want; and the bite of want is ever deeper when its tooth is sharpened by the sense of injustice. And can we believe that this education, which is being so widely extended amongst the masses of all civilized States, will not tend to raise their tastes and stimulate their desire for a higher condition of personal comfort and refinement? If we are not prepared to re-adjust in some fashion the distribution of wealth, the present policy of universal education does seem to me something like the scheme of a maniac. What is it but to sow broadcast amongst the people the seeds of discontent at a system which at the same time we tell them is the result of inexorable economic law? To educate the people—to widen the sphere of their knowledge—to train their intellect and cultivate their taste, and teach them to aspire to a higher moral and intellectual condition of existence, and at the same time to tell them that any corresponding amelioration of their physical condition is a thing hopelessly impossible,—that the privations of penury and the pangs of starvation are necessary ills, which defy the wisdom of the legislator to correct, or the benevolence of the philanthropist to relieve, what is this but to transform discontent into despair, and ultimately to convert the national school into a hotbed of the deadliest Nihilism?

Shall we then say that there is no hope for the future—that our modern civilization must die, like those which have preceded it in the world's history? Shall we, like the men of old continue to eat and drink and marry and be given in marriage, while the waters of anarchy are oozing up under our feet, and the windows of heaven—the divine retribution for national wrong—are opening above our heads? or will the men of this generation, warned by the ruin of the civilizations of the past, evoke the means of salvation for that which we have inherited? I would fain fancy that over the storm clouds which blacken the horizon I see the bow of promise, the symbol of safety. I see it in the fact that the governments of civilized States are becoming more and more the reflex of the will of the people, and that not of peoples barbarous and ignorant as of old, but of peoples growing year by year in intelligence and knowledge, as they have already grown in political power; and I cannot but believe that, when they once come to perceive the true cause of the ills which press so heavily on their condition, no prescription of birth, or rank, or wealth, or power, will be able to withstand the fulfilment of their desires, and the application of the remedies which they are certain to, and have a right to demand. At the same time I cannot close my eyes to the one disheartening feature in the present age; it is that in the great republic of America, the greatest experiment the world has seen in the science of government, where political rights have been more widely extended and longer enjoyed than amongst any people on the earth, the same evils, which are the inheritance of older States, are growing with the same vigorous vitality as that which characterises every development in that wonderful country. The dominance and monopoly of wealth, the strife between labor and capital the insane contrivance of the *strike*, the widening gulf between class and class, between rich and poor, are all, to take the evidence of their own writers, repeating themselves in the land of republican freedom, with the same ominous aspect as that which looms over the future of the most aristocratic of European States. But I cannot lose all faith in America; I cannot lose faith in a country which came triumphant out of the great war for the emancipation of the slave, and the maintenance of the Union; I cannot forget how, whilst the purblind critics of the English press were prophesying that the self interest and selfishness of the Western States would induce them to withhold their aid in that great struggle, all minor, all selfish considerations were merged in the instinct of a lofty patriotism; and from the farms and log huts of the western prairies, from a people, though keenly suffering under the pressure of a protective tariff which they

hated, mothers sent forth their sons and wives their husbands to fight in the common cause, that, come what might, the great experiment of a free republic, to which they were pledged in the eyes of the civilized world, come what might, should be maintained inviolate. And I cannot but believe, that when that great people come to perceive the real cause of the growing evils and the possible destruction of the nation of which they are so justly proud, the singular energy and inventiveness, which are the peculiar characteristics of the American citizen, will not fail to discover or be slow to apply such remedies as may avert the threatened disaster.

And not less in these colonies of our own Empire, which have grown up as if by an enchanter's wand on the shores of the Pacific, not less on us, though on a smaller stage, does the duty lie, to meet with courage the demands of the future. We stand in a position peculiarly fitted for the attempt. Tradition and precedent, and old world forms and prejudices, and a superstitious reverence for private over public rights, have not yet interwoven round us their inextricable web. The memory, though yearly growing fainter, still lingers amongst us, of those early days in these settlements, when a community of toil, and an almost equality of wealth, bound us all, class and class together, in a strong community of feeling and interest. To us then more than to all others has fate allotted the task of dealing with the problems of the future. By what specific laws, it is not for me now to suggest, but by legislation, I confidently believe, it must be, which must be based on such a reconsideration of the rights of property, as shall tend to redistribute more equally amongst all the joint results of the productive powers of the earth and the creative energy of human labor. That the poor will ever wholly cease out of the land, and crime be heard of no more, we may not hope; but it may be the imperishable glory of the statesmen in these new born nations, so to modify the social and economical conditions of life, that wide spread poverty shall not be the necessary result of artificial law, and crime shall not be bred by the cravings of want, and matured by the sense of wrong.

And if after all it be that our civilization too is destined to fulfil the law of all organic life, and to sink into decay; if the mighty empires of the present must pass away like a tale that is told, we may yet cherish the faith, that from their ashes a new civilization will arise, to which that of the present may be but as the rude institutions of the savage or the tottering footsteps of the child; that man will rise ever higher and higher to those lofty regions of social, moral, and intellectual being, to which the secret and prophetic yearnings of his son) assure him that he is capable of aspiring, until at last his final destiny is lost to our present feeble sight in the light which shines around the throne of Him, whose image we are, and by whom and for whom all things are and were created.

decorative feature

Edwards and Green, Printers, Wellington.

A Proposal for Holding An Australasian Exhibition in London.

Addressed to All who have at Heart the Progress and Prosperity of the Australasian Colonies, and More Particularly to Members of Legislatures, Municipal Councils, Chambers of Commerce and of Manufactures, and other Public Bodies,

By R. E. N. Twopeny,

Formerly Secretary of the South Australian Royal Commissioners at the Paris, Sydney, and Melbourne International Exhibitions, and Promoter and Manager of Private Venture Exhibitions at Adelaide, Perth, and Christ Church.

"If people will only take the trouble to realize Mr. Twopeny's ideas we believe that they will not be long in becoming converted to his views."—Melbourne Argus, leading article, June 21, 1883.

Sydney: Gibbs, Shallard, & Co, Printers and Binders. 70 Pitt Street. 1883.

GENTLEMEN,

In bringing forward a project involving a large expenditure of public money, I am aware that I must be able to show that great public advantages must result from its adoption. This, I believe, I shall be able to do, if you will be so kind as to read the following explanation of its nature and aims, and *think it out* carefully. And, first, I would explain that as my present engagements will prevent my taking any but a purely honorary part in carrying it out, should it be adopted, I have no personal object in advancing it. I would ask you, therefore, to forget my personal insignificance, and consider this project purely on its merits, giving only such weight to the expression of my personal opinions as may be due to the fact that for five years I made the principles of Exhibitions my constant study, and was engaged in the practical work of carrying them out.

Objects of the Scheme.

The main objects of this scheme are to attract population and capital to develop the resources of these Australasian colonies by making the European, and more especially the British, public acquainted with the opportunities which exist here both for settlement and for investment. Other objects are to extend the markets for our frozen food and wine, by overcoming the prejudice now entertained by European consumers; to show the mother-country a faithful representation of the work accomplished in Australasia by her sons, and the opportunities which still exist here for Englishmen to improve their condition without losing their nationality; and to draw closer the ties which should bind these sister colonies together by presenting the first model of a Federal Australasian Government, and arousing a national Australasian patriotism, which shall have its foundation in our attachment to the mother country.

The Need for It.

Of the three fundamental sources of wealth Australasia possesses the first—land in abundance. But in the other two—capital and labour to develop the resources of the land—she is yet very deficient. There is no one amongst us who will not admit that the progress of Australasia may be measured by the influx of capital and population to her shores. There are few who will question the advantage to be gained by promoting a larger influx of these essential factors of our development.

The mother country is at once that from which it is most desirable that we should receive capital and population, and that from which we have the best opportunities to get them. For generations yet our population must come chiefly from the United Kingdom, and our capital from London.

This and many other passages have been quoted verbatim from the Melbourne *Argus*, by the kind permission of the Editor.

And yet the Board of Trade statistics show that during the decade 1870-79, out of every hundred emigrants from Great Britain and Ireland, ninety went to swell the population of the United States, whilst of the 10 per cent, who settled in British territory after leaving the mother country, only four found homes under the Southern Cross. Difference in distance—which means cost of passage—has undoubtedly much to do with the distribution of British emigration, but surely this cause is insufficient to account for so enormous a disproportion! In the distribution of British capital invested abroad it exists equally. Despite repudiation and the continuous failure of bogus companies, British capital pours into America in fertilizing streams, whilst to Australasia it comes in dribblets, accompanied occasionally by a very unpleasant intimation that under certain circumstances the supply will be cut off.

Are the natural resources and social condition of the United States so much superior to those of Australasia, as to warrant this preference on the part of our countrymen for a foreign soil, a foreign life, and foreign securities? We who know these colonies well can conscientiously give a negative reply to this question. The reason of the different treatment we receive lies chiefly, as I have already said, in distance; that we cannot alter. But it also lies very largely in our youth and obscurity. Our resources and our civilization do us little practical service in the way of attracting population and capital, simply because they are unknown to nine-tenths of the British people, and are not properly realized by the majority of the remainder. There can be little doubt that had the advantages which these colonies offer been partially known at home, hundreds of thousands, who turned their steps towards the Great Republic, would have set their faces in this direction, and thousands who are now lamenting the loss of their money there would have invested it here with profit both to themselves and to us.

What is to be done? How is this ignorance, which is so detrimental to our progress, to be removed?

I reply that *we must advertise*. Australasia is in the position of a tradesman who opens an opposition shop, but finds that, although he can sell as good or even better articles, people continue to patronise the old establishment simply because they know more about it. As far as population and money are concerned, America is the "old establishment," and consequently she secures without effort by far the larger share of public favour. Is it not of the utmost importance to us to break down the existing prejudice, to compel our fellow-countrymen at home to understand that on the whole they will find their interests better served by casting in their lot with us than by establishing themselves in a foreign land?

I readily acknowledge that we have made several fairly successful attempts at advertising. We have been represented at numerous Exhibitions; we have held International Exhibitions ourselves; we have scattered statistics in thousands, and pamphlets only less numerous than the sands upon the sea shore. But what has been done is nothing to that which remains to be accomplished. Statistics, pamphlets, and lectures are admirable in their way, but it is necessary *first to engage the attention of those we wish to impress*. We have distributed pamphlets, and they have been more or less read—mostly less. But no one who reads our English papers, or talks with any Englishman who is generally considered to be well-informed, will contend that these pamphlets have been understood. Again, the Exhibitions at which we have been represented have been held in countries

whence neither population or capital could be expected to come here, and our courts there have been insignificant atoms in the International molecule, passed over unnoticed by many, and, when visited, giving but a very imperfect idea of our resources. The Exhibitions held here certainly produced a great sensation upon those who visited them, but, unfortunately, we could not bring any large number of European visitors out to see them, and the reports in the European press, though useful as far as they went, were meagre. For all this there can be no question but that these Exhibitions proved profitable to the colonies in which they were held. The stimulus given to commerce since 1879 is undeniable. The proof of the pudding is in the eating. More immigration and investment have unquestionably resulted from these efforts. But it has been no more than a drop in the bucket. The need for population especially was never greater than at the present moment. Our natural resources and our manufacturing industries alike are crying aloud for labour. Our attempts at advertising then have so far been altogether inadequate to our requirements. Is this not because we have begun at the wrong end?

I believe that the comparative inefficiency of the advertising we have hitherto done is due to our having under-estimated the depths of the prevailing indifference to Australasia, to our having over-estimated the capacity of the British public for receiving information about us. The business man advertises down to the level of those he wishes to reach. The pamphlet and the lecture are excellent in their proper time, but *first we have to engage the attention of our customers*. How can we arrest that attention?

The Nature and Efficiency of the Exhibition.

When an Australasian Exhibition is spoken of you naturally think of the Australasian Courts at the Sydney and Melbourne Exhibitions, and it does not take much thought to arrive at the conclusion that a *fac-simile* of those courts would be altogether too insignificant to attract attention in London. But my proposal is for an Exhibition of such an entirely different character from any hitherto held that, in considering it, it becomes necessary to dismiss from the mind all previously conceived ideas of Exhibitions. And herein lies its greatest difficulty. The objective is always so much more powerful than the subjective that, almost without being aware of it, people are apt to think of what they have seen instead of trying to realise the kind of Exhibition I have in view. Nothing is further from my mind than the idea of holding an Exhibition of the ordinary humdrum kind. I agree with my critics, that such an Exhibition would fail to attract. An Exhibition, such as I propose, would not be a mere dead museum or bazaar, but as nearly as possible a living representation of Australasian life, scenery, manners, industry, and resources. The exhibits would not be presented as subjects for admiration in the abstract, but a personal interest would be excited in them by giving such particulars concerning their production as would appeal to the eye and the imagination.

To begin with, the collection of exhibits from each colony would have to be on the same scale as the Victorian Court at the Melbourne Exhibition—the only really representative collection of the resources and industries of an Australian colony which has yet been shown at any exhibition. Then the exhibits of each industry should be shown together in separate departments, instead of all jumbled up together. An undifferentiated mass of anything is meaningless and uninteresting, but directly you classify the component parts of the mass the meaning becomes clear, and interest is at once aroused. Having thus succeeded in attracting the attention of the visitor, he should be provided with further information. To each class of exhibits there should be one or more attendants to give explanations to visitors, photographs (coloured, if possible) illustrating the life and processes in connection with that industry, and a placard placed in some prominent-position, showing the number of hands employed in it, and the rate of wages paid to them. Thus wool would be accompanied by pictures of station life and appliances, placards showing statistics of growth, rates of wages paid to hands, ration scales, &c. Grain and Hour would have photographs attached, showing farms and farming operations, mills and method of transport, and bills giving the fullest information with respect to agriculture, and the life and pay of those either directly or indirectly connected with it, the conditions on which land could be purchased, &c. Would not such a method of treatment make the exhibit of flour something more to the English farmer and agricultural labourer than a mere mass of extra-refined meal? Would it not thus become to him a living thing, speaking in distinct and unmistakable tones of a far-off land, where the conditions of life are easy, where home is reproduced, where English habits and customs prevail, and where many industries are prosecuted with success? Again, a saddler visits the building. He sees several cases of saddlery, and thus learns that saddles are manufactured in Australia. He looks up from the saddles; and finds a big placard staring him in the face, conveying the information that so many hundred people in that particular colony are engaged in saddlery at wages of from say 10 to 15 shillings. Would not this turn his thoughts powerfully to the advisability of emigrating?

The exhibits have been classified; photographs, models, and other appliances illustrating each industry, and

placards giving the striking facts in connection with them are posted conspicuously in their neighbourhood. But this is but the first chapter of the lesson I wish to teach the visitor. So far the object has been to attract his attention; now that it has been engaged, we must follow it up. His mind is now in a condition to receive and digest information, which he would have shied at before; we can now safely bring to bear upon him the lecture and the pamphlet. Short graphic lectures should be delivered in the building daily, with panoramas and models to illustrate the subject; the magic lantern might also with advantage be brought into use. Pamphlets should be distributed gratuitously, giving particulars of the life of each class of settler. These lectures and pamphlets should not, as they have hitherto done, deal with colonial life in a general way. What is everybody's business is nobody's business. They should treat as far as possible of every particular class, of labour. It would not, of course, be necessary to have a separate pamphlet on each trade. There should, for instance, be one pamphlet on the life of the artisan, giving particulars of the rent he would have to pay, the kind of cottage he would live in (illustrated by a woodcut), the wages he would get, the price of food, clothes, and articles of household use. Then at the end would come the particulars as to each trade, supplied by some competent authority. The life of the farmer, and of the agricultural labourer would be similarly treated in another pamphlet. A third would deal with the life of the miner, and a fourth treat of "Australasia as a field for Investment." Everyone would thus be able to choose the information he was in need of, instead of having to wade through a dry mass of miscellaneous knowledge. Lectures and pamphlets, like exhibits, must be classified if they are to be serviceable.

Not the least valuable and interesting part of the Exhibition would be really good Government collections, illustrating the fauna, the flora, and the geology of each colony. To say nothing of the possibility of useful discoveries being made by giving European *savants* an opportunity of seeing these collections, Science is popular at present, and to make the Exhibition attractive we must bring all kinds of influences to bear. Upon that grandest of all aids to success, fashion, which in London at present means what the Prince and Princess of Wales do, we can safely count. H. R. H. would, one can almost say certainly, not only take the presidency of the Exhibition, but also take an active interest in the proceedings. It would soon be considered "the correct thing" to "do" the Australasian Exhibition, and, in England, where the aristocracy go the middle and lower classes follow. For the first two sections a special attraction should be provided, on the principle that there should be a hook for every fish. First, they should see a refrigerating room, with meat, &c., displayed in every state through which it passes from the time it leaves our shores until it goes into the hands of the cook. Having thus prepared their minds they should be passed on to the refreshment rooms, where for half-a-crown they should* be given an "Australasian lunch"—soup, fish, roast, entrees, game, puddings, butter, cheese, fruit, wine, should all be Australasian. Even the bread should be baked of Australasian flour. No one who could afford it would forego the pleasure of being able to say that he had lunched entirely on meats and drinks produced at the other end of the world, or being able to descant critically on the relative merits of Australian kangaroo, New Zealand frost fish, beef, wildfowl, &c. The visitors who had partaken of such a curious meal would tell everybody about the wonderful things they had eaten. They would talk, and we should be advertised. With the savour of our viands in his nostrils, and the generous juice of the Australian grape stimulating his circulation and warming his heart, the visitor would be obliged to confess that these southern lands are not wanting in the elements of civilisation, and we might reach his imagination through his epigastric regions. Nor would this be the only advantage of the luncheon. When people had drunk our wines out of curiosity, and had eaten our meats and found they were good, they would ask for them at the shops, and thus the prejudice, which our frozen food and wine trades are striving to overcome, would disappear.

At least one day in the week the Exhibition should be open free of charge, so that there should not be a working man in London who could not take his family to it. It has been objected that because free museums and picture galleries are not well patronised by the working-classes, that they would not come to see this Exhibition. But the cases do not run on all fours. An Australasian Exhibition would be a temporary novelty of a popular character, well within the understanding of the masses, and purposely made specially attractive for them. The very word museum indicates to most people (myself, I fear, amongst the number) a dry-as-dust sort of place to be carefully avoided, and picture galleries are generally also beyond the taste of the working class. This Exhibition would unquestionably be the most popular, novel, and interesting free show ever offered to the British working man. But, since we specially want to reach the agricultural labourer, this would not be sufficient. Canvassers should, therefore, be sent into the agricultural districts to tell people about the Exhibition, and to distribute to agricultural labourers excursion tickets to come up to London and back free of charge. Objection has been taken to this idea on the ground that these country visitors could not afford to pay for lodging in London. There is, however, no reason why they should have to stay a night. They need only spend one day in the Exhibition, and the travelling backwards and forwards could be done at night. To prevent fraud they should be unable to make use of the return half of their ticket, unless it had been clipped at the gate of the Exhibition. By arrangement with the railway companies over a million French working men were brought from

the provinces to the Paris Exhibition free of charge for a very small sum, and £20,000 would do wonders in this direction. I venture to say, moreover, that the mere announcement that labouring men could go to London and return to their homes at the expense of the young British communities at the Antipodes would produce a great and lasting impression on the minds of the masses in the mother country.

Not the least attraction of the Exhibition to the British public will be in the novelty in the idea. The British public like pluck, and above all, pluck in their descendants; and the idea of reversing the usual order of things, and taking the war into the enemy's camp, so to speak, appeals to the popular imagination. Another source of attraction lies in the very name of the Exhibition. The ordinary mind will always prefer a homogeneous to a heterogeneous conception, a pure breed to a hybrid, and the word "Australasian" has a definite, certain ring. More than this, it tells of a land of which people have begun to hear a little of late, just enough to arouse their attention to the fact that they know nothing about it, and that they would like to know something about it if they could get that knowledge without much trouble. There is a certain mystery and uncertainty, a delicious sense of the adventurous attaching to Australia in the mind of the British public, which an exhibition would act upon. "Queer sort of place Australia; wonder what the deuce they can exhibit; suppose we go and see," would be the sort of feeling a number of people would have. It has been a complaint against International Exhibitions of late that they are little better than bazaars—Regent Street with a halo of Royal commissions thrown around it. The British public, with a yearly improving Regent Street before them, are not enthusiastic about another London International, though it is twenty years since the last was held. But here would be an Exhibition from which the bazaar would altogether be excluded. Not that I would rely solely on solid attractions. There is room for bringing a strong popular element into the Exhibition by representations of bush scenes (such as that which I planned in the South Australian Court at the Melbourne Exhibition), Maori pahs, and other of those touches of Nature which make the whole world kin. A cardboard model of an inch to the foot of some of the busiest parts of Melbourne or Sydney, would be exceedingly effective, and do a great deal to make people realise the existence here of highly organised communities, supplied with all the appliances of civilization. Wax, life size, Australian types, would also attract the wonder of the multitude. I would neglect no feature in connection with Australasia which could attract any class of the community.

It may be argued as regards our manufactures, that people living in England can see better things every day in England. Apart from the interest attaching to the modifications which the circumstances of Australian life have brought about in our manufactures, is there not a special source of attraction in the fact that these things were made in an out of the way half civilized country, such as the ordinary Englishman imagines this to be? It is not to him a grape from a thorn? Would it not surprise—which is the mother of interest—him to see the degree of excellence attained by many of our manufacturers? I answer from practical experience at the Paris Exhibition that it would. If I was asked once I was asked a thousand times whether such and such an article was produced in Adelaide; and though the English people who visited the Paris Exhibition belonged mostly to the educated classes, their astonishment was a perfect picture to behold.

But this Exhibition would appeal not only to the love of the fashionable and the love of the new. When all is said and done, man cannot live merely upon beer and skittles. The strongest source of attraction lies in the fact that it would have a strong practical interest to every class of the English people, from the highest to the lowest. The educated classes do not know what to do with their boys at the present moment; the farmers are finding American and Australian competition too strong to make farming pay, and are on the look-out for fresh fields and pastures new; the working man was never harder up, and agricultural labourers in particular are being driven out of England by the pressure of population. Capitalists have been taken in so often over foreign securities that they are searching for safer fields for investment. Does anyone mean to tell me that all these people will not be glad of an opportunity to learn, *in an amusing manner*, something about the capabilities of Australasia? If you show a starving man a photograph—which cannot lie, though it may flatter—of a cupboard full of victuals, within an easy walk, will he not take the trouble to look at the photograph? Having seen the photograph; will he not "make for" the victuals?

The ordinary International Exhibitions have doubtless got stale and flat, but that any novelty in the way of an Exhibition, however small, will attract a large number of visitors, the recent successes of the Electric and Fisheries Exhibitions clearly proves. Surely it is plain to the most ordinary understanding that an Australasian Exhibition is capable of presenting more new and interesting features than a Fisheries Exhibition.

Apart from the sources of attraction to the Exhibition, and the effect produced upon the minds of those who visit it, I would call attention to the enormous amount of information about these colonies which will be spread throughout the United Kingdom by the Press in connection with it. Anyone who glances over recent English titles will see that every paper, from the "Times" down to the smallest provincial rag, is full not only of descriptions of the Fisheries Exhibition, but of all kinds of information about fish and fisheries which under ordinary circumstances would never have become known to the general public. And so it will be in this case. Not only descriptions of the Exhibition, but of Australasia and Australasian life will be published in every

paper in Great Britain and Ireland, and in the leading continental papers. Why this advertisement alone is worth the whole cost of the Exhibition if not a soul came to look at it.

And now that I have laid my proposals before you, let me answer some of the objections which have been raised. One journal, with a singular confusion of thought, has asserted that this proposal is underlain by the same principle as that of the private-venture Exhibitions which I originated. The least reflection will, I think, show that my proposal is for an Exhibition which shall be national in the highest sense of the word as opposed to private. Individual exhibitors at this Exhibition can only seek their own profit out of the public advantages resulting from the Exhibition, and cannot make any direct profit out of it as is the case in International Exhibitions. It must be a national effort for a national purpose. Would not an Exhibition on the lines I have marked out tell the world "something new beyond what we have already told?" The last time we exhibited in England—which is obviously the only place from which we can expect to get any large amount of capital or population—was in 1862; and the whole of the exhibits from the Australian colonies in that Exhibition could have been shown in one decent sized room. Never has anything like a representative collection of our products and manufactures been shown in England or Europe. At the London Exhibition of 1862 our courts were a mere drop in the International bucket. I do not suppose one visitor out of a score even knew that Australia was exhibiting. Can we not then "reasonably expect to get a larger batch of spectators than we have had hitherto?" It has been urged that there would be no local enthusiasm. If the Prince of Wales took the matter up—and his action in trying to get up the Colonial Museum gives good warrant that he would—I do not think we need fear for want of enthusiasm in England.

Nor after all is the Exhibition solely in our own interest. Is it not important to the mother country that her surplus population should be directed to British rather than to American soil, that her capital should be invested within the limits of the Empire, and that the ties between the mother country and this her Australasian daughter should be drawn closer together? It seems to me that these are strong reasons for anticipating the hearty support of our fellow-countrymen in England, and for awakening their enthusiasm.

Practicability and Cost.

I will now ask those of you who agree with me as to the efficiency of such an Exhibition, to enter into the mode of carrying it out, and the cost.

The first step obviously must be for the Governments of the colonies concerned to agree to appoint conjointly a Federal or General Commission to perform the same duties with regard to this Exhibition as are generally performed by the Commission of the nation which holds an International Exhibition. These duties may roughly be defined as follows:—To enter into communication with the participating colonies, to provide a building in which to hold the Exhibition, and to issue and carry out regulations for its management. Seeing that the work of this general Commission would be almost entirely in London, it might reasonably be composed of the Agents-General, a few prominent Anglo-Australasians and Englishmen — such as the Duke of Manchester — interested in the colonies. H.K.H. the Prince of Wales should be asked to be President, and to prevent intercolonial jealousies, and ensure influence, experience, and popularity in the executive management, I would suggest that Sir Philip Cunliffe Owen, the Director of the South Kensington Museum, and late British Executive Commissioner at Paris, be asked to take the position of Commissioner-General. The expenditure of the General Commission should be defrayed by the participating colonies *pro rata* to population, and, of course, each colony would have its own Commissioner, just as is done for any International Exhibition in a foreign country. As something has been said about the difficulty of federal action in the matter, I would point out that there would not, as is the ease at most Intercolonial Conferences, be any place for one colony to get an advantage over another in the working of the General Commission. Each colony would be left to further its own interests by means of its own Commission. The General Commission would be limited to those functions which could not be done by the Provincial Commissions, and by which all the participating colonies would benefit exactly in proportion to the efforts they made through their Provincial Commissions.

Where is the Exhibition to be held? Here two courses present themselves. The cheaper is to rent 600,000 square feet, which I calculate to be the utmost space we could fill, in the Crystal or Alexandra Palace. The better would be to obtain permission from the Imperial Government to erect a temporary structure in the Horticultural Gardens at South Kensington, where the Fisheries Exhibition is now being held. The cost of the former plan I guess to amount to about, £18,000, that of the latter I estimate at £60,000, the contract being for use and waste only. It will be seen that this latter estimate is reasonable when I recall to your mind that the cost of the temporary portion of the Melbourne Exhibition buildings, covering an area slightly larger than 600,000 square feet, was £56,000. Take off £16,000 for cheaper labour and materials, and add £20,000 for ornamental purposes, and you arrive at £60,000 as the cost of a building of the same size sufficiently ornamental not to

disgrace the colonies.

But how do I arrive at my 600,000 square feet? Thus:—The Victorian Court at the Melbourne Exhibition occupied 178,000 square feet, New South Wales, 30,000; New Zealand, 12,000; South Australia and Queensland, 10,000 apiece. On the basis that the productions of each colony were represented as fully as those of Victoria were on that occasion, I calculate that the courts of each colony at the London Exhibition might reach the following dimensions:—Victoria, 150,000; New Zealand, 100,000; New South Wales and South Australia, 80,000 apiece; Queensland, 60,000; Tasmania, 30,000; Western Australia and Fiji, 10,000 apiece; New Guinea, New Hebrides, and other islands, 10,000 between them; refreshment and lecture rooms, 70,000—making in all, 600,000 square feet. The expenditure of each colony to fill the above areas I roughly estimate as follows:—Victoria, £30,000; New South Wales, South Australia, Queensland, and New Zealand, £20,000 apiece; Tasmania, £15,000; Western Australia and Fiji, £8,000 apiece. It must be understood, however, that these are only rough estimates, as the amount which each colony would spend on its own representation would be a matter entirely for its own consideration.

The expenses of the General Commission can, however, be calculated more easily. The following table shows alongside of my estimate the amounts expended for the same purpose, as shown on the balance-sheets of the London International of 1862, and the Melbourne International of 1880. In comparing these items, it has to be remembered that an International Exhibition deals with a larger number of widely separated countries, and an immensely larger number of small exhibits, and, further, that the Melbourne Exhibition was half as large again as the Australasian one would be, and the London one three times as large. The alternative items for building for the Australasian Exhibition represent the cost of hiring part of an existing building, or of building a temporary structure. At London the contractor was to be paid £200,000 or £300,000, according to the amount taken at the gates, £200,000 being the minimum.

To recoup this outlay there would be the admissions at the gates, which might amount to anything between £50,000 and £150,000, according to the success of the Exhibition. Nor do I think that £100,000 can be considered an unreasonable mean estimate when you note that the Fisheries' Exhibition took £20,000 in admissions the first week after it was opened, and that the Electric Exhibition is reported to have taken £130,000. Should anyone think that the free opening of the buildings on Saturdays would affect the receipts at the gates on paying days. I would point out that in England classes do not mix as they do here, and that at nearly all public institutions there are two sets of days—2s. 6d. and 1s. days—attracting two different classes of visitors.

There is no Exhibition announced in any part of the world for the year 1885, and I would therefore suggest that the Exhibition be opened on Easter Monday in April of that year, and remain open for a period of six months. At least a year's notice would be required to make the necessary preparations. If 1885 should be thought inconvenient there seem to me to be strong reasons for fixing on the year 1888 as being the centenary of the settlement of Australasia. I understand that there is a proposal on foot for holding an Intercolonial Exhibition in Sydney that year to commemorate the event. We who live in Australia know pretty well what the achievements of the first century of our existence have been. Would it not be preferable to show them to our fellow-countrymen in England? At the end of the half-year the child returns from school and proudly shows its mother the prizes of his industry. Is there an inhabitant of these colonies "with soul so dead" that he will not be proud to display for the approval and admiration of the mother-country the proofs of the achievements of her sons in Australasia during the short space of a hundred years? Surely it is in London rather than in Sydney that our centennial should be held.

The Proposed Permanent Exhibition.

The New Zealand Government, to whom I submitted my proposal, have announced their intention of asking the Australasian Governments to co-operate with them in establishing a permanent Australasian Exhibition. But this seems to me to be putting the cart before the horse. A permanent Exhibition would probably be the outcome of a temporary one, just as the South Kensington Museum was the outcome of the London International, and if a free lease of a central site could be got it might be well to build the nucleus of the temporary Exhibition of stone. But before doing this it would be necessary for the Australasian Parliaments to make up their minds to an annually recurring expenditure for maintenance, and a much larger original outlay than a temporary Exhibition would involve. Then, the essence of success in these matters is to "make a splash," and this could far more easily be done for a temporary Exhibition than for a permanent one, which people could easily go to see at any time. Again, a permanent Exhibition could be little more than a collection of raw products, much smaller, less attractive, less representative, than a combined display of our industries and resources. A permanent Exhibition would, I believe, be useful, but a temporary one seems to me to be likely to

be more effective in itself, and the best foundation stone for a permanent one.

Conclusion.

In conclusion, let me ask you to bear in mind that the effects of the Exhibition would not be confined to those who visited it; that the information about Australasia spread abroad by the Press and through the reports of visitors would reach to the uttermost corners of the United Kingdom; that there would hardly be a soul from John O'Groat's to Land's End who would not gain some crumbs of new knowledge about these communities. It is the march of the troops through the children's playground which makes the recruits of ten years afterwards. Who can doubt but that the bread thus cast upon the waters would bear fruit after many days, and in immigrants who, at the time of the Exhibition perchance, learnt no more about it than the mere fact that it was being held?

Thanking those who have taken the trouble to read this proposal,

I have the honour to be, gentlemen,
Your obedient servant,

R. E. N. Twopeny.

Gibbs, Shallard, and Co.,

Printers, Publishers, Stationers, Lithographers, Pitt Street, Sydney.

The Memorandum of Association And Articles of Association of the New Zealand

Native Land Settlement Co., Limited

Auckland: H. Brett, General Steam Printer, Wyndham Street.

The New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company Limited

Memorandum of Association of the East Coast Native Land and Settlement Company (Limited).

The name of the Company subsequent to registration was changed with the sanction of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies in accordance with the provisions of the Companies' Act to "The New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company Limited"

1. The name of the Company is "The East Coast Native Land and Settlement Company (Limited)."
2. The Registered Office of the Company will be situated in the North Island of New Zealand at Gisborne in the Provincial District of Auckland.
3. The objects for which the Company is established are:
 - The acquisition of Native Land on the East Coast of the North Island of New Zealand by the voluntary association of Owners of Native Land who shall contribute Land with Europeans who shall contribute Funds for the purpose of effecting the settlement of the land by farmer settlers and others in areas of such extent as and in other respects upon terms as nearly as may be similar to those provided by the Acts and Regulations relating to the Sale and disposal of the Crown Lands in the Colony of New Zealand or upon such other special terms and conditions as Native Owners in assigning Land to the Company may stipulate.
 - To aid and promote Immigration into the Company's Estates and for the purpose aforesaid to grant and lend any sum of money.
 - To make or to contribute towards the cost of making or constructing Public Works such as Roads Bridges Wharves and the like which may be necessary or useful in opening up and developing the Company's Property.
 - To guarantee the performance of any contract or obligation.
 - To borrow or raise money by the issue of or upon Bonds Debentures Bills of Exchange or other

obligations or securities of the Company or by Mortgage or charge of all or any part of the property of the Company or of its uncalled Capital or in such other manner as the Company may think fit.

- To lend money on the security of real Property in New Zealand.
 - To Sell Improve Manage Develop Lease Mortgage Dispose of or otherwise deal with all or any part of the property of the Company in such manner and upon such terms as the Company may find most advantageous and suitable.
 - To do all such other things as are incidental or conducive to the attainment of the above objects.
4. The liability of the Shareholders is limited.

5. The capital of the Company is Five Hundred Thousand pounds (£500,000) divided into One Hundred Thousand (100,000) Shares of Five Pounds (£5) each with power to accept Land from Aboriginal Owners thereof at prices agreed on or to be agreed on and to issue paid-up Shares to such owners to the extent of the agreed on price of the Land which they may convey to the Company and with power to increase or to reduce Capital by special resolution.

We the several persons whose names and addresses are subscribed are desirous of being formed into a Company in pursuance of this Memorandum of Association And we respectively agree to take the number of Shares in the Capital of the Company set opposite our respective names.

- WILLIAM LEE REES of Gisborne Solicitor Ten Shares
- J. B. POYNTER Poverty Bay Farmer Ten Shares
- W. H. TUCKER POVERTY Bay Articled Clerk Ten Shares
- HENARE POTAE Rangatira Oteawa Twenty Shares
- WI PERE Rangatira Oturanga Twenty Shares
- J. A. JURY Rangatira o Wairarapa Ten Shares
- T. W. PORTER Gisborne Ten Shares
- MAJOR ROPATA Waiapu (by Agent T. W. Porter) Ten Shares

Articles of Association of the New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company (Limited).

I.—EXCLUSION OF TABLE B.

1. The Articles of Table B of the "Joint Stock Companies' Act 1860 " shall not apply to the Company.

II.—INTERPRETATION.

2. In the interpretation of these presents the following words and expressions shall have the following meanings unless excluded by the subject of context:—

The "Company" means "The New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company, Limited."

"Month" means a calendar month.

"Capital" means the capital for the time being of the Company.

"Shares" means the Shares in which the Capital is from time to time divided.

"Shareholders" means the holders from time to time of the shares of the Company.

"Office" means the Registered Office of the Company.

"Aboriginal Native" means an Aboriginal Native within the meaning of the Native Lands Acts.

Words importing the singular number only include the plural number words importing the plural number only include the singular number words importing the masculine gen-gender only include the feminine gender.

III.—CAPITAL AND SHARES.

3. The Capital of the Company is £500,000 in One hundred thousand Shares of £5 each.

4. The issue and allotment of Shares shall be made to such persons and on such terms and conditions as the Board of Directors may think fit Shares may be issued and allotted either as paid up in full or as partly paid up by way of payment for lands and hereditaments live and dead stock and personal property from time to time or at any time purchased or contracted for by or on behalf of the Company.

5. The Directors may require that Shares held by Aboriginal Natives shall in no case be transferable except (1) With the consent of the Native Committee with whom the Native holder is connected (2) With the consent and approval of the Directors of the Company Every Share Certificate for any such Shares shall be endorsed

accordingly.

IV.—CALLS.

6. The Directors may from time to time make Calls upon Shareholders in respect of all monies unpaid on their Shares and each Shareholder shall be liable to pay the amount of calls so made to the persons and at the times and places appointed by the Directors Provided that calls shall not exceed 5s. per Share and shall not be made in any case at intervals of less than three months.

7. A Call shall be deemed to have been made at any time when the resolution authorising such Call was passed.

8. If before or on the day appointed for payment any Shareholder does not pay the amount of any Call to which he is liable then such Shareholder shall be liable to pay interest for the same at the rate of Ten pounds per cent, per annum from the day appointed for payment thereof to the time of actual payment.

9. On the trial or hearing of any action or suit which may be brought by the Company against any Shareholder to recover any debt due for any Call it shall be sufficient to prove that the name of the Defendant is on the Register of Shareholders of the Company as a holder of the number of Shares in respect of which such debt accrued and that notice of such Call was duly given to the Defendant in pursuance of these Articles and that such Call was not paid And it shall not be necessary to prove the appointment of the Directors who made such Call nor that a quorum of Directors were present at the Board at which such Call was made nor that the meeting at which such Call was made was duly convened or constituted nor any other matter whatsoever.

10. The Company may if they think fit receive from any of the Shareholders willing to advance the same all or any part of the monies due upon the respective Shares beyond the sums actually called for and upon the monies so paid in advance or so much thereof as from time to time exceeds the amount of Calls then made upon the Shares in respect of which such advance has been made the Company may pay interest at such rate as the Shareholder paying such sum or sums in advance and the Directors may agree upon.

V.—TRANSFER OF SHARES.

11. The instrument of Transfer of any Share in the Company shall be executed by both the Transferor and the Transferee and the Transferor shall be deemed to remain the holder of such Shares until the name of the Transferee is entered in the proper Register in respect thereof.

12. Shares may be transferred in the following form or to the like effect:—

I _____ of _____ in consideration of _____ paid to me by _____ of _____ do hereby transfer to the said _____ Shares numbered _____ in "The New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company (Limited) " standing in my name in the books of the said Company to hold the same unto the said _____ his Executors Administrators and Assigns subject to the several conditions on which I hold the same at the time of the execution hereof And I the said _____ do hereby agree to take the said Shares subject to the conditions aforesaid.

As witness our hands this _____ day of _____ 188

The Directors may require that no transfer of Shares held by any Aboriginal Native owner shall be valid until the same has been consented to by the Native Committee with whom such Aboriginal Native owner is connected and further until the Directors for the time being have consented in writing to any such transfer And every Share Certificate or Scrip for Shares issued to any such Aboriginal owner shall be indorsed as Not Transferable except with such consent.

13. The Company may decline to Register any Transfer of Shares made by a Shareholder who is indebted to them or unless the Transferee be approved by the Board.

14. The Transfer Book shall be closed during the thirty days immediately preceding the Ordinary Annual Meeting in each year.

15. Upon every Transfer of Shares the sum of Two shillings and sixpence shall be payable to the Company.

VI.—TRANSMISSION OF SHARES.

16. The executors or administrators of a deceased Shareholder shall be the only persons recognised by the Company as having any title to his Share.

17. Any person becoming entitled to a Share in consequence of the death bankruptcy or insolvency of any Shareholder or in consequence of the marriage of any female Shareholder or in any other way than by transfer may be registered as a Shareholder upon such evidence being produced as may from time to time be required by the Directors.

18. Any person who has become entitled to a Share in any way other than by Transfer may with the consent of the Directors instead of being registered himself elect to have some person to be named by him registered as

a holder of such Share.

19. The person so becoming entitled shall testify such election by executing to his nominee a deed of transfer of such Share.

20. The deed of transfer shall be presented to the Directors accompanied with such evidence as they may require to prove the title of the Transferor and thereupon the Directors shall register the Transferee as a shareholder.

VII.—FORFEITURE OF SHARES.

21. If any Shareholder fails to pay any Call due on the appointed day the Directors may at any time thereafter during such time as the Call remains unpaid serve a notice upon him requiring him to pay such Call together with any interest that may have accrued by reason of such non-payment.

22. The notice shall name a further day and a place or places being a place or places at which Calls of the Company are usually made payable on and at which such Call is to be paid It shall also state that in the event of non-payment at the time and place appointed the Shares in respect of which such Call was made shall be liable to be forfeited.

23. If the requisitions of such notice as aforesaid are not complied with any share in respect of which such notice has been given may be forfeited by a resolution of the Directors to that effect Provided that no Share shall be forfeited unless a Call due in respect thereof shall be at least three months in arrear.

24. Any Share so forfeited shall be deemed to be the property of the Company and may be disposed of in such manner as the Directors think fit. A Certificate in writing under the hands of two of the Directors and countersigned by the Chairman that a Share has been duly forfeited in pursuance of these presents and stating the time when it was forfeited shall be conclusive evidence of the fact therein stated as against all persons who would have been entitled to the Share but for such forfeiture and such Certificate and the receipt of the Company of the price of such Share shall constitute a good title to such Share.

25. A Shareholder whose Shares have been forfeited shall notwithstanding be liable to pay to the Company all Calls and Interest thereon owing upon the said Shares at the time of the forfeiture but the Directors may if they think proper pay back to any such Shareholder such portion of the proceeds realised upon the sale of such Shares as they see proper.

VIII.—CONVERSION OF SHARES INTO STOCK.

26. The Company may convert any Paid-up Shares into Stock.

27. When any Shares have been converted into Stock the several holders of such Stock may thenceforth transfer their respective interests therein or any part of such interests.

28. The several holders of Stock shall be entitled to participate in the Dividends and Profits of the Company according to the amount of their respective interests in such Stock And such interests shall in proportion to the amount thereof confer on the holders thereof respectively the same privileges and advantages for the purpose of voting at meetings of the Company and other purposes as would have been conferred by Shares of equal amount in the capital of the Company but so that none of such privileges or advantages except the participation in the Dividends and Profits of the Company shall be conferred by such aliquot part of Consolidated Stock as would not if vested in Shares have conferred such privileges or advantages.

IX.—INCREASE OF CAPITAL.

29. The Company in an Extraordinary Meeting convened for that purpose may from time to time by special resolution increase its Capital by the creation of new Shares of such description and amount as may be deemed expedient.

30. Such Extraordinary Meeting may determine the conditions on which such increase shall be made the number and amount of the shares into which such increased Capital shall be divided and the time mode and terms at and according to which such last mentioned Shares shall be issued and how the Premium if any on such Shares shall be applied And in particular such Shares may be issued with a preferential or qualified right to Dividends and in the distribution of Assets of the Company and with a special or without any right of voting.

31. Any Capital raised by the creation of new Shares shall be considered as part of the original Capital and shall be subject to the same provisions in all respects whether with reference to the payment of Calls or the forfeiture of Shares on non-payment of Calls or otherwise as if it had been part of the original Capital.

X.—BORROWING POWERS.

32. The Directors may from time to time at their discretion borrow from any of the Directors Share-holders or other persons any sum or sums of money for the purposes of the Company but so that the monies at any one time owing shall not exceed the nominal amount of the Capital.

33. The Directors may raise or secure the repayment of such money in such manner and upon such terms and conditions in all respects as they think fit and in particular by making drawing accepting or endorsing on behalf of the Company any Promissory Notes or Bills of Exchange or by Mortgage or charge of all or any part of the property of the Company and of its uncalled Capital for the time being.

34. The Board of Directors may also from time to time issue debentures for such amounts and payable at such times and in such manner and at such rates of interest and generally upon such terms and with such security as the Board of Directors may from time to time think fit And in like manner the Board of Directors may from time to time issue Debenture Stock either redeemable or irredeemable upon such terms and with such security as the Board of Directors may from time to time think fit Such Debentures and Debenture Stock respectively may be made payable to bearer or otherwise as the Board of Directors may direct.

35. The Debentures and Debenture Stock may be designated "Mortgage Debentures" or "Mortgage Debenture Stock" and may be secured by a conveyance and assignment of the lands tenements and hereditaments and other the real and personal property for the time being of the Company or of any part or parts thereof including the unpaid capital for the time being of the Company to the New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Agency Company Limited or to any other body corporate or persons as Trustees for the holders of such Debentures or Debenture Stock or otherwise as the Board of Directors may deem expedient and with such remuneration (if any) to the said New Zealand Loan and Mercantile Agency Company Limited or other the Trustees for the time being as the Board of Directors may from time to time think fit.

36. Such Mortgage Debentures or Mortgage Debenture Stock may be issued in New Zealand or in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland by the Directors or by such Agents as the Board of Directors may appoint.

37. Any Debentures Bonds or other Securities may be issued at a discount premium or otherwise.

38. The Directors shall cause a proper Register to be kept of all Mortgages and Charges especially affecting the property of the Company or any part thereof

XI.—GENERAL MEETINGS.

39. The first Ordinary Meeting of the Share-holders shall be held at such time not being more than twelve months after the incorporation of the Company and in such place in Gisborne as the directors may determine.

40. Subsequent Ordinary Meetings shall be held at such time and place as may be prescribed by the Company in General Meetings and if no other time and place is prescribed an Ordinary Meeting shall be held on the first Monday in September in every year at such place in the City of Auckland as may be determined by the Directors.

41. The Directors may whenever they think fit and they shall upon requisition made in writing by any number of Shareholders holding in the aggregate not less than one-tenth of the Shares of the Company issued convene an Extraordinary Meeting.

42. Upon receipt of such requisition the Directors shall forthwith proceed to convene a meeting If they do not proceed to convene the same within twenty one days from the date of the requisition the re-quisionists or any other Shareholders holding the required number of Shares may themselves convene a meeting.

43. A notice specifying the place time of meeting and the purpose for which any Extraordinary Meeting is to be held shall be transmitted by post to each Shareholder twenty-eight clear days at least before the day of meeting And no other business than that specified in the notice shall be transacted at such meeting.

44. Twenty-eight clear days' notice shall be given of all Ordinary Meetings and that by advertisement or in such other manner as may be prescribed by the Company.

45. No business shall be transacted at any Ordinary Meeting except the declaration of a Dividend unless a quorum of Shareholders is present at the commencement of such business and such quorum shall consist of not less than ten Shareholders personally present.

46. If within one hour from the time appointed for the meeting a quorum is not present the meeting if convened upon the requisition of Shareholders shall be dissolved In any other case it shall stand adjourned to the same day in the next week at the same time and place and if at such adjourned meeting a quorum is not present it shall be adjourned *sine die*.

47. The Chairman (if any) of the Board of Directors shall preside as Chairman at every General Meeting of the Company.

48. If there is no such Chairman or if at any General Meeting he is not present within fifteen minutes after the time appointed for holding the meeting the Shareholders present shall choose some one of their number to

be the Chairman of the meeting.

49. The Chairman may with the consent of any General Meeting adjourn the same from time to time and from place to place but no business shall be transacted at any adjourned meeting other than the business left unfinished at the meeting from which the adjournment took place.

50. At any General Meeting unless a poll is demanded by at least Five Shareholders a declaration by the Chairman that a resolution has been carried and an entry to that effect in the book of the proceedings of the Company shall be sufficient evidence of the facts without proof of the number or proportion of the votes recorded in favour of or against the resolution.

51. If a poll is demanded by Five or more Share-holders it shall be taken in such manner as the Chairman directs and the result of such poll shall be deemed to be the resolution of the Company In the case of an equality of votes at any General Meeting the Chairman shall be entitled to a second or casting vote.

XII.—VOTES OF SHAREHOLDERS.

52. Every Shareholder shall have one vote for every Share up to five he shall have an additional vote for every complete five Shares beyond the first five up to one hundred and an additional vote for every complete ten Shares beyond the first one hundred Shares.

53. If any Shareholder is a lunatic or an idiot he may vote by his Committee or other legal Curator and if any Shareholder is a minor he may vote by his Guardian or any one of his Guardians if more than one.

54. If two or more persons are jointly entitled to a Share or Shares the Shareholder whose name stands first in the Register of Shareholders as one of the holders of such Share or Shares and no other shall if he be present be entitled to vote in respect of the same and if such person shall not be present then the person jointly entitled with him to the said Share or Shares and whose name shall stand next in the said Register as one of the holders of such Share or Shares and no other shall if he be present be entitled to vote in respect of the same and if there be more than two persons jointly entitled to the said Share or Shares so on in like order.

55. No Shareholder shall be entitled to vote at any General Meeting unless all Calls due from him have been paid.

56. Votes in respect of Shares may be given either personally or by proxy.

57. The instrument appointing a Proxy shall be in writing or in print and under the hand of the Appointor or if such Appointor is a Corporation under the Common Seal and duly attested by a witness No person shall be appointed a Proxy who is not a Shareholder of the Company.

58. The instrument appointing a Proxy shall be deposited at the registered office of the Company not less than 24 hours before the time for holding the meeting at which the person named in such instrument proposed to vote but no instrument appointing a Proxy shall be valid after the expiration of three months from the date of its execution unless in relation to an adjourned meeting.

59. Any instrument appointing a Proxy may be in the following form which may be altered as found convenient

I _____ of _____ being a Shareholder of " The New Zealand Native Land Settlement Company, Limited," and entitled to _____ Votes [or Vote] hereby appoint _____ as my proxy to vote for me on my behalf at the [Ordinary or Extraordinary as the case may be] Meeting of the Company to be held on the _____ day of _____ [or at any General Meeting of the Company that may be held within three months from the date hereof]

As witness my hand this _____ day of _____ 188

Signed by the said in the presence of

Provided always that if any Shareholder shall have given or shall hereafter give to any other Shareholder a general Power of Attorney conferring upon such Shareholder a general power to appear for him and vote in his name at all meetings of this Company or of Companies in which he may be a Shareholder or shall in any other shape or way give to such Shareholder authority to act for him which but for the foregoing provision as to Proxies would be legally sufficient authority for such purpose then and in such case such Shareholder on whom such authority shall have been conferred shall on producing for inspection such Power of Attorney or a duly certified copy thereof at the office of the Company at least one day before the meeting at which he desires to act under the same and if such be required on production of the original of such power or on proof that the same is deposited at any Deeds or Land Registry office within the Colony and so long as such power or authority is not in writing expressly revoked be entitled to attend such General Meetings of this Company and act and vote in the name and on behalf of the Shareholder conferring such authority upon him.

XIII.—BOARD OF DIRECTORS.

60. The number of Directors shall be not less than ten nor more than twenty of whom at least one- fifth shall be Aboriginal Natives within the meaning of the Native Lands Acts Whenever the number of Directors is less than twenty the Board of Directors may at any time add to their number by electing qualified Shareholders but so that the total number of Directors shall not exceed twenty.

61. From and after the confirmation of this Rule by an Extraordinary Meeting of Shareholders the present Directors shall cease to be Directors (except such as may be re-appointed) and the following shall be Directors of the Company viz. John Logan Campbell Hon. James Williamson M.L.C. Josiah Clifton Firth Hon. Daniel Pollen M.L.C. James McCosh Clark Thomas Russell C.M.G. Seymour Thorne George M.H.R. John Blair Whyte M.H.R. Allan McDonald M.H.R. Thomas Morrin C. A. deLautour M.H.R. J. W. Matthews Patrick Comiskey Wi Pere J. Buchanan M.H.R. Robert H. Rhodes J. Barraclough.

62. The Directors shall receive such remuneration as may be sanctioned at a General Meeting and it shall be divided in such manner as the Directors may think fit.

63. The Company from time to time may by the resolution of a General Meeting increase and having increased diminish the remuneration of Directors provided that such remuneration shall never without the unanimous consent of the Board of Directors be less than the remuneration to be sanctioned as hereinbefore provided.

64. There shall be no meeting of Directors unless at least Three European Directors are present.

65. The continuing Directors or Director may act notwithstanding any vacancy in the Directory.

66. The Share qualification of an European Director shall consist in his being the registered holder of One Hundred Shares at the least and of a Native Director of Fifty Shares at the least.

67. No Director shall be disqualified to act as such by reason of his being a Managing Director or Agent of the Company or being otherwise interested in the operations or business thereof.

68. Every Director shall vacate his office on ceasing to be the registered holder of his qualifying number of Shares or becoming bankrupt or suspending payment or compounding with his creditors or being found lunatic or being of unsound mind or by resignation of his office but until an entry of such vacating of office shall be made upon the book of proceedings or minutes of the Board his acts as a Director shall be valid and effectual.

69. At the first Ordinary Meeting of the Company all the Directors shall retire from office and the Shareholders shall thereupon elect permanent Directors.

70. At each Annual General Meeting after the first one-fifth of the Directors for the time being or if their number is not a multiple of five then the next greater number shall retire from office but shall be eligible for re-election the retiring Directors being fixed by ballot unless the Directors agree among themselves until the whole have so retired and there-after by seniority of service.

71. The Company at the General Meeting at which any Directors retire in manner aforesaid shall at the meeting fill up the vacant offices by electing a like number of persons.

72. If at any meeting at which any Election of Directors ought to take place no such Election is made the meeting shall stand adjourned till the next day (unless the next day be a Sunday or a public or general holiday in which case such meeting shall stand adjourned until the next day ensuing such Sunday or public or general holiday) at the same time and place And if at such adjourned meeting no election takes place the former Directors shall continue to act and shall be entitled themselves to fill up such vacancies by electing a sufficient number of qualified Shareholders as Directors.

73. The Company in General Meeting may remove any Director before the expiration of his period of office and may appoint another person in his stead .The person so appointed shall hold office during such time only as the Director in whose place he is appointed would have held the same if he had not been removed Any occasional vacancy, in the Board shall be filled up by the remaining members of the Board by the appointment of any duly qualified Shareholder who shall in all respects stand in the place of his predecessor till the next Ordinary Meeting of the Company.

74. The Directors may meet together for the despatch of business adjourn and otherwise regulate their meetings as they think fit Questions arising at any meeting shall be decided by a majority of votes The Chairman shall have a deliberative vote only but in case at any meeting there be only three Directors present including the Chairman and the Chairman disagrees with the other two Directors upon any question that question may if the Chairman see fit be postponed to the next Ordinary Meeting but no longer A Director may at any time summons a meeting of the Directors.

75. The Directors may elect a Chairman of their meetings and determine the period for which he is to hold office but if no such Chairman is elected or if at any meeting the Chairman is not present at the time appointed for holding the same the Directors present shall choose one of their number to be Chairman of such meeting.

76. All acts done by any meeting of the Directors or of a Committee of Directors or by any person acting as a Director shall notwithstanding that it be afterwards discovered that there is some defect in the appointment of any such Directors or persons acting as aforesaid or that they or any of them were disqualified be as valid as if

every such person had been duly appointed and was qualified to be a Director.

77. The Directors may delegate any of their powers to Committees consisting of not less than Three Directors as they shall think fit Any Committee so formed shall in the exercise of the powers so delegated conform to any regulations that may be imposed on them by the Directors.

78. A Committee may elect a Chairman of their meetings. If no such Chairman is elected or if he is not present at the time appointed for holding any meeting the members present shall choose one of their number to be Chairman of such meeting.

79. A Committee may meet and adjourn as they think proper Questions at any meeting shall be determined by a majority of votes of the members present and in case of an equal division of votes the Chairman shall have a casting vote.

80. The Directors shall cause minutes to be made in books provided for the purpose

- Of all appointments to office made by the Directors.
- Of the names of the Directors present at each meeting of Directors and Committees of Directors.
- Of all orders made by the Directors and Committees of Directors and
- Of all resolutions and proceedings of meetings of the Company and of the Directors and Committees of Directors.

And such minutes as aforesaid signed by any person purporting to be Chairman of any ensuing meeting of Directors or Committee of Directors at which such minutes shall have been read and confirmed shall be receivable in evidence without further proof.

XIV.—POWERS OF DIRECTORS.

81. The business of the Company shall be managed by the Directors who may exercise all such powers of the Company as are not by the "Joint Stock Companies' Act 1860 " or any other Act amending the same or by these articles declared to be exercisable by the Company in General Meeting subject nevertheless to any regulations of these Articles to the provisions of the said Act and to such regulations being not inconsistent with the said regulations or provisions as may be prescribed by the Company in General Meeting but no regulation made by the Company in General Meeting shall invalidate any prior Act of the Directors which would have been valid if such regulation had not been made.

82. Subject to but without restraining the generality of the last preceding regulation the Directors shall have power to do all acts and things which they may consider proper or advantageous for accomplishing the objects and carrying on the business of the Company And in particular they shall have power to do the following things:—

- They may commence the business of the Company as soon as they shall see fit.
- They may appoint and at pleasure remove any Manager Agents Officers Clerks or Servants as they shall from time to time deem expedient and may determine the powers and duties of such Manager Agents Officers Clerks or Servants and fix their salaries and emoluments.
- They may at their discretion pay for any Property or Rights acquired by or services rendered to the Company either wholly or partially in Cash or in Shares Bonds Debentures or other Securities of the Company and any such Shares may be issued either as fully paid up or with such amount credited as paid up thereon as may be agreed upon and any such Bonds Debentures or other Securities may be either specifically charged upon all or any part of the Property of the Company and its uncalled Capital or not so charged.
- They may secure the fulfilment of any contracts or engagements entered into by the Company or the payment of any Mortgage Debentures or other securities by Mortgage or charge of all or any of the property of the Company and its unpaid capital for the time being or in such other manner as they may think fit.
- They may attach to any Shares to be issued as the consideration or part of the consideration for any Contract with or property acquired by the Company or in payment of services rendered to the Company such conditions as to the transfer thereof as they think fit.
- The Directors shall have power to accept the surrender of all Scrip for Original Shares issued prior to the 20th March 1883 and may issue new Scrip of equal value for the same provided that new Scrip issued for Original Scrip so surrendered shall be and be made subject to the same restrictions and limitations and conditions as the Original Shares were subject to.
- They may appoint any person or persons to accept and hold in trust for the Company any property belonging to the Company or in which it is interested and may execute and do all such deeds and things as may be requisite to vest the same in such person or persons.
- They may institute conduct defend compound or abandon any legal proceedings by and against the

Company or its Officers or otherwise concerning the affairs of the Company and also may compound and allow time for payment or satisfaction of any debts due and of any claims or demands by or against the Company.

- They may refer any claims or demands by or against the Company to arbitration and observe and perform the awards.
- They may make and give receipts releases and other discharges for money payable to the Company and for claims and demands of the Company.
- They may invest any of the monies of the Company not immediately required for the purposes thereof upon such securities and in such manner as they may think fit and they may from time to time vary or realise such investments.
- They may before recommending any dividend set aside out of the profits of the Company such sum as they think proper as a Reserve Fund to meet contingencies or for repairing improving and maintaining any of the property of the Company and for such other purposes as the Directors shall in their absolute discretion think conducive to the interests of the Company and they may invest the several sums so set aside upon such investments as they may think fit and may from time to time deal with and vary such investments and dispose of all or any part thereof for the benefit of the Company and they may divide the Reserve Fund into such special funds as they think fit.
- They may from time to time make vary and repeal Bye-laws for the regulation of the business of the Company its Officers and Servants or the Members of the Company.
- They may enter into all such negotiations and contracts and rescind and vary all such contracts and execute and do all such acts deeds and things in the name and on behalf of the Company as they may consider expedient for or in relation to any of the matters aforesaid or otherwise for the purposes of the Company.
- They may in the name and on behalf of the Company appoint any person or persons to be the Attorney or Attornies of the Company for and in the name and on behalf of the Company to execute all or any Deeds or Instruments whatsoever to carry out any instructions or resolutions of the Company or the Directors and to do any acts whatsoever And they may empower such Attorney or Attornies to execute any such Deeds or Instruments under the Private Seal or Seals of such Attorney or Attornies instead of the Common Seal of the Company And every power purporting to be granted by the Company as aforesaid shall as between the Company their Successors and Assigns on the one hand and the person or persons dealing with the Attorney or Attornies of the Company on the other hand continue in force (notwithstanding the same power may have been revoked or the Company wound up or dissolved) until all and every the Attornies to whom the same power is given shall have received notice of such revocation winding up or dissolution.
- They may by their Attorney or otherwise appoint a Directorate of not more than five persons to act for the Company within Great Britain and Ireland and such appointment shall *ipso facto* entitle and authorise the Directors so appointed to exercise all the powers and authorities which the Ordinary Directors themselves may or might exercise under these Articles in so far and to such extent as necessary or required in the carrying out of any of the objects of the Company which the Directors in New Zealand have resolved shall be undertaken and in the promotion and management of such business within Great Britain and Ireland.

XV.—INDEMNITY.

83. Directors Managers and other Officers of the Company shall be indemnified by the Company against all losses and expenses incurred by them in or about the discharge of their duties except such as shall happen from their own wilful act neglect or default No Director shall be responsible for any other Director or for any Officer Clerk or Servant of the Company or for any loss or expense happening to the Company by the insufficiency or deficiency of value of or title to any property or security acquired or taken on behalf of the Company or by the bankruptcy or tortious act of any customer or debtor of the Company or by anything done in the execution of the duties of his office or in relation thereto or otherwise than for his own wilful act or default.

XVI.—DIVIDENDS.

84. The Directors may declare a dividend to be paid to the Shareholders in proportion to the number of Shares held by each and to the amount paid up upon such Shares.

85. No Dividend shall be payable except out of the profits arising from the business of the Company.

86. The Directors may deduct from the Dividends payable to any Shareholder all such sums of money as

may be due from him to the Company on account of Calls or otherwise.

87. Notice of any Dividends that may have been declared shall be given to each Shareholder.

88. No Dividend shall bear interest as against the Company.

89. The declaration of the Directors as to the amount of the net profits of the Company shall be conclusive.

90. Every Dividend shall be paid by cheques on the bankers which shall be delivered or sent by the Secretary to the Shareholders.

91. In case two or more persons are registered as the joint holders of any Share or Stock any one of such persons may give effectual receipts for all Dividends and payments on account of Dividends in respect of such Share or Stock Provided that in case of payments to Maori Committees of any Dividends the receipt of the Chairman of such Committees shall be sufficient.

XVII.—ACCOUNTS.

92. The Directors shall cause true accounts to be kept of the sums of money received and expended by the Company and the matters in respect of which such Receipts and Expenditure take place and of the Assets Credits and Liabilities of the Company.

93. The Books of Account shall be kept at the Registered Office of the Company or at such other place or places as the Directors think fit.

94. The Directors shall from time to time determine whether and to what extent and at what times and places and under what conditions or regulations the Accounts and Books of the Company or any of them shall be open to the inspection of the Shareholders and no Shareholders shall have any right of inspecting any Account or Book or Document of the Company except as conferred by statute or authorised by the Directors or by a resolution of the Company in General Meeting.

95. At the Ordinary Meeting in every year the Directors shall lay before the Company a statement of the income and expenditure and a duly audited Balance-sheet containing a summary of the property and liabilities of the Company made up to a date not more than three months before the meeting from the time when the last preceding statement and balance-sheet were made or in the case of first statement and balance-sheet from the incorporation of the Company.

96. Every such statement shall be accompanied by a report of the Directors as to the state and condition of the Company and as to the amount which they recommend to be paid out of the profits by way of dividend or bonus to the Shareholders and the amount if any which they propose to carry to the Reserve Fund according to the provisions in that behalf hereinbefore contained.

course of the post and in proving such service it shall be sufficient to prove that the letter containing the notice was properly addressed and put into the post-office.

NAMES OF SUBSCRIBERS.

- WILLIAM LEE REES of Gisborne Solicitor
- W. H. TUCKER Articled Clerk Gisborne
- H. POTAE Rangatira o Uawa
- WI PERE Rangatira o Turanga
- J. A. JURY Rangatira o Wairarapa
- T. W. PORTER Gisborne
- Major ROPATA Waiapu (By Agent T. W. Porter)

decorative feature

The Land Question in Victoria.

Speech Delivered by Mr. James Mirams, M.L.A.,

On the SECOND READING OF THE LAND ACTS CONTINUATION AND AMENDMENT BILL, In the Legislative Assembly of Victoria,

OCTOBER, 1882.

Price-Threepence.

Melbourne PRINTED AND PUBLISHED BY A. H. Massina & Co., General Printers, 26 LITTLE COLLINS STREET EAST,

Introductory.

THE increasing importance of the Land Question, and the widespread interest with which it is regarded in

this and the neighbouring colonies, has induced a number of the supporters of the views advocated by Mr. James Mirams, M.L.A., to republish in full the admirable speech recently delivered by that gentleman on the motion for the second reading of the Land Acts Amendment and Continuation Bill. This measure is now before the country, and no more opportune time could be presented for submitting the immense array of facts contained in the speech in question for the consideration of the large section of the community interested in an early and correct solution of the difficult problem raised in connection with the disposal of the Crown lands of Victoria. The speech, which is distinguished by its clearness and lucidity, contains an impartial review of the history of land legislation in this colony, and points out most unmistakably the errors and defects of the existing system. The remedy which Mr. Mirams commends for immediate adoption is one that has many strong advocates in this and the other Australasian colonies, in all of which the Land Question has, for many years, proved a fruitful source of controversy. The adoption of a system of State leasing would, at least, prevent the perpetration of fresh blunders, and avoid the perpetuation of those which have been committed in the past. Of the speech itself the *Age* says:—"It would be difficult to speak too highly of the valuable contribution made to the leasing question by the hon. member for Collingwood, Mr. Mirams, in a speech which exhibited some of the best qualities which distinguish him—industry, fair dealing, lucidity of statement, considerable powers of generalisation, and a keen sense of the weakness of his opponents' arguments."

The compiler of the speech is largely indebted to the admirable report which appeared in *Hansard*.

The Land Question in Victoria.

Mr. Mirams.—Mr. Speaker, at all times it is a somewhat difficult matter to do justice to a large question of this kind, but it is additionally difficult in the circumstances under which I am called upon to address the House to-night, when there is such an evident indisposition on the part of honourable members to enter into the discussion at all, being desirous of taking up business which they consider to be of more immediate importance. I am not responsible for that, however. I cannot, in justice to the views which I hold on this very important question, refrain from addressing myself to it, even although in doing so I may run counter to the wishes of a large number of honourable members. I desire, first of all, to address myself to the speech made by the Minister of Lands when he introduced this measure some five months since. On that occasion the honourable gentleman supplied the House with a table of statistics. There is no doubt that the paper which he supplied us with was a very voluminous one except as regarding the particular aspect of the question which we are called upon to discuss. A large portion of the information which I think the country had a right to look for was not forthcoming, and those of us who had to address the House on the particular aspect of the question to which it related, and who are opposed to the view which the honourable gentleman holds as to the way in which the remaining portion of the public estate ought to be dealt with, have had to justify ourselves and our position by means of information gathered from all kinds of sources, instead of being supplied with it in an authoritative form by the Lands Department. I refer more especially to the fact that we have been supplied with no official statement as to the amount of land which has been selected under the various Land Acts that have been in operation for many years past, and which has passed out of the hands of those who originally held it. That, in my opinion, is one of the most important matters which the House should have been called upon to deal with. I am quite sure that no honourable member can attempt to properly deal with the question until he is in possession of full and correct particulars as to the methods in which the land has been disposed of, and of the results of those methods; and no honourable member can attempt to deal successfully with the land in the future without obtaining that information. The Minister of Lands supplied us with a considerable number of figures which have very little to do with the questions at issue between the various parties in the House and in the country as to the manner of dealing with the public estate in the future. The first passage in the speech of the honourable gentleman to which I shall refer is the following:—

"It must not be forgotten that our soil is exceptionally rich, especially for wheat-growing, and that our climate is so favourable as to have the effect of causing many persons from the other colonies to settle and make their homes here."

I may here mention that the foregoing statement supplies incidentally one of the best answers to a frequent argument used against the leasing principle, namely, that our settlers are sure to leave us unless we can offer some very peculiar attractions in the mode of our land legislation. The Minister of Lands, having made the statement which I have read, ought to have given us some facts to bear it out. If our climate and our soil are exceptionally good for the growth of cereals, especially wheat, the honourable gentleman ought at least to have proved his statement, and he ought further to have proved that the growth of wheat has been encouraged by the Land Acts of the past, and more particularly by the present one—that of 1869—which is the principal one under which selection has taken place, and the principle of which he asks us to extend very greatly in the Bill at

present before us. Now, what are the facts relating to this alleged superiority of our climate and of our soil for the growth of cereals, as supplied by the figures submitted by the honourable gentleman himself? In the table which I am about to submit, honourable members will be shown how far the statements of the Minister of Lands are borne out, and to what extent he was acquainted with the real question at issue. He gave us the wheat averages per acre for the several colonies for the year 1880, and also supplied a return relating to this colony for the year 1881. There were no returns for the other colonies later than 1880, so that I shall take that year's average, in order to deal fairly all round. The average yield of wheat in Victoria in 1880 was 10 bushels per acre; in Queensland it was 20¼ bushels. The Minister of Lands made a great point of the fact that our average was greater than that of South Australia; but, if the question of the number of acres under cultivation is to be admitted into the argument, the superiority of our climate and soil will not be admissible. The average yield in New South Wales in 1880 was 10¾ bushels per acre; in Western Australia it was 15 bushels; in Tasmania it was 15 bushels; and in South Australia it was only 5 bushels in that particular year. It should be remembered, however, that that was an exceptionally bad year for South Australia, as will be seen from the fact that, in the year previous to it, the average yield per acre was, not 5 bushels, but ¾ bushels. The average yields of all kinds of grain throughout the colonies in the year 1880 were as follows:

Mr. Francis.—You include the maize harvests of New South Wales and Queensland?

Mr. Mirams.—Of course I do, but that makes no difference so far as my argument is concerned. If I leave out the maize harvests of the north-eastern colonies, I might as well omit the barley harvests of Victoria. The Minister of Lands bases his argument on the superior quality of the soil and climate of this colony for the growth of wheat, and I want to point out that, if we disregard all other crops, some of which are exceptional in particular colonies, and confine ourselves to the illustration which the honourable gentleman himself has taken, namely wheat, there is only one colony which is worse off than ours. So then what becomes of his statement that our land and climate are exceptionally adapted to the growth of wheat? The honourable gentleman then proceeded to show that the selection which went on under the Land Act of 1869 was of great benefit to the country, because it had resulted in the growth of large quantities of grain. He contended that, for this reason, the principles of that Act should be continued. Now, as his advocacy of the desirability of continuing the Act depends to a great extent upon asserted facts, the facts which he adduces ought to be undoubted and un-challengeable, and he ought to have proved them to be so. I admit that the sum total of the figures which he supplied was a great one, but, I ask, of what use is it to us, unless we take it in comparison with the quantity of land which we have parted with to secure the yields he has spoken of, and with the returns made previous to the coming into operation of the Act of 1869, which he has extolled so highly, and the principle of which he is so anxious to extend? Speaking upon this point, the honourable gentleman said—

"Under our system of selection, notwithstanding all that has been said against it, Victoria has become the greatest wheat-producing colony in Australia. During 1880, the area cultivated was 1,997,000 acres, which produced 13,625,000 bushels of grain. That yield was above the yield of any other colony, that of South Australia, from a large area of land, being 8,867,000 bushels. This satisfactory state of things has been brought about by our land law."

Of course, in using the term "our land law," he is referring to the law which has been in existence since 1869, and which he approves of, and asks us to extend by the present Bill. I want to know why the honourable gentleman in his figures did not go back to 1879? Why did he content himself with comparing 1881 with 1880? Simply for the reason that if he had gone back to 1879 his whole argument would have been broken to pieces, because in 1879 the yield was much larger than in either 1880 or 1881. As a matter of fact there was a greater yield of grain, by 1,275,000 bushels, in the year 1879 than there was in 1881, notwithstanding all the land that was taken up in the meantime. There is another aspect of the question which deserves attention, and which was brought under notice by the newspaper which supports the Ministry—the *Argus*. After the Minister of Lands made his speech on the second reading of this Bill last session—the House will remember that the honourable gentleman has given us two second-reading speeches on the Bill—the *Argus* contained a leading article, in which, speaking of the large totals of yields of grain which had been given by the Minister, it said—

"But this is no proof of successful settlement."

Why? Because every one knows that one of the principal conditions under which selectors take up their land is the condition of carrying out so much cultivation. Whether they intend to hold the land genuinely, or have merely taken it up speculatively for the purpose of selling it at the end of three years, they must at all events perform a certain amount of cultivation, and consequently the gross result is necessarily large. As the *Argus* said—

"While the selectors are engaged in fulfilling the conditions of their licences and leases, which prescribe cultivation to a certain extent, and while the land they till retains some of the fertility of virgin soil, we may be sure that the production of wheat and other grains will be large. The real results of our agrarian experiments will not be known until most of the selectors' titles have matured, and they are free to do what they please with

their holdings."

That will be the real test. The honourable member for Creswick (Mr. Richardson) last night, as the result of working out the matter for himself from figures supplied by the Lands Department and by the Government Statist, estimated that 50,000 of the selectors under the various Land Acts have parted with their holdings.. That is a point to which the Minister of Lands ought to have devoted his attention, and it is a real, true, and authoritative statement of the case upon that issue which the House has a right to demand from the Lands Department before it is asked to part with a single further acre of land upon any condition whatsoever. It seems to me to be perfectly monstrous that the head of a department which has already parted with more than 13,000,000 acres of land under the selection clauses of the various Land Acts should come to this House and ask it to pass a new Bill on the same lines, only affording facilities for getting rid of the land more quickly by affording increased powers of selection, without giving us any real, truthful, and authoritative statement as to the quantity of land that is now held *bonâ fide* by the people who took it up in the first instance, and who professedly took it up for the purpose of cultivating it. Upon that point the country has been supplied with no authoritative information at all, and, in the absence of that information, honourable members have to make calculations for themselves. The honourable member for Creswick has arrived at the result which I have mentioned by calculating according to one process, and, as I shall presently show, I, by calculating by a totally different process, have arrived at a result remarkably close to that of the honourable member for Creswick. But even if the amount of grain mentioned by the Minister of Lands were a criterion of successful settlement, the honourable gentleman would still have to make good another point before he would be in a position to base an argument upon it for the House agreeing to extend the present system. He would have to show that, before the passing of the Land Act of 1869, the principle of which we are asked to extend, there was little or no cultivation at all—that the colony did not produce much wheat or other agricultural produce until that Act came into operation. Why did not the honourable gentleman bring down a statement showing the amount of cultivation in the year 1869, before the Land Act of which he so much approves came into operation, and the amount of cultivation now, so that we might see what has been the net result of parting with the additional 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 acres of land? The honourable gentleman did not do that, but I have taken the trouble to do it for myself, and for the benefit of the honourable gentleman and of the country. I will submit the figures to the House, and I think they will tell a tale which will astonish some honourable members. In the year 1869—the year before the present Land Act came into operation—the total quantity of land alienated, or in process of alienation, which I consider to be the same thing, for land which has once been selected seldom returns to the Crown, though it may pass into the hands of other persons than the original selectors—was 10,169,662 acres. At the end of 1881 the total quantity alienated was 19,819,739 acres, so that the amount of land selected under the Land Act of 1869 at the end of 1881, which is nearly twelve months ago, was 9,650,077 acres. What has the colony got in the way of the extension of agriculture, in the way of the settlement of the people, in the way of additional production from the soil, in return for squandering those 9,600,000 acres? The only argument that has ever been used for parting with the land upon the terms on which we have been parting with it is that we gave it away knowingly, willingly, and with our eyes open, for the purpose of settling people on the soil who were to become the heads of industrious families. We were going to place a "yeomanry," to use the cant phrase, upon the soil, and from them, as citizens, we were to reap indirect benefits—though I must say that I have never heard it shown exactly where they were to come from—which would more than compensate the community for giving away its estate on the ridiculous terms on which we have been parting with it for the last dozen years. Well, what have we got in return? The number of acres cultivated in 1869 was 827,534, deducting from which 49,372 acres which were fallow in that year, leaves the actual area under crop in 1869 778,162 acres. At the end of 1881 the area cultivated was 1,813,941 acres, or, deducting 142,866 acres which were fallow, 1,671,075 acres. Thus, as the net result of parting with nearly 10,000,000 acres, there was an increased area cultivated to the extent of 892,813 acres. We have got rid of nearly 10,000,000 acres of land for the purpose of getting less than 1,000,000 acres cultivated—and cultivated in the style of cultivation which those selectors give us who merely comply with the terms of the Act for the purpose of getting the fee-simple—a style of cultivation which gives us a return of 10 bushels to the acre of wheat and $6\frac{3}{4}$ bushels to the acre, taking the crops all round. Is that a result which is calculated to satisfy this House and this country that we are on the right track in dealing with the land, so that we should not only go on in the same way, but that we should go on in the same way twice as fast? Let us look into the particulars of the figures I have given. The quantity of land upon which wheat was grown in 1869—I shall only trouble the House with round numbers—was 288,000 acres; of oats, 144,000 acres; barley, 28,000 acres; maize, 1000 acres; rye, 4000 acres; and of peas and beans, nearly 4000 acres. In 1881 the area of wheat was 921,000 acres. I would call attention to the fact that wheat is the cereal for which this colony is supposed to be peculiarly adapted, and the promotion of the growth of wheat more than anything else is the object held to justify our dealing with the land in the way we have been doing. Yet in 1881 there were only 632,000, or less than three-quarters of a million, acres of wheat more than there were in 1869, when

we had only parted with 10,000,000 acres instead of 19,000,000 of land. When we consider that nearly all the 10,000,000 acres alienated in 1869 was held in large estates, used as sheep runs, I confess I cannot see how it can be regarded as a "success" that the 9,000,000 acres alienated in selection since 1869 have only increased the area under wheat by 632,000 acres. Most of the land parted with before the Land Act of 1869 was held in large estates, and the squatters did not grow wheat, but sheep.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—The effect of the Land Acts has been to put the people on the land instead of sheep.

Mr. Mirams.—We will come to that directly. If the honourable gentleman can prove that the Land Act has put the people on the land, he will have more trouble in proving that it has kept them there. The Land Act was not passed merely to put people on the land, but to keep them there, and the honourable member for Creswick last night clearly showed that 50,000 out of the 80,000 selectors who took up land under the various Acts are nowhere to be found on the land. Returning, however, to the subject I was discussing, I find that the total yield of grain in 1869 was 10,305,299 bushels, and in 1881 13,967,935 bushels, an increase of 3,662,636 bushels only. That is the net result of parting with 9,650,000 acres, so far as settlement can be judged by the results shown in cultivation. There is another point which is important, as showing the character of the cultivation under the old system before the Land Act of 1869 came into operation, and the character of the cultivation since. In 1869 the average yield of grain was 21-89 bushels to the acre, whereas in 1881 it was only 12-19 bushels to the acre, being a decrease in the average yield per acre of all kinds of grain of no less than 9-70 bushels to the acre, which, assuming the older cultivated land to be as fertile as formerly, give a yield per acre for the new land of 5-42 bushels only.

Mr. McLean.—Because the selectors have to cultivate land which is unfit for cultivation.

Mr. Mirams.—I fail to see the compulsion. No one compelled them to take up the land if it was not fit for cultivation.

Mr. McLean.—They wanted it for other purposes.

Mr. Mirams.—They wanted it to get rid of it. That is just what I say. A large number took up land, and merely went through the form of cultivating a portion of it, in order to comply with the conditions of the Land Act, so that they might then pass the land on to someone else who would buy it, and then they went with the money they so obtained to some of the other colonies.

Mr. McLean.—I have seen land——

Mr. Mirams.—What the honourable member has seen in one particular instance is nothing. I am dealing with the whole net result of the twelve years' land transactions of the colony as set down in the public records. Exceptional cases do not affect the average, which is what I am dealing with. If the land is exceptionally bad in some cases, it is exceptionally good in other cases. Then what is the result as regards root crops? In 1869 the total number of acres under root crops was 45,397, and in 1881, 41,662, so that, while the acreage under grain increased in the interval, the acreage under root crops decreased. I do not know what deduction honourable members who are more acquainted with agricultural matters than I am will draw from that fact, but to me it appears to afford direct proof of my contention that the kind of cultivation we have had, as a rule, from selection is not genuine, not the cultivation of *bonâ fide* settlers who intended to remain on the soil. If it were genuine, it strikes me that the quantity of land under root crops would not have decreased during the twelve years, in view of the larger area under cultivation, but would at least have increased side by side with the increase in the growth of grain. Is it not the fact that the readiest and least expensive way in which that portion of the selectors who take up land for speculative purposes can comply with the conditions of the Land Act is by putting in a crop of wheat? I believe it is, and I think that circumstance accounts for the fact that root crops have not been grown so extensively as they formerly were. Whether that be so or not, the fact remains that there were 3735 acres less under root crops in 1881 than in 1869, although the yield was greater in 1881 by 2640 tons. The number of acres growing hay in 1869 was 140,435, and in 1881, 211,461, or an increase in the latter year of 71,026 acres. Although there was this increase in the acreage, the produce of hay only increased by 13,000 tons. The grapes grown in 1869 amounted to 110,185 cwt., and in 1881 the quantity was only 93,318 cwt., so that less grapes were grown in 1881 than in 1869.

Mr. Connor.—A large number of vineyards were destroyed in 1881.

Mr. Mirams.—But surely the colony does not depend for the production of grapes on one district alone. Every one who professes to know tells us that this colony is wonderfully adapted for the cultivation of grapes and the manufacture of wine—and the result of the Exhibition at Bordeaux proves the truth of the statement—and surely the fact that a few acres were destroyed at Geelong should not diminish the returns of the whole colony for twelve years. If this colony is adapted for grape growing, as every one says it is, and we had real *bonâ fide* settlers, who wanted to make the best of their land, the number of acres under vines would have gone on increasing at such a rate during the twelve years that the mere occurrence of one bad season in one district in the colony would not render the yield in 1881 less than it was in 1869. The destruction of vineyards

in Geelong might have somewhat reduced the increase, but on the whole there would certainly have been a great increase, and not a decrease. I am only dealing with the broad facts; so long as honourable members do not dispute the facts, they can, at the proper opportunity, attempt to account for them, or explain them away as best they can. The Minister of Lands stated, a few minutes ago, that people had been put on the land instead of sheep. Now the fact is that they have not. The number of sheep in the colony is greater now than it was before the Land Act of 1869 came into operation.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—The result of subdivision.

Mr. Mirams.—There we have another quibble. The honourable gentleman asserted that the Land Act has been a great success, and based his assertion upon certain figures. When I come to deal with those figures he attempts to lessen the force they give to my argument by what I must call a parcel of miserable quibbles, which have no force when properly investigated. He first takes a fact, or an alleged fact, and when he is bowled over he attempts to get away by some side-wind or excuse. He stated distinctly, only a few minutes ago, that the Land Act had settled people on the land, and driven the sheep off.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—I said the Land Acts had settled people on the land instead of sheep—referring to the squatters' sheep.

Mr. Mirams.—What does the honourable gentleman mean? I want him to explain, if he can, to the House and the country how it comes, if the sheep have been driven off to make room for selectors, that there were 436,662 more sheep in Victoria in 1881 than there were in 1869. That proves that we have not driven off the sheep—that the selectors do not cultivate, but run sheep. If we have simply changed the sheep-breeders from the big to the small men, we have not got what we bargained for. The Land Act was not intended for that. It was intended to settle cultivators on the soil. It was intended to settle farmers—to establish a "yeomanry." The Land Act fixed the area of selection at 320 acres. Did any one suppose for a moment, when that Act was passed, that 320 acres of land were going to be taken up for the purpose of sheep-breeding? The Land Act was intended to settle farmers on the land, and not sheep-breeders. The number of cattle had increased in 1881 by 593,748, and the number of horses by 113,686.

Mr. Connor.—By improving the land.

Mr. Mirams.—I suppose the cows and the sheep would have stopped breeding if they had remained the property of the squatters, and there had not been selectors. That is the meaning of the honourable member's interjection, if it means anything. There is another point in connection with this matter to which I wish to call attention. Sending the people to the land, whether they have remained there or not, has imposed a very large burthen upon the country. It has necessitated the expenditure of immense sums of money, which the country has had to borrow. We have had to provide for the construction of railways, roads, bridges, post and telegraph offices, schools, and all the other conveniences of civilisation. If the Government encouraged the people to go upon the land, it was quite proper to follow them with those appliances. As to the mode in which it has been done, there may be differences of opinion, but the fact of the propriety of the proceeding no one will dispute. Well, we have got rid of nearly 10,000,000 acres of land under this process, and we have burthened ourselves with £10,207,000 of additional debt. What I say is that we would not have had the debt if we had adopted another system. Very likely, if we had sold the land properly instead of giving it away in the manner we have been doing, we need not have borrowed money. We might at least have obtained sufficient from the land to provide those conveniences for the people to which I have referred. That, however, is another question which I do not propose to go into just now. I now come to the question of settlement. The Minister of Lands, in speaking on this point, said—

"Our desire is to continue the land policy which has been in force for so many years, and which has had the effect of settling the people on the lands and making Victoria the greatest wheat-producing colony in Australia, and one of the greatest wheat-producing countries in the world."

As regards the question of wheat production, if the figures I have cited do not satisfy honourable members, they will have to find others for themselves. In dealing with the question of selectors, I may say that I have taken my figures from the last report I could obtain at the Lands Department. The total number of selectors of all kinds, so far as I can estimate them from this report, who had taken up land previous to 1870—the year in which the present Land Act came into operation—was 17,443. The number who have taken up land under the present Act was, at the date of the report, 78,339. The honourable member for Geelong (Mr. Berry) will now see something about the "proportion" he spoke of. Of course it would not be at all likely that the quantity of land cultivated by 17,000 selectors would at all equal or approach the amount of land cultivated by the 78,000 selectors under the present Land Act. Counting the 17,443 selectors previous to 1870 and the 78,339 selectors since, we find that the total number of persons who have selected land in the colony is 95,782. Seventeen per cent, of those have forfeited their selections, which reduces the number to 79,513. That is the number of people who should be in occupation now if they had remained there in accordance with the implied terms upon which they took up the land. The number of holdings in the colony in 1881 above one acre and up to 500 acres was

44,543. Of course no one will attempt to say that the whole of these 44,543 holdings are selections. In the first place, during the last twelve years, no selector could take up more than 320 acres, and this return embraces every holding up to 500 acres. I am driven, however, to use the return owing to the paucity of information which is available when anyone wishes to discuss a question of this sort. No return can be obtained which will give the number of holdings in the colony limited to 320 acres, which is the statutory limit of a selection. The number of holdings is given up to 300 acres, and then there is a jump to 500 acres. Consequently, when anyone tries to find the number of holdings up to 320 acres he has to take the number up to 500 acres, and then make a reduction on some theory of his own. In addition to this, a very large number of these holdings are held by people who have never been selectors at all; they are occupied by persons who purchased them either direct from the Crown, or at second-hand from other persons who purchased them direct from the Crown. Nearly all the farms in West Bourke, for instance, are either leasehold farms, or freehold farms not obtained by selection at all; and the same is the case in East Bourke and in the counties of Bourke, Grant, Mornington, and Dalhousie. A very large deduction, therefore, has to be made from the 44,543 holdings up to 500 acres, in order to arrive at the real number of selections now held by selectors who have taken up land under the system of selection. I estimate the number to be deducted at 15,000—of course some other honourable member may make a different estimate—and subtracting this number from 44,543 leaves 29,543 selectors who are now in possession of land selected under the various Acts, out of the 79,513 selectors who took up land. That is to say, there are gone—there are not represented on the land now—according to my calculation, 49,970 of the selectors. This calculation I made ten months ago, and used in a speech on this question at Collingwood. So far as I know, the honourable member for Creswick has never seen it, yet it is a remarkable fact that the estimate which he has given the House, and which was arrived at by an entirely different method, is the same as mine within 30, for last night he estimated that 50,000 of the selectors who have taken up land are not now to be found on the land. A calculation of that sort arrived at separately, on independent grounds, by two-honourable members, can hardly be, although possibly somewhat astray, very far from the facts of the case; and it may, perhaps, be accepted, until the Minister of Lands supplies the House and country with an authoritative return from his department which will put us right. The fact is that, go where you will throughout the country, and converse with whom you may on the subject of the lands, you will not proceed far before you find numbers of persons—I have always done so—full of stories of individual cases within their own knowledge of selectors who selected for no other purpose than to comply with the conditions of the Land Act, and then get the best price for their allotments they could possibly obtain. Assuming what I have described to be correct, is it a result with which the Legislature ought to be satisfied? Is it one which ought to induce us to base another land law on the same principle, with provisions enabling the Lands Department to get rid of the territory at an even greater rate? I say it is not.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—You forget that the purchase of a single acre may transfer a holding to a higher area.

Mr. Mirams.—But the Minister of Lands will see that, to make anything out of his interjection, he must show a reduction in the number of the one-acre areas, because the moment one is added to another allotment it must cease to stand as it formerly did in the records of the Lands Department. In no case can what the Minister of Lands alludes to touch my argument in the least, and, moreover, I think he will find it difficult to show that the single-acre allotments are less in number than they were before. I have gone into the question of area in exactly the same way I did into that of the number of selectors, but it is not necessary that I should explain the precise method to the House. 'Whether honourable members do or do not agree with me as to the exactitude of my results, they must admit, in the absence of authentic information on the point from the Lands Department, that there is every presumption that the figures I have given are based on truth. No one denies that a very large number of the selectors have sold out, and that a very considerable proportion of those who have done so have not only left their holdings but the colony also, to settle in other places. So that our Land Act, instead of settling people on our own soil, has operated to provide facilities for the settlement of Victorians in the neighbouring colonies. This removal of selectors is one of the most important of the subjects we are called upon to consider in relation to our land system. Perhaps there are some honourable members who, if they will not adopt my views on the point, will accept those of the *Argus*. Well, the *Argus* of 11th November, 1881, describes the results of the Land Act as follows:—

"But we know that the attempt to create a yeomanry on a large scale has only been partially successful. Selectors struggle on until they can get a title, and then in too many instances their holdings, which have been granted on easy terms, in the hope that they would be attached to the soil, go to swell the estates of the large land owners. Then with a sum of money in their pockets, which they have acquired in a great measure at the expense of the general body of the Victorian taxpayers, they take their departure for the neighbouring provinces, where the capital with which we have furnished them can command greater advantages."

And on the same question the *Sydney Morning Herald* of 24th February, 1882, speaks in the following

strain:—

"All those men who transferred their holdings in Victoria had no chance to select again. The law prohibited such a process. It was necessary for them to seek another colony, and the great majority were drawn across the Murray by the superior inducements of the land and land law of New South Wales. Immigrants to Victoria having in Victoria acquired capital by selling out, came to us with their earnings and their energies, and their experience as land speculators. Five years ago we felt their influence in a new flush of prosperity, especially in our southwestern district. While Victoria was mourning their departure, our land and Customs and railway returns were rapidly increasing; our free and comparatively illimitable land reserves were acting as a sponge, and we were becoming moist at our neighbour's expense. To some extent, the same conditions still exist. They might be perfectly satisfactory if only the present were to be considered; but it must be recognised that surely as Victoria has met her reckoning day, so are we advancing on ours. Land monopoly is not unknown in New South Wales. Dummyism is a very familiar word in our vernacular; the process begun across the border is continued here; land is going for a fraction of its value to incorporated companies and non-resident landlords. The lesser matters of continuous strife between selector and squatter, and consequent waste of energy, might be forgotten, could it be shown that we have in any degree learned the lesson Victorian history teaches, or that our selectors were as a body honest homemakers and tillers of the soil, and not merely birds of passage and transferrers."

That is the testimony of the leading journal of New South Wales as to the effect of our people going over to that colony to settle with money supplied them by the sale of land here which was given to them for a very different purpose, and on terms which would never have been allowed them except with the hope that they would remain firmly settled on our soil, and in that way indirectly and directly benefit this colony. That is an aspect of the case to which I think the Minister of Lands will do well to give his serious consideration, and upon which he ought to supply some authentic information before the debate proceeds much further. I will now deal with the proposal to extend the area of selection. Not satisfied with the 320-acre limit, the Minister asks us to double the area of selection, on the plea that the land already taken up is superior to that which remains to be selected, and that therefore, if the selectors of the future are to be treated equally with the selectors of the past, they ought to be able to take up 640 acres to the others' 320 acres. There is one view of this case to which I would like to direct attention, before I enter upon it more in detail—which may indeed be said to force itself on us from the start. If it is so necessary to deal out even-handed justice between the few people who now want to select and those who selected previously that we are bound to give the former 640 acres in order to put them on an equality with the selectors at the 320-acre rate, what justice are we going to mete out to the thousands and thousands in the colony who, when the land is all gone in 640-acre selections, will have none at all? Are our ideas of justice in the matter to be at an end when the 6,000,000 acres estimated by the honourable member for Creswick to be fit for agricultural purposes are exhausted? Are we to be just, honest, and fair to our own citizens only up to that point? Surely, if the Minister of Lands goes upon the ground that there ought to be equality of treatment in the matter, he could not possibly ask the House to pursue a more absurd course than the one he proposes. If justice is the word, and we ought to be just to those who come first, ought we not to be equally just to those who come last? That we have hitherto been getting rid of the national estate at such a rapid rate that there is little more of it left is surely a reason why we should decrease rather than increase the area of selection. If those who select now are not so well off as those who selected formerly, still they have advantages over those who will not be able to select in the future. Again, in the very next breath, the honourable gentleman told us that under the Bill those who formerly selected 320 acres would have the privilege of taking up another 320 acres. What then becomes of the contention that each of the present race of selectors ought to have 640 acres, because the value of the land he can select is one-half less than that of the land previously selected? Why, the ground upon which the argument is urged is cut from beneath it. If 320 acres taken up years ago is worth 640 acres taken up at the present time, where is the even-handed justice of giving the man of the smaller but equally valuable allotment the opportunity of selecting an additional 320 acres? By such treatment you immediately put him again ahead of the other. Unquestionably, according to the premises laid down by the Minister, if the former selector is to have 640 acres, the latter selector ought, to be placed on the same footing, to have 960 acres. In fact, the Minister shuts himself off altogether from using his equality argument. Then he must know that almost all the members of standing in the House who have preceded him in dealing with the subject of the lands have expressed themselves as opposed to the idea of extending the area of selection to 640 acres. I have by me volume upon volume of *Hansard* out of which I could read plenty of extracts showing that such members used the strongest possible language against the adoption of the 640-acre area, condemning it on a great variety of grounds. For example, it was denounced in the land debate of 1872 by the honourable member for Warrnambool, the then honourable member for Belfast who now represents Portland, and the honourable member for Brighton; in that of 1873, by the honourable member for Stawell, the then honourable member for the Wimmera (Mr. MacBain), the honourable member for Ararat, the honourable member for

Geelong (Mr. Berry), and the honourable member for Ballarat West (Major Smith); and in that of 1875-6, by the honourable member for Barwon, and the Hon. George Higinbotham, who represented East Bourke Boroughs.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—Yet the Land Bill of 1869 when it first left this House extended the area of selection to 640 acres.

Mr. Mirams.—That is true, but the feeling of the House and country proved to be so strong against the area being so large that the Assembly undid what it had done, and reduced the area to 320 acres.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—It was the Legislative Council that made the reduction.

Mr. Mirams.—And this Chamber agreed with the alteration for the reasons which will be found set forth in the speeches I refer to. Now, however, it is proposed to revert to the system which was then discarded. Let us next look at another aspect of the subject. The Minister of Lands, in his second-reading speech on the Bill, said:—

"We have nearly 32,000,000 acres of land to deal with at the present time. Of this area, as I have already pointed out, I believe that about 9,000,000 acres will be taken up under the selection clauses of our Bill. Owing to those 9,000,000 acres being so interspersed among the 32,000,000 acres, it is impossible to separate them except by selection. That is the only way in which the good land can be separated from land which is fit for no other purpose than grazing; and after the 9,000,000 acres have been selected, the balance of 22,000,000 acres will have to be dealt with in some different way."

But what does the honourable gentleman want to separate the agricultural from the grazing lands for? Is it not one of the objects of the Bill to combine grazing with agriculture? Is not the mixture and contiguity of such lands just what he would desire? He must admit as much himself, because I find a few lines further on, in the speech I refer to, that he stated as follows:—

"By this arrangement selectors will be able to rest and manure their agricultural holdings by running sheep over them, and by having two strings to their bow—agriculture and grazing, instead of agriculture only—they will be able to increase their chances of farming successfully and profitably."

Seeing that he aims at combining both industries, why does he not want to combine in each holding land of both the kinds suited to them? In any case, why does he want to separate them? His different statements can hardly be reconciled with his arguments. If he asked the House to believe that it would be difficult to mark out areas containing the required proportions of agricultural and grazing land, I would know what he was driving at, but he has done nothing of the sort. Further on he stated:—

"We estimate that it will take from 10 to 15 years before the 9,000,000 acres of agricultural land still available for selection will be taken up; and after those lands have been taken up, we will have, as I have already said, 22,000,000 acres still remaining. That is close upon the one-half of the total area of the colony. So that the statement that under our Bill the lands of the colony will be squandered is simply a cry of 'wolf' when there is no wolf."

Yet the honourable members who side with the Government in opposing the mode of settlement in advocacy of which I will speak presently are never tired of telling us that it is too late to resort to it, simply because all the lands of the colony are gone. How will they make their assertion fit in with that of the Minister of Lands? The next statement of the honourable member I will draw attention to is the following:—

"The improvements required are reduced from 20s. to 10s. per acre; and, as is now the case in New South Wales, youths and girls of 16, instead of 18, will be allowed to take up land. This concession with regard to age is intended for the benefit of parents of large families. For a long time it has appeared an anomaly that a youth of 18 should be able to take up 320 acres, and that the head of a family of five or six should not be able to take up more; but, by reducing the minimum age to 16, growing boys will be able to help their parents by taking up land."

But what is there special about the "youth of 18" that the minimum age should be reduced to 16? Will not a boy of 16 grow up in a few years, and become his own master, just as a boy of 18 will? If you cannot expect a boy of 18 to help his parents, how can you expect a boy of 16 to do so? Many honourable members will remember that, on the 27th June last, in response to a motion of mine, a return showing the number and area of selections which had been transferred during the nine months ending 31st March, of the present year, was laid on the table of the House. It was signed by the responsible officer of the department, and showed that 1730 selections were transferred, and that their area was 339,444 acres. The return just laid on the table refers to the operation of certain sections of the Land Act, but how far those sections bear on the question at issue I cannot yet tell. In the 12 years during which the present Act has been in operation there have been 16 periods of nine months each, and, if the figures given in the return which I have quoted may be taken as a criterion of those periods, we arrive at this result, that out of the total area selected, 5,271,000 acres have been transferred during the currency of the 12 years. The only explanation which I can see of the difference between the figures which I have quoted and those which appear on the return laid on the table to-night is that the particular nine months

upon which my figures bear formed an exceptional period, during which there was some unusual reason why selectors should transfer their holdings which was not in operation previously. If that is the reply to my argument, it will have to be proved that that particular period was of an exceptional character. I am strongly inclined to think, however, that that period was of an average character, and, if it was, and if the facts and figures adduced by the honourable member for Creswick (Mr. Richardson) are likewise correct as to the number of selectors who are not now in possession of the holdings which they originally took up, then I say we have arrived' at a serious aspect of the question, and one which we are entitled to have distinctly and definitely settled. If I and others are wrong in our calculations, there ought to be sufficient reliable information submitted to the House by the Lands Department to satisfy honourable members and the country as to the real operation of the existing law, not only as regards the number of transfers, but also the direction in which the land has passed away from the original holders. Honourable members will find from the departmental returns that, during the past 12 years, the size of the estates covering a given area has increased almost to the same extent that I, by my process of calculation, proved the holdings of the selectors to have been transferred. If we take the area held in large estates in 1870 and compare it with the area held in the same way at the present time, we shall find that the increase is almost parallel with the decrease of the selections which have been handed over to other than their original owners. If my statements are not borne out by the returns obtainable in the department, the House and the country are entitled to be supplied with correct information, whatever it may be, before they are called upon to consider and legislate upon a question of such vital importance as the disposal of the public estate.

Mr. W. Madden (Minister of Lands).—It is all given in the annual returns.

Mr. Mirams.—There is a great deal of information which is not given in the annual returns, and which I have had to work out, by a long process, in order to give the House the simple figures which I quoted' last night. There is another point in the speech of the Minister of Lands to which I desire to refer before leaving this branch of the subject, and it is in relation to the mode in which the honourable gentleman; proposes in the Bill to deal with what he calls the squatters' runs. I do not object to the method which he intends to adopt in relation to a portion of those runs. In my opinion he takes a very wise course in: determining that in the future only runs of a smaller area than have hitherto been granted shall be obtainable from the State. That is a move in the right direction. He also proposes to fix the rent of those runs at a certain sum, and then to put the rights of the runs up to public-auction, so that the highest bidder above the upset price may obtain them. I have not much objection to that, but I have grave objections to the mode by which the honourable gentleman proposes to ascertain the amount of rent to be fixed upon the runs in the first instance. The honourable gentleman said in his speech when introducing the Bill:—

"The grazing capabilities of the new runs will be assessed before they are offered to public competition, and a rental of 1s. per sheep will be charged."

I would like to know why, in fixing the amount of rent, the honourable gentleman proposes to continue the system which has been in operation' in dealing with squatters' runs for so many years past, and which has; worked so prejudicially to the public interests, and so greatly to the benefit of the pastoral tenants—that is the method of assessing the rent according to the number of sheep which the land will carry? I admit that, by putting the land up to public competition, we shall, to a very great extent, remove evils which existed when there was no competition. Under the new system the purchasers of runs may have to pay a pretty good premium to the State for their leases of three-years, but I shall show that even to that practice there are grave objections. It has frequently been said that the absolute capabilities of runs cannot be ascertained, unless either by the persons who have been using them, or by their immediate neighbours, and, consequently, competition for the right to have the runs for three years would be very limited indeed, and not likely to bring much to the State by way of premium. In the past, the lessees paid 1s., per head for the number of sheep which these runs were supposed to carry, and the consequence was that one-third more sheep than were paid for were placed upon the land. In August, 1877, I moved for a return covering the previous ten years, showing the proportion which the number of sheep paid for to the Government bore to the number actually placed upon the runs. That return showed that in 1867 the runs were assessed to carry 5,354,000 sheep, and that 7,512,000 were depastured, and that in 1868, 5,207,000 sheep were paid for, while 7,348,000 were depastured. Without going through the whole of the figures, I may say that they bear the same proportion through the whole of the ten years. The last year with which the return dealt was 1876, when the assessment of the runs was reduced owing to the amount of land taken for selection. In that year the sheep paid for numbered 3,248,000, while the number depastured was 4,834,000. In addition to the sheep, there were a large number of cattle and horses which were not taken into account in the return, and I have not included them because I left them to be regarded as a set-off against the freehold land which some of the holders of the runs must have possessed. There could, however, have been but little freehold land, because the total area in 1876, including the freehold land, was 21,906,000 acres, and if that area is compared with the quantity of land held under pastoral leases in the same year it will be found that

there is not much difference between the two. Whatever that difference may really be, I have allowed as a set-off against the cattle and horses not included in the return. In view of these facts, I assert that the Minister of Lands ought not to have proposed to continue the existing system in the assessment of runs. In my opinion he ought to value the runs, not on any fancy assessment, but on the number of sheep and cattle which the runs have been known to carry for several years past, and which can be easily ascertained from the books of the parties who have held them. I have now done with my criticism of the honourable gentleman's speech in moving the second reading of the Bill, and of the Bill itself. I suppose it will be said that my criticism involves a condemnation of those persons who, in the past history of the colony, were instrumental in passing the Land Acts to which I have referred; that I, as a member of the Liberal party, ought not to be so anxious to find fault with the results of what has been called liberal legislation; and that, in stating that that legislation has failed in obtaining the principal object towards which it was directed, I am inferentially casting a slur on the judgment or the patriotism of gentlemen who, in the past, have agitated land reforms, and by whose instrumentality the various measures were passed into law. I do not think that I am called upon to defend myself from those charges. Even assuming that the results of the various Land Acts which have been passed have been as prejudicial to the public as I have stated, I say that I am casting no slur at all. It must be said, however, that legislators, in framing those Acts, had the country and the future all before them, and knew nothing of what the results of their actions might be. Now, however, we are called upon to legislate with all the results of previous Acts behind us, and we have an opportunity of judging what is likely to be the best for the future of the colony. If those results have not been satisfactory, am I to be debarred from drawing attention to them and urging a new departure, because to do so will be an admission that previous land reformers, whom I respect and admire, have been misled? I believe I am not called upon to take any such position. My duty to my constituency, and to that section of the community which holds the same views as I do, compels me to speak, and I feel that I should be neglecting my duty if I allowed any feeling of reticence to interfere with me in my efforts to ascertain clearly what the results of past legislation in regard to land have been. It may fairly be said that, granting that land legislators may have been misled, they are not to be judged solely by the results of the various Land Acts, because it may safely be asserted that the greatest land reformers the colony has ever had were unable to secure all that they wanted; that they were compelled to accept compromises, and that, had they been able to pass the Acts in the form in which they desired them to remain, their actions would have had better results than we are now able to look back upon. I am certain that this would have been the case more particularly in two points. The results would have been different, in the first place, if it had been insisted, as was proposed, that no selector should be allowed to take land unless he could show that at least he had capital proportionate to the quantity of land he wanted to take, so that he could work it properly. It was not to be expected that a penniless man could take up land and attempt to comply with the conditions of the law without laying himself open to very great risk of having his holding taken from him by some means or other. There was another condition which ought to have been imposed, and which would have gone a long way to secure better results. It was advocated by a great many liberal legislators at the time, but they were unable to secure its adoption. I refer to the proposal to extend the probationary term beyond the three years which had to elapse before a selector got complete possession of the land. If land reformers in the past had had their way in these matters they would have taken means to prevent the land passing out of the selectors' hands, though it should be said that it often passed away under circumstances over which the selectors had no control. They went on the land without sufficient money to work it properly and to comply with the conditions, and a succession of bad seasons caused their holdings to slip into the hands of those from whom they had borrowed money. It will thus be seen that in saying that past Land Acts have failed in the grand object of settling people on the soil as permanent and industrious holders, and in making them good citizens, employers of labour, and purchasers of articles of commerce, I am not open to the charge of casting reflections on the land reformers of the past. Had the Duffy Land Act not contained the word "assigns," a large proportion of the land which went out of the hands of the selectors, many of whom were dummies, would have remained in the occupation of that class. If we are to part with the land at all, it is almost impossible to impose such restrictions as to prevent it from slipping out of the possession of those who first get it. Those who have capital and desire to obtain more land will get it from those who have selected from the Crown. There is no real remedy to prevent it, and in such transactions the State is defrauded of the difference between the amount paid by the selector and that received by him from the purchaser, for I contend that the capitalist who buys the land from the selector could equally well buy from the State. It makes no difference in a monetary point of view to the purchaser whether the land is bought from the one or the other, provided the price paid is the same in each case. It should also be remembered that the land thus sold by the selectors is not only obtained by them in the first instance as a gift, but the State also gives them a large annual payment into the bargain. I will assume that a selector has sold his farm at £5 per acre, and in doing so I have the authority of the Minister of Public Works, who says he knows of instances in which land, obtained from the State for 20s. an acre, to be paid in ten annual instalments of 2s. each, has been sold for £20 per acre cash down with no other

improvement than a fence. In the illustration which I am now giving, the selector receives only £5 per acre, and he has paid 20s. per acre for it in ten yearly instalments of 2s. each. Without deducting the amount spent in improvements, it will be seen that we give the selector 3s. on every acre that he holds in every one of the ten years—the difference between a rent of 5 percent, upon its capital value and the 2s. which he pays—and then we give him the land for nothing at the end of the ten years.

We now come to deal with the question of the land as it presents itself at the present moment. My remarks up to this time have been directed to the criticism of the proposals of the Government to meet the necessities of the case. I think I have shown that the provisions of the past have not accomplished the object we have in view. We have now to consider what is the best course to adopt to secure the fullest results and the best returns from the public estate, not only in the interests of those who go upon the land, but in the interests of the whole community to whom the public estate belongs. No one, I think, will deny that the land of the country belongs to the people of the country—that there has been no particular privilege given by Providence to any one class which could enable them to claim an exclusive right to the soil over any other class. It is the duty of the State, therefore, to make the best use it can of the public estate in the interests of the people who compose the State. We are, at the present time, the representatives of those people. Members of this House in dealing with the land stand exactly in the position of trustees for the public, and we are called upon now to undertake one of the most important duties that devolve upon us—to decide what is the best thing for us, as trustees, to do with the remainder of the public estate which is left under our control. We have no power over the past, however much we may regret the want of success which has followed our past efforts.

Mr. Grant (Chief Secretary).—We have.

Mr. Mirams.—I admit that, in the particular way in which the honourable gentleman is looking at the matter, we have something to do with the past. We have sold or parted with the land, but, of course, I admit that the State, backed by a majority of the community, could even determine to take it back again, or could determine to put a tax upon it. But all must acknowledge that it is much harder to go back upon the past, to impose conditions which are to be retrospective upon property we have parted with, than it is to deal with that which is still absolutely within our own control. Accepting that position, and assuming that the 35,000,000 acres which are left are all we have to deal with, it becomes our duty to consider what is best, in the interest of the whole community, to be done with the land that still remains. Although honourable members may dispute the extent to which our past system has been a failure, no one will assert that it has been an absolute success, or even so successful that we should go on in the same direction with light hearts. Looking at the question in its broad aspect, it seems to me that there are four parties who have to be considered. The first is that section of the community who are anxious to obtain the whole and sole possession of the lands of the colony. I do not say this in any carping spirit towards those persons, because we find the same feeling existing in other countries, and I presume that it is a natural feeling. It is especially a natural feeling in a country like this, that when men become possessed of wealth by any means—by trade, by mining speculation, or by fortunate gold discoveries—they should desire to invest their wealth in a landed estate, which, while yielding a certain and progressive return, will at the same time also secure for them and their children certain advantages which are only obtainable from the possession of landed property. That feeling is abroad in England at the present time to so large an extent that moneyed men are willing to give prices for landed estates which will only return them 2 per cent, on the capital invested. They look to the extraneous advantages which the position of landed proprietor will secure for them to make up the difference between the return they obtain for their money and the larger return they would receive if they invested it in some other direction. But, while admitting that that feeling is natural, I say that it is our duty, as trustees of the public estate, to ask ourselves how far we ought to give way to that feeling, and help those who entertain it to satisfy it—how far it is in the interests of the whole community that we should afford those persons an opportunity of securing for themselves the whole of the remaining portion of the public estate that they desire to secure. It is impossible, I think, for any man to consider the state of the land question in England, Ireland, and Scotland at the present time without coming to the conclusion that it would be a very bad thing indeed for the people of this colony if at any time the state of things which exists in those countries should exist here. We are bound to look forward in this matter, for we are here as pioneers of this great country, and we have to make laws which are to affect the future for generations yet unborn. As public men, intrusted with great public duties, we have not merely to think of what pleases "Little Peddlington" at the present moment—what this or that constituent may desire in relation to securing a selection! for himself or someone else. If we are to rise to the height of our position in considering this question and our responsibilities in dealing with it, we are bound to take a broad view, to look ahead, and to legislate for the future as well as the present. There is this party in the State which desires to secure the land. Then there is a second party in the State which is quite willing to lay hold of any law that is passed in order to assist the first class to obtain large estates if, in so doing, they can secure for themselves a few pickings out of the transaction. On this point it is unnecessary to do more than remind honourable members of the experience of the past. It is idle for us, like the ostrich, to put

our heads in the sand and suppose that we shall not be seen by our pursuers—to shut our eyes to the facts of the case, and to pretend that there is no such thing as dummyism or a dummy—that, whatever has taken place in the past, dummyism has died out. We are bound to recognise that there is a class in the community who are willing to help those who desire to accumulate large estates, if in the process they can put a certain percentage of profit in their own pockets. Then there is a third class—the true *bonâ fide* cultivator, who desires to obtain land for real settlement and cultivation. It is for that class that we profess to legislate, but, in professing to legislate for that class, we have in reality so legislated as to assist the two other classes in obtaining their several objects at the sacrifice of the public estate. Finally, apart from these three classes, there is the whole community, who have as much right to be considered as any of these three sections—more right, indeed, to be considered than any of the three, except it be the real *bonâ fide* selector who desires to become possessed of the soil, that he may settle upon it, and rear up his family upon it, and improve and cultivate it. The question then arises—How can we, in the light of past experience, so legislate as to secure the use of the land to those whom we desire to use it without assisting those to obtain it whom we do not desire to have it? I assume, of course, that there is no public man in the community who professes to desire to assist in any way in the further accumulation of large estates. Now, the experience of the past goes to prove that we cannot stop the action of the second class to whom I have referred, who are willing, to make use of the laws, to pass land on to the large estate holders while making a profit for themselves, so long as there is on the statute-book a law which permits the alienation of land in fee-simple. As long as the Crown parts with the fee-simple of the land, so long will the large estate owner, who wants to get land and has the money to pay for it, be able to procure it. The amount of money to be paid is nothing to him. He is like the moneyed man in England, who is content to obtain half the return from land that he could obtain by investing his money in other directions. No law can be made which will prevent the large estate owner from accomplishing his object and gratifying his desire to extend his estate, except a law which will prevent the fee-simple of the land passing out of the hands of the Government. If the Government keeps the land itself, it is utterly impossible that it can pass to anyone. But honourable members will say, if the Government keeps the land, what use will be made of it? I say the right thing for the Government to do with it, is exactly what those people who want it will do with it if they get it—what their descendants in the next generation will do with it, and their descendants in the generations following. When those people obtain land, we know that they do not let it lie idle and unproductive. They either devote it themselves to grazing or farming, or, in many cases, they let it out upon lease to others who will cultivate it. What will happen when the State has parted with all that remains of the land? Assuming that this Bill is passed, and that the 10 or 15 years, which the Minister of Lands says will be required to get rid of the remaining 9,000,000 or 10,000,000 acres of agricultural land have elapsed, we shall then have no more land to offer for farms upon the terms we have been offering it. What will happen then? Do we suppose that population is going to stop? Because the Government will have no more land to part with, do we suppose that everything will come to a stand-still? Nothing of the kind. Everyone knows that, immediately the State has got no more land to offer, those who desire to become farmers will be compelled to lease land from those who have been allowed to accumulate it. Consequently, instead of having a set of leaseholders with the Crown for landlord, dealing with them on broad national principles, and treating them as human beings and as fellow-citizens, we shall be gradually drifting towards the condition of things in the old country—a condition in which the cultivators will be the tenants of the owners, and will have to pay large rents, increasing year by year as the colony becomes more thickly settled, and the land becomes, in consequence, more valuable. Seeing that that will be the inevitable result of our present system, I ask, then, would it not be a wise thing for the State to step in now and make another experiment? Our past legislation has not been successful, and, even if we do not succeed by adopting the system which I advocate, at all events we shall even then be in a better position than if we adopt the proposal of the Government, and get rid of the remaining 9,000,000 acres of agricultural land in fifteen years—allowing the full time given by the Minister of Lands. We shall not be able to hark back when we have parted with the land in fee-simple. That experiment once entered upon, the result will be final. The land will be gone. But if the Government of the country step in now and say—"We will give this new system a trial; we will sell no more land, but lease it," even if that system does not produce the good results that I anticipate it will, we shall, at all events, when we have proved that, be in a position to try another experiment. We shall still have the land, and when the leases have expired, if we are satisfied that the system has not proved successful, we can again return to the present system of selection, or adopt any other system of disposing of the land which may find favour with the public at that particular time. The Minister of Lands shakes his head. I know the honourable gentleman is thinking about the Yarra bank leases and the difficulty there would be in preventing the leaseholders from turning their leases into freeholds. I shall deal with that aspect of the question presently. There is not a statement or an assertion which has been levelled against the proposal in the press or in this House which I am not prepared to answer.

I wish now to say a few words as to what I understand by the leasing system. I desire to do so because I

have noticed that, in the whole of the discussion in relation to this question, the public have been systematically misled, either wilfully or ignorantly. All through the discussion the word "leasing" has been played upon, and it has been assumed that the advocates of the principle of leasing in this colony intend to follow the leasing system of the old country. It is assumed that the same sort of thing is intended, that the same conditions would surround it, that the same disabilities would exist on the part of those who would hold the leases, and that the same advantages must necessarily come to the State as accrue to private owners leasing farms on the conditions which obtain at present in the old country. Now there is no similarity whatever between the two systems, except in name. Everyone who knows anything of the conditions under which land is held at home knows that the tenants have to pay enormous rents, and that they have to make enormous improvements, which go into the pockets of the landlords. I do not pretend to say for a moment that in all the leases held in those countries all the improvements made by the tenant go to the landlord. But I say that, taking the average—and I can only deal with them in the bulk—the leaseholders in England have to leave their improvements, without any remuneration, on the land when the term of their leases has expired. If it were not so, where would be the ground for the agitation which is going on in England at present to secure a land law which will give the farmers there the three things which the people of Ireland have been fighting for, and which go under the name of "the three F's?" All over England the farmers' clubs and associations are agitating for the introduction into the Imperial Parliament of a Bill which will secure for the English tenants the same rights as the Irish tenants have obtained under the law which gives them "the three F's." One of the three F's is that they shall have their improvements, or the portion of their improvements which remains unused when their time expires; this is classed under the head of "free sale." They wish to have the power of selling freely, without let or hindrance, their portion of the improvements which remains unused when their lease terminates. On the question of the conditions under which leases are held at home, Professor Caird, who is regarded in England as one of the highest authorities on the land question, said in a recent lecture:—

"Between the year 1857 and 1875 the agricultural land in the United Kingdom, was augmented in value by £331,000,000. Of this enormous sum only about £60,000,000 was due to the landlords. The remainder was created either by improvements erected by the tenants or by the operation of natural causes, such as the growth of contiguous towns or the construction of railways. Now, making the most ample allowance for what John Stuart Mill termed the 'unearned increment'—estimating it at one-half of this increase—the sum of at least £136,000,000, the produce of the industry and capital of the farmer, hast in the course of eighteen years, gone into the pockets of the landlords."

The attempt of honourable members in this House, and the attempt of writers for the press, who disapprove of the leasing system, to class the kind of leasing which contains conditions producing results of that sort with the proposal which I advocate is either the result of the grossest ignorance, or it is purposely done to mislead the public on the real issue. Taking the figures which I have read as the groundwork of my illustration, what would be the result if we had the leasing system which I advocate here? If this land had belonged to the Government of Victoria, instead of to the English landlords, and the increase in eighteen years had been exactly the same, the £60,000,000 expended by the State would be its own property, the natural increase from the growth of population and the construction of railways would also be the property of the State—and the increase from such causes would be greater in this colony, where we spend much more in proportion to the population on the construction of railways than they do at home—but the £136,000,000 expended by the tenants would be absolutely their own property, not to be touched by the State. Not only that, but there would be no increase in the rent for the next term of the lease based upon the expenditure of that £136,000,000. Whatever increase of rent was asked for the second term should only be asked for by virtue of the increase in the value of the land brought about by the operation of other causes—by the expenditure of the State, the landlord, on the land, or by the expenditure of the community, also through the State, upon the construction of railways, or by the increased value given to the land by the increase of population, without any effort on the part of the leaseholder. Those increases would be the fair property of the State, but the £136,000,000 of improvements effected by the tenants would be absolutely their own to sell to the next comer, if they did not get the renewal of the lease, and to keep and use without any increased rent on account of them if they themselves became the possessors of the land for another term. Are those two systems at all comparable? Is it fair, is it just, is it statesmanlike to talk as though they were the same? Does it show any recognition of the real issue at stake for honourable members to tell us that leaseholds in England, held under such conditions as I have mentioned, are not popular, and that consequently leaseholds, held under totally different circumstances and conditions, would not be popular here? It appears to me that when the opponents of the leasing system in this colony have resort to that mode of dealing with the question, it can only be because they have no real genuine argument to offer against the system on its merits, and they are driven to condemn it by a side-wind since they cannot confute it by fair, open, and straight argument. The next proposal I would make in connection with the system would get rid of another objection which is very strongly urged against the leasing system—the objection that backstairs political

influence would always enable Crown tenants to obtain advantages from the State which they could not obtain from private owners. Honourable members in this House are never weary of referring to the leaseholds on the south bank of the Yarra as an illustration in support of that argument.

Mr. Bent (Minister of Railways).—Hear, hear.

Mr. Mirams.—Let me tell the honourable gentleman who cheers that statement that there is nothing in the illustration at all. In the first place, those who advocate the system of State leaseholds do not believe in leaving it in the power of any Government to be influenced by any backstairs influence whatever. Our proposal is that the public estate should be taken out of the hands of the Government of the day, that it should be put entirely apart from political influence, and managed by commissioners appointed for the purpose, exactly as savings banks are managed by commissioners, or as the Duchy of Cornwall is managed by commissioners in the interests of the Prince of Wales. The commissioners would manage the land in the interests of the community, precisely as the directors of any corporation manage any land that it may have in freehold in the interests of the corporation. This system would obviate the objection that political backstairs influence could be brought to bear in order to wrest, in the interests of one or two individuals, concessions which the country was not prepared to make to the people as a whole. As to the Yarra bank leaseholds, let honourable members recollect the facts. We had a system going on in the colony by which every one else in the community was permitted to obtain the freehold of his property. A selector who went up the country and took up land could obtain the freehold of it; a miner who had taken up land originally under a miner's right could get the freehold of it; a man who, under the "novel industry" provision, established a vineyard, or an olive yard, or anything else of the kind, could do the same thing. All these people were allowed, without restriction, to obtain freeholds; but while this system was going on in connection with every one else, was it not somewhat strange, and somewhat unfair, that another set of men who, whether wisely or not, were allowed to take up certain sections on the south bank of the Yarra, should be placed in a different position? Remember that these sections were also taken up under the "novel industry" provision of the Land Act. The land was taken up under, exactly the same conditions as were imposed on those people who went further up the country and devoted their land to other purposes. Under the "novel industry" section one gentleman established a brewery, though I never knew before that a brewery was a novel industry. I am told that another gentleman built a public-house under the same section. Certainly there is nothing novel in a public-house. But I ask, was there anything to be surprised at in the fact that when every other class in the community which took up land was allowed to purchase the freehold, the persons who took up land on the south bank of the Yarra should ask for the same privilege? I am not at all surprised that they did ask for it, and I am not at all surprised that the Government of the day—I think it was the McCulloch Government who gave the first permission—granted their request. If the Government had refused, they would have been in the anomalous position of refusing to one section of the community what was being granted to every other section. But that position of affairs is not on all fours with the condition of things which I would like to see carried out, namely, that no one should get the freehold. If the law provided that no one should have the freehold, it would be the exception to give it; and it would be very much harder to make the exception in that direction than it was to make the exception in the case of that land held under lease. I wish to draw attention to another point. Certain parties who held land under lease on the south bank of the Yarra were allowed to convert their tenure into freehold, and, after a while, Other parties who had also taken up land there on the same terms asked the Government, of which the honourable member for Geelong was the head, to grant them the same concession. That Government are generally blamed for leaseholds on the south bank of the Yarra being converted into freeholds, but they simply, when they were asked to do so, granted one set of people what preceding Governments had done for others. Previous Governments had allowed persons holding land on the south bank of the Yarra, under the very same conditions, to convert their leaseholds into freeholds, and how could the honourable member for Geelong refuse to treat other people in the same way? He could not do so. The honourable gentleman agreed to allow them to turn their leaseholds into freeholds, but he went out of office a day before the expiration of the thirty days allowed by law within which any contract for the sale of Government land can be cancelled. Mr. Service was the head of the next Government, and he refused to carry out the arrangement made by the honourable member for Geelong. Very soon afterwards Mr. Service was ejected from office, and the honourable member for Geelong came back again, and fulfilled the promise which he made when he was previously in office. Apart from the political aspect of the question altogether, the honourable gentleman would have acted unfairly and unjustly to those lessees if he had not permitted them to convert their leaseholds into freeholds, as others had been permitted to do by preceding Governments. If the honourable member had taken the first step in that direction he would have been to blame in the matter; but whatever blame attaches to the conversion of the leasehold tenures on the south bank of the Yarra into freeholds is attachable to the Government who first sanctioned it, and not to succeeding Governments, who simply placed one set of lessees on an equality with others. The case of the Yarra bank leases, however, does not at all upset the proposal I am advocating, because if it was the law, and not at all dependent upon an act of administration,

that there should be no further alienation of land, I venture to assert that no Government would go behind that law, and convert leaseholds into freeholds by an act of administration.

An HONOURABLE MEMBER.—They could not do so.

Mr. Mirams.—True, they could not do so. I therefore hope that we shall hear no more about the leases on the south bank of the Yarra being a "shocking example," and a direct proof that if the Crown lands were leased, instead of being sold in fee-simple, the tenants would be sure in time to get them converted into freeholds. In connection with the details of the scheme which I advocate, there is one point to which I desire to direct the attention of the House. I have said that I would have the whole of the Crown lands placed in the hands of commissioners appointed for the purpose, who should deal with the public estate in the interests of the public—look after the interests of the public in the same way that the trustees of a private estate would look after their wards if they were placed in charge of any. I would therefore lay down no stringent unalterable conditions as to the area to be leased to any individual, the length of tenure, or the terms upon which the land should be occupied. I would leave the commissioners absolutely free, within certain bounds to be settled by the Legislature, to make whatever terms they considered best with persons who wanted to lease Crown lands, exactly in the same way that private lands are leased. Does any one suppose, for instance, that the land in Collins-street belonging to St. James' Church, which is about to be leased to private individuals, will be leased upon exactly the same terms, and for the same length of time, in every case? It might suit one tenant to pay a large ground rent on condition that at the end of the term for which his lease was granted he was to retain the ownership of the buildings which he erected on the land; it might suit another tenant to pay a small ground rent, and to let the buildings belong to the trustees of the Church at the expiration of his lease; and it might suit a third tenant to make a different arrangement from that entered into by either of the other two. With reference to Crown lands, a great variety of arrangements might be entered into in the interests of the tenant on the one hand and in the interests of the State on the other. It might suit one man to go into the ranges, and take up a large area of land absolutely useless for cultivation, and at the present time almost valueless to the State. The trustees of the public estate might be willing to let him have it on a long lease at a certain rental, but he might prefer to take it on a shorter lease at a lower rental, and the trustees might see their way to meet his views. The Crown lands should, in fact, be absolutely in the control of these commissioners to deal with them in the same way that they would deal with them if they were their own property. Does anybody suppose that the Hon. W. J. Clarke, in dealing with his immense estate, binds himself to grant leases in every case for the same length of time, and on the same terms? Nothing of the kind. He suits his terms and conditions to his customers. He makes one sort of arrangement with one man, and another with another man, looking after his own interests in each case; and that is what the commissioners of the public estate would do if they were allowed—within proper limits fixed by law—to deal with the Crown lands in a business-like way. We would then have an immensely improved estate, bringing in a revenue which would increase every year. I have now given a rough outline of the proposals which those who advocate the leasing system in this colony are prepared to support; and I think honourable members must admit that the scheme is as different from the condition of things which exists in England as day is from night, or summer from winter. We are told by others—and those who adopt this line of argument appear to think that it is a magnificent one—that the idea of leasing the lands is a fad, that it is new-fangled, and a craze. I was highly amused at the Minister of Lands when, in the speech which he made nearly five months ago, he said that the idea of leasing the lands was a "new-fangled theory," as if he thanked God that he was not as other men are, that he was not such a fool as to be taken up with anything "new-fangled." I can imagine that if the honourable gentleman and those who think with him had lived in the olden times they would have been among those who voted for imprisoning Copernicus for daring to believe that the earth revolves round the sun. That was a newfangled notion when it was brought forward, and I have no doubt that there were persons of the same calibre as the Minister of Lands who howled at Copernicus for daring to introduce it, and who jeered at his theory as a "fad" and a "craze." I can also imagine the honourable gentleman forming one of the conclave who sentenced Galileo, who compelled him to repeat the seven penitential psalms every day, and made him withdraw his statement that the world revolves round the sun. Sir, every new proposal that has been brought forward in opposition to previously-conceived notions has been branded, traduced, sneered at, and derided as "new-fangled" by those who had not brains to understand it, or who were interested in maintaining the old system. The phrase "new-fangled" is a very convenient one to be applied to the leasing system by those persons who cannot answer the arguments in support of it; but I will point out, in the first place, that the leasing theory is not new-fangled, and, in the second place, that if it is new-fangled, I am in very good company when I advocate it. I could, if it were necessary, quote numerous extracts from writers on political economy—men of acknowledged thought, power, and influence in political circles in England in their day, and whose words are read and honoured at the present time—who have held exactly the same view that I hold in regard to the leasing system; and it is because I have seen it held by them, and have read their advocacy of it, that I consider it to be my duty to do what I can to induce honourable members to

make use of this opportunity, almost the last which may be afforded them, of securing at least a partial acceptance of the theory in this country. Not only has the leasing system been advocated by some of the greatest political thinkers in England, but it is not even new in this country. The idea of leasing the lands in Victoria is almost as old as the Constitution. We obtained the Constitution in the year 1856, and the agitation for the adoption of a system of leasing the lands was first commenced in 1857, and it has been continued intermittently ever since both in this House and the country by some of the foremost men in the colony, and yet the Minister of Lands tells us that it is a new-fangled theory. I will trouble the House with a brief epitome of the history of the agitation in favour of the leasing system. So far as my researches have enabled me to discover, the first person who advocated the theory in this colony was Dr. Hickson, who delivered a series of lectures upon it, which were reported in the *Argus* in 1856 and 1857. In 1857 the leading journal of the colony, which now sets itself up as the champion of the selling theory, and pats itself forward as the backer of those who call the leasing theory a craze, advocated the leasing of the lands in almost exactly the same words that I am using to-night. I will quote from two leading articles in the *Argus*, one of which appeared on the 16th of May, 1857, and the other on the 27th of the same month. The first of those leading articles said—

"But to return to the description of tenure we would propose instead. It is necessary that the land should be thrown open freely to labour, and by giving an absolute right over all improvements, either to sell or bequeath them to successors, every power will be conferred which now is conferred by the fee-simple of the land itself, except that of locking it up uselessly. The title may be made good and transferred from one to another without all the legal technicality which we have adopted from a country whose lands are held under laws based on the requirements of a feudal system, and which we are foolishly endeavouring to perpetuate."

We were then told by the *Argus* that the colony was foolishly endeavouring to perpetuate the system under which the lands were held in England. We have foolishly perpetuated that system up to the present time, and now the same journal is doing its utmost to continue a system which it then declared to be foolish, and warned the colony against adopting. The article proceeded to say—

"The unproductive branches of the Government expenditure may be much reduced, and taxes will eventually assume the less objectionable form of rent, which every one is willing to pay for what he derives a direct benefit from. As a tenant willingly undertakes to pay his landlord a portion of the proceeds of his labour for permission to appropriate the remainder, so a tenant of the public lands may be fairly called on to contribute for the general good a portion of the produce of the land he is allowed the sole use of. Instead of a number of petty landlords exacting as much as they can from their tenants, we would have the Government, as the State landlord, managing the public property so as to yield the most benefit to the community, and only taking from the tenants what is absolutely necessary."

The *Argus* had no doubt about the value of the leasing system at that time. Its only anxiety was that the public might not see the matter in the same light that it did. The article continued as follows:—

"If this principle is found to be the correct one and brought into operation, all other taxes for the purpose of revenue may be gradually abolished, and the rent required from the tenants of the public lands will be very much less than what is now paid to private individuals, and need be but a small percentage on the present purchase money."

These statements are on the lines of what I have said here this evening, and on previous occasions, and elsewhere. On the 27th of the same month the *Argus* returned to the same subject, and used stronger language, if possible, in advocacy of the adoption of the very system which it now cannot find words sufficiently strong to traduce and malign. On that date it made the following remarks in a leading article:—

"In a recent article under this heading we endeavoured to sketch the groundwork of a plan for the settlement of the lands of the colony, which we should very much like to see fairly tried. If one district were to be set apart for the experiment, it would soon become apparent whether or not the theory is sound and reduceable to practice. It is only by seeing it in operation that the prejudice which many are inclined to entertain against the proposed plan, merely because it savours of innovation, can be removed; and it is surely worth our taking some trouble to ascertain if it is possible to carry out free-trade in the only way in which it can be brought to perfection, and to throw off for ever a moiety of the burthen the productive interests have now to bear. By selling the land, or in any way giving to individuals the power of converting it into a monopoly, one tax is imposed on all consumers of its produce for the benefit of the landlords; and to obtain a revenue for the public service additional taxation of another kind has to be resorted to. If one of these taxes would be sufficient, why need we impose them both? The public interest requires that only one of those should be raised, and no one objects to pay a fair rent for the use of land, but there are few who will not evade the payment of a tax when possible; and this tendency to evasion (we might almost call it an instinct) necessitates the employment of a large number of officials merely for the prevention of smuggling, the support of whom consumes much of the revenue. In the possession of a public property capable of being made to yield an income much beyond our wants, for the legitimate expenditure of Government, we have the opportunity of removing for

ever the second and more odious portion of this burthen, and of very much lightening the first, and at the same time of showing to the world what free-trade really means. Until the revenue is raised altogether by a system of direct taxation, this can only exist in a mutilated state."

These were the sentiments of the *Argus* in 1857, and they could not be more forcibly put by the most thorough advocates of the "new-fangled theory" who can now be found in the present community of the colony. The arguments put forward by the *Argus* in 1857 are absolutely unanswerable, and they cover nearly all the ground of the theory. Now why was the leasing system not adopted at that early stage of the colony, when it could have been adopted with comparative ease, and when its adoption would have saved the colony from the evils under which it now groans in consequence of bad land legislation? Sir, the Hon. George Higinbotham, on the floor of this House, within the hearing of many honourable members now present, showed that it was not adopted because of a letter which Mr. John Stuart Mill wrote to a gentleman in this colony. That letter turned the tide of public opinion, which was then setting strongly in the direction of the leasing system. I will read an extract from a speech made by Mr. Higinbotham on the land question in this House on the 30th June, 1875, on this point. It is as follows:—

"Mr. John Stuart Mill, in 1858, raised the very argument which the honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Tucker) now raised. He expressed an opinion, which he conveyed in a letter to a gentleman connected with the press in Melbourne, that it was in vain to attempt to institute a system of leasing public lands, because, as he said, men, and especially Englishmen, were so desirous of possessing the fee-simple that, although leasing was the best system in his opinion for dealing with the land, it was a system which he did not believe would be carried into effect in our English community. An attempt which was then being made to obtain the public approval of the leasing system was abandoned in deference to the opinion expressed by that great authority at that time."

I admit that people who want land desire to obtain the fee-simple, but what I ask is—Are we bound to give way to that desire in order to satisfy one-tenth of the community, when by doing so the other nine-tenths will suffer? It is our duty, as legislators, to legislate for the community as a whole, and not for the satisfaction of the desire of some persons, the gratification of which may be inimical to the rest of the people. Mr. Higinbotham went on to say—

"Mr. John Stuart Mill, however, completely altered that opinion before he died. For a year and a half before his death he advocated, very powerfully and in a variety of forms, a system of leasing. He even went beyond that, for he advocated the expenditure of capital in recovering for the State in England the great bulk of the alienated lands."

Mr. Berry.—We shall have to do that here.

Mr. Mirams.—I am sure of it; and therefore it is advisable to make the quantity of land which we shall have to repurchase as little as possible by keeping what we have got in our own hands. I am as satisfied as I am that I stand here that in the future—I don't know how long that future will be—we shall have to buy back the lands from those who have got them, and we shall have to repurchase them upon terms and conditions that the country will be ill able to afford, and that will bring down upon those who now persist in parting with the Crown lands, and thus make the repurchase more difficult, the curses of those upon whom the duty of effecting the repurchase will be imposed. Mr. Higinbotham added the following remarks in reference to Mr. John Stuart Mill:—

"And some time before his death he communicated to a gentleman in this city the opinion he then entertained that the people of Australia had a great opportunity, which Englishmen had lost, by being able to save from alienation the public lands in these colonies yet unalienated, and to preserve them for the use of future generations."

This, I think, disposes of the question as to whether the idea of leasing the lands is a new-fangled theory as far as other countries are concerned. But, in addition, what do I find? That there is hardly a public man in this country who has not advocated the leasing system at one period or another. The leasing theory died out for a time in the colony after 1857, and a number of Land Acts were passed dealing with the lands on an entirely different basis; but in 1871 the agitation cropped up again, and a Land Reform League, with which the late Mr. Gresham was prominently associated, was started, the main object of it being to secure a system of leasing instead of alienation. The *Argus* was then true to the principle that it advocated in 1857, though it did not espouse it so strongly, being apparently not quite sure whether it would be exactly in the interests of its constituents to speak out so boldly in favour of leasing as it did in 1857. However, one extract from its issue of the 8th January, 1872, will satisfy even the Minister of Lands that he was altogether wrong when he talked about the leasing theory. The *Argus* of that date said—

"The programme of a proposed society, to be called the Land Tenure Reform League of Victoria, has been issued, and, whatever objection may be taken to some of the items it contains, it cannot be denied that the ends which it will be its endeavour to attain have received the sanction and approval of many of the most eminent

political economists of the day."

The objects of the league were as follows:—

- The immediate cessation of the sale of all Crown lands.
- The fee-simple of the public domain to vest in perpetuity in the State—that is, the people in their corporate capacity.
- Occupancy, with fixity of tenure, subject to rental for revenue purposes. Transfer of tenant right.
- Land already alienated from the State to be repurchased by the State. No resale to individuals to be permitted.
- The gradual abolition of all indirect taxes whatever. The revenue of the State to be derived solely from the rentals of the land."

After saying that the objects of this league had "received the sanction and approval of many of the most eminent political economists of the day," the *Argus* went on to state—

"The idea of permanently vesting the ownership of the land in the Government of a country in trust for the general community is by no means new."

I hope that after this we shall hear no more from the Minister of Lands or from anybody else about leasing being a "new-fangled theory." The next public action in reference to leasing to which I will allude is that taken by the late Mr. George Harker, a gentleman who, I suppose, will be admitted by every member of this House to have been a cute business man, a man of integrity, and a man of considerable ability. Mr. Harker for many years represented the constituency which I have now the honour to represent. In 1873 he brought before this House a resolution to give effect to the objects of the Land Tenure Reform League, of which he was a member.

Mr. Bent (Minister of Railways).—And he bought an estate at Healesville the next day.

Mr. Mirams.—I have nothing to do with that, and it has no relevancy to the point at issue. If Mr. Harker did what the law allowed him to do, that fact does not make the law a good one. I will read two or three extracts from Mr. Harker's speech in proposing the resolution to which I refer. He said—

"It has always appeared to me that, when we had self-government conferred upon us, all the Crown lands were virtually handed over to the whole of the people of the colony. If that be true, what right had we, as legislators, to alienate any portion of that which belonged to the whole community for the benefit of a small portion of the people? It seems to me that, in doing so, we have infringed upon a natural right. The right of the whole of the people to the lands of the colony is as much a natural right as the right to the free use of the atmosphere which surrounds us, or of the water which we necessarily require. I think I shall be able to show that the way in which we have allowed the best lands of the colony to be alienated is a policy that cannot be justified. . . . Now under what circumstances have the best lands of the colony been allowed to pass away from the Crown? Virtually the possessors of them have obtained them for nothing."

Now this is exactly what I have repeated to-night, and what I have told honourable members on every occasion that I have had the opportunity of doing so. Mr. Harker further remarked—

"What I mean is that the best lands in the colony are certainly worth 2s. 6d. per acre per annum as a mere rental; and if selectors have got the fee-simple of those lands—as they have in numbers of cases—on payment of 2s. 6d. per acre per annum for eight successive years, the State has virtually passed away the freehold of the people without getting any money equivalent for it whatever."

This is exactly the ground I take. Mr. Harker went on to say—

"The principle of the State leasing the land is in actual operation in this colony in connection with mining leases. Does the State find any difficulty in carrying out the provisions of those leases? Is it not quite an easy matter for the State to see both that the rents are collected and the conditions of the leases are duly fulfilled, complicated though they be? If that is so, I really know no reason why the leasing system should not be applied, with equal success, to the whole of the unsold lands of the Crown."

This is the view which was maintained by Mr. Harker in 1873. He moved an amendment on the Land Bill then before the House, which amendment gave rise to a debate, and was supported by several honourable members, amongst whom was the present Chief Secretary, who on that occasion said—

"For myself, however, having given the matter a great deal of thought, for some time past, I must say I entirely agree with the honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Harker) in everything he has said. . . . The arguments of the honourable member for Belfast (Mr. Wrixon) against the State leasing the lands instead of selling them are, I think, more of a theoretical than a practical nature. . . . It might, perhaps, not be advisable to adopt the leasing principle in cities, towns, and boroughs. There the Crown might still continue to sell the fee-simple of the land as an inducement to persons to erect good buildings."

I don't agree with that, because I see improvements going on all around me on leasehold land.

"The honourable member for Belfast really admitted the point for which the honourable member for Collingwood contended when he said that alienation should be backed up by a tax. . . . It has been suggested that it is too late in the day to begin a new system when so much land has already been alienated."

And the same parrot cry is raised now, although in the meantime we have managed to get rid of 7,000,000 or 8,000,000 acres. But there was no force in the cry then, and there is, if possible, even less force now. Surely, the smaller the area of the land left to us the more reason there is why we should take care of it. The honourable gentleman also said—

"If it belonged to a private individual, and he desired to turn it to the best advantage, he would probably not sell an acre of it, and why should the State?"

I repeat that question, and I leave the Chief Secretary to find an answer to it, and to himself. Mr. Harker's resolution was negatived without a division, but Mr. Higinbotham, not content with that situation, moved a further amendment, in the shape of a string of resolutions, one of which embodied the leasing system in a modified form, and it was supported by the present Chief Secretary, the honourable member for Ballarat West (Major Smith), and Mr. Burt, then one of the members for North Melbourne. Finally, it went to a division, and among the names of those who voted for it I find those of Mr. Bent, the Minister of Railways.

This is not the only division of the kind at the head of which I find the same name. The other names are—Mr. Burt, Mr. Cope, Mr. Harker, Mr. Higinbotham, Mr. Phillipps, Mr. Richardson, Mr. A. T. Clark, and Major Smith. Many of these gentlemen are still in public life, and I am most anxious to see how far they retain their old principles, or how far they have been led astray by the new theories of the *Argus*. The same question came up again in 1875, in connection with the Land Bill introduced by Mr. Casey, the then Minister of Lands. On that occasion the present Speaker, in his capacity as the representative of South Grant, moved a resolution in favour of leasing, with the reservation that every leaseholder should be allowed to purchase a small portion of land as a site for his homestead, but it was negatived without a division. However, practically the same matter was brought forward a second time, in the shape of a resolution moved by Mr. Godfrey, a gentleman who was then one of the members for East Bourke, and who is now seeking election to a seat in the other House for the Southern Province. At that time he gave a hearty support to the leasing principle, but, like many others, he has fallen away from his first love. A division was taken on the question, and among the names of those who voted in favour of Mr. Godfrey's proposition were those of Mr. Bent, Mr. Campbell, Mr. Dixon, Mr. Gaunson, Mr. Higinbotham, Mr. James, Mr. Johnstone, Mr. Jones, Dr. Madden, Mr. Moore, Mr. Patterson, Mr. Purves, Major Smith, Mr. Woods, Mr. A. T. Clark, Mr. Godfrey, Mr. Berry, Mr. Crews, Mr. Levien, and Mr. Grant. The latter honourable gentleman also spoke on the subject as follows:—

"He had listened with a great deal of attention to almost all the speakers during the discussion, and nothing had transpired to change the views which he expressed on the second reading of the Bill of 1873, namely, that he believed that land was in its very essence inalienable, but that, like all theories, this was apt to be subject to modification. He then stated his opinion that country lands ought to be leased, and that lands in cities, towns, villages, and suburbs should be sold by auction. To that opinion he still adhered."

Up to 1875, then, the honourable gentleman held views in favour of the system I am now advocating, and I wait to see how far he will act consistently with them at the present juncture. It is unnecessary I should follow the course of the question further. The debates on the subject honourable members can study at their convenience, and I will only say respecting them that they will well repay any one who desires to give the matter full and impartial consideration, and who is not prepared to be led away by party interests, and by personal or political prejudices. It will especially profit such an one to read the speeches of Mr. Higinbotham on the point, for the arguments he advanced run all through the discussion. Sir, the pages of *Hansard* for 1873 and 1875 are full of instruction with respect to the leasing principle, and it is a disgrace to the House and to the country that their study is so systematically neglected. I have now given the history of the question, so far as this country is concerned, up to the present time. I will next deal with some of the objections urged to the introduction of the leasing system under existing circumstances. First among them, not because of its weight, but because it is the one most persistently reiterated, is that it is too late to begin. It is a complete answer to that argument—if you will dignify it by calling it an argument—that no man in his senses would think of applying it to the case of his own individual property. Were a man among us to declare that because he had wasted half his substance it was of no use to take any care of the other half, we would have little hesitation in declaring him insane. Certainly we would pronounce him utterly unfit to be intrusted with the management of his own affairs. How can honourable members of this Chamber, elected to their seats by the people of the country, presumably because of their ability to grasp large and important questions, and deal with them in a practical and business-like way, justify to themselves opposition to the proposal I am discussing on any such ground? I could understand a similar objection being urged against some two-penny-half-penny question, the settlement of which was a matter of no importance whatever, but it passes my comprehension how honourable members, with 35,000,000 acres to deal with, and the future interests of a noble country like this to consider, can dare to let their names go down to posterity—to generations yet unborn—as those of men who were content to ignore those interests on the flimsy pretence that, having spent so much, it was too late to begin to take care of what was left. I say that the fact that so much of our national estate is gone affords all the more reason why we

should do everything we can, even if we go beyond what we might have been content to do at the beginning, to save what is left in the interests of those who will come after us. If any honourable member opposed to leasing has got any real argument, if he can show that the leasing principle is a wrong one—that it violates a fundamental law of our nature, and is against right and justice to individuals—I would be glad to hear him; but it is too much to elevate into even the appearance of an argument a motive for procedure which every man here must know in his heart he would not be fool enough to let influence him with respect to his own private affairs. The next objection is that leaseholders will not cultivate. I ask those who take up that ground, and especially the newspaper writers who are everlastingly dinning their assertions on the point into our ears, upon what terms land in England, Scotland, and Ireland is cultivated at the present time? I venture to say, without referring to any figures, that nine-tenths of the land cultivated in England is held on a leasehold tenure, if not a tenure that is worse, namely, one that depends simply on the will of the landlord. Why, those who tell the people of this country, and expect them to believe it, and to accept it as an argument against introducing the leasing principle here, that land is not generally cultivated on a leasehold tenure, might just as well say that the sun does not shine, or the moon does not rise—or, in fact, make any other ridiculous statement they choose which every one knows to be contrary to fact. For practically the whole of the land cultivated in England is held on a leasehold tenure, and the same may be said of more than half of the land in Belgium, a country where the soil is cultivated in the highest manner and to the highest extent, and with the highest results. I take the latter fact from a pamphlet, copies of which the representative of Belgium at the Exhibition left behind him here for the general information, and which is full of instruction respecting social and political matters in that country. But, for statistics which fly in the face of the objection I am dealing with, we need not go further than our own country—the one in which we now live—because it is well known that a very large portion of the cultivated land in this colony is held and cultivated on a leasehold tenure. Would honourable members like to know how large that portion is? Well, on that head I can only again complain of the paucity of the information obtainable in any of our public departments with respect to any great public question. Would anyone believe, for instance, unless he was solemnly assured on the point, that although he can obtain from the Lands Department the acreage of the cultivated land held on lease in years further back, he cannot get similar knowledge with respect to the present year? It seems just as though the department expected that some attempt would be made to use the facts the figures would disclose, and was possessed of an idea that it would be best to keep things as dark as possible. I have got, however, a return on the subject for 1871, and I find that, notwithstanding all the facilities afforded by different Land Acts for the selection of Crown lands as freeholds, no less than 22 per cent, of the occupiers of land in that year were leaseholders. Furthermore, I find something even more remarkable, namely, that 31 per cent, of the cultivated land of the colony was then held on a leasehold tenure. What, then, is the use of telling us that Victorians will not cultivate on a leasehold tenure? That *[unclear: and]* condition of affairs in 1881? In that year 11 per cent, of the land in occupation was occupied by leaseholders, no less than 2,000,000 acres being held on lease from private owners. The proportion of that acreage which was in cultivation I have not been able to ascertain, but I think we may fairly assume it to be about 400,000 acres. Then what was the rent being paid in that year to private landlords for the use of land originally obtained from the State at an average of £1 1s. 6d. per acre? Mind, I am taking no special cases, but an average of the figures supplied to the Government Statist. I find that for agricultural land the rents paid were from 6s. to 14s. per acre, the highest terms being 80s., and the lowest 3s. per acre; while for pastoral lands the rents were from 2s. 6d. to 6s. 6d. per acre, the highest terms being 10s. 6d., and the lowest 1s. 3d. per acre. If the State had kept that land, could it not have been now receiving from 3s. to 80s. per acre just as well as the present owners? Could not that money have gone into the public treasury to be spent on such public works as canals, waterworks, roads, or bridges, instead of the funds for those purposes being taken out of the pockets of the hard-worked mechanics of the colony? With respect to the rents paid for pastoral lands, it is particularly worth notice that the lowest terms, namely, 1s. 3d. per annum, are just 3d. per acre beyond the 1s. per acre paid by the selector of Crown lands with the fee-simple given in at the end of 20 years. These are facts which the public have a right to know, and it is a disgrace to the Lands Department, if not to the Minister of Lands also, that it should lie on the shoulders of a private member to hunt them up, and afterwards submit them to the House and country in the face of the greatest opposition, and in spite of the strong desire of many honourable members to shorten the discussion. I say that, if we have any right to deal with the question before us with a full and complete knowledge of all its surroundings, the facts I have submitted ought to have been supplied to us by the Government. The next point raised in opposition to the leasing principle is that a leasehold is not a good security. First of all, that statement is not true. Next, if it were true, it would represent no valid objection to the principle I am advocating. Are we here to find good securities for a few favoured individuals at the expense of all the rest of the community? Our task is something higher than that. But, in fact, a leasehold is a good security, the extent of its goodness depending on the terms on which it is obtained. The leasehold I am advocating is one which would involve improvements being as much the property of the leaseholder as they would be were he a freeholder with a

preferential claim to a renewal at its expiration. Let us take, under these circumstances, the cases of two farmers, each with £1000. One of them spends his money in buying the freehold of his farm, while the other leases his farm from the Government on these equitable terms, and keeps his £1000 in his pocket, in order to spend it as he goes along in stocking his holding and improving it, being able, should he want more money, to borrow on his improvements. Meanwhile the case of the former is that, in order to raise money to stock his farm, he has to mortgage it, which he will only be able to do, under the most favourable circumstances, to the extent of two-thirds or three-fourths of its value. Under these circumstances, which of the two is in the most advantageous position? As a matter of fact the freeholder, who, there can be little doubt, will have to borrow at a higher rate than 5 per cent., will have to pay as much in interest upon £750 borrowed as the rent of the leaseholder's farm will amount of the latter will be the best. Not having sunk any money in the purchase of his property, he will have been able to put one-third more money into improvements, and consequently his borrowing power will be as great, while his farm will be more profitable. Besides, he will be able to borrow not only on improvements made but improvements to be made. So much for the security a leaseholder will have to offer. I am free to admit that short-dated leases, where the lessee has no claim for improvements, would scarcely be accepted as good security, but the leases I have in view would be extremely different. Do we not know that money is lent on leaseholds every day? The splendid buildings just put up in Queen-street near Little Collins-street are erected on ground leased for 21 years. Only a very short while ago the institution with which I am connected advanced money on leasehold property in Collins-street. In truth, if the lease be long enough, and there be a claim for improvements, there is not much difference in character between the security it offers and that of a freehold. Let us remember, too, that we desire to give the leaseholder only a certain amount of security. We don't want to give him a security which it would be to his interest to sell, but merely one on which he could raise money if needed to enable himself to work his farm.

The next objection to the leasing system is that we shall have our population leaving us, because they cannot get a freehold here, and going where a freehold is obtainable. The first answer to that was supplied by the Minister of Lands, which I read last night. He told us that so great are the attractions of Victoria, irrespective of the land tenure question, that persons are actually coming from the other colonies to settle here. Again, if the argument I am dealing with has any power, why don't the leaseholders, who are paying from 80s. to 1s. 3d. per acre per annum for their land, clear out for the other colonies? Is State landlordism thought likely to be worse than private landlordism? On the other hand, I ask how long do honourable members suppose Victoria would, if Parliament adopted the present proposals of the Government, be able to compete for settlement with the other colonies? Why, the whole thing is an utter absurdity. It is the biggest sham ever offered to the consideration of sensible men. With our land being taken up in areas of 640 acres we could only hold our own in such competition for a very few years longer, and then we would have no territory to deal with. Instead of keeping up a rivalry with colonies whose territory is so much larger than our own, ought we not rather to face the position? Would it not be better for us to admit at once to ourselves that Victoria, not being one-fifth the size of any of its neighbours, competition for settlement on the basis of offering easy terms for the acquisition of freeholds ought to be out of the question with us? At the same time we have advantages of another kind, and these, combined with a good system of leasing, are amply sufficient to hold our present population, and also to attract more from elsewhere. Surely to make use of those advantages in that way would be infinitely better than entering upon a course of land squandering, which can only bring us in a few years into the position of having no Crown lands to deal with. It is said that a land tax would answer every purpose I have in view as well as the leasing system. If there is any truth in the statement, made by those who object to that system, that the tenants would combine to wrest from an unwilling Government the freehold of the land which they held by leasehold tenure, and if they were strong enough to accomplish their object, where is the power to come from that would be great enough to impose a tax? If the leaseholders are to be so numerous and so powerful as to take from the remaining portion of the community the whole of their share and interest in the land—for it is urged that they would be able to influence Parliament sufficiently to have their leaseholds converted into freeholds—would they not be powerful enough to prevent the imposition of a tax on land which was sold to them in the first instance? In the past a land tax could only be imposed under very exceptional circumstances—circumstances which a large number of people are constantly praying may never occur again. Now, if we were only able to secure a land tax from a few proprietors under such circumstances, where is the power that would be sufficient to wring a tax out of the great number of landed proprietors who would have a vital interest in the question if the land continues to be extensively sold in small quantities instead of being leased? Again, if we admit that a part only of that power would be sufficient to convert leaseholds into freeholds, how would it be possible to impose a land tax in opposition to the whole of it combined? The two positions are absolutely unworkable. One or other of them must be given up. That Parliament would be supreme as against the whole, and not as against a part, is an absurdity which needs only to be stated to be proved. It must either be admitted that Parliament would have no power to impose a tax, or that the tenants

would have no power to wring freeholds out of an unwilling people. One or other of these propositions must be accepted by every logician, and I do not care what position other gentlemen take in relation to the question, because I am not anxious to convince those who are not inclined to follow their argument to its legitimate issue. I assert that it would be impossible to convert the leaseholds into freeholds. Only let the people of this country once realise the advantages which would accrue to them from the adoption of the leasing system, only let them once feel and see the money coming in from rents, only let them once realise the fact that it is a perpetual revenue, increasing year by year as the value of the land increases, and I defy the leaseholders to bring about legislation which shall rob the people of the revenue thus derived, even supposing them to be unprincipled enough to attempt it, and I regard it as a libel on the people of this country to say that they would attempt it. It might as well be said that the people will insist on riding on the railways for nothing, as that they will ask to have the use of the land free. The number of people who use the railways is greater in proportion to the whole community than the number of leaseholders would be, and yet we have never heard of the slightest agitation being got up at election times with the object of forcing the candidates to declare themselves in favour of allowing the population to travel free of cost on the State railways. Where would we find a man to stand up on a public platform in this colony, and advocate such a thing? And yet I say there is as much reason, justice, and force in this application of the argument as there would be in the other. If you let a piece of land to a tenant at so much per annum, and he has the use of the land, his money is not a tax but a rent, just as is the sum which a man pays his landlord for the use of a house. It might be said by those who oppose the leasing system that, the whole body of household tenants being more numerous than the landlords, they ought to rise up at election times and insist on their candidates promising to try and pass a law that would wipe out landlords altogether, so that the tenants might have the use of the houses for nothing. One proposal would just be as reasonable and fair as the other. But there is no fear that the leaseholders would attempt to repudiate their obligations. If they did, however, the other nine-tenths of the population who would not be leaseholders, and who would be reaping the advantages accruing from the continually increasing rent, would take very good care that they did not get what they asked for. But, supposing that I am wrong, and that there would be a sufficient number of tenants so roguish as to want to escape the conditions of a legitimate bargain made with their fellow citizens through the Government, and supposing that they actually succeeded in accomplishing their object, what then? What worse position would the community as a whole be in than it would be if the State gave the tenants the freehold of the land at the outset? It would be in no worse position, and it would have the advantage of having made a trial of the leasing system. I therefore say that there is nothing in the argument that the tenants would force the hands of the Government of the day. Those who oppose the system say further that it would raise the value of the land that has already been disposed of. I am free to admit that it would, but I am perfectly indifferent to the fact, because it would be impossible to raise the value of that land without raising also the value of the remainder, which the State would keep. If we passed a law to-morrow that no more land should be sold, and the effect produced by it was to raise the value of the land already parted with £1 an acre, the value of all the remaining land would be enhanced in proportion. Do not honourable members know that the reserved shares in a company increase in value in the same proportion as the shares already on the market? If the shares already on the market are valued at half-a-crown premium, the shares held in reserve would, if floated, be quoted at the same price. And, in a similar manner, if we legislate so as to increase the value of the land already disposed of, so in proportion shall we increase the value of the land that we keep, and the fact that by introducing the leasing system we should be enhancing the value of a few properties held at the present time would not be such a very bad thing, and certainly it ought not to be sufficient to prevent us from doing justice to the rest of the community. I should be ashamed of myself if I refused to support the passing of a law which my judgment told me was one calculated to benefit the country as a whole because, incidentally, it would be a pecuniary advantage to a certain section. The position is so untenable that I think no honourable member would think of taking it up. Another argument which the opposers of the leasing system urge against it is that it would necessitate the repurchase of the land already sold. If it did lead to that—and I am not prepared to say that it would not do so—it is better that it should lead to it at once when we have only part of our public estate to buy back, than that the present system should be continued by which the country will be brought into the position which England and Ireland occupy at the present time. The greatest political thinkers of the day are now advocating the repurchase of the whole of the land in Ireland, in order to use it in the same way that I am asking the House to use what is left to us in Victoria. I am quite aware that there is an agitation in Ireland in favour of the Government repurchasing the land, with the object of selling it again in small blocks to a peasant proprietary. I venture to predict that if the English Government repurchased the land from the present holders, the advanced political thinkers would advocate exactly the same policy as I am now advocating. They would prevent the Government from selling the land again, and they would have public opinion with them. Their argument would be—"You have bought the land, and it is quite right that you should; but now you have got it you must keep it in the interests of the people." Honourable members who know what is going on in Ireland are

aware that there is a strong party in that country who are exactly in accordance with the view that the Government should purchase the land, but who are utterly opposed to its being resold. The mechanics, the tradesmen, and the townspeople of Ireland are beginning to ask themselves the question—"What better position should we be in if we had a large number of small landlords instead of a few large ones?" And that feeling will grow, because it is founded upon right, and truth, and justice. If ever the British Government goes so far as to buy back the estates held by the present owners, they will never be able to sell them back again to small proprietors. They will be compelled to let them on lease, not on the rack rents which the tenants have been paying to the large landed proprietors, but on rents which will pay a small interest on the purchase money, and which will not prevent the leaseholders from cultivating their holdings with profit to themselves and to the whole community. That is the position which affairs are gradually and slowly, but surely, coming to at home, and every man who has given his attention to this question and what is written upon it in English, Scotch, and Irish current literature knows that what I say is the truth. Seeing what is coming on in regard to land, and the difficulty the British Government have in buying it all back at the enormous valuation which is now put upon it, we ought to take a lesson, and say that no more of the public estate shall be sold here, so that there will be less to repurchase when the time comes. Let the present generation get the benefit of increasing rents, which will enable the next generation to buy back the land already sold. Amongst the advantages which would result from the adoption of the leasing system, the financial advantage stands in the foreground. I do not mean to say that that is the only advantage, nor do I intend to convey that it alone would be sufficient to warrant us in adopting the system, but it certainly stands in the foreground. The great social and political advantages of the system are such as ought to command the attention of this House, and of the community as a whole. In laying the foundations of this colony, do we want them to result like those at home have resulted? Are we so enamoured of the state of things there that we want to copy them here? The arguments against it are so numerous, and so patent to every man of intelligence, that it is not necessary for me to go over them. I will not waste either my own or honourable members' time by recounting the social and political arguments in support of the position which I take. I will deal only with the financial aspect of the question. What, in the first place, are the financial advantages to be derived from the system which the Government have brought forward? I will contrast them with those of the leasing system, and then leave it to honourable members and to the country to put one set of results against the other. The Premier, in the course of his Budget speech, referred to the land revenue, and laid on the table a return showing the amount of alienation which had gone on up to that time. He estimated that the total of the payments for the current year, on account of land revenue, would be £549,000; that at the end of the year ending the 30th June, 1901, the amount would dwindle down to £10,000, and that in the next year it would disappear altogether. That is the income which we have to look forward to from the present system. Of course the revenue might be dragged out for 15 or 20 years longer, when the land remaining for selection was being paid for, but at the end of that period nothing more would be obtained. Now, what is the other side of the question? According to the return laid on the table by the Minister of Lands when introducing the Bill, there are 35,000,000 acres still in possession of the State, and the area is divided into three classes. There are 9,500,000 acres of land fit for agricultural settlement, 16,000,000 acres fit for grazing purposes, some of which are occupied by squatters, who pay more or less rent to the State, and 10,000,000 acres which the honourable gentleman called waste land. I venture to say that the last term is a misnomer, because a very large portion of that land, if not fit at present for grazing or for cultivation, only requires to be kept until the colonies are more thickly populated, until some different uses are found for the lands, and until the minerals with which this colony teems are discovered in them and brought to the surface. It must also be remembered that the timber which grows upon these so-called waste lands will render them as valuable as if they were devoted to agriculture, so that to talk of them as waste lands is misleading to the public and absurd. Only to-day a gentleman came into my office and informed me that "outsiders" were told that there was no land left in the colony worth taking up. I said that he might disabuse his mind of that idea altogether, because, by the Minister of Lands' own confession, there were 9,000,000 acres fit for agricultural settlement still left in the possession of the State, 1 (3,000,000 acres fit for grazing purposes, and 10,000,000 acres of waste lands. Now let us assume as a very low valuation of the 9,000,000 acres which are capable of cultivation, that they are worth £1 an acre, the price at which we at present part with such land. That will be admitted to be a very low valuation if the glowing accounts of the Minister of Railways, when describing the country through which some of his lines will pass, are to be accepted as correct. We may take the grazing land as being worth 10s. per acre, and the waste lands 5s. At these valuations the capital value of the land amounts to £20,062,500, and if we let the land on lease at, say, 5 per cent, rental on that capital value, we should have a revenue of £1,003,125 per annum so long as the lease continued. If a 5 per cent, rental is too high, then take a 4 per cent, rental, and the annual revenue we should receive would be 42802,500; at a 3 per cent, rental it would be £601,875; at a 2½ per cent, rental—which would be 6d. an acre on agricultural land", 3d. an acre on grazing land, and lid. an acre on waste land—it would be £501,562, or nearly as much as we are getting now for the absolute sale of land, and,

moreover, it would be a perpetual source of income, and one which would increase according to the increasing value of the land. Of course, do not suppose that all the land would be taken up at once, but we must not circumscribe the question by the limit of the immediate present. If all the land would not be taken up now, it would be by-and-by, and in addition, if it increases in value during the next 50 years as it has done during the past—and where is the man who will say that it will not—we shall have three or four times the revenue which I have here quoted. [*unclear: As population extended and as money was required for governmental*] purposes, the revenue would have to be increased, and to supply the deficiency the rents from these leaseholds would be utilised, instead of that, if we accept the proposal of the Government the land revenue will dwindle down to nothing at the end of twenty years. Is there a man in the colony who, having given his undivided attention to the question, can hesitate for one moment in saying which system is the best from a financial point of view? The other aspects of the question I leave honourable members to think out for themselves. In conclusion, I hope this House will rise above every consideration in its desire to do its duty to posterity. Some honourable members may ask—"What is posterity to us?" Is it becoming to Englishmen, who are never tired of boasting of their ancestors, and of what their ancestors have done for them, to say that they disregard posterity, and that they want those who come after them to think less of us than we do of those who went before us? I would be sorry to think that the future generations of this colony should have it to say that we, from any petty party or personal object, could be induced to depart from what, in our own judgment, we thought to be right in dealing with this question, and I ask every honourable member to vote upon it in that light. Above everything else I ask that, at least, the people of the country should have a chance of saying whether they want this system which I advocate or not. I would impress it upon the Government and the House not to venture, at the fag-end of the last session of a Parliament which is moribund, to legislate upon a question of this great, this vital, and this lasting importance. To do so under these circumstances would be to act in a manner which no honourable member could justify to his own conscience now, or to the posterity which is to come after him.

Mr. Connor moved the adjournment of the debate. The eloquent address delivered by the honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Mirams) would require a good deal of consideration, and, as honourable members appeared to be tired out, it would not be wise to proceed further with the debate that night.

Mr. Zox seconded the motion. The honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Mirams) had delivered an excellent speech, lasting between five and six hours, and honourable members, whether they agreed with his views or not, would be willing to admit that it reflected the highest credit on him. The honourable member had taken great pains in the preparation of his address, and honourable members intending to reply to it should be afforded an opportunity of studying the question.

Mr. Walsh said that the honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Mirams) had brought forward an aspect of the land question which might almost be considered new, and his views were not likely to be fully understood until honourable members had an opportunity of seeing them in print and carefully considering them.

Mr. Berry remarked that the speech of the honourable member for Collingwood (Mr. Mirams) was a very able one as representing certain views, but unless more rapid progress was made with the debate there would be no legislation at all. Some honourable member should have been prepared to reply to the honourable member for Collingwood.

The motion for the adjournment of the debate was agreed to.

A. H. Mussina & Co., Printers, 26 Little Collins-street East, Melbourne.

decorative feature *The Progress of Victoria.*

A Reply to an Article by G. Baden Powell, ESQ., On "Protection in Young Communities,"

Published in the "Fortnightly Review."

BY James Mirams, ESQ.,

Member of the Parliament of Victoria;

Chairman of the Colonial Royal Commission on the Tariff.

Melbourne: Griffith and Spaven, Printers, Smith Street, Fitzroy. 1883.

The Progress of Victoria.

A Reply.

THE people of the British colonies on this side of the world are proud of the ties that bind them to the great mother country; and in all discussions that are raised on the subject of her colonies, and her relations thereto,

peculiar interest is felt. The remarkable growth and progress of Victoria—one of the youngest and wealthiest of them all—affords a gratifying proof of the superior colonizing powers of the race from which her people are descended.

This being the case, it is somewhat painful to find that not only the people, but the material resources of the colonies, are sometimes strangely misunderstood and widely misrepresented. Writers, who pay transient visits to our shores, satisfy themselves with making observations and forming opinions upon the most superficial data, return home, and write lengthy articles to newspapers and journals, to give publicity to the fact of their travels and the information which they think they have gained. These articles are generally written in support of the individual views of the author, and ignore altogether the colonial aspects of the case and the altered circumstances and conditions under which old theories have to be applied, and old axioms reduced to practice.

The misrepresentations which form the subject of complaint on the present occasion are not, let us hope, wilful; and if the writer of the article in the *Fortnightly Review* will study the facts and figures which we shall have occasion to produce, he must admit that his deductions have been drawn from erroneous information.

Mr. Baden Powell, the writer of the article in question, has paid two visits to Victoria, and on the strength of these visits, and the observations which they may have afforded him the opportunity of making, but which could only have extended over a limited period, he has given to the world this article, the avowed object of which is to prove that New South Wales has made more progress under, and in consequence of its free trade policy, than Victoria has under a policy of protection.

The secondary aim of the writer is to prove that, taking these colonies as illustrations, John Stuart Mill's admission that protection might be found under certain conditions economically defensible in a young community," is wrong in theory and unwarranted by experience.

In order to accomplish this task successfully, the first thing he should have done was to make it perfectly clear that New South Wales is a free trade colony as unmistakably as Victoria is protectionist. If he cannot do this, his premises are incomplete, and his conclusion utterly breaks down. He appears to have had a notion that his position was open to attack from this quarter, and he appears also to have been equally alive to the fact that he could not make it impregnable; for he does the best he can under the circumstances, and intrenches himself as completely as possible by saying that New South Wales "has followed an *essentially* free trade course." What a convenience, what a very godsend, are these adverbs and adjectives—which seem to mean so much, but which in reality commit their employers to so little—to partisan writers, who, starting with a purpose, are compelled to make the facts square with that purpose; and which, if they will not, then so much the worse for the facts! In this case the very use of this qualifying word proves that Mr. Powell knows that the policy of New South Wales is not a free trade policy; for it is unreasonable to suppose that if he could have left it out, and thereby have made his case so much the stronger, he would not have taken that advantage.

We need not rest this issue upon the negative proof which Mr. Powell himself gives us. We can supply the same positive evidence as was doubtless within his knowledge, when he judiciously guarded himself by the use of the word "essentially."

The next point which, it appeal's to us, should have been placed beyond a doubt, was the relative advance of the two colonies in manufactures, that being the only real test of the superiority of either policy, and to secure which advance was the sole object of Victoria in adopting her present course. Instead of this our critic passes very cursorily over this, the only really important fact to determine, and devotes himself principally to a comparison of our condition in relation to matters which have very little, if anything, to do with the question in dispute. We are not surprised at this, because if he had rested his case upon a careful and impartial analysis of the manufacturers of the two colonies, even with the scanty information which New South Wales supplies as to hers, he would have found it impossible to make the facts—colour and twist them as he might—square with the foregone conclusion with which he set out, and upon his being able to do which his argument and his article depend.

We propose to deal with these two points in the order in which we have stated, and to show that Mr. Powell either knows so little of the question upon which he presumes to instruct others, as to render his utterances absolutely valueless; or that he has suppressed the truth and distorted the facts to suit his free trade views.

New South Wales has a climate and soil suitable for the growth and manufacture of sugar, and therefore very properly assists those industries by imposing a duty of 5s. per cwt. upon raw sugar, and 6s. 8d. per cwt. upon the refined. In this way the grower is amply protected, and the refiner gets an additional protection of 1s. 8d. per cwt. If this were done in Victoria, it would be stigmatized as a shameful departure from the true theory of political economy; but because it is done by our neighbours, it stamps them as "essentially" freetraders. In Victoria we have but one duty upon sugar, and that is 3s. per cwt.; and the assistance our refiners get is the permission to refine in bond, and so to pay the duty merely upon the manufactured article. On tobacco, the protection to the grower and manufacturer is, in both colonies, exactly equal. The Victorian duty is 1s. per lb. higher than the New South Wales; but Victoria imposes an excise duty of 1s. per lb. upon the home

manufactured article, while New South Wales does not, which equalizes the conditions.

New South Wales protects her carpenters and workers in timber in the same way as Victoria does, by imposing a duty upon doors, sashes, shutters, and dressed timber. She protects her agriculturists, as we do, by imposing a duty upon bacon, hams, cheese, corn-flour, dried fruits, malt, maizena, raw sugar, chicory, hops, tobacco leaf, preserved and bottled fruit, jam, and wine. She protects her biscuit manufacturers, her manufacturers of chemicals, spirits, wine, beer, sugar, molasses, cordage and rope, jams and jellies, confectionery, cigars and tobacco, bags and sacks, varnish, oils, starch and blue, candles, paper, powder and shot, pickles and sauces, and many other industries which might be enumerated did time and space permit. This list is enough, at any rate, to show that New South Wales has no more claim to be called Free Trade than we have, and that those of her public men who, on the strength of such claim, bask in the beams of the Cobden Club, do so under false pretences, depending upon the ignorance of their entertainers and their own good fortune to carry them through.

We have now to show that the Victorian policy of Protection has accomplished the object for which it was adopted; and there can be no better method of doing this than by comparing our progress in this direction with that of our neighbors. In making this comparison, it must be distinctly borne in mind that every advantage, except skill and energy, was on the side of New South Wales. She had a settled population, a long-established, self-government, abundance of raw materials for many industries, the start of us by the existence of many manufactories—boots and shoes, machinery, ship-building, to wit—and, above all, coal in abundance, which we have had to purchase from her. We were a young community with a roving population, the result of the decline of the gold yield, without any of the surroundings which New South Wales enjoyed; and if, therefore, our policy had succeeded only to the extent of enabling us to hold our own, John Stuart Mill's opinion would have been fully borne out. We shall be able to show that in every branch of manufacturing industry we have left our competitor hopelessly behind. The difficulty of showing this simply and clearly at once is very great, because New South Wales carefully abstains from publishing any set of statistics in relation to its manufactures similar to those which we publish in Victoria. For instance, we can, from our annual returns, show that the amount of fixed capital invested in plant, machinery, land, and buildings by our manufacturers has increased by nearly four millions sterling during the last ten years, the exact figures being as follow:—

Then, again, we can tell what is the result of a year's work of our manufacturers by deducting the value of the raw materials operated upon from the value of the articles produced, thus:—

New South Wales furnishes no such information, and such as it does afford is all but valueless for the purposes of comparison, because of its meagreness and the difference of method upon which it is collected. As an illustration of this difference, let us take the statistics relating to agricultural implement manufactories. New South Wales tells us that in 1880 she had 50 factories employing 231 hands, and that she exported implements of her own manufacture to the value of £78. This is the sum total of the information that is available. Such as it is, what does it prove but that the 50 so-called actories may be nothing more nor less than country blacksmiths' shops, employing from four to five hands each, whose chief, if not only, work is to repair the implements of the neighborhood?

Victoria, on the other hand, tells us that in the same year she had 54 factories, 28 of which were worked by steam power, employing 975 hands, using materials to the value of £91,659, and turning out goods to the value of £202,535, carrying on operations with a fixed capital in land, buildings, plant, &c., of £127,380; and that she exported implements of her own manufacture to the value of £8,476, after supplying her own farmers.

If any further proof be needed of the folly of comparing or judging of the relative position of the two colonies by comparing the *number* of the *so-called* factories of the one with the *number* of the *real* factories of the other, we have it in the fact that while New South Wales, with very little more than one-third the land under cultivation that Victoria has, had to depend almost entirely upon her imports of implements to supply her farmers, notwithstanding her 50 *factories*. Victoria supplied her farmers entirely from her 54 factories, and had a few hundred pounds' worth to spare. The following statement will make this important point perfectly plain:—

We have gone thus minutely into this case not so much because of its own importance, as that it serves as an illustration for all; and it supplies a direct and conclusive denial of Mr. Powell's assertion that, notwithstanding the protection we give to our own manufacturers, we are "still forced to supply ourselves with these 'prohibited' or 'weighted' foreign articles; and import on an annual average about as much as unprotected New South Wales." We have selected it also because he has himself chosen it as one of three industries, the *number* of which, he says, "has largely increased in *both* colonies."

It would be trespassing too far upon the space at my command to follow the other two—foundries and clothing factories—as we have this one; or we could show exactly similar and even more startling results. Taking for the nonce, however, the value of the exports of their own productions in these two lines for the two colonies during 1880, we shall be able to form a very fair estimate of their relative position and importance.

These are the figures for 1880; and what progress, if any, New South Wales has made during 1881, we have no means as yet of knowing. Victoria, however, increased her exports upon these two lines in the 12 months nearly £100,000, the exact figures being for last year £301,359. Would any sane man, with these facts before him, or available for his use if he required them, attempt to make it appear that there is any comparison between the two colonies in the matter of manufactures?

Mr. Powell admits that we have far outstripped our neighbors in the manufacture of cloth and woollen goods, notwithstanding that they had the start of us for years. Sydney tweeds were selling in Victoria long before we had a woollen mill in existence; now, we are driving them out of their own markets even. If this is not a proof of the wisdom of our policy, it is hard to say what it is. He attempts to detract from the evidence in our favor, which he clearly sees this fact to be, by coupling with it the statement that in the matter of ship-building New South Wales is leaving us far behind. Now, without entering into a minute statement of the conditions and circumstances which operate to this result, as, for example, the monopoly which she has of the trade in coal, it is hardly necessary to point out that, so far from this fact assisting Mr. Powell in his argument, it has the directly contrary effect. We protect our cloth manufacturers by putting a duty of 15% upon imported cloth, and they succeed. We do not protect our ship-builders by putting a duty on ships, therefore, the building of ships does not increase with us. That is the fair and legitimate conclusion derivable from his own premises.

Mr. Baden Powell, as we have already noted, is very guarded and cautious in his statements, taking care to qualify them in such a way, as to make it somewhat difficult to join issue with him; and, even in those assertions which are most definite, he takes care to introduce a qualification behind which to shelter himself in the event of an attack.

Thus, when he speaks of New South Wales as being a Free Trade colony, he introduces the adverb "essentially," by which he hopes to escape the charge of misrepresentation. Then, in the two following assertions, which we are about to disprove, he introduces qualifying words which he hopes will serve him the same good purpose. He says, when speaking of our manufactures, that their development as compared with the great natural industries of the country is *insignificant* and further he says, "in neither colony is there any *appreciable export* of commodities manufactured in the colonies." The italics mark the words upon which he depends for shelter, but they will not save him. So far as New South Wales is concerned, his statement is, we believe, perfectly correct, as the examples already given amply bear witness, In the case of Victoria, on the contrary, it is utterly wrong, as we will presently show. We will prove that we have an "appreciable" export of our own manufactures, and will show what proportion it bears to the exports of the produce of what he is pleased to call our "great natural industries." The following tabulated statement of the exports of Victoria, for the years 1872 and 1881 respectively, will show at a glance in which direction most progress has been made, so far as the exports can afford any criterion. It must be borne in mind, however, that, great as the increase of our manufactured exports has been, it is nothing as compared to the increase in the local consumption which can be estimated by noting the falling-off of our imports of those articles which we are now making for ourselves, and by a reference to the value, before stated, of one year's produce of our factories.

The facts brought out by this table, compiled from the Government Statist's returns, are:—

- That the principal "great natural industry" has declined very considerably in the decade.
- That the industry for a long time next in importance has not increased during the decade sufficiently to make up for the declension of the other.
- That the third industry, that of agriculture, has made an immense stride during the same period.
- That manufactures, the development of which Mr. Powell ventures to tell his readers has been "insignificant," have far surpassed either of the others in their progress.
- That the protected industries are those which are most prosperous and have made most progress. In the list of manufactures given, there are two only which are absolutely un-protected (unless there be a few included in the line " All other Articles "), and these are the two which show a falling-off in their exports. The decline upon these two articles—tallow and preserved meats—has been £261,128. The protected industries have supplied this gap in our exports of manufactures, in addition to supplying the whole of the £937,279 increase. The actual state of the case is, that protected industries have increased their exports by £1,198,407, while those of the unprotected have declined £261,128, leaving a net increase of £937,279.
- That, seeing our manufactures have surpassed our agriculture, the question of the condition of the manufactures in New South Wales, as compared with ours, is seen at once. Agriculture is one of the "great natural industries," compared with which manufacturing development has been "insignificant" in New South Wales. In that colony their agriculture is one-third of ours. Their manufactures are far behind that small amount of agriculture. Our agriculture is three times as great as theirs, and our manufactures are before our agriculture in their progress and position.

We are aware that exception may be taken to the inclusion of tallow in the list of manufactures, but we purposely placed it there, lest we should appear to strain after effect. It is a pastoral product, and is usually

considered a raw material. With us, however, it is a manufactured article, the "boiling-down" establishments being erected for that purpose alone. If we had placed it in the pastoral list, it would have reduced the increase shown on that line; while its removal from the list of manufactures would have considerably augmented the increase shown there.

For the rest, this statement speaks for itself; and the facts which it sets forth have only to be compared impartially with the position of New South Wales, to convince any one of the thorough ignorance of our critics of the entire circumstances upon which he delivers his judgment, and about which he assumes to instruct the British public. From the latest published statistics of New South Wales, he will find that the exports of their own products increased from £9,206,101, in 1871, to £12,679,782 in 1880—an increase of £3,473,681. He will further find that the increase upon wool alone was £5,743,373, thus clearly demonstrating from her own documents that her other products, manufactures included, had fallen off to the extent of the difference between the net increase and the increase upon wool alone—namely, £2,269,692.

If any additional proof of the great and increasing development of our manufacturing industries be required, we have it in the following extract from the address of the retiring chairman of the "Manufacturers' Association," delivered at its annual meeting a few days since. Speaking on this very subject, he said:—"Manufactures *especially* had made *wonderful* strides during the last few years, but the advance made during the last year was greater than any. He would venture to say that every manufacturer present could employ many more workmen than he was doing . . . Foundries and workshops had now more work than they could do, and their work was in every way of a greatly superior description than used to be turned out in former years."

Thus we have practically proved to ourselves as a community that protection is the "method that answers." Let us hope that, in Mr. Powell's case, it may be followed, not only by "thoughts that are true," but by words that are true also.

Will this gentleman, in the face of these facts and figures, maintain the assertions to which they supply a full, fair, and unanswerable denial? They show that, so far from the development of our manufactures being "insignificant" as compared with our "great natural industries," it has been greater than either of the other; and that the total exports of our manufactured goods have reached the very "appreciable" sum of over two millions sterling, which is constantly and rapidly increasing; and that the whole advance of New South Wales is due to its pastoral industry alone. Another fact which this statement brings out is this, that, of the £13,384,836, the value of the goods manufactured by us last year, we exported a little over two millions' worth, and ourselves consumed eleven and a quarter millions' worth. Is it any wonder, we would ask Mr. Powell, that our imports have not kept pace with those of New South Wales, seeing that we have been supplying ourselves to this enormous extent? The fact that our imports have not so increased is the very best evidence of the success of the policy which he is attempting to prove a failure.

Will he still assert that there is not much difference in the out-put of the factories of the two colonies? We venture to think not. Will he still assume that the number of factories so called, or the number of hands employed in them, in New South Wales has any real bearing upon the question? We hardly think he will, in the light of this fuller information. What has the number of hands to do with the question, unless we also know what is the extent of the power by which the machinery is worked? The work of our 32,000 *employes* is supplemented by machinery driven by engines of 14,502 horse-power; and unless Mr. Powell can show that New South Wales surpasses us in this respect, what purpose, but to mislead, can he serve by comparing the hands employed and the number of the works?

Having thus shown, fully and distinctly, the unfounded and erroneous nature of the assumed facts upon which the whole argument and theory of this writer rests, we might fairly leave all else that he has said to the discernment of his readers. If we adopted that course, we might be supposed to have chosen it because we were unable to reply to the other points raised by him against this colony. There are several statements, therefore, which we will proceed to answer. They are in reference to the questions of external trade, population, accumulations, and revenue.

Taking these subjects in their order, we have first to deal with the question of external trade—the imports and exports. We have already shown that the increase of exports from New South Wales, so far as that depends upon her own productions and is not simply an increase of carrying business, is entirely due to the enormous increase of her wool yield. This increase of wool is due to the immense area, nearly four times that of Victoria, which she has to devote to pastoral pursuits, and to the great impetus which has been recently given to that industry, largely by Victorian capital and energy. The imports have increased principally upon those items which Victoria is now making for herself, and has, therefore, no necessity to import. The figures in relation to this matter are not correctly given by Mr. Powell. He says that the external trade of New South Wales has increased £10,000,000 from 1871 to 1880, whereas the increase has been only £8,620,673. He has also very materially mis-stated the trade of Victoria, by leaving out of his calculation all the goods transhipped in the bay, which are not included in the tables of imports and exports, but which form part of the trade of the colony. The

real position is as follows:

The relative increase of the two colonies, therefore, has not been as 10 to 3, as Mr. Powell states, but as $8\frac{1}{2}$ to 4. Take away the increase of New South Wales' export of wool, of her own production, £5,743,373, and the total external trade of that colony would not have kept pace with that of Victoria. The surprising thing is, that with such an enormous increase in that commodity across the border, while the yield in Victoria has declined consequent upon so much land having been selected for agricultural purposes, Victoria has been able still to keep so far ahead of her rival in the matter of commerce, the difference between them still being £4,000,000, not £1,000,000 as given by Mr. Powell. In addition to the fact that our factories turned out goods to the value of $13\frac{1}{2}$ millions last year, and so have rendered imports of very many articles all but unnecessary, we have no longer to import our food supplies. Ten years ago we had to depend very largely for wheat and flour upon foreign countries; now we supply ourselves, and have a large surplus to export. According to Mr. Powell's idea, this is an evidence of our failing prosperity; but we in Victoria hold a very different opinion. He is welcome to his theory, so long as we continue to reap the practical benefits of disregarding both it and him, and all who are of his way of thinking.

There is another aspect of this case, which Mr. Powell in all fairness should have presented to his readers. When he was here in 1878, we were in the midst of the political turmoil of the Reform struggle, and he must know that the depression in trade which we were then suffering, and from which we are now recovering, was ascribed by all with whom he associated to political causes. If this was a correct opinion, it is surely absurd to ascribe it now to our fiscal policy. At any rate, to whatever cause it was due, it could not have been to our tariff; for, with the very same tariff, slightly altered in 1879 in a still more protective direction, we are now greatly increasing our trade. The Premier, Sir B. O'Loghlen, in a recent debate, stated that during the last year the increase of external trade had been three and a-half millions. Until we have the figures from New South Wales to hand it is impossible to say whether she has made a corresponding advance. We are assured, however, that our policy is not ruining our trade.

The next question is that of population; and there are several very patent explanations of the quicker growth of population in New South Wales than in Victoria. The first is, that our neighbor spends large sums in importing population, while we do not; the second is in the condition and circumstances of the people themselves. New South Wales is an old-established colony, and had families of all ages gradually growing up to become parents in their turn, long before the rush of a male adult population to Victoria consequent upon the discovery of gold took place. This condition of things continued in New South Wales without material disturbance, and, as a result, its population has gone on increasing in the usual geometrical ratio which prevails under such favorable circumstances. In Victoria the case has been exactly the reverse. Our population was composed at first chiefly of adult males, who came to find gold and go away again. It maintained its nomadic character for fully ten years, say from 1851 to 1861. Then, when gold-digging ceased to afford such constant and remunerative employment, we adopted our Protective policy for the purpose of providing work for as many hands as possible at the various trades to which they had been brought up, but which they had temporarily abandoned when they came to Victoria gold-seeking. The result was, that many of them were thus retained who would otherwise have left for want of employment. These settled down, married, and are now the fathers of families, the eldest children of which families are only now reaching a marriageable age. During all these twenty years our population has been increasing truly, but it has been an increase only from the first stock, and, as a result, our adult population to-day is small compared with our total population, and not much larger than it was twenty years since. The next twenty years will tell a different tale, as year after year brings these Victorian-born children to manhood and womanhood, and the geometrical ratio of increase begins. Directly the first children of these settlers begin themselves to become parents, every succeeding year will add a fresh batch to the number; and so it will go on until it will not be lack of population we shall have to complain of, but rather lack of room and comfortable provision. The third explanation is found in the fact, that we have had in operation amongst us for the last twelve years a very vicious land law, which, while it has helped some *bona fide* selectors to settle as permanent farmers, has afforded a great many more adventurers and unscrupulous persons the opportunity, by taking advantage of its conditions, to take up 320 acres of land upon an annual payment of 2s. per acre for three years; at the end of that time to sell the land to the nearest squatter or large estate-holder for some £2 to £4 per acre; to pay the Government the balance of 14s. per acre out of the money they thus received; and to pocket the difference, varying from, say, £1 6s. to £3 6s. per acre. By this process the object for which the State parted with the land upon such terms, namely, the settlement of farmers, has been defeated; and that which it desired to prevent, namely, the growth of large estates, has been accomplished. In addition to which, our population has left us and gone over the border into New South Wales, Queensland, or one of the other colonies. This has been brought about by means of our Land Act, in the following way:—It is one of the conditions of the Act that no man shall select more than 320 acres. Accordingly, any man who has gone through the above process has no further opportunity for selecting in Victoria. He consequently goes, with

the money he has made by evading our land law, into New South Wales or Queensland, where, with that sum, he can establish himself in a much larger way, as the terms upon which he can get land there are more liberal as regards quantity than they are in Victoria, our neighbours having fully twenty times as large an area to deal with. The fourth explanation of this population question is the matter of area itself. New South Wales is bound to have a larger population than Victoria, if for no other reason than its larger area. This is so self-evident that one need not waste words in comment. On this point we have only further to add, that with such evident reasons for a disparity in the rate of growth of population in the two colonies, a writer must be sadly in want of an argument to bolster up a weak and halting theory who would look for an explanation for this disparity to the operation of their various fiscal policies.

We now come to deal with the question of accumulations—the savings of the people as represented by the increase of capital. Our censor rests his assertion, that New South Wales is accumulating wealth faster than Victoria, upon two illustrations only, out of the many which are available, and which any unprejudiced and fair-minded writer, without a preconceived and preannounced theory to support, would not have failed to bring forward. Unfortunately for his character for correctness, both his illustrations are exaggerated, the first one grossly exaggerated, to suit his argument. "Rateable property," he says, "has doubled in New South Wales in the decade, and only increased by one-half in Victoria." This is absolutely contrary to the facts, as his readers would have seen for themselves if he had published the figures which he has readily done when they apparently told in favour of the position he desires to establish. The exact state of the case is as follows:—

These figures, which are taken from the report of the Government Statist of each colony, show beyond dispute that instead of the difference in the rate of progress in this particular being 50 per cent., as stated by Mr. Powell, it has been barely over 15 per cent. They also show, what it was convenient for our critic to hide, that the smaller, and younger, but Protectionist colony, has accumulated wealth in the shape of rateable property to more than double the amount of its larger, older, but Free Trade neighbour.

The other illustration is also perverted and misleading, through the absolute ignorance of the writer of the question with which he ventures to deal. He says that the number of the depositors in Savings Banks has increased in New South Wales during the decade from 21,000 to 32,000, and in Victoria from 38,000 to 76,000; and from these premises arrives at the conclusion that "wealth in democratic Victoria is accumulating in the hands of a few." It would be interesting to know the exact process of reasoning by which this public instructor arrives at the fact,—that an enormous increase in the number of persons who are in a position to open and keep accounts at Savings Banks is a proof that "wealth is accumulating in the hands of a few." We can assure him, at any rate, that the 76,000 persons in Victoria who have made these deposits recognize and appreciate the fact that wealth is accumulating in their hands; and while we can show 76,000 such, to the 32,000 of New South Wales, we are not likely to alter the policy by which that result has been attained. He also, by this same inverted process of reasoning, assures his readers that the increase in the average amount to each depositor's credit in New South Wales, and its decrease in Victoria, is another proof of the concentration of wealth in the hands of a few in the Protected colony; and further, that "it is a result generally associated with a high tariff by all writers on political economy." If these writers, whoever they may be, have no better foundation for their theories than Mr. Powell himself adduces in this instance, neither they nor their theories are worth consideration. To any ordinary person, who is not a writer on political economy, a *few* bank deposits of *large* amount indicate accumulations in the hands of a *few*; while a *large* number of deposits of *small* amount indicate its distribution amongst *many*. Superior persons of the political economist class can, and very often do, see things in exactly the reverse way to that in which they appear to less exalted minds. There was no occasion, however, for Mr. Powell to go in search of any such far-fetched explanation of the facts which he sets forth in relation to this matter. There were plain and ample reasons for it close at hand, which he surely was well aware of, when he undertook to enlighten the British public upon the question; but to have used them would not have helped him to establish the position for which his article was penned. Accordingly, they were quietly ignored. One reason for the difference in the average amount of deposits, and presumably in the class of depositors, is the usually higher interest which these banks give in New South Wales than they give in Victoria. This, coupled with the other fact, that in Victoria *no depositor is paid any interest upon any sum larger than £6250*, fully explains why the average of our deposits is much smaller than the average in the other colony. This limitation was introduced about 1875, for the very purpose of preventing these banks from being used by capitalists, when fluctuations in the current rate of interest might otherwise induce them to avail themselves of the 4 per cent., fixed by law as the rate given by these institutions. These facts expose fully the absurdity of all Mr. Powell's conclusions in reference to this question.

There is another most important aspect of this case, which cannot and would not be ignored by any one who desires to do justice to the issues raised by this writer, and to the colonies interested, in their proper appreciation by the public which he addresses. This aspect of the case is set out in the question—Of what possible use, as affording any information respecting the relative advancement of any two communities in the

accumulation of wealth, is any illustration of that advancement which embraces *two only* of the many and varied forms which such accumulations assume? If Mr. Powell's facts, arguments, and conclusion in this matter of Savings' Bank deposits had been all in his favour, instead of all against him as they are, it would have proved nothing as against Victorian accumulations, or the policy assumed to be involved; because in "Victoria the middle and artisan classes have a favorite mode of investment for which New South Wales has no adequate parallel, namely, Building Societies. These institutions pay their shareholders from 8 to 12 per cent., and their depositors at least 1 per cent, more than the banks; and the result is that they are enormously patronised by those who have small savings to make, and by those who build or purchase small homes for themselves by their assistance. A comparison, therefore, to be of any value, must be based upon the sum of at least all the large public forms of accumulation which are available in each colony. Unfortunately, the statistics of New South Wales are as defective in this direction as we have already shown them to be in relation to manufactures, consequently no such comparison can be made beyond that covered by the three items—rateable property, Bank capital and deposits, and Savings' Bank deposits. Taking these three, the comparison is as follows; and if Mr. Powell, or any one else, can see in it any ground for the belief or the assertion that free trade is preferable to protection as a wealth-producing policy, they have an obliquity of vision from which we can only wish they were free.

These figures show conclusively which colony has the advantage in the matter of accumulated wealth. The only lines upon which New South Wales comes anywhere near Victoria are those relating to the business of banking; and the explanation of that is to be found in these two facts that, during the late political turmoil, very large sums were said to have been withdrawn from deposit in Melbourne and sent over the border for deposit in Sydney; and that immense sums were known to have been withdrawn for the purpose of making large purchases of land from the New South Wales Government, which sums, of course, found their way into the Sydney banks. During the last year (1881), the deposits have increased in Victoria to over £21,000,000. It is only fair to add that nearly eight millions of the increase of rateable property in New South Wales is due to the fact that that amount is the result of the formation of new municipal districts during the decade, and is not, as with us, the increase in the value of property previously subject to rates.

As a further illustration of the unprecedented progress we have made in the accumulation of wealth during this period, we may cite the following statement, in addition to the above, of some of our more prominent forms of investment.

This table shows that, in these forms of investment alone, Victoria has an accumulation of capital of over 125 millions sterling, and that nearly two-fifths of this amount has been accumulated during the ten years in question, in which, according to Mr. Powell, the millstone of Protection has been dragging us down to ruin. We are so well pleased with ruin of this description, that we shall welcome its more rapid approach. It will be seen that there is only one line in the above list which shows any decline, and that is the line devoted to the mining industry, which has fallen off consequent upon the decline in gold-mining. But this industry, even, has had a great revival during the last twelve or eighteen months, consequent upon the facilities for obtaining money at lower rates of interest, which now exist; and a valuation of the plant made up to the end of 1881 exceeds that above quoted by £30,000.

In the face of these facts, which ought to have been known to any public writer who should undertake to instruct less informed persons, it is most unjust to malign and misrepresent Victoria for the purpose of supporting a political theory and proving some political economist in the wrong upon a question of policy.

There is only one other matter which remains to be noticed, and that is the argument founded upon the question of Revenue. It is unnecessary to dwell upon it at any length, as our critic, in his desperate attempts to make adverse circumstances prove the same point, has successfully answered himself upon this question. He first proves, to his own entire satisfaction, that our Import trade suffers terribly in consequence of our high tariff. Very good, say we; that is the best possible proof that our object is in course of accomplishment; we are supplying ourselves, instead of buying from abroad. It does not suit Mr. Powell's theory, however, to admit that such is the case—that we make our own goods; so, in another part of his article, when he is aiming at proving that our manufactures are little or no use to us for this purpose, he asserts that we have still to supply ourselves from abroad to as large an amount as New South Wales. This contradiction is so gross and absurd that, lest we should be thought to exaggerate it, we quote his own words as follow;—"If we compare the articles which are imported into Victoria under a heavy duty, and which enter New South Wales free, we shall find that, in spite of the increase in price, Victoria still is forced to supply herself with these 'prohibited' or 'weighted' foreign articles; and imports of these classes, on an annual average, about as much as the unprotected New South Wales." If this statement be true, will Mr. Powell explain how it is that our Imports have not increased as rapidly as those of New South Wales? Then will he further explain how it is that, if we import as much of these articles as our neighbours, upon which we collect heavy duties and they collect none, our Customs Revenue is, as he asserts, declining, while that of New South Wales is increasing? In the meantime, and until he determines

which of these two contradictory and irreconcilable statements he intends to hold by and which he intends to abandon, we are relieved from the necessity of answering him. We are prepared to admit that our Imports have not increased so rapidly as our neighbour's, and that, as a natural consequence, our revenue from Customs' duties correspondingly lags behind theirs; but we accept these facts as the direct proofs of the success of our Protective policy, unless it can be shown that our people are less able and less willing to purchase what they require now, than they were before this policy was adopted. That they are not less able, the enormous growth of their accumulations unanswerably proves; and that they are not less willing is equally well proved by the fact that, last year, in addition to the consumption of imports of the high duty-paying articles—equal, according to Mr. Powell, to that of New South Wales—they consumed eleven and a quarter millions' worth of goods turned out from our own manufactories, the actual consumption being £17 2s. 5d. per head of the population of imported articles, and £13 10s. 6d. per head of home productions—a total of £30 12s. 10d. per head of the entire population. Will Mr. Powell produce one Free Trade population which can compare with ours on these lines? Until he does, not all his manipulation of figures, misrepresentation or suppression of facts, will serve his purpose in the least. At any rate, he must go on his travels again in search of some other "shocking example" wherewith to refute Mr. John Stuart Mill. Victoria will not help him, except with those, if they are to be found, who are more ignorant of this colony, its history and circumstances, than he is himself.

Toward the close of his article he expresses the opinion that there is in this colony a "reactionary movement in favor of a lower tariff," and gives utterance to a wish that his contribution will give fresh impulse" to this movement. We can assure him that there is no such movement as he imagines, and, further, that if there were, such articles as his, so manifestly unfair and unreliable, so easily opposed and refuted, would have just the opposite effect to that which he desires. He thinks he sees in the appointment by the Premier of a Royal Commission to inquire into the working of our tariff, of which Commission the writer has the honor of being Chairman, an indication that such a movement is going on. His opinion is based, in this case as in all those which we have already dealt with, upon a want of knowledge of the subject. The Commission is appointed to ascertain what duties can be removed, if any, without interfering with the settled policy of the colony. Mr. Powell must have known this if he had even read the terms of the Commission before he ventured to publish his opinions of its purpose and scope. We may assume, therefore, that he went upon the principle that, if he knew little or nothing of his subject, his readers would know less; and that, as "among the blind, the one-eyed man is king," he might safely dare contradiction or refutation.

There is very much more evidence that New South Wales will follow our fiscal policy than there is any probability that Victoria will revert to free trade. The energy and vigor with which the protectionist party in that colony is carrying on its operations, through the lately-organized Protection League," bears witness to this fact.

Before closing this reply to this travelled economist, it may be as well to say that in the statement of our accumulations no account has been taken of State property in land, railways, waterworks and public works and buildings; municipal improvements, or church and school property, all such being exempt from rates, and therefore not rateable. These items represent at least £100,000,000 more, making a total fixed capital of £225,000,000. When it is remembered that this accumulation is the work of little more than thirty years, and the result of the labour, less the £22,000,000 borrowed, of an average adult male population of less than 200,000, it will be admitted by every impartial person that the fiscal policy and political conditions under which it has been achieved cannot be so bad as they are represented. At any rate, it is essential that any man who, on the strength of a flying visit to our shores, undertakes to pose as an authority upon either or all of these questions should display at least a fair acquaintance with his subject, and manifest an impartial judgment in dealing with it. These conditions we noticed to be "conspicuous by their absence" in Mr. Powell's article. Hence we have ventured to break a lance in defence of our home, our policy, and our institutions.

Life is too short, we are too busy, and we are too accustomed to the thousand-and-one misrepresentations of all that concerns Victoria, its politics and progress, its manufactures and commerce, its social condition and its material resources, its present aims, and its future prospects, its capabilities and its disabilities, which constantly appear in the British Press, to trouble ourselves about answering them.

In this instance the case is different. Our critic is a well-known public writer, who, by virtue of his visits to this part of the world, would be accepted, in some sort, as an authority; and the medium which he selected for the dissemination of his crude opinions and incomplete facts was well adapted to bring them under the notice of the public. Under these circumstances, we could not allow him or his misrepresentations to remain unnoticed or unanswered. We shall be well rewarded if we have helped our readers to form a more correct opinion of this grand colony than any they may previously have entertained, and if we have helped to secure for the future fuller information upon our affairs, before they speak or write, on the part of those who presume to instruct us in the mode of carrying on our Government.

Griffith and Spaven, Printers, Smith Street, Fitzroy.
Regulations

For the Advertising, Preparing, and Issuing Agricultural Leases of the West Coast Settlement Reserves
[Extract from the *New Zealand Gazette*, 15th Feb., 1883.]

coat of arms Wellington: By Authority: George Didsbury, Government Printer. 1883

Regulations

For the Advertising, Preparing, and Issuing Agricultural Leases of the West Coast Settlement Reserves.

WM. F. DRUMMOND JERVOIS, Governor.

Order in Council.

At the Government House, at Wellington, this thirteenth day of February, 1883.

Present:

HIS EXCELLENCY THE GOVERNOR IN COUNCIL.

WHEREAS by "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," it is enacted that the Governor in Council may from time to time make, alter, and revoke regulations, *inter alia*, for the advertising, preparing, and issuing leases of the West Coast Settlement Reserves:

Now, therefore, His Excellency the Governor, in pursuance and exercise of the power and authority conferred upon him by the hereinbefore in part recited Act, and by and with the advice and consent of the Executive Council of the said colony, doth hereby make the following regulations as those upon which leases of the said reserves for agricultural purposes shall be advertised, prepared, and issued, that is to say,—

INTERPRETATION CLAUSE.

In these regulations and in the Schedules, if not inconsistent with the context,—

"The Act" means "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881:"

"Substantial improvements" means houses and buildings, and includes fencing, planting, draining, and reclamation of land, the benefit of which is unexhausted at the time of valuation:

"Lessor" means Trustee as defined by the Act:

"Lessee" means any person taking a lease from the lessor under the Act:

"Reserves Trustee" means the West Coast Settlement Reserves Trustee as defined by the Act:

"Notice" means a notice given by causing the same to be personally served on any person, or by leaving the same at his usual or last known place of abode or business in the colony, or by forwarding the same by post addressed to his usual or last known place of abode or business:

"Publicly notified," "public notice," means a notice published by advertisement at least twice in a newspaper having general circulation in the district wherein the land to be leased is situated.

How first Leases disposed of.

1. Every lease (hereinafter referred to as a "lease") shall be put up to public competition by tender, after public notice thereof, at an upset rental equivalent to five pounds per centum on the capital value as fixed by the lessor of the land proposed to be leased.

Provided that such value so fixed shall not be less than the price for which similar lands may be sold for cash under the law for the time being regulating the price of such land in the district.

2. Every tender shall be in the form in the First Schedule hereto. Forms of tender can be had on application at the District Land Offices, New Plymouth, Patea, and Hawera.

3. Every tenderer will be notified that his tender has been accepted, in the form in the Second Schedule hereto, or to that effect.

4. All tenders for any land shall be opened by the lessor or Reserves Trustee at one time as advertised.

Any such tender shall be deemed to be informal and incapable of being accepted unless closed up and accompanied by a statutory declaration in the form or to the effect set forth in the Third Schedule hereto, and

also accompanied by an amount equal to six months' rent at the rate tendered, paid either in cash or by a marked cheque. Forms of declaration can be obtained at the offices before mentioned.

5. The highest tenderer for a lease, if his tender shall equal or exceed such upset price, shall be declared the lessee, and be entitled to possession of the lands the lease of which has been so purchased by him when and so soon as he has executed a lease thereof in accordance with the provisions of the Act and these regulations, and has complied with any other conditions lawfully prescribed in that behalf at the time of sale.

6. If the rent offered by two or more persons is of the same amount, and is higher than that offered by any other tenderers, then the lessor shall decide by lot which of such two or more persons shall be declared the lessee.

7. The deposits and fees paid by the unsuccessful tenderers shall be returned to them by the lessor or Reserves Trustee immediately after the tenders have been opened.

8. If any person who has been declared a lessee hereunder shall fail to execute his lease within twenty-one days from the date of the notice of acceptance of his tender in the form in the Second Schedule hereto, his deposit shall be absolutely forfeited to the lessor, and his right to obtain a lease of such lands shall absolutely cease and determine: Provided the lease is ready for execution at the office for the district of the Reserves Trustee; otherwise the lessee shall not be deemed to have committed default until the expiration of fifteen days after notice shall have been sent to him that the lease is so ready.

Provided, further, that at any time within seven days from such forfeiture the lessor may declare the next highest tenderer for the same lease to be the lessee, or, if the rent offered by two or more persons is the same amount, and is higher than the rent offered by any other tenderer save the one who has so forfeited his right to a lease as aforesaid, the lessor may decide by lot which of such others shall be the lessee, upon his again pa[unclear: y for th]e deposit and fees as aforesaid, if his deposit [unclear: shall] have been previously returned to him; and thereupon the provisions of the Act and these regulations shall apply to such person as if he had been declared the lessee on the day of the opening of the tenders. But any such tenders, to be capable of being accepted under this proviso, must equal or exceed the upset price as aforesaid.

And in case of forfeiture of his right to a lease by the person so declared a lessee under the above proviso, the procedure prescribed by the said proviso shall, *mutatis mutandis*, be continued from time to time, until the land be leased in accordance with the Act and these regulations, or until there be a failure of all tenderers whose tenders are formal and who are willing to accept the lease in accordance with the Act and these regulations.

9. If no tender shall be received for any of the leases advertised for competition by tender prior to the time fixed for opening the tenders, any person may at any time thereafter apply for any one of such leases, and be declared the lessee thereof at the upset rental fixed, upon complying with the other conditions of the Act and these regulations prescribed as to tenders.

If two or more applicants shall lodge their tenders at the same time, the right to the lease shall be decided by lot.

10. Any one person may tender for two or more leases at the same time, but, except in the case provide: for by clause fourteen hereof, he shall not be capable of becoming the lessee under more than one lease; and if he shall be found, upon the opening of the tenders, to be the highest tenderer for more than one lease, he shall, except in the case before mentioned, elect forthwith which of such leases he will accept, and thereupon the lessor shall, subject to the other provisions of the Act and these regulations, declare the next highest tenderer for the lease or leases which the first-mentioned tenderer has elected not to accept to be the lessee, or, if there be two or more tenderers at the same amount and higher than any other tenderers, shall decide by lot.

Provided that, in the event of any person tendering for two or more leases, the deposit of a sum equal to one half-year's rent of the tender largest in amount shall be sufficient.

Provided further that, if he be tendering for two or more leases such as he may in the aggregate become the lessee of under the fourteenth clause hereof, the deposit shall in such case be a half-year's rent, at the rate tendered for each such lease.

11. The lessor may at any time reduce the upset rental of land which he has failed to lease, subject to the proviso to clause one hereof, and may again call for tenders for the same at such reduced rental.

12. Any person of the age of eighteen years may become a lessee hereunder, and shall be as capable of executing a lease and shall be bound by the terms thereof and of the Act and these regulations as if such person was of full age.

Limits of Area for each Lessee.

13. No lease shall be made to any person nor shall any person be capable of becoming the lessee under a lease or a sublessee who, under the lessor, shall become either the tenant, or occupier in the whole, either by himself or jointly with any other person or persons, including the lands comprised in the lease, of a greater area

than six hundred and forty acres of rural land and forty acres of suburban land.

14. No person shall be capable of becoming the lessee under more than one lease, unless the lands comprised in the several leases adjoin each other.

Provided that lands shall be deemed to adjoin, or be contiguous to, each other if only separated by a road or stream.

15. The provisions of the last two preceding clauses shall not apply to persons who may become lessees or sublessees by marriage, or under a will, or by virtue of an intestacy.

As to Preparation, Cost, Execution, and Registration of Leases.

16. Every lease shall be prepared by the lessor, and shall, as nearly as may be, be in the form and contain the powers, reservations, provisions, conditions, covenants, and agreements set forth in the Fourth Schedule hereto.

17. Every lease shall be in duplicate, and the lessee shall be entitled to the registered copy of the same, provided he shall have paid, before the execution of such lease by the lessor, the moneys payable for stamping and registering the lease, and a fee of one pound.

18. Every lease shall, after execution thereof by the lessor and the lessee, be registered by the lessor under "The Land Transfer Act, 1870," or any amendment thereof.

As to Term, Payment of Rent, and Taxes.

19. Every lease of rural land shall be for a term fixed so as to expire on the thirtieth day of June in any year.

20. The lessee shall pay the rent reserved by his lease to the lessor by equal half-yearly instalments in advance, on the first day of the months of January and July in each year.

21. The lessee shall be liable for all rates, taxes, or assessments of every nature or kind whatsoever imposed upon the occupier of the lands included in his lease during the term for which he is lessee.

As to Transfers, Subleases, and Sales by Mortgagees, &c.

22. No lessee, or any person claiming by, through, under, or in trust for him, shall transfer, charge, sublet, or otherwise part with the possession or occupation of the land leased to him, or any part thereof, without the previous consent in writing of the lessor, and until the transferee, sublessee, or person acquiring possession or occupation has deposited with the lessor a statutory declaration in the form or to the effect set forth in the Third Schedule hereto.

23. No trustee in bankruptcy or under a deed of assignment who as such has acquired a lease, and no Sheriff or other officer of any Court who may be entitled to sell a lease by virtue of any process of such Court, shall be capable of selling such lease until the purchaser has deposited with the lessor a statutory declaration in the form or to the effect set forth in the Third Schedule hereto.

24. All dealings with or under leases in contravention of the provisions of the two last preceding clauses shall be absolutely void.

As to Surrenders.

25. Any lessee may, with the consent of the lessor, surrender the lands leased by him, and thereupon valuations shall be made, and a new lease of the said lands offered for sale in like manner as if the lease so surrendered was about to be determined by effluxion of time, save that it shall not be competent, for the period of seven years from the date of such surrender, for the lessee who has so surrendered to become the lessee of the new lease either originally or by transfer or sublease.

As to the Taking for Public Purposes, or Resumption, of Lands leased.

26. Should any part of the land so leased be taken for public purposes or resumed by the lessor, the rent payable by the lessee shall be abated in such proportion to the whole rent payable under the lease as the area so taken or resumed bears to the whole area leased, and the lessee shall, upon such taking or resumption of the whole or any part of the lands leased by him, be paid by the lessor compensation, valued by arbitration, for any substantial improvements of a permanent character which may have been made by him and may be then in

existence on the said lands the possession of which has been so resumed.

27. If by reason of such taking or resumption any portion of the land included in the lease is so severed from the rest of the land included therein as in the opinion of the lessee greatly diminishes the value to him of the portion severed, then he shall, with the consent of the lessor, be entitled to surrender any portion so severed, and shall thereupon be entitled to a further abatement of rent and to compensation as if the portion so surrendered had been taken or resumed as above mentioned: Provided that should any difference arise in respect of any matter affected by the preceding clause or this clause it shall be referred to arbitration in the manner hereinafter provided.

As to Occupation and Improvements.

28. Each lessee shall, within two years from the date of his lease, bring into cultivation not less than one-tenth of the land leased by him; within four years from the said date, not less than one-fifth of the said land; and within six years from the date of his lease, in addition to the cultivation of one-fifth of the land, shall place on such land substantial improvements of a permanent character to the value of one pound for every acre.

29. Each lessee of suburban land shall, within one year from the date of his lease, fence in all the open land leased by him.

30. Improvements to be suitable to, and consistent with the extent and character of, the holdings; and none shall be allowed for in any valuation in excess of five pounds for every acre of rural land, or ten pounds for every acre of suburban land.

As to Arbitration.

31.

- "Whenever in these regulations a valuation or other matter is required to be referred to arbitration, such reference shall be to two persons, one to be appointed in writing by the lessee (which term throughout these regulations includes the executor, administrator, or permitted assignee of any lessee hereunder), and the other by the lessor.
- If either the lessee or the lessor shall fail to appoint an arbitrator within twenty-one days after being requested in writing to do so by the other party, then the arbitrator appointed by the other party shall alone conduct the arbitration, and his decision shall be final and binding on both parties.
- If the said arbitrators shall fail to agree upon the matter referred to them within twenty-eight days after the same has been so referred, then the matter so referred shall be decided by an umpire appointed by the said arbitrators before they shall have entered on the reference; and the decision of such arbitrators or umpire shall be final and binding on both parties.
- Every such arbitration shall be carried on in the manner prescribed by "The Supreme Court Practice and Procedure Amendment Act, 1866," or any amendment thereof.
- All costs of and incidental to the reference shall be in the discretion of the arbitrator or umpire.

Miscellaneous.

32. The conditions set forth in the Act and these regulations as regards leases shall operate and shall be deemed to bind the lessor and the lessee as fully and effectually as if they were set forth in every lease.

33. If any lessee hereunder shall make default in the payment of rent or in the observance or performance of any of the conditions herein contained, or which may be expressed or implied in his lease, and shall allow such default to continue for three calendar months, or shall be convicted of making any false declaration hereunder, his lease shall thereupon absolutely determine, and the lands included in the same, with all improvements thereon, shall absolutely revert to the lessor, without any payment whatsoever to the lessee, and without releasing him from his liability in respect of any rent then due.

Schedules.

FIRST SCHEDULE.

"THE WEST COAST SETTLEMENT RESEEYES ACT, 1881."

Tender for Agricultural Lease.

To the Public Trustee.

I [*or We*], the undersigned, do hereby tender for Section, Block _____, _____ Survey District, as notified by an advertisement published in the _____ of the _____ day of, 188, and in accordance with the conditions of tender exhibited at _____, for the sum of £_____per annum for the whole term of _____ years. I [*or We*] enclose herewith for £, being the deposit payable as required.

Should the tender be accepted, I [*or We*] undertake to sign a lease of the said land within twenty-one days after receiving notice of such acceptance.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 188 .

Christian name and surname in full:

Occupation:

Residence:

Post town:

SECOND SCHEDULE.

"THE WEST COAST SETTLEMENT RESEEVES ACT, 1881."

Acceptance of Tender for Agricultural Lease.

West Coast Settlement Reserves Department, _____, _____, _____, 188 .

SIR,—I am directed to inform you that your tender of to lease, in accordance with the conditions of tender exhibited at _____, Section _____, Block _____, _____ Survey District, for _____ years, at an annual rent of £ per annum for the whole term, has been accepted by the Public Trustee. A lease and counterpart will be forwarded for your perusal and signature to this office, notice of which you will receive. Should you fail to execute the lease within twenty-one days of the date hereof, and pay the sum of £ for preparing, stamping, and registering such lease, your claim thereto will be liable to be forfeited, and the land declared open for occupation.

I have, &c.,

To.

A.B.

THIRD SCHEDULE.

"THE WEST COAST SETTLEMENT RESERVES ACT, 1881."

Declaration on taking a Lease, or becoming the Transferee or Sublessee of a Lease.

I, A.B., of [*Insert place of abode and occupation*], do solemnly and sincerely declare—

- That I am of the full age of eighteen years.
- That I am the person who, subject to the provisions of "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," is tendering for the purchase [*or is desirous of becoming the transferee or sublessee*] of a lease of [*Here specify land*].
- That I am purchasing such lease solely for my own use and benefit, and for the purposes of cultivation, and not directly or indirectly for the use or benefit of any other person whomsoever.
- That, including the said lands, I am not the tenant or occupier, directly or indirectly, either by myself or jointly with any other person or persons, of any lands anywhere on the West Coast Settlement Reserves exceeding in the whole six hundred and forty acres of rural land and forty acres of suburban land.

And I make this solemn declaration conscientiously believing the same to be true, and by virtue of an Act of the General Assembly of New Zealand intituled The Justices of the Peace Act, 1882."

A.B.

Declared at _____, this _____ day of _____, 188, before me,

>

Justice of the Peace for the Colony of New Zealand

[*or Solicitor or Notary Public*].

NOTE.—This declaration will require a half-crown stamp.

Fourth Schedule.

"THE WEST COAST SETTLEMENT RESERVES ACT 1881."

MEMORANDUM OF LEASE.

WHEREAS a grant under "The West Coast Settlement Reserves Act, 1881," has been issued to of the lands hereinafter described: and whereas, in exercise of the powers and authorities in that behalf imposed upon him by the said Act, the Public Trustee has agreed to grant this lease:

Now, Therefore, I, the Public Trustee, do hereby lease to _____, of _____, who and whose executors, administrators, and assigns are hereinafter referred to as and included in the term "the lessee," All that piece of land situate in _____, containing, be the same a little more or less, as the same is described in the Schedule hereto, and de-lined on the map or plan thereof drawn hereon and bordered: excepting and reserving nevertheless out of this demise unto the lessor, his successors or assigns, all mines, metals, minerals, coal, lignite, lime, slate, or freestone in or upon the land hereby demised, with power to work, use, possess, sell, and dispose of the same, or any part thereof respectively, except such as may be required by the lessee for his own use but not for sale or disposal; with power also to the lessor, his successors or assigns, to make roads through the said piece of land, and for such purposes, or any or either of them, to erect or build houses and other convenient buildings thereon on payment of surface-money only, the amount of such damages in cases of disagreement to be settled by arbitration as hereinafter mentioned: To hold the said premises unto the lessee for the term of _____ years, commencing and to be computed from the _____ day of _____, 18 _____, at the yearly rental of _____, payable by equal half-yearly payments on the _____ day of the months of and _____ in each and every year during the said term, subject to the following covenants, conditions, and restrictions:—

- That the lessee shall and will, during the said term, pay unto the Public Trustee or his successors (hereinafter referred to as "the lessor"), the said yearly rental on the days and in manner hereinbefore mentioned.
- That the lessee shall and will, during the said term, bear and pay all taxes, charges, rates, or assessments now or hereafter during the said term to be assessed, charged, or imposed upon the hereby demised premises, or upon the landlord or tenant in respect thereof, or of any buildings or improvements thereon.
- That the lessee shall not assign, sublet, mortgage, or part with the possession of the hereby demised premises, or any part thereof, without the consent in writing of the lessor previously obtained for that purpose.
- That the lessee "will insure" and "paint outside every alternate year."
- That he "will fence" and "cultivate."

And it is hereby expressly agreed and declared between and by the said parties hereto that within three months before the determination of this demise by effluxion of time all buildings and fixtures, including fencing, on the land hereby demised, which shall be deemed to be substantial improvements under the regulations made under the said Act, shall be valued by arbitration in the manner hereinafter mentioned; and a fresh lease of the said land for the same period and on the same conditions as this lease shall be offered for sale by public tender, subject to the payment by the incoming tenant to the lessee of the valuation so to be ascertained as aforesaid; and in the event of there being no accepted tenderer at the said auction the lessee shall have the option of accepting a new lease of the said land for the same period and on the same conditions as this lease, at a rental to be fixed by arbitration as hereinafter provided, but in the fixing of which the arbitrators or umpire shall not be entitled to take into consideration the value of the improvements for which the lessee would otherwise have been entitled to payment as aforesaid; and if the lessee shall decline to accept such new lease or to execute a counterpart thereof, on the same being tendered to him for the purpose, he shall forfeit all right and title to the value of such improvements as aforesaid.

And it is hereby further declared and agreed that throughout this lease, where any matter is agreed to be referred to arbitration, then such matter shall be determined by the written award of two arbitrators, one to be appointed by the lessor and the other by the lessee, and, in case the said arbitrators shall fail to agree upon an award within twenty-eight days after their appointment, then by the written award of an umpire to be appointed in writing by such arbitrators before entering upon the consideration of the matters referred to them; and if either party, after receiving written notice from the other party of the appointment by such other party of an arbitrator, shall fail within twenty-one days after the receipt of such notice to name an arbitrator, or shall name an arbitrator who shall refuse to act, then the arbitrator appointed by the party giving such notice may proceed in the reference alone, and his award on the matter referred to arbitration shall be final and conclusive on both

parties; and the said arbitrator or arbitrators and their umpire shall have full power and authority to decide all questions which may arise in the course of the said reference, and in particular any questions as to what matters or things are proper subjects of valuation; and the cost of every such reference and award shall be, in the discretion of the arbitrators or umpire, and the submission hereby made on the award thereon may be made a rule of the Supreme Court of New Zealand at the instance of either of the parties hereto:

Provided always that, if the rent hereby reserved shall not be paid on the days hereinbefore appointed for payment thereof, then and in such case it shall and may be lawful for the lessor to charge to and recover from the lessee interest at the rate of fifteen pounds per centum per annum on all overdue rent from the date it became due until the date of actual payment:

Provided always that if the rent hereby reserved shall be in arrear and unpaid for the space of three calendar months next after any of the days herein appointed for payment thereof, although no formal demand shall be made for such payment, or in case the lessee shall infringe, or fail to perform or observe, any or either of the covenants, conditions, or agreements herein contained or implied, and by and on the part of the lessee to be performed or observed, then and in any such case it shall be lawful for the lessor into and upon the demised premises, or any part thereof in the name of the whole, to re-enter, and the same to have again, repossess, and enjoy, and to let, use, and dispose thereof as if these presents had not been made; and in case of such re-entry the lessee shall not be entitled to receive, nor shall the lessor be compellable to pay, any valuation or sum for any improvements whatsoever, anything herein contained to the contrary notwithstanding; and such re-entry shall in no wise prejudice the right of the lessor to recover any rent then due or payable, or right of distress, action, or suit that may have arisen under these presents prior to such re-entry.

Dated this _____ day of _____, 18.

Lessor.

Lessee.

The Schedule referred to in the foregoing lease.

FORSTER GORING,

Clerk of the Executive Council.

Annual Report of the Dunedin

Chamber of Commerce.

August, 1883

Dunedin: Printed at the "Daily Times" Office, Dowling Street MDCCCLXXXIII

Committee.

Chairman:

- George Bell.

Vice-Chairman:

- George Joachim.

Committee:

- T. Brown
- G. L. Denniston
- J. M. Joness
- J. R. Danson
- J. M. Ritchie
- E. J. Spence
- J. Roberts
- E. Moore
- J. T. Mckerras

- H. E. Williams

Secretary:

- H. Houghton.

List of Members.

- Adams, J. A. D.
- Allen, C. S.
- Arthur, Jno.
- Ashcroft, James Austin, T.
- Bagley, R. P.
- Baldwin, Capt.
- Bank of New Zealand
- Bank of New South Wales
- Bank of Australasia
- Bardsley, S.
- Barron, Jno.
- Bartleman, A.
- Bastings, H.
- Bathgate, J.
- Baxter, D.
- Beal, L. O.
- Begg, A. C.
- Bell, George
- Benjamin, H.
- Black, C.
- Black, A.
- Blair, R.
- Blakeley, John
- Blyth, George
- Brown, Thomas
- Brown, W.
- Brydone, T.
- Burt, A.
- Bury, Maxwell
- Callan, J. R.
- Cargill, E. B.
- Chapman and Strode
- Churton, W. H.
- Chisholm, Robt.
- Clarke, G. T.
- Colonial Insurance Co.
- Colonial Bank of New Zealand
- Connell, J.
- Coulls, Wm.
- Cowie, George
- Culling, T. S.
- Danson, J.
- Davie, John
- Davies, Wm.
- Denniston, G. L.
- Dick, R.
- Dodson, T. H.
- Driver, Henry

- Dunedin Finance Co.
- Dunedin Iron and Wood-ware Co.
- Duthie, Jas.
- Dymock, W.
- Elder, Wm.
- Elliott, G. W.
- Equitable Insurance Co.
- Esther, George
- Ewing, R.
- Fagan, M.
- Fargie, J.
- Farquhar, G. P.
- Fenwick, George
- Findlay, J.
- Fish, Jun., H. S.
- Fitchett, F.
- Fox, Capt. Jas.
- Franckeiss, J. F.
- Fulton, F.
- Gage, Wm.
- Gilchrist, William
- Gillies, R.
- Gillies, J. L.
- Glendining, R.
- Gregg, William
- Guthrie, H.
- Guthrie, W.
- Hallenstein, B.
- Hardy, H. F.
- Hart, H.
- Hay, R., C.E.
- Hayman, M.
- Haynes, D.
- Heeles, M. G.
- Hepburn, W.
- Heycock, A. H.
- Hislop, J.
- Hislop, Walter
- Hodgkins, W. M.
- Hogg, James
- Holmes, A.
- Hosking, J. H.
- Houghton, J.
- Howison, C. M.
- Hoy, Sew
- Hudson, R.
- Inglis, A.
- Irvine, Major-General
- Jack, A. H.
- Joachim, G.
- Joel, M.
- Jones, J. M.
- Jones, H. S.
- Keast and McCarthy, Limited
- Kempthorne, T. W.
- Kennedy, W. C.
- Kenyon, E. P.
- Kettle, C.

- Kirkpatick, H.
- Kohn, S.
- Lane, W.
- Larnach, W. J. M., C.M.G.
- Law, H.
- Leary, R. H.
- Lees, A.
- Lees, W.
- Lewis, G.
- Logan, P.
- Low, Thos.
- Maclean, G.
- Maclean, H. J.
- Macneil, A.
- Marine Insurance Co.
- Matheson, G C.
- Meenan, F.
- Meenan, M.
- Mendershausen, M.
- Mills, James
- Mill, John
- Moore, C.
- Mollison, A.
- Morrison, J. H.
- Mowat, Andrew
- Mudie, J. B.
- Murray, R. K.
- McFarlane, A.
- McGlashan, E
- McKerras, J. T.
- McLaren, R.
- McNeill, H.
- McQueen, C.
- McVicar, R. S.
- National Bank of New Zealand
- National Insurance Co. of New Zealand
- Neill, W. G.
- New Zealand Insurance Co.
- New Zealand Shipping Co.
- Nimmo, R.
- Oliver, Hon. R.
- Park, R.
- Park, J. A.
- Parker, Hon. E. W.
- Paterson, A. S.
- Paterson, R.
- Petre, F. W.
- Philp, W. L.
- Pym, M.
- Pyke, V.
- Quick, E.
- Quick, W. H.
- Ramsay, K.
- Rattray, J.
- Reeves, C. S.
- Reid, D.
- Reid and Duncans
- Reid, Jun., D.

- Reynolds, Hon. W. H.
- Richards, John
- Ritchie, T. T.
- Ritchie, J. M.
- Roberts, W. C.
- Roberts, J.
- Robin, J.
- Ross, A. H.
- Ross, M.
- Royse, William
- Russell, Gray
- Saunders, R.
- Scott, Capt., R.N.
- Scott, J. R.
- Scoular, W.
- Scoullar, A.
- Shacklock, H. E.
- Sievwright, B.
- Simpson, W. L.
- Sinclair, J.
- Sinclair, Mark
- Sise, G. L.
- Smith, J.
- Smith, R. F.
- Smith, E.
- Solomon, Saul
- South British
Insurance Co.
- Spedding, D. M.
- Spence, E. J.
- Sprent, J. S.
- Standard Insurance Co.
- Stewart, J.
- Stewart, W. D.
- Stephenson, John
- Stevenson, Wm.
- Stout, Robert
- Strachan, Wm.
- Stronach, D.
- Taylor, W.
- Thomson, A.
- Thomson, J. B.
- Tomlinson, T.
- Thomson, A.
- Turnbull, G.
- Union Insurance Co.
- Union Bank of Australia
- Victoria Insurance Co.
- Wales, N. Y.
- Watson, G.
- Watson, W.
- Watson, J. F.
- Wayne, F.
- West, G. R.
- Westport Coal Co.
- White, J.
- Wilkie, James
- Wilkinson, T. M.

- Wilson, James
- Wilson, R.
- Winchester, W. T.
- Wise, Caffin, and Co.
- Wright, J. T.
- Wright, Wm.
- Wyper, R.
- Young, T.
- Young, H.

Dunedin Chamber of Commerce.

Report of the Committee of the Dunedin Chamber of Commerce for the year ending 30th June, 1883, presented at the Annual Meeting held on the 31st August, 1883,—the President, Mr. Robert Wilson, in the chair.

Report of Committee.

The Committee beg to submit their Report on the principal subjects which have come before them for consideration during the past year.

AMENDMENT OF BANKRUPTCY LAW.

In March last the Hon. the Minister of Justice invited by circular opinions from the various Chambers in the Colony upon the proposed alteration in the existing Bankruptcy Law. A Sub-Committee was appointed to consider them, and, by invitation, two legal members of the Chamber, Messrs. W. D. Stewart and R. Stout, were asked to take part in their deliberations. Various alterations were suggested and embodied in a report by the Committee forwarded to the Minister of Justice, copies of which were also sent to the different Chambers for their consideration and approval. The views of the Chamber were very ably supported in the Assembly by Mr. H. S. Fish. The Bill passed by the House of Representatives is, in the opinion of the Committee, a good, workable measure; likely to remove the glaring defects on the previous Law of Bankruptcy. A very cordial vote of thanks was accorded to Messrs. Stewart and Stout for the valuable aid afforded by those gentlemen in the preparation of the report of the Committee.

OTAGO CENTRAL RAILWAY.

The following resolution of the Chamber was brought before the Hon. the Minister of Public Works in November last:—"That a deputation of the Chamber wait upon the Hon. the Minister of Public Works upon his arrival in Dunedin to urge upon him the desirability of pushing forward the works of the Otago Central Railway with expedition and despatch." This was strongly urged by the deputation who waited upon the Minister. The Committee regret that, notwithstanding the promise of the Minister of Public Works, so small a sum has been expended in pushing on this most important work during the past year. The Committee are now enabled to state that there appears to be a better disposition on the part of Government to construct a further section of the line. A sum of £130,000 has been placed upon the Estimates for the extension of the Railway, and there is now a better prospect of this arterial line being pushed on with greater energy than has been the case during the past three years..

HARBOUR BOARD.

Several conferences with the Harbour Board have been held for the purpose of assisting the Board in the removal of the differential dues between Port Chalmers and Dunedin, for the increase of the Board's revenue by raising the rates of wharfage, and in other ways aiding the Board in obtaining additional revenue. The Committee have strongly opposed the imposition of an export rate on interprovincial cargo, believing it to be an unnecessary restriction on the coastal trade of the Province. The Committee have given their support to the Board in their efforts to give greater despatch to vessels in the discharge of cargo. A resolution of the Chamber on this subject has been energetically given effect to by both the Harbour Board and the Railway Department—and one great source of complaint by the masters of vessels visiting this Port is now in course of removal. The Sub-Committee's resolution on this subject, as also those on the proposed reconstruction of the Harbour Board, are appended.

STOCK EXCHANGE.

Shortly after the last General Meeting the Committee invited the Stock and Share Brokers of the city to meet them in conference for discussion of details of the proposed Stock Exchange, the necessity for which had previously been affirmed by the Chamber. The Committee regret that nothing came of the attempt, the Brokers generally preferring a continuance of the present mode of carrying on their business to that suggested by the Chamber.

PUBLIC AUDITORS.

This subject has been discussed, and the general advisability affirmed that provision should be made for securing that the accounts and balance-sheets of all Public Companies and Corporate Bodies should be audited by persons duly qualified and licensed for the purpose, and that this is necessary for the protection of the general public, and that it is not adequately provided for at present.

TELEPHONE CHARGES.

The Committee brought under notice of the Chamber at its last meeting the excessive charge made by the Telephone Department for the use of their instruments. The Committee laid their views before the Hon. Mr. Dick, the Minister for Post and Telegraphs, strongly arguing a reduction from the present charge of £17 10s. to £10 for places of business, and £5 for private houses. In the Assembly, Mr. Fish moved for, and obtained, the appended return; and on the motion of Mr. Hurst, Member for Auckland, a Committee was appointed to consider the whole question; from the report of the Committee subscribers may confidently look for a considerable reduction. At the present time Dunedin has 229 Subscribers to the Telephone Exchange.

THE AGENT GENERAL.

The Resolution conveying the thanks of the Chamber to Sir Francis Dillon Bell for his services to the Colony was forwarded in a letter from the Chairman in March last. This with its acknowledgment by Sir Francis, the Committee deem of sufficient importance to embody in the Report of the Proceedings of the Chamber.

DIRECT STEAM SERVICE.

During the past year a commencement has been made of a Direct Steam Service between New Zealand and the Mother Country. Several magnificent steamers have been despatched by the New Zealand Shipping Company, to whose enterprise the Colony is indebted for the inauguration of a regular monthly line of steamers. It is to be hoped that the Assembly will offer such a substantial subsidy as will ensure the continuance of a large class of steamers, rendered more necessary now if the Colony is to attract to its shores a class of immigrants hitherto deterred by the lengthened voyages of sailing ships.

THE POSTAL UNION.

The Committee regret that the Government have not seen their way to join with other Australian Colonies in obtaining reduced and uniform postal rates, through the entrance of New Zealand with the other Colonies of Australasia into the Universal Postal Union. The loss of revenue to which the Hon. the Minister objects, the Committee believe would be found to be much less than he expects, owing to the increase in correspondence which has invariably been found to arise from a reduction in the rates of Postage.

AVERAGE BONDS.

The controversy over the custody of Average Deposits, so far as Dunedin is concerned, may now be looked upon as settled. The resolution of the various Underwriters' Associations in Australia—that the form of bond approved by Lloyds' should be adopted, has been given effect to by the ready assent of the Masters and Agents, in a recent case of general average, to the placing of the Deposits to a trust account in the names of the Master, the Chairman of the Dunedin Underwriters' Association, and one of the Consignees.

MANUFACTURES.

In estimating the value of our Exports it is necessary to take into consideration a fact of great importance that is very liable to be overlooked. The Committee refer to the great increase of our manufacturing industry as evinced in the returns from the Mosgiel, Kaiapoi, and Roslyn Woollen Mills, in which 5705 bales of wool have been worked up of the value of £74,800 during the past year. Of necessity, the Export Returns appear less by the value of the raw material consumed, but our local manufactures add materially to the wealth of the Colony.

EXPORT OF FROZEN MEAT.

The following statement shows the quantity exported and the growth of this new industry since its commencement in February of last year:—

NEW MEMBERS.

The abolition of the entrance fee upon members joining the Chamber has fully met the expectations of those gentlemen who advocated the change. Seventy-two new members have joined during the past year. The withdrawals and removals leave a present membership of 222.

DAILY EXCHANGE.

The Committee regret to state that the efforts made to establish a Daily Exchange have thus far been a failure. The large hall has been opened to the public from 12 to 1 o'clock, free of charge, a privilege which has been very slightly appreciated by the general public. The Chamber is now well and liberally supplied with Home and Colonial newspapers. The telephone has been added for the convenience of members. With all these advantages the Committee cannot close this report without expressing a feeling of disappointment with the results obtained.

R. Wilson, *Chairman.*

THE AGENT GENERAL.

Dunedin,

March 28, 1883.

Sir
Francis Dillon Bell, K.C.M.G., London.

Sir,—I have the honour, by request of the Chamber, to transmit to you the undermentioned resolution passed by the Chamber at its meeting held on Thursday last, the 22nd inst.

Embodying as it does the very favourable estimation in which your services as Agent General of the Colony are held, I trust you will have as much pleasure in receiving, as I have in conveying to you, this cordial expression of feeling on behalf of the commercial community of this city.—I have, &c.,

ROBERT WILSON, Chairman.

[RESOLUTION.]

Resolved—" That a cordial vote of thanks be given to Sir Francis Dillon Bell for the success that has attended the floating of the £1,000,000 loan, for his able pamphlet on New Zealand finance, and his exertions in inaugurating a direct steam service with Great Britain."

7, Westminster Chambers, London,

S.W.,

June 4, 1883.

Sir,—I have to acknowledge the receipt of your letter enclosing the resolution of the Chamber of Commerce, and I beg to return my grateful thanks to the Chamber for the honour they have done me.

The success of the million loan very likely appeared all the greater by comparison with the last financial operation we had to make. That the Colony should have been able only three years after giving, £120 of stock for £97 10s. in cash, to place a four per cent, loan at £98 12s. 6d., shows how much its credit had risen in the time. I am very grateful for the Chamber's appreciation of my own part in the business; but you may depend upon it that the real secret of our success was the confidence of investors in our good faith, and the belief in our determination to maintain economy and sufficient taxation as the true security of our finance.

As to the steam question, I confess to having devoted more pains to it than to anything else, except finance. We can hardly measure the good that would come to us from a properly established direct line, but the indispensable condition of any permanance in such an enterprise is that it should pay, which means that we must be willing to give reasonable help to it at first, though we ought to allow no monopoly of our trade to be set up.

With regard to my paper on the public debts, I could not see without great pleasure how widely attention became attracted to the wonderful facts I have attempted to record. A few minor points were disputed at the time with some acerbity, and I was prevented by a tedious illness from defending them as I should have liked; but it will not be long before I vindicate, in a second edition, the conclusions which had been impugned.

I thank the Chamber heartily for a recognition which has now to be added to the generous support and confidence I have always received from the Government. The time of my engagement is passing fast away, and my successor will soon be chosen. I trust it may be his good fortune, as it has been mine, to get, in what must always be a difficult and laborious work, not only the approval of the Ministers, but kindness and encouragement outside the official circle such as the Chamber has extended to me.—I have, &c.,

F. D. Bell.

The Chairman Chamber of Commerce,

Dunedin.

The PRESIDENT delivered the following Address:—

It now becomes my duty to move the adoption of the Report, and in doing so it will be expected that I should make some allusion to the numerous topics upon which it touches; I wish it to be understood that the Committee are in no way responsible for the opinions I am now expressing. I have given much time and thought to the business of the Chamber since the last meeting, and though I cannot congratulate Members upon an improved state of business, I see no reason for alarm. There is no doubt about the Colony having taxed its powers to the utmost extent—both by public and private borrowing—and as a matter of course the ill effects of this will have to be borne for a time. It is impossible not to feel the pinch arising from payment of large sums of money for interest on borrowed capital. But we can do this—we can hold our hands, borrow no further, and in the meantime manfully restrict our wants to our means of paying for them. If we do this we shall soon surmount our difficulties, and the cloud that now hangs over New Zealand will pass away, and we shall, be both better and wiser for the lesson we are learning. Our securities are good—we want time for the development of our resources, and, above all things, we want, a steady flow of the right sort of immigrants to utilise them; and these, I hope, we shall attain by the direct Steam Communication which has been so successfully inaugurated by the enterprise of the New Zealand Shipping Company. Bearing on this subject I would refer Members to the letter of Sir Francis Dillon Bell which is printed with the Report, and I would express the hope that such a subsidy, or such assistance by way of freight and passage money, will be offered by Parliament as will ensure a continuance of the service which the enterprise and liberality of the New Zealand Shipping Company have furnished to the Colony, or of some equally satisfactory line. If two can be supported, so much the better. We must have no monopoly. The Company that offers the best class of vessels suited to the wants of the Colony should receive the support of the Government. I hope we shall not see it defeated by a repetition of that misplaced economy, which for party purposes interfered with the appropriation Government proposed for the service last session.

In my former address I touched upon the depression that then existed in business circles. Trade has not improved since that time. I am sorry to say that I think it worse. The Treasurer in his Financial Statement drew attention to the large increase in our imports as one of the disturbing causes. That is an evil which will cure itself. Already the published statements show a decline, and from inquiries I have made, I look for a great diminution in our imports during the present financial year. We must not shut our eyes to the changes that are working amongst us. Large Joint Stock Companies are gradually absorbing or extinguishing the middle-men. Merchants, individually, are passing away, and their places are being taken by Joint Stock Companies possessing large capital, borrowed in the London market at one half the rates of interest our Bankers charge for the use of their capital. Against this no private enterprise can successfully compete. The profits are not spent in

the Colony, but go to support a class of absentees whose only interests in the country are the dividends they are receiving from it. Whether or not Mercantile Companies of resident shareholders will meet these new conditions of trade is, as yet, an untried experiment. Another cause of the present dullness, is, in my opinion, due to the comparatively sudden changes in the value of land. This is partly owing to the competition of the Banks and Loan Companies when capital was abundant to advance on mortgage of landed securities. Speculation was thus encouraged, and large purchases were made in expectation of realising larger profits by selling in suitable allotments for small farmers. The action of the Government in throwing extensive areas open for selection on favourable terms for settlement has closed the door to land speculations, and instead of disposing of their purchases as expected, they still remain on the buyers' hands, and the money thus advanced remains locked up, and unavailable for commercial purposes. If we look at the extent of the mortgage indebtedness of Canterbury, Otago, and Southland collectively, amounting to £614,899,251, on which upwards of £1,000,000 has annually to be paid in interest by a population of 260,000. I think you will agree with me therefore, that the general depression is due not to over importation alone, but to the presence of those Joint Stock Companies amongst us, who have aided and stimulated an unwise speculation in landed estate, before we had a population to develop the resources of the country.

A large amount of public attention throughout the neighbouring Colonies has been given to the annexation of New Guinea and other Islands of the South Pacific. This question, which has been warmly taken up in Australia, is one that requires careful consideration by all who are interested in the spread of civilization and the growth of commerce in the Pacific. I am not prepared to discuss this question to-day, but I do ask you to watch with interest the progress it is making in Australia, and to be prepared to give a support to any Ministry who may advocate its adoption by the Parliament of New Zealand. The wider question of Federation is receiving much attention in the Home Country. Whether we shall form an integral part of that great Empire, or become an independent Federation of Australian States—that Greater Britain of the South which writers like to depict—time and experience will settle. In the meantime there is a subject that concerns us all, and which the various Colonies of Australia and New Zealand can arrange amongst themselves—and that is a Customs' Union by which the free interchange of the natural products and manufactures of each Colony may circulate freely between each State without the obstruction of Custom houses. I see no difficulty in carrying such a Customs' League through. We have the lines of the German Customs' Union to follow, and it is a matter of history that that great nation owes its formation to the successful carrying out of the scheme by which all intermediate Custom houses were swept away, and merchandise and manufactures within the States comprising the Union passed freely from one to the other, free from the injurious effects of the hostile tariffs which had previously set State against State. Take, for example, our trade with Australia. Last year we took from her £400,557 of imports, and we exported in return £339,723, chiefly in grain. The heavy duties imposed in Victoria prevent us from supplying that Colony with cheaper Cereals grown here. The duty we impose of fifteen per cent., for revenue purposes only, keeps out a large number of native products and manufactures with which Victoria could supply us as cheaply as from England or from other countries, were those duties between the Colonies abolished. Depend upon it, a great impetus would be given to the natural production of each Colony were steps taken for the early formation of such a Customs' league. A still further advance would be made in the formation of a Federal State of the Australian Colonies, and one which, whilst developing the natural products of the various States comprising it, would add to the comfort and prosperity of those who are founding great and prosperous Colonies in this Southern Hemisphere.

I must congratulate you on the success that has attended the shipment of frozen meat to Europe. We cannot but appreciate the labours of those amongst us, especially Messrs. It. Campbell, W. J. M. Larnach, and Jas. Shand, to whose efforts in carrying through the New Zealand Refrigerating Company in all its preliminary stages New Zealand is largely indebted, and whose services have been overlooked in the success of the enterprise. Since the initiation of this trade Otago has exported 62,167 first-class sheep, other Provinces have shipped 44,345, making a total of 106,575, and this without any appreciable rise in the prices obtainable for fat sheep in the open market, thus plainly showing the large stock we have to draw upon. With the experience gained, and with ordinary care in keeping up the standard we have attained, there is no placing limits at this time to the extent to which this trade may ultimately grow—or to the benefits likely to flow therefrom throughout New Zealand to all engaged in pastoral pursuits. I hope every effort will be made by those engaged in the trade to uphold the high character which has been secured for New Zealand frozen meat in the London market. In connection with this Export of Frozen Meat, I may mention the very satisfactory progress our Woollen Factories are making, and whose consumption is already affecting the export of wool. From returns obtained I find that during the past year 5605 bales of wool of the value of £74,800 have been worked up by the Kaipoi, Mosgiel, and Kaikorai Mills, and the value of the goods manufactured may very fairly be estimated at £250,000.

At our last Meeting I called attention to the high rates charged by the Telegraph Department for the use of

the Telephone. So excessive did the Chamber think the rate, that they took steps to bring it before Parliament at the earliest possible period of the session, and I have to thank Mr. Fish for the energetic manner in which he took up the business. The question was referred to a Committee whose Report fully bore out the statement of the Chamber, and the result has been a recommendation in favour of the reduction in the rate charged equal to £5 0s. 0d. per annum on the annual charge previously paid by subscribers I think the Chamber have done good work by moving in this affair, and one which must lead to a generally extended use of the instrument, and to the increase of the revenue derivable from it.

I cannot close my remarks without referring to the heavy losses sustained by the agricultural interest during the past season. Over a large portion of this and the neighbouring Province of Canterbury heavy and continuous rains during the harvest spoiled a great part of the abundant crops which were gathered, and which have now been rendered unfit for consumption or for shipment to other markets. My own experience has shown me that we cannot always escape these visitations, but we can make better preparations for meeting them than were made last season, by greater care being given to stacking and thatching, and by a more generous use of the labour which is available at harvest time, and which, I fear, was not resorted to during the late harvest. There needs also some provision for drying damp grain to fit it for shipment.

I shall not weary you with a mass of statistics. You will find a number of returns bound up with the Committee's report, which have been carefully compiled from official sources, and to which I would refer members desirous of comparing our present progress with that of the past year. But I may refer with pride to the increased settlement that is taking place throughout this Province under the deferred payment and perpetual leasing of the amended land laws Acts of the colony, now being wisely and liberally administered by the present able Minister of Lands, Mr. Rolleston; under whose fostering care we may rest assured that full effect will be given to the leasing and sale of our remaining public estate. I may also refer to the large increase of our local industries, to the establishment of new mills and manufactories, and to the enlargement of others, and to the various occupations that have opened and are opening up for the employment of skilled labour. I sincerely trust the colony will continue to progress in all its material interests, that the difficulties which at present surround us may be surmounted, and that we may turn to good account the lessons of thrift which they are teaching us just now.

I now beg to move the adoption of the report.

Seconded by Mr. W. D. Stewart and unanimously adopted.

Dunedin Chamber of Commerce.

Cash Account, from 1st July, 1882, to 30th June, 1883.

Examined and found correct,

John Davie.

R. Wilson, *Chairman.*

H. Houghton, *Secretary.*

Dunedin,

1st July, 1883.

Comparative Table of Imports and Exports for the Port of Dunedin for the Years ending June 30th, 1881, 1882. and 1883 respectively.

Customs Revenue Returns for the year ended 31st March, 1883, for all Ports of Entry.

Return of Shipping at the Port of Dunedin for the year ending 31st July, 1883.

Registered Tonnage of Colonial Owned Vessels, Port of Otago.

Return shewing the number of Foreign and Intercolonial Vessels Entered and Cleared at New Zealand Ports during the year ending 30th June, 1883.

Being an increase of 136,562 tons on the year.

Gold Exported.

Return of Gold Exported from 1st April, 1857, to 30th June, 1883.

Exported for the year ending 30th June, 1883, 248,862 ozs., of the value of £994,555, of which Otago exported 83,446 ozs., of the value of £333,804.

Sheep Returns.

Export of Frozen Meat.

The following statement shows the quantity exported and the growth of this new industry since its commencement in February of last year:—

Wool Shipments.

During the past year 3,180 Bales of Wool, of the value of £42,800, were consumed by the Mosgiel and Kaikorai Woollen Mills. These added to the quantity exported raise the production of Otago for 1883 to 67,833 Bales Wool, and the value to £1,226,838

Exports per head of Population, including Wool and Gold for 1882, £45 11s. 5d.

The National Debt of New Zealand.

From which, deducting cost of construction of Railways, £10,478,898 from the total indebtedness of £27,729,535, leaves £17,250,637 as the national debt of the Colony at the present time apart from Railways.

Railway Revenue over Expenditure is approximately estimated up to 31st March last at £360,526. The amount realised on the estimated cost of the Railways is £3 8s. 10d. per cent, per annum, and there are evidences of improvement in that direction.

Railways.

Population.

Being an estimated Increase during the year of 16,797 on total Population of Colony.
The Maori Population is 44,000 in addition to the above.

Banking Returns.

For the Quarter ending June 30th, 1883.

Being a decrease of £548,464 on the Year.

Advances £14,556,525, being an increase on the year of £674,660.

Savings Banks.—GOVERNMENT AND PRIVATE.

Total Amount of Deposits in the Colony at the end of Year 1882, £1,832,047. Depositors, 68,358, averaging £26 16s. 0d. each Depositor, being an increase of £282,533.

Property Tax Returns.

For the Year 1882 and 1883.

Assessment capital value of real property under the Property

Exclusive of exemptions of £500 and under in value.

NOTE.—The returns of personal property are not yet complete. Some alteration was made in the Property Tax Acts last year which made foreign capital employed in the Colony liable as well as local capital.

Return showing the Total Amount in Money remaining secured by Mortgages under the Land Transfer Acts on the 31st March, 1883.

Agricultural Statistics.

In Otago the average reached 28.94 bushels Wheat to the acre.

In Otago the average reached as high as 29 bushels Wheat and 37 bushels Oats to the acre.

COMPARATIVE RETURNS 1882, 1883.

Whilst Victoria grew 9 bushels wheat, New South Wales 15 bushels, Queensland 8 bushels, South Australia 4½ bushels, Western Australia 7 bushels, Tasmania 18 bushels, New Zealand grew 22 bushels to the acre. In Potatoes New Zealand produces nearly 5½ tons to the acre—the average for Australia is 3 tons.

Coal Fields.

Output.

Our Imports.

From "Otago Daily Times," Sept. 26, 1883.

An analysis of the imports of the past two years will be found of interest to the trading community, as showing some of the main items which made up the large increase in 1882. It is impossible without going into wearisome details to make this analysis complete, as there are more than 600 different items in the official returns. There are, however, two trades—the soft-goods and the hardware trade—that can be separated from the other trades of the Colony, as representing large sums, and being conducted for the most part by different individuals from those who import general merchandise. There are also some large items which can be selected as giving a general idea where the other chief increases are to be found. We have compared the year 1881 which may be taken as an average one) with 1882, which certainly represents one of excessive importation.

showing an excess for last year of rather more than a million. The following figures account for the greater part of this excess, and show that more than half of it is represented by softgoods and hardware. Let us first take

Excess in 1882, £339,677.

Excess in 1882, £237,501.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Excess in 1882, £425,946.

SUMMARY OF EXCESS IN IMPORTS.

This would account for the whole excess, but there are a good many articles of which we imported less last year than in 1881, We will now summarise the principal items under this head:—

SHORT IMPORTED.

Decrease in 1882, £290,516.

PROGRESS OF OTAGO.

In 1860 the population of Otago was estimated at 12,500 persons. In that year the exports of the province were carried to England by a single sailing ship—the Gloucester, of 611 tons.

In 1861, the year of the gold discoveries, we exported £727,321 worth of gold, and the export of wool had risen in value to £111,065, being a considerable increase on the previous year. Taking the two years 1861 and 1862, it will be interesting to note that the total imports for 1861 amounted to £860,000, of which sheep figured for £61,257, horses £78,308, cattle, £5,810, and wines and spirits £32,609. In 1862 the imports had risen to £2,094,493, and the exports to £1,742,433, of which gold amounted to £1,550,704. The importation of live stock has greatly increased—sheep to £95,100, horses £125,273, and wines and spirits £161,730.

In 1863 the importation of live stock, sheep, horses, and cattle reached the large sum of £414,097. From that time the importation rapidly fell: the country was becoming stocked, and values were falling greatly. The imports for that year reached £2,094,483; the exports, gold and wool, £2,329,127.

In 1883 Otago and Southland possess 3,586,000 sheep, and during the past season they exported 64,653 bales of wool, valued at £1,184,038. The imports of general merchandise amount to £2,697,406, and exports to the value of £1,856,616. The population of the province has increased to 141,450 persons; Dunedin and suburbs to 45,000. During those 20 years Otago has exported gold of the value of £16,564,675. One-third of the entire trade of the Colony is carried on by her merchants, and one-third of the customs duties of the Colony is collected at her ports.

In 1863 the locally-owned steam fleet was represented by the s.s. *Pride of the Yarra* and other small steamers employed between Dunedin and Port Chalmers, until the arrival of the p. s. *Golden Age* at the close of that year. Out of the latter has sprung up the magnificent fleet of the Union Steam Ship Company, numbering 27 vessels, and of the aggregate tonnage of 24,791 tons—a fleet unsurpassed by any of the Colonies of Great Britain, and of which the people are justly proud.—*Otago Daily Times, Sept. 27, 1883.*

The Sixth Annual Report of the Educational Institute of Otago, 1882-83.

Office-bearers of the Institute.

President: DR. MACDONALD.

Vice-Presidents: Jno. Nicholson, ESQ. (Balclutha) J. H. Rice, ESQ. (Oamaru) W. S. Mehaffey, ESQ. (Invercargill).

Secretary: MR. D. WHITE.

Treasurer: MR. W. J. Moore.

Librarian: MR. R. S. Gardner.

Representatives of Branch Associations:

Dunedin MR. Walter Hislop.

Tokomairiro MR. Jas. Reid.

Balclutha MR. James McNeur.

Lawrence MR. W. Macandrew.

Waitaki MR. Alex. Stewart.

Invercargill MR. William Duncan.

Representatives of the Institute: MR. W. S. Fitzgerald MR. W. Milne. M.A. MR. J. B. Park MR. Alex.

Montgomery MR. John Stenhouse.

Report of the EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF OTAGO.

1882-83

THE Committee of Management have much pleasure in laying before Members the Annual Report of the Institute.

The subjects brought under the consideration of the Committee during the past year have reference to matters which concern teachers generally.

The resolutions from the Annual Meeting respecting the formation of a New Zealand Institute, were fully considered. The question of establishing a New Zealand Institute has been before the Committee on several occasions; indeed, it was part of the original intention in founding the Otago Institute, that, as soon as similar organisations were started in the other Provincial districts, it would then be desirable to have a

New Zealand Educational Institute.

A circular, containing the resolutions referred to, was sent to all the Teachers' Associations in the Colony, inviting them to send representatives to Christchurch for the purpose of drawing up a constitution for the proposed Institute. Nineteen representatives met as appointed, and discussed the subject at length. Your Committee nominated Dr. Macdonald, Messrs. Park, Fitzgerald, and White to represent Otago. The delegates report that the meeting was very successful; this was mainly due to the great interest manifested in the movement by the Canterbury and North Island representatives. The proposals adopted by the Conference are attached to this report.

New Zealand University.—Teachers' Regulations.

Your Committee have had under review the Regulations of the University permitting teachers to proceed to the B.A. examination. Members are doubtless aware that, according to existing statute the privilege would have been withdrawn this year, but the Senate having been memorialised on the subject, agreed to extend the time to 1884, not 1886 as reported in the local press. It will be for the Annual Meeting to say whether it is advisable to again petition the Senate for a further extension of time.

Inspectors' Recommendations on Syllabus.

The Inspectors recently reported to the Otago Education Board on the requirements of the Syllabus, and suggested that amendment should be made in respect to (*a*) excluding History from the Third Standard; (*b*) fixing number of attendance necessary to qualify for examination; (*c*) treating History, Geography, and Grammar as class subjects. Your Committee cordially concurred in the course of instruction recommended, and expressed a hope that the suggestion would be given effect to.

Branch Reports.

The Southland Branch has seceded from the Institute.

A Branch has been established at Tapanui, which, although small, gives promise of increased membership.

Your Committee are of opinion that a Branch might be started at Palmerston as a centre, and will be glad to see the subject, taken up at the Conference of Teachers, resident in and around that district

Science Lectures at the University.

It is gratifying to the Committee of Management to find that the University has made provision for another course of Lectures, to be given by Professor Shand, on "Mechanical Physics."

Finance.

The Treasurer reports a balance in hand of £24 13s. 2d., a satisfactory sum, seeing that one of the Branches has failed to pay up, and another has seceded from the Institute. It must be remembered, also, that the annual subscription is now only five shillings per member.

Balance Sheet.

The Conference.

The Education Board having sent out circulars to Committees advising the closing of the schools, it is confidently believed that all who wish to be present will be able to attend. The arrangements with the railway authorities are the same as those of last year. The Committee desire to record their appreciation of Mr. Pryde's services in carrying out arrangements necessary for the success of the meeting.

D. White, *Secretary*.

W. T. Moore, *Treasurer*.

New Zealand Educational Institute.

The following is the Constitution adopted by the representatives at Christchurch:—

- That the New Zealand Educational Institute shall consist of the Teachers' Associations and Institutes in Auckland, Wellington, Nelson, Canterbury, and Otago, and such other Associations as may hereafter be admitted to the Institute.
- That the object of the Institute shall be to promote the interests of education within the Colony of New Zealand.
- That the General Council of the Institute shall consist of members elected by the local Associations.
- That each Association shall be entitled to one representative for the first twenty members, and one for every additional fifty names beyond the first twenty names on the roll of membership.
- That the President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the New Zealand Institute shall be elected by and from the General Council.
- That the Council shall meet annually, during the Christmas vacation, at the chief centres of population, as shall be hereafter named by the Council.
- That the General Meeting of the members of the New Zealand Institute shall be held once every two "years at such place as the Council shall determine.
- That each Association shall pay the Treasurer of the New Zealand Institute the sum of _____ for each name on the roll of membership.
- That the General Council shall have power to make bye-laws for the conduct of all business, meetings, and proceedings of the Institute.

It will be part of the business of the forthcoming meeting to discuss the Constitution, and elect representatives on the General Council.

Scholarship Regulations.

The following are the resolutions adopted by the Committee appointed to report on this subject:—

- That there should be two sets of scholarships—a junior and a senior.
- That there should be an equal number of each.
- That the Dunedin High Schools be excluded from the junior competition.
- That all holders of junior scholarships should attend the Dunedin High Schools.
- That all schools be entitled to compete for senior scholarships.
- That there be an alteration of the text-book prescribed for the junior competition.

Annual Report of the Balclutha Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. John Nicholson.

SECRETARY: MR. Adam Miller, B.A.

LIBRARIAN: MR. A. Gregor.

We beg to submit the Sixth Annual Report of the Balclutha Branch of the Educational Institute.

During the past year the membership of this Branch has slightly increased. Three members have removed from the district, while seven names have been added to the roll. Up to date, 9 members have paid their subscriptions, the amount of which comes to £3 7s 6d; while our annual expenditure amounts to 9s 8d.

The Branch has met five times during the year, but we regret to state that the attendance has not been so large as in former years. Papers have been read on the following subjects: "Knowledge is power" by Mr. Renton; "The average age at which a child should be presented for the 1st Standard" by Mr. Nicholson; and "The relation of Inspectors of Schools to the Education Department." by Mr Waddell; and various subjects of educational interest have been discussed at our meetings. The following is an extract from the minutes:—"It was agreed unanimously, on the motion of Mr Waddell, that the following motion be proposed at the Annual Meeting of the Institute, 'That the General Committee of Management be instructed to take all lawful means, by petitioning the House of Representatives or otherwise, to have Inspectors of Schools placed under the immediate control of the Education Department.'"

JONATHAN GOLDING, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Waitaki Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

President: MR. W. G. Wallace.

SECRETARY: MR. R. Peattie.

LIBRARIAN: MR. W. Darley.

This Branch of the Educational Institute of Otago has held nine meetings during the year, viz.—One annual meeting, seven monthly meetings, and one picnic. During the year there have been many changes among the teachers of the district. Mr. Wallace, the President for the year, left the district towards the end of it. Very few have taken a keener interest in the Institute than Mr. Wallace, and the Branch recorded a vote of thanks to him. As a result of these changes, and from other circumstances, several papers were lost to the Branch. The only papers were "The Situation," by Mr. Peattie; "Reading," by Mr. Walker; and "The Liberal Culture of the Teacher," by the Rev. Dr. Macgregor. At the other meetings, matters affecting the position and well-being of teachers were discussed.

Mr. Jas Lindsay and the Rev. Dr. Macgregor, both of this Branch, read papers at the General Conference.

R. PEATTIE, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Tuapeka Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. Robt. Neill.

SECRETARY: MR. W. Macandrew,

I have the honour to report for the year 1882-83 as follows:—The lectures in Dunedin during the winter months interfered seriously with the meeting of this branch.

Seven meetings have been held during the year, which have been fairly attended. The following papers were read and discussed Mr Selby on "Reading," and Mr Alnutt on "Leading and Driving." The papers were usually read one day, and the discussion took place the following meeting.

Several interesting subjects were taken up for discussion, and, on the whole, the members have taken a lively interest in the meetings.

WILLIAM MACANDREW, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Tapanui Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-3.

PRESIDENT: MR. J. K. Menzies.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: MR. P. McO. Wilson.

I have the honour to submit our First Annual Report.

Four meetings have been held during the year, which have been fairly attended. We have as yet only six members, but anticipate an increase. Our schools being much separated interferes with the attendance at our monthly meetings.

P. MCO. WILSON, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Milton Branch.

Office-Bearers. 1882-3.

PRESIDENT: MR. James Reid.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: MR. John Lyttle.

I have the honour to submit the Annual Report of the Milton Branch for the year ending 12th May, 1883.

During the year several members left the district, and their successors have not yet joined our Branch, consequently our roll number is lower than formerly.

On the 6th June; 1882, Mr Reid spoke on the necessity of some change in the syllabus, especially in the arrangement of History, Geography, and Grammar, and the motion—"That Mr Petrie's suggestions for modification of the syllabus be supported," was carried. The Branch did not hold its usual meetings during the months of Professor Scott's lectures on Physiology. After resuming, the following subjects were dealt with:—(1) "The School Grounds," a paper by Mr McDuff. (2) "The Pupil Teacher System," a discussion introduced by Mr Mahoney. (3) "The Preparation of Teachers," a paper by Mr Reid. The Rev. Mr Chisholm agreed to read a paper at the Annual Conference.

The annual picnic was held in February at the Taieri Beach. We were joined by several members of the Dunedin and Lawrence districts, and spent a most pleasant day.

WILLIAM M'ELREA, *Interim Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Dunedin Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. D. McNicoll.

TREASURER: MR. W. Hislop.

Secretary: MR. W. J. Moore

MEETINGS—In all, eight regular meetings were held during the year, the attendance of members at each being fairly satisfactory.

PAPERS, &c.—Fewer papers were read this year than in any other, a circumstance attributable mainly to the want of a fixed system of securing contributors. In September the President introduced for discussion a system of "Mutual help in schools." November 4th: Mr. Jas. Jeffery read a paper on "The English Language." March 3rd: The Secretary introduced for discussion the Otago Pupil Teachers' Regulations. June 2nd: Mr. Jas. Rennie read a paper on "The Insecurity of Teachers' tenure of position in New Zealand."

MEMBERSHIP.—The question of membership came on for consideration at the last meeting of the Branch, when it was unanimously resolved to issue circulars with a view of securing the countenance and active

assistance of the many teachers in our midst. This step has resulted in a substantial addition to our membership roll.

decorative feature

W. J. MOORE, *Secretary*.

Dunedin:

Colls, Colling, and Co., Printers,

Crawford Street.

AUCKLAND FREE PUBLIC LIBRARY. Address Delivered by Sir George Grey, K.C.B.,

At the Theatre Royal, *Auckland*, June 5th, 1888.

REPRINTED FROM THE "NEW ZEALAND HERALD."

Auckland: WILSONS & HORTON, GENERAL PRINTERS, QUEEN AND WYNDHAM STS. MDCCCLXXXIII.

Address by Sir George Grey, K.C.B.

PURSUANT to notice Sir George Grey addressed the citizens of Auckland in the Theatre Royal, upon the subject "The principles which should guide the citizens in founding a Free Public Library." Every part of the theatre was densely crowded. The doors were to have been open at half-past seven, but as early as seven o'clock crowds had assembled at all the entrance doors to the theatre. It was deemed expedient, in order to prevent obstruction of the footpaths, to open the doors at an earlier hour. The public were therefore admitted to the theatre at a quarter-past seven o'clock. In less than ten minutes the dress circle was crowded with ladies and gentlemen. In an equally short space of time the pit and stalls were densely packed with auditors. The stage, which served the purpose of a platform, was also thronged.

In order to prevent over-crowding, cards of admission were issued to the following, among others, the greater portion occupying seats on the stage:—Bishops Oowie and Luck, Honorables Henderson, Dignan, Williamson, Chamberlain, T. Russell (O.M.G.) and Mr. Swainson, A. J. Cadman (M.H.R.), George (M.H.R.), Moss (M.H.R.), Dargaville (M.H.R.), Hurst (M.H.R.), Tole (M.H.R.) Mitchelson (M.H.R.), Harris (M.H.R.), Hobbs (M.H.R.), Hamlin (M.H.R.), Peacock (M.H.R.), Sheehan (M.H.R.) Whyte (M.H.R.), McDonald (M.H.R.), Whitaker (M.H.R.), Professors Thomas, Brown, and Tucker, Revs. Buddie, Walpole, Paul, Pritt, Baker, Carrick, Evans, Dudley, Munro, Reid, Whewell, Spurgeon, Parsonson, Robertson, Runciman, Macnicol, Lenehan, Purchas, M. Fynes, Maunsell, O'Gara, clergymen Ponsonby Wesleyan Chapel, and Grafton Road Wesleyan Chapel, Vaggioli, Tebbs, Downey, Bates, MacDonald, Hamer, Bruce, Kidd (Registrar of the University College), O'Hara, Gould, Mackay, Nelson, Burrows, Mayors of Auckland, Parnell, and Onehunga, Drs. Hooper, Richardson, Philson, Goldsboro', Dawson, Kenderdine, Harrison, Mrs. Dr. Potts, Drs. Moore, Lee, Stockwell, Mr. J. E. McDonald (Chief Judge Native Lands Court), Colonel Lyon, Mr. Theo. Kissling (District Land Registrar), Mr. T. Macfarlane (Trustee in Bankruptcy), Major Green (Sheriff of Auckland), Mr. H. S. Smith (District Judge and Resident Magistrate), Messrs. W. S. Wilson, J. L. Wilson, Furby (Telegraph Department), T. T. Masefield, Stephenson, Bums, Cousins, Atkin, J. L. Campbell, Dacre, Pond, G. P. Pierce, Battley, Montague, Levi Coupland, Harper, McDonald (Harbour Board), John Abbott, C. A. E. Abbott, R. Graham, J.P., Henry Brett, S. Yaile, Dunningham, F. L. Prime, J. P., James Philson, John Anderson, P. Darby, Henry Palmer, J. P., M. Danagher, Thwaites, John Buchanan, Peter Dignan, J. Howard, Errington, (Waterworks Engineer), H. N. Abbott, R. and R. Duder, D. Nolan, R. W. Moody, J. P., Frederick Ireland, James Coates (Accountant National Bank), Griffin (U.S. Consul), Neil Heath (Principal Girls' High School), Thomas Morrin, O'Sullivan (Chief Inspector of Schools), V. E. Rice (Secretary Board of Education), Thomas Thompson, T. H. Hall, Bycroft, Offer, Mackechnie, Firth, Mason (2), Waddel, Gee, D. A. Tole (Commissioner Crown Lands), T. B. Hill, Cole, J. T. Boylan, T. T. Gamble (German Consul), Barber (Consul of Denmark), Albyn Martyn, A. McArthur (Principal Training College), D. B. Cruickshank (Consul for France), Phillips, L. D. Nathan, J. B. Thomson, J. P., T. Hill (Collector of Customs), A. G. Horton, Biss (Chief Postmaster), Hugh Campbell, Garret (Garrett Bros.), Cosgrave, J. P., Hardie, Edmund W. Otway (Engineer Public Works Department) C. A. Harris, Worthington (Head-teacher Wellesley-street School), D. Goldie, A. V. Macdonald (General Manager of Railways), Harrison (Head-teacher, Howe-street School), Bayley (Head-teacher, Ponsonby School), the Head-teacher Nelson-street School, W. McCullough, Tarbutt, D. Lynch, Gittos, W. C. Daldy, J. P. Leonard (Head-teacher, Parnell School), R. C. Barstow, Dennison, William Buchanan, J. Cunningham (Police Court), Hamilton Brothers, J. Edson, D. L. Murdoch (General Manager Bank of New Zealand), S. Coombes, Editors—HERALD, Star, Freeman's Journal, Lance, Observer, Free Press, Hon Colonel Haultain, Kissling (Manager Bank of New Zealand), D. Hean (Manager National Bank), J. Lawford (Manager Bank of

Australasia), T. H. Ivey (Manager Bank of New South Wales), Grierson (Manager Union Bank), Burton (Manager Colonial Bank), R. Cameron (Savings Bank), Tyler, E. Hesketh, Hughes, Brewer (Registrar Supreme Court), Kummer (Danish Consul), J. B. Russell, G. Aickin, A. Boardman, T. Cooper, F. D. Fenton, Laishley (Chairman Board of Education), Brigham (Secretary Harbour Board), President Auckland Club, Thomas Buddie, Rose (Vice-President Noi'thern Club), Cheeseman (Secretary Auckland Institute), Governor of Mount Eden Gaol, Young (Medical Superintendent Lunatic Asylum), Resident Surgeon Provincial District Hospital, Stone (Chairman Auckland Harbour Board), P. A. Philips (Town Clerk), Fraser and Tinne (Chairman and Secretary Chamber of Commerce), William Coleman, A. Devore, Coupland, Williamson (Crown Prosecutor), Henry Keesing, J. P. King, Mackechnie, Murchie, Harper, James (Secretary Auckland College and Grammar School), G. A. Buttle, J. King (Bank of Australasia), Mowbray, Giblin (Accountant Bank of New Zealand), Butler (Accountant Bank of New South Wales), Glover, G. M. Reed, Alexander, Richmond, Browning, A. McDonald (Accountant Union Bank), J. B. Stoney (R.M. Court), Traffic Manager Railway Department, S. Jackson (Jackson and Russell), A. Saunders, J. B. Graham, J. Waymouth, Landon, Gee, J. M. Shera, Hughes (Superintendent Fire Brigade), J. Craig, J. Marshall, H. H. Lusk, F. Leahy, Fleming.

On his appearance on the platform, SIR GEORGE GREY was received with great enthusiasm, the entire audience rising to their feet.

On the motion of REV. C. M. NELSON, seconded by Mr. J. M. SHERA, the Acting Mayor (Mr. WADDEL) was called to the chair.

The CHAIRMAN, having read the advertisement, briefly introduced the speaker, and in the course of his remarks said: It seems most opportune, at least to me, that an address on this subject should be delivered at this time, especially when such a gentleman as Sir George Grey, presents himself to instruct you. It is also opportune for a more satisfactory reason, and that is, as I believe I may state, the City Council is in a position, from the funds they have in hand, and the munificent bequest of the late Mr. Edward Costley, to take steps for the erection of necessary buildings for the Free Public Library and Art Gallery. (Cheers.) I sincerely hope that at no distant date you will be called upon to take part in laying the foundation stone of an institution that will be worthy of the munificent gifts which are given to the public by the citizens of Auckland. (Cheers.)

SIR GEORGE GREY, who on rising to address the meeting, was received with loud applause, spoke as follows:—Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: In addressing you to-night upon the principles on which your Free Public Library should be established, I shall embrace under that heading your Art Gallery, your Institute, and the other kindred institutions, which must form part ultimately of one great establishment. Now what I would remark to you first is this: that we should consider what should be the peculiar characteristics of a great institution of that nature founded in this town.

The Position of New Zealand.

Probably you will all admit that the main incentive to the progress in any nation as a separate people is the rivalry, and the desire to surpass others, which may prevail amongst its citizens; and that, in the same manner, a rivalry between nations is what tends most to the advancement of all. For example, if you will look at Great Britain. It lies separated from France by hardly a greater interval than separates this island from the Middle Island of New Zealand. Then, immediately joining France we have Belgium, Holland, Germany, Denmark, Sweden, Norway—all the most learned nations of Europe, assembled, as it were, in one great mass. Those nations, excelling as they do in literature, in art—in all the qualities which constitute human excellence—are, as it were, at once the judges and the witnesses of one another's actions, of the proceedings of each of them, and an emulation and rivalry necessarily exists between them, if not to lead in the van of civilization and literature, at least to be left at no distance behind in the race. What is our position here? We are separated by great breadths of ocean from all other nations on the face of the earth, and even those nations which surround us most nearly have but few opportunities of giving us a great example as to the course we should pursue in attempting to gain those objects we have now in view. We occupy a very isolated position indeed. There is little to rouse our emulation, to awake our rivalry with any other people. An effort was made early in the establishment of this colony to remedy those difficulties in our position, by dividing these island into separate provinces or states, which in some degree caused emulation to rise amongst one another, and to arouse the people in the different parts of New Zealand each to try to surpass the other, and under that system, great emulation and great rivalry did exist. Various kinds of colonisation were tried, and various means of developing the energies of New Zealand in every part, and thus were safely founded the great colonies which have arisen within the limits of these islands, but it seemed wise to a majority in your Parliament—I will not say to a majority of the people, because at that time there was no justice in the representation, but it seemed wise to the majority of your Parliament to abolish those institutions, giving thereby a keen pang of disappointment to myself and to many others. (Cheers.) But what was our duty? Not to sink under a blow of the kind, but instantly to rally up to the

misfortune which we thought had fallen upon us; to endeavour to make the best of our position, and so to found our future institutions, that notwithstanding such a disadvantage we might still make that progress which we believed we were capable of achieving. (Cheers.) Many feared that one dead level of human enterprise would soon exist in New Zealand. The people in the remote parts of the colony, finding their wealth drawn away to one central portion, finding that the prevailing instinct was to subsist upon the Government, and to trust to the Government and the land fund to found all great institutions—the fear was that the people of this part of New Zealand would sink into a state of apathy, and forget what was their duty as free men in founding institutions of this kind, by constant appeals as paupers to the public treasury. (Applause.)

Auckland's Benefactors.

But what took place? Great tracts of public lands of a very valuable kind were bestowed upon institutions in other parts of New Zealand (hear). We have no tracts of public lands, the great mass of the best part of the provincial district still remaining in the hands of the native proprietors, and our hopes seemed but small; but from our midst arose, and unexpectedly, a host of benefactors who, performing the duties of the State, have given us the means of founding an institution which for centuries will exist. (Cheers.) How much do we owe to Judge Gillies, who led in this movement? to Mr. James Williamson, who was his copartner? (hear); to Mr. Thomas Russell, who sent out a great bequest from England? (hear); how much do we owe also to Mr. Mackelvie—(cheers)—who can tell the debt of gratitude which he has imposed upon us? How much do we owe to Mr. Costley? (Applause.) We owe a great debt to Dr. Campbell— (hear)—for he interested himself greatly in the promotion of art within the limits of this our city. (Applause.) I say these benefactors led on in the great movement, showing that the people of Auckland were able to meet the circumstances as they arose, and that in the munificence of their citizens they could more than countervail the parsimony of a distant Government. (Applause.) I believe this institution, just founded, may not surpass others, but still believe that in its character and in its effects we justly emulate the career of the other parts of the colony, justly determine to enter into a generous rivalry. We think we can, by our own unaided efforts, lead the van in the education of this country, in the arts and literature, in the sciences, and in painting, music, and all that can adorn life or cultivate the human understanding. (Cheers.) I have named all these great benefactors. There are yet others. I cannot stop to name them all, but I would say this, and I address myself to all the youth amongst you, the youth of both sexes, to aid in this great undertaking. Let them remember that it is not the magnificence of the gift which constitutes the merit of the benefactor. The boy or the young girl who, pursuing the study of geology, of botany,—whatever it may be, collects some small treasure of their own, and bestows this upon our Museum, if it is their all, is, in the judgment of true and good men, as great a benefactor as those who gave the very largest gifts from great resources. (Cheers.)

New Zealand's Population.

All may aid in this undertaking, and I will show you, by-and-by, a way in which many of you who little think of it, may have the gratification of so doing. Well, what further have we to consider next? What is the population we have to provide this Library for? Why, we who stand here are amongst that vast population, who, in the present century, moved by some mighty impulse, have quitted their homes in England, Scotland, Ireland—nay, Nova Scotia, and distant parts of America—in France, in Germany, in Scandinavia and Italy, all flocking to one common centre in New Zealand—a migration wonderful in its extent, still more wonderful in its mixed population, and still more remarkable in the difficulties it imposes upon all those who have to deal with a population of so mixed a character. Speaking different languages, accustomed to different laws, to varied modes of government, but still all gradually merging into the use of that one familiar tongue—the Anglo-Saxon language—which is to dominate the world. (Cheers.) This is the population for which we have to provide. Those are the people for whom, and for their children, we are to secure a mode of instruction in our public institutions, which shall enable this central position of Auckland, and these central islands of New Zealand, ultimately to flood the Pacific with learning, and to dominate with a just and righteous supremacy—not of tyranny, but of intellect, over the great extent of islands which surround us upon every side. (Cheers.) That is the kind of library we must establish. Those are the kind of people for whom we must provide it—a library suited to the future capital of a great ocean, a library fitted to cultivate people of many languages and many nations, a library calculated—in centuries from this time, I trust—to be the admiration of the world. (Cheers.) Where was the greatest library of which we have any record? Was it at the greatest centre of commerce at the time, the great centre of civilization of the nations which were in its vicinity, at Alexandria? I say, yes, and it should be the object of this city that here should rest a Library, in this great centre of commerce, which shall hereafter become famed in this part of the world, I trust, as was that which dominated in the Mediterranean Sea

in former times. (Applause.)

Characteristics of a Good Library.

What do I hold then to be the first characteristic of this Library? If it is a proper one it should be such as to compel persons to resort to Auckland who wish for information on a great variety of subjects. (Hear.) If we can accomplish that; if in our isolated position, separated far from other nations, we can compel the learned of those nations to come here for information, then that knowledge which the ocean puts far from us we shall, by what we offer, bring to our very doors. Already you may see the spread that learning has taken in this country. You have now an important Grammar School; you have now a University established amongst you; you now bring the learned from Europe here to instruct your youth, and you may soon have the command of all the best intellect in Europe for the purpose of instruction if you follow on in the course in which you have entered. But by the choice of the materials which we place in this Library, we can bring persons from every part of the earth to drink at sources of knowledge which they can obtain in no other place. (Applause.) Let us see, therefore, what we should do. First of all I would say that people of all nations who may assemble here respect antiquity. There is no nation that has not a reverence for past ages. We should tie them, therefore, to us by taking care that all the knowledge which past ages afford should, if possible, be collected in the various institutions which we are about to found. (Applause.) Above all, I hold that as the Anglo-Saxon language is to be our great medium of communication with all the countries which lie beyond us, we should take care that there is a complete collection of Anglo-Saxon literature, a complete library of the English tongue from the very earliest periods, collected within the walls of the institutions we are to have. (Applause.) What efforts have been made to accomplish this? Let me tell you. As soon as your libraries are opened you will have placed at your disposal the very best and choicest works of the English language. (Applause.) Those who desire to do so may pore over the very earliest productions in the English tongue. They may take the works printed by Caxton, now of such excessive rarity in the world, examine them, ascertain what was then the spelling of the English language, understand what was then the form of the grammar of the English language, for that has very much altered. They may with delight handle the volumes and pages which were handled by the first printer of the English tongue, and read how he sat in his study poring over books and pamphlets, and thinking what new work he should produce, and at last resolving to produce the very work which the citizen of Auckland holds in his hands, not fresh from the hands of Caxton, but still coming handed down through four centuries, as it were from the first master of printing in the English language. (Applause.) Then, if they please, they may read with the contemporaries of Shakespeare the first edition of his poems, and handle the volumes which undoubtedly the learned of England in that day handled and perused with delight; may take Spencer's "Fairy Queen," and see the exact form in which the poet chose his work to appear, a form beautiful in itself; see its dedication to the great Queen—to the Empress Elizabeth, as he calls her; as we now have the Empress Victoria—(cheers)—applying this term of Empress to a great Queen, and showing that it was not first implied to the Queen who now sits upon the Throne. They may delight themselves by reading the old English writers whose works are very rarely to be obtained at the present time—masters of the English language, which has progressed until it has attained its present perfection—and I think in that manner experience an enjoyment which few people of a young country have ever had the pleasure of experiencing before. (Applause.) But, passing from the English language, let us recollect that a still more remote series of literature should be open to us all. Let them remember that in the Middle Ages, when printing was unknown, the industrious monks within their monasteries—institutions of which we now think but little—laboured for a lifetime to produce some single magnificent volume—(applause); and they may take in their hands some such work as that, one of which will be at their disposal, an enormous folio, most beautifully executed, and find the humble man who had completed that work saying, "*Inutilis servus Dei*," unworthy servant of God that I am to have done so little. Let them look at the manuscript Bibles which this city may possess, written also by patient monks in the scriptorium, by which a perfect knowledge of the Scriptures was through those dark ages brought down to the present generation. (Applause.) Let them look at the manuscripts in Greek, which, in the very earliest periods of Christianity, were painfully compiled, written in a minute but exquisite handwriting. Let them look at the beautiful missals which you will be possessed of, in which artist and writer alike did their best to hand down to future times the prayers in the liturgies of most of the Christian races. Let them consider how much we owe to the men who devoted their lives to industry of this kind. (Applause.) Then, again, let them look—and this, I hope, all of you will have the pleasure of doing before long—let them look at the manuscripts of the classical authors, which in the same manner were copied and re-copied in those monasteries that future generations might be in possession of the masterpieces of elocution and literature of that great nation called the Roman people. (Applause.)

Classical Study.

Perhaps the weakest point in your Public Library will be the number of classical authors you will have. There will be a perfect set of the Latin classics, some few of the first Greek authors, but still my own library was formerly stripped of the finest editions of those authors that they might go to another colony; and in that point there will be a certain degree of weakness. But let me add a few words now of my own thoughts on this subject. They may be weak thoughts, but they are convictions I firmly entertain, and I should like to impress one of my ardent wishes upon your minds. Remember that the great Latin writers had in their boyhood no ancient language to study. The years that are passed by our youths in some of the colleges and universities, in studying dead languages were, by the great Latin writers and the great Greek writers given to the study of their own languages; and if the Romans learned Greek they learned it as we learn French—they learned from the mouths of their living slaves, from the mouths of their living friends, from frequent intercourse with Greeks, and thus principally studying their own language they arrived at a perfection in it which but few writers have attained in the English tongue. The life of a literary man was in those ancient days entirely devoted to that one thing. They did not spend years in acquiring a knowledge of dead languages, which were but of little use to them in after life. Now, what I argue from this is as follows: For myself, I have always said, let Latin and Greek be taught, and in those charters which I have issued, on the foundation of public schools, I have inserted a clause providing that Greek and Latin should be taught in them. Those who understand either one of these languages, or who understand them both, have open to them vast storehouses of information, a vast amount of pleasure, and a vast amount of food for their imagination. I would say they have open to them a road to great delight and great enjoyment. But, upon the other hand, there are but few who in this busy world and this lifetime can, without detriment to their proper duties, afford sufficient interval to acquire such a knowledge of those languages as to enable them to use them with facility in future years, to render them a necessary part of their existence. The greatest living master of the English language, Mr. Bright— (applause)—knew neither of these languages. There are now ample and beautiful translations of every author of merit which can be read in the classics. While, therefore, I would take care that every institution founded here taught the Greek and Latin languages, I would venture to say this—I think it cruel to say to any man who speaks fluently the English tongue, and is thoroughly master of it, who has learnt some branch of knowledge thoroughly—I say it is cruel to say we will prevent you entering some profession which you may earnestly desire to enter because you do not know Latin or Greek. (Applause.) I say this, that if men abandon their homes in all parts of the earth for the purpose of coming to this colony, and of rising here to distinction and honour, they have a right to have every pathway to such distinctions and honours laid fairly open to them. (Applause.) No obstacles of that kind should be thrown in their way— (applause)—obstacles, the overcoming of which will neither render them better men nor more useful to their fellow-citizens. (Hear, hear.) Therefore, whilst I tell you that great provision, or considerable provision, has been made to procure for this colony manuscripts in the Latin and Greek tongues, thus allowing new readings to be made of authors, and in this way encouraging the study of those languages by those who have the time and opportunity so to study them, I will never be a party myself to using them to shut out from employment and from distinction men who are masters of their own language and of other subjects. (Cheers.)

Curiosities of the Library.

I pass on to other things. I have said this:—" We must have something in our institution to attract to it not only the Anglo-Saxons, but those other races who have come here." First, let us think of the German population. Well, I will say this, that when your library is established they may enter it, and there handle the books of Hans Sachs, which appeared about 1520—the sweetest singer that has been given to Germany, and to whom a statue has been recently erected at Nuremberg by the German people. They can enter the Library, and there handle those books which have passed down from the hands of friends of his down to theirs. I have no doubt you have all heard of that magnificent German song, "What is the German Fatherland?" the sound of which roused the hearts of a great part of Europe. There in the Library you will see it in the handwriting of its author, the poet Arndt; and these are literary treasures of almost inestimable value. If there are French persons, or persons of French descent, who desire to be encouraged to visit the Library let them remember that they, too, have been thought of, and that they will find a manuscript which formerly belonged to the great Sully, which was written for Philip the Fair in the utmost beauty of writing, and artistically illuminated. Let them remember they may go and see the handwriting of Marie Antionette when carried a captive back to the Tuilleries, and witness the signature of one who suffered as much as any female for the last thousand years. If there are Italians who desire to reap pleasure from the Library, let them go and find the beautiful manuscript of Petrarch, and let

them see the beauty with which the poems composed by that great poet were preserved to the Italian people. In that way, by examining such books, you will have open to you stores of very great value, which must cultivate the public taste, and touch the feelings of people of many lands. Further, I will say this—that, to attract persons to this Library, we should be able to show something in history which may interest all. It would be a proud thing for you to be able to say one portion of a period of English history can only be written in the city of Auckland, and that he who writes the latter part of the history of the reign of Cromwell, and of the short period during which his son ruled and influenced the English nation—that whoever desires to do so must come to this city of Auckland, mix amongst us, or send to some copyist to make copies of the manuscripts which will be in your possession. It may be called a weak sentiment on my part, but I believe there is hardly one who hears me who would not share the same sentiments and feelings. To take in one's hands a letter addressed to Cromwell, by his ambassador to Sweden, held by Cromwell in his hands, looked over by his eyes, perhaps with pleasure, and to read the message of a foreign sovereign to him, so that one seems absolutely to see the man himself, and to read the words he read to this effect, "The King of Sweden said to me that he wondered that so great and experienced a prince, who had achieved such great actions, although accompanied by manifold dangers, should at last hesitate to do that in which consisted his most visible security." This the King of Sweden said in reference to assuming the title of King. That was the temptation addressed to Cromwell, that was the advice of a neighbouring monarch, at that time one of the great Kings of Europe. Cromwell had this temptation before him, and the great-souled man took no notice of it, assumed no title, did nothing, and let the flattering words pass, unheeded by him. (Cheers.) I think that no man can hold the documents of that kind in his hand, and can look at them without being greatly moved to think that he has, as it were, been present almost at such a scene as I have described. In the same way you will have what is a rare thing indeed out of England, an actual treaty, one which was concluded by Richard Cromwell with the Hanseatic towns, of which no record exists, because apparently it was stolen or carried away immediately before the restoration of Charles II. But there you will see the signatures of Lyle, of Strickland, of Montague, indeed of the whole of the great council of England at that time, and the signatures of the foreign ambassadors. This was a confirmation of a treaty which, I daresay, you have all heard of, in which Cromwell guaranteed to assist all the Protestant Powers, and the Hanseatic towns in particular, and it is signed by the Council as if Richard Cromwell was the sole ruler of England, although he was so soon to abdicate that position. If you are inclined to envy the greatness of Cromwell or inclined to think his position was an enviable one, you will also have an opportunity of reading the pamphlet, "Killing no Murder." Read the dreadful incisive words in which that pamphlet was written, the determined threats it covertly uttered, and conceive the misery of the man to whom such a pamphlet was addressed, whose life seemed to hang upon a thread, and liable at any moment to be taken from him. In this way those who choose to visit Auckland may read passages of history unpublished, unknown to the public except in the records which are here, and I think you will find that men of literary distinction, men of intellect, will, the moment such papers are thrown open to the public, avail themselves of the opportunities given to take from them those parts which they think will be most interesting to the British nation. (Cheers.)

Languages of the Pacific.

Then, what else ought we to do to render Auckland a place of resort to people generally? Evidently this; you should have here in your Library the key to all the languages of the Pacific and Australia; and I venture to say it will be admitted no man can write truly upon the languages of Australia without coming to Auckland; that here will exist in manuscript the works which will enable a perfect description of the Australian languages to be given. Amongst other things, you will find what I believe to be a thing of extraordinary interest—the Gospel of St. Luke translated jointly into the native language of New South Wales, by a Mr. Threlkeld and a native of Australia, who was himself a Christian, and who had a thorough knowledge of the English language. To the goodness of Mr. Threlkeld, missionary, we owe that work. He wrote it out in a beautiful manner in the declining years of his life, and not knowing after his death what might be the fate of what had cost him and this native such a long period of trouble and anxiety, he sent it to me as a present, hoping that I would see that his labours would not be lost to the world, and that they would be preserved. Mrs. Layard has since beautifully illuminated it, in the manner of an ancient manuscript. And the manner in which it will be preserved will be by entrusting it to your care, and his name to the regard of yourself and your descendants. (Cheers.) If I were to tell you the number of works in the languages of the Pacific which will be found in your Library I should weary, and it would take me almost hours to describe them; but let me tell you, most of these works have been produced by men you have known—by Mr. English, of the Presbyterian Mission, and various Wesleyan missionaries who have visited this colony from time to time, and mixed amongst you—men venerated for their piety, men whose lives were devoted to the welfare of the inhabitants of the Pacific. Almost all are manuscript productions, or their first printed copies, printed in small presses by their own hands—every-thing thus

surrounds them which can render them valuable in the estimation of those who have known these gentleman here, or the children of those who have been their friends. All these will be confided to your care, that here you may raise a Library, access to which will be absolutely necessary to anyone who studies the languages of the races of the Pacific. (Cheers.) These works are not only of great ethnological value, but will be endeared to you by the recollection of the labours and sufferings which were undergone in the production of them; but they are left to us valuable records to the present time, and I hope to future ages. (Cheers.) Then again, this great mercantile city, enthroned upon this isthmus, with the ocean upon each hand, with winds and currents to favour your passage to all the islands of the Pacific, and Nature having pointed you out as the proper capital for that commerce—this is a port to which many nations must throng, and you will have, as far as I can calculate, the means of enabling those who resort to this place to acquire a knowledge of any language they may select out of a collection numbering possibly one hundred dialects or tongues.

Sunday Opening.

I did not know until lately that your Public Library is open on the Sunday, but I had taken means to compel you to open it upon the Sunday. (Cheers.) A gentle pressure was put upon you, because in your Library there will be large portions of the Scriptures, often the whole, in at least 120 languages or dialects. (Cheers.) Could you, if your port is resorted to by sailors from all nations—would you dare to shut out from men, from every nation and clime, the power to go and read the Scriptures in their own tongue—(cheers)—when you might afford them an opportunity of so doing? I thus put a gentle pressure upon you which would have compelled you to open the Library on the Sunday, but the Corporation, I find, have already taken a step which I think wise, and have without delay afforded that facility to the public. (Cheers.)

Scripture Manuscripts.

In this I may be wrong, but I appeal to all of you, is it not something to be able to say the people of the city of Auckland, have in our possession, as our property, a Library, such as, in one respect, nowhere else exists, in which all men may come and read the Scriptures in their own tongue—(cheers)—because even the great Bible Societies have nothing of this kind? Many of these portions of Scripture are in manuscript, never having been published; many of them have been printed in distant islands which the Bible Societies know nothing of; and the Bible Societies themselves have been careless in keeping copies of their own works, and are now with difficulty trying to recover works they have printed but have sold the whole of, and can hardly obtain copies of; and you here will have in your possession that which any one of these societies would give much to obtain for its own library. If I were to name any great glory of a particular public library which would be likely to endear it to all men, it would be to state that it is the one library in the world in which the Holy Scriptures may be read in more languages than in any other library upon the face of the earth. (Cheers.) All these various points give your Library an extreme degree of interest.

Remarkable Letters.

I will now pass to other points. I wish to impress upon your particular attention,—because all may aid in this—the letters which your Library will contain. The collection has been formed upon this principle. As far as I know there is but one scurrilous production in the whole collection, I think, and that one was printed in New South Wales; and on account of its extreme ferocity I kept that one as a specimen. (Laughter.) No other work has been admitted which was evidently written for the purpose of wounding and doing harm. Many works are written professing to be so and so, but the real object of which is to injure and stab and hurt. No such work or letter will be found in any that is handed over to you. Amongst those handed over to you will be a complete correspondence with very many of those who have been great and remarkable in this century—letters from remarkable men, men of character, which will enable you to live with them, to feel with them, to understand what was their mode of life, what were their thoughts, what their aspirations, what were their pleasures, and often what were their sorrows; how sometimes a great author has gone on for years without any remuneration, without his work selling, hardly without any appreciation, and at last you will find a letter coming from him "the flood of prosperity has broken on me; my work sells, I am in easy and comfortable circumstances, all I have toiled for for years has at last been brought home to me quite unexpectedly;" and you will find the man broken with his work, his life having been a life of labour and disappointment; at last, but when he can hardly enjoy it, entering upon the possession of that comfort of which he was worthy years before. (Cheers.) You will find him saying, "I have felt so disappointed in life, I have known such sorrows, I am ill, I am weary when all this good fortune has at last come upon me," and you will see from some sign at the end of his letter that he has hardly realised the pleasure he has henceforth an opportunity of enjoying in the world. Your sympathies will be

enlisted in the people by the various letters you will find. I thought of trying to illustrate this subject by just reading a few letters to you. (Cheers.)

The Queen.

I think it would be interesting to you to know how your Queen in her private life deals with men of science. (Cheers.) We know but little of the reign of Elizabeth, a sovereign of say about six million people, but the little we do know betokens a haughtiness with those about her, and the gracious acts performed for her were to such acts of subserviency, as that of Sir Walter Raleigh, who threw down his cloak to prevent her treading in the mud, but there was nothing in that Queen's condescension which would make a man of science feel as if his knowledge rendered him in the Queen's estimation her equal in that respect. I will read two letters of Sir Charles Lyell in illustration of this subject. The first letter is without date, but that does not matter, because the second gives it. It is as follows:—"My dear Grey,—If you are not too much engaged, will you be my guest at the Geological Society Club, on Wednesday next, and go to the Society's meeting after it if so disposed. We dine very punctually at half-past five o'clock, in order to be in time for the early meeting, where I expect a good discussion. We meet at Clunn's Hotel, Convent Garden, in morning dress. I enclose a card. You need not reply.—Ever faithfully yours, CHAS. LYELL." But he had an invitation himself, and for another day and so this comes:—"53, Harley-street, March 26, 1860. My dear Grey,—I have just received a letter from Colonel Biddulph saying that I am to dine with Her Majesty on Wednesday 'if not inconvenient,' instead of Tuesday (to-morrow) for which I had received a card. So I must go to the Palace instead of receiving you at our club as I had hoped." What I would ask you to do is, consider the sovereign of upwards of one hundred million people sending a message to a man of science saying she would rather he dined with her on another day "if not inconvenient to him." Nothing could be more courteous or kind. Does it not show a sympathy with her subjects which must fill us with admiration for her? (Cheers.) Is it any wonder that in her reign science has made such progress as it has, when these are the terms upon which she lived with the men who have adorned her reign by their discoveries and their abilities. What a lesson from a Queen to all her subjects, to respect the feelings, to be courteous to all with whom they come in contact. Is it wonderful that by such acts she has won the love of rich and poor alike?

I am anxious furthermore, to mention to you one other subject in reference to your Queen. I told you that I thought you would all like to know something of your sovereign. I will tell you what occurred on the day after her accession, and show you what curious work her Ministers first put before her to do. There are some duties which one can conceive the monarch of a great Empire has to perform on such an occasion. Here was a young girl, almost a child, ascending the Throne. There must have been certain things of great importance to which her attention should have been drawn. Immediately after her accession to the Throne, there was a letter to which the Royal sign-manual was attached, and which signature was most beautifully written—the handwriting almost of a child, and very different from her present signature—but written with the greatest care, her desire evidently being while making this her first signature to public documents, to give her subjects a good impression of their sovereign, to show them that nothing was done carelessly by her that was a public duty, although it might only be attaching a signature to a document. She had to write her signature probably to some hundreds of copies of this paper. You may guess the time that would be occupied in signing such a number of documents. And what was this document? It was one in which certain terms in the prayers, collects, and liturgies, customary to be used for the sovereign throughout her vast dominions, were to be altered. For instance, wherever the word "King" was used "Queen" was to be used, and wherever the word "William" was used, "Victoria" was to be used. These were directions which every one of her subjects had complied with before this letter could reach the various authorities, and were absolutely unnecessary, for one proclamation would have done for all, but such was the first duty imposed upon the greatest Queen the world has seen for many centuries. You will have that document in your possession. You will see how your great and good sovereign employed her first day after her accession. Probably the like of it will never occur again. Nevertheless you will see how a great monarch can be occupied in such circumstances. There is another illustration of the use to which these letters may be put. I would wish to draw your attention to this, that if you read these letters carefully you will find that no man in the present century or in the end of the last century, who was a hero or made an idol of by the people, but was distinguished by certain qualities which were little marked, but which in their letters you will find developed, and I will pass to a letter of Lord Nelson's to show how completely this is worked out. The occasion was this—but I would put this to you first of all. Supposing an Admiral in time of war, in command of a fleet, and not a very large fleet, were asked to grant a convoy to the merchant vessels of a foreign government, with whom England was on no particular good footing, don't you think the great majority of these men would say—"Hang these captains; what have I to do with them? It is as much as I can do to take care of Her Majesty's ships and British vessels; I am not going out of my way to

protect people who pay nothing for the cost of this navy, and whose safety would be no advantage to us." You are all aware of the feeling which the United States bore to George III. They believed him to be a tyrant and oppressor. They had wrongs and grievances, and it was to his actions and passions that they were attributed.

Lord Nelson.

Lord Nelson, being on board the Captain, in Gibraltar Bay, May 20, 1797, the Vice-Counsel of the United States of America wrote to him, representing that twelve vessels of the United States were, with their cargoes on board, then lying at Malaga, from which place they were unable to proceed on their respective voyages, as three French privateers were lying ready to seize upon them the moment they were from under the guns of Malaga, and that the masters were sure that the French Consul would adjudge them to be good prizes to those privateers, as they had seen in the course of the month several American vessels and cargoes adjudged by the Consul at Malaga good prizes to them, and that it was impossible to get protection for them unless Lord Nelson would be pleased to afford them the protection of His Majesty's flag. Lord Nelson replied as follows:—"I shall immediately grant the protection you have requested by sending a frigate to-morrow off Malaga, who shall protect them close to the coast of Barbary, where, you tell me, they will consider themselves safe. In thus freely granting the protection of the British flag to the subjects of the United States, I am sure of fulfilling the wishes of my sovereign, and, I hope, of strengthening the harmony which at present so happily subsists between the two nations.—I have the honour to be, dear sir, your most obedient servant, HORATIO NELSON." Well, then, you see the generosity and the promptitude of this great man's action. His wish was first to wipe off decisively and plainly the aspersions which rested on his sovereign's character of dislike and hostility to the American people, and to make Great Britain serviceable to all nations that were on friendly terms with his country. If you will look to other letters of Lord Nelson, you will see how this great man was equal in all other respects to great occasions, when they arose. You will be able to ascertain why it was that men who were considered to be great men by their country, had also a claim to be considered great by other nations, and no nation would have considered a man great who was not prepared to act with promptitude, sincerity, and generosity at such periods of time.

Sir J. W. Herschel.

I would allude, now, to another subject. I have recently read about what are called practical men. When a man says "I am a practical man," and he says so continuously, it is very generally found that such a person is an ignorant man on many subjects. I read this of a man who thought himself a very good man and a very great writer. He said that "the sublime science of astronomy lifts our minds to the consideration of the entire universe, and leads us to view with contempt this little planet to which we are attached, and to despise the momentary life which we spend here." I have heard that even quoted; I have lately seen it printed. Now, I hold in my hand a letter written by the late Sir J. W. Herschel, the greatest of astronomers, who achieved not only an English but a European reputation, and a reputation which will last for centuries of time. This letter shows that when he ceased from his severe studies of astronomy he could sit down and write a letter such as this, full of suggestions for the good of this "little planet," in which we are living; full of thoughts for the happiness of his family, and never lost an opportunity to do all the good he could for every part of the world, spurring me and others to do all the good we could in the position in which we were placed. He says:—"Collingwood, December 27, 1841.—We have received and been quite delighted with your book, which is one of the most spirited and interesting things in the narrative line of moving ventures happed by land and sea,' which has come across us for many a day, and I lose no time in thanking you both in Lady Herschel's name and my own for the attention of directing a copy of it to be sent us. The publication having taken place in your absence, I must also congratulate you on your choice of an editor, who has certainly done his part well, and 'got it up' in a way that I think must be very satisfactory to you. I understand it is making quite a sensation in London, and will no doubt have the effect of directing a good deal of public attention to the line of coast and country described in it. I am quite proud of my range of mountains, as it is, I think, the first time my name has figured on a map of the world." He goes on to say: "I hope among the more interesting and responsible duties of your situation in South Australia, you will not lose sight of the preservation and identification (by some definite and systematic mode of conforming writing to pronunciation) of the aboriginal dialects. The opportunity is precious. They must speedily perish as spoken languages, and (if not so preserved) a most invaluable record in ethnology will be lost forever. Nothing can be more grievous than to see these ancient and venerable monuments all over the world (infinitely more important than all the hieroglyphics and inscriptions about which all the learned are disputing) mouldering away before our eyes, while nobody seems to regard them in their true light, or consider it worth an effort to save them, either from being utterly lost or (which, in unwritten tongue, is perhaps even worse)

distorted by an erroneous and ill-concerted system of phonetic expression. A commission has been sitting for some time, of which I am a member, for reporting on the best means of replacing the lost standards of weight and and measure destroyed in the burning of the Houses of Parliament. In our report, which is nearly ready, I have taken care to have strongly insisted on the advantage, and indeed necessity, of forwarding to all the colonies authentic copies of the standards of length, weight, and capacity, to be there securely deposited, and to be thenceforward referred to as the colonial standards—together with a provision for their comparison at stated intervals with a set of itinerant standards, to be kept constantly going the round of the colonies in a certain rotation. Now, I think it would immediately tend to draw the attention of Government to this matter (which appears to me of no small future importance) if applications for such standards were made by the Colonial Governments themselves, and that, the earlier the better in their political existence, before errors and mistakes can have had time to creep in and get established. Should you agree with me in this, your position affords an opportunity which, if used, may save considerable annoyance to your successors, and to future generations of colonists, by putting straight at first, a matter which becomes more difficult as time progresses. The importance of a magnetic survey of all the colonised and colonisable parts of Australia is daily becoming more and more evident. Surveyors are too apt to work by compass, in some cases it is to be feared neglecting altogether, and of necessity in every territory where no such magnetic survey has been made, making undue and erroneous allowances for the magnetic declination, or deviation of the needle from the true meridian. Very many surveyors are ignorant of the fact that this element is continually varying, and on the direction and amount of its variation nothing but observation, purposely instituted, can give correct information. It is hardly possible to over-estimate the amount of confusion and litigation which must be caused to the next generation, when land becomes more valuable, and which may be spared them by a moderate outlay and reasonable attention at present, to determining with strict precision the 'magnetic elements' at a series of well-chosen stations along the coast, and in the interior of newly settled country. I trust you will not think it impertinent or intrusive of me if I seize this opportunity of directing your attention to this subject; the more so, as such a magnetic survey is already resolved on, if not in progress, in Canada, and provision is making for carrying a similar one into execution at the Cape. Here again, a suggestion to the Home Government from the local authorities might have an excellent effect, and as a magnetic observatory now exists in full activity in Van Diemen's Land, a centre of reference (distant it is true, but still very valuable if connected with one on the West Coast) also exists, upon which any extent of operations might be securely based. But I must not take up time so valuable as yours must necessarily be with further details of this nature."

Those who know anything of me will know that I have, throughout my life, adhered to this sage counsel regarding the preservation of languages. I have, from the earliest time to the present, done my utmost to preserve and record the languages and dialects of each of the nations amongst whom I have lived. It was in this manner that this great man stirred me up to do things which should be of benefit to these colonies. I have done my best to get these things done here, and in other colonies, especially attending to the subjects of weights and measures, believing that a uniform system of weights and measures prevailing throughout the whole Anglo-Saxon speaking race would tend greatly to extend its weight and influence in every part of the world, and would draw more closely together the bonds of amity which unite the several nations who speak that language.

Letters from Livingstone, Speke, Sturt, &c.

I should also like to tell you, in connection with the letters you will have, that you will also find letters from the most celebrated travellers—indeed, you will be able to travel with them so to speak—men such as Livingstone, Speke, Sturt, and others. I think I may assure you that it would be impossible to write a complete account of the travels of any of these eminent men without having access to these letters. Those who would desire to write an account of their journeyings could hardly complete the records of them unless they came to this city of Auckland, and availed themselves of these documents, which I hope shortly will be in your possession. Let me say that with regard to Livingstone one remarkable fact came out from some of his letters which are now your property. It is a matter of very great interest. It was a young lady who made the discovery, when examining some of Livingstone's letters. I was not aware that I possessed such a letter, for it had been addressed to the late lamented Dr. Bleek for the purpose of being delivered to me. "When Livingstone was travelling in Africa, he was astonished on coming to a particular place to find people chanting in their own language the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and other similar prayers and services. Upon inquiry it turned out that the Jesuits had been in that place about 100 years before. They taught the inhabitants of the district those prayers and parts of Christian doctrine, which for a whole century were preserved amongst the native people. Livingstone collected these, and sent to me the copies he had made. Now, I consider this a most remarkable circumstance, as showing how long a time knowledge of that kind will be preserved amongst aboriginal people.

It is a fact well worthy of publication, and these records are in the highest degree worthy of your consideration when they come into your hands. You will also find a number of missionary letters from all portions of the Pacific, from Bishop Patteson and Bishop Selwyn, so that you may accompany them even in their journeyings if you please. You will have accounts of these travels by natives, in their own language, who accompanied these distinguished men. Here in New Zealand you may live again in the earliest days of this Colony, when the Scriptures were being translated into the native tongue. You can be present with Archdeacon Maunsell, and then understand the great labour that was bestowed by him in translating portions of the Scripture into the Maori language. You can, so to speak, travel with the first missionary, Mr. King, and you may use the first New Zealand prayer book, the very copy with which he travelled among the natives. Leaving that, you may take up the first publication of any part of the Scriptures in the language of the Esquimaux. You will be able to take into your hands the first part of the Scriptures with which the first missionary travelled and spread those seeds from which sprung the conversion of the whole Esquimaux population, who were obliged to live for six months of the year in total darkness. You will have an opportunity of seeing the efforts that were made to raise this people, whom only a few whalers had up to that time visited, and which efforts brought them to a recognition of the great truths which are contained in religion, truths which are found to constitute the happiness of the human race; and you will be filled, I think, with admiration and wonder when you reflect that these people for centuries had been buried in darkness, and knew nothing of the outer world or milder climates, suddenly found themselves brought into communion with a new race of men, and conversing as it were with patriarchs, prophets, and evangelists, with all the greatest beings who had enlightened and made bright this world. You may, if you please, bear a part with Bishop Crowther in his labours on the banks of the Niger, and learn how Christianity, by the labours of that Bishop, began to enlighten nations in Central Africa. When I look upon these letters and books, they never fail to raise in me a feeling such as I cannot describe. If you will take up these letters and examine them, you will understand what great things have been accomplished for the benefit of aboriginal people. They cannot fail to give you pleasure such as they have given to me. In perusing them you will become, as it were, the partners and companions of those devoted men, who did such important work in those distant regions.

New Zealand's First Martyr.

Even in New Zealand you may take in your hand the book which belonged to the first native martyr here. That man attempted to preach the Gospel near Hokianga. He was told that any man would be destroyed who should make the attempt, but first writing in pencil a devout prayer in the book which you can still read, he went unarmed amongst these people. They attacked him, they beat him down with the butt end of their muskets, he having this book alone as his defence. He raised it to protect his head, and you will see the indentation of the butt end of the musket which drove the book into his skull, which is still stained with his blood and brains. It will be something to look upon 100 years hence, and I cannot but think that every one who does look upon it will feel reverence and admiration for the man who, as yet little more than barbarian, conceived it to be his duty, at the risk of his life, to do what he could for the benefit of his countrymen. We are indebted to Mr. John White of Hokianga for this book, and a narrative of the transaction which he has written on the title page. You will also find there a little manuscript in the Australian language. You will find that an Italian nobleman determined to take priest's orders, in order that he might be instrumental in converting the natives of Australia. He was taken from a ship and landed on an inhospitable shore, but sometime afterwards a little colony was established there for the purpose of giving refuge to people wrecked from ships in Torres Straits. That man was carried by the natives to this new settlement. He was in need of medical assistance, being weak from bad food and long privation. He was in a desperately declining state. In a few days he died. His only property was the manuscript which will be in your possession. It was a manuscript in the language of the people amongst whom he lived. It was presented to me, and I have found it to contain matter of great interest. Such an interest undoubtedly attaches to it. It affords evidence of the great qualities that the man possessed, and which inspired him with the resolution to undertake the task he had imposed upon himself. No man, it appears to me, could look upon a manuscript such as this unmoved. You will find also in your Library, many other letters of missionaries and early Christians, of the greatest interest, from all parts of the world. I am confident that in number, variety, and interest, no such collection has ever before been formed, nor could it have been, for in no other age have such great and manifold efforts been made to convert so many nations. But let me tell you of some of the curious ways in which some of those books were acquired. I will tell you how one volume was acquired.

Early Maori Grammars.

The first Maori grammar was written by a Professor Lee, who was assisted by a missionary; you will see in a letter of his which I had bound into the volume, the great difficulties he had to contend with. The second one was published about the same time that Dr. Maunsell's was published. That was a grammar by Dr. Norris. Only one copy was printed; by some mistake the type was lifted, and no other copy could be taken off; it thus became what is called a *unicum*. This gentleman gave the grammar to a professor in Germany who was a great friend of his, and who had written very much upon the subject of language. I was very anxious that Auckland should have a copy of every grammar that had ever been published in reference to New Zealand. "When asked for this book, the gentleman said that a *unicum* was of great value, and he did not wish to part with it; but it was suggested to me that it might be obtained through the influence of friends of both parties. I found that I had certain German friends, and amongst them Bunsen, who was German Ambassador in London, some of whose letters to me you will also find in your library. Now, this German professor who possessed this *unicum* was not only a singularly learned man, but a cheerful one. He said if Sir George Grey would send him a little Cape wine, which he could place on his table when he gave dinners to his friends and tell the story of how he had parted with his book, he would be disposed to give it up. When I heard that I told him that I would send him some of the best Cape wines that could be procured. I had a selection of such wines made and forwarded to him. He sent the book to me, beautifully bound in red morocco. Some time afterwards I was informed that he had been made rector of his university, and that in that capacity it was necessary that he should give a series of official dinners. I received information some afterwards that the wine I had sent was most excellent. (Laughter and cheers.) I have put this letter into the collection too, so that you may see the odd way in which books may be acquired, and you will find I did not disgrace you by giving too small a return for this treasure. There is another way, and perhaps the oddest way, that ever a book was got.

Manuscripts from Africa.

At a place in Africa, immediately under the Line, two fragments of remarkable books were picked up. They were written in Arab characters, but the language was native. They had reference to the proceedings of the armies of the Emperor Heraslius in Africa, and narrated a series of events of which we have no other records. When I read the account of these fragments, I endeavoured to obtain similar manuscripts. I had a sort of ambition to become possessed of books of this description, which I imagined might contain information of extraordinary historical interest. I thought the best chance of getting them was by writing to Livingstone and Speke. I wrote to them, and both of them promised to do what they could to assist me, and to spread the intelligence amongst any Arab traders they met that I wanted such books. Speke came back, but was unable to get any books. Livingstone did not come back. Some time afterwards I became Governor of New Zealand, and after I had been here a few months a case arrived from Captain Crawford, of Sidon. He said in a letter which he wrote to the Colonial Secretary of the Cape of Good Hope, which is in your library, that when he was at Zanzibar, a very respectable old Arab gentleman called on him and gave into his charge a case which he understood contained a very valuable manuscript, which the old gentleman, after much difficulty and research, had procured at a great distance in the interior of the country. The case, however, contained several beautiful manuscripts written in Arabic characters. The gentleman made Captain Crawford understand that the case was for Sir George Grey. I had, however, left the Cape at that time, and they were sent on here. You will be in possession of those manuscripts. Now, I don't know that Arab gentleman who procured them from the interior, and I have never been able to thank him or make the slightest return for his generosity, or in any way to show my gratitude. I do not know the Arabic characters, and I am afraid they must lie unread with you until some man amongst us shall solve the difficulty, and lay open the treasure of history which the manuscripts may contain. You will find amongst the letters some from colonists worthy of the greatest attention, military officers, naval officers, and men of great distinction in every walk of life. You will, in examining these letters, be able to judge of many things that have taken place here by a much better light than you at present possess. And I will ask you while you are judging the actions of men who were here in the early days—those military, naval, and civil officers whoever they may be—that you will make allowances for the difficulties in which they were placed. You must remember that these men came into a country where there were two races in conflict. You will remember these men knew nothing of the language of the race with which they were brought in contact. The aspect of everything was strange; the murders committed by one of these races were considered by them a legitimate mode of carrying on warfare. The European race regarded them with horror, and felt a natural aversion to those who would perpetrate such cruelties. Many things arose which were a constant source of alarm to the European race. Mothers were often in terror for the safety of their children, and were appealing for protection, which if not granted, men would have taken the law into their own hands, and undoubtedly atrocities would have been committed on both sides. The greatest efforts had to be made in the shortest time to avoid new difficulties. Lines of action had to be determined upon almost in a moment that must have produced

great results. You must remember that persons tried by troubles of this kind, and obliged to make an instant decision, could scarcely avoid some error. You must judge them calmly and fairly. They are not to be judged as many sitting quietly in their arm chairs are often inclined to review events; you must judge them with consideration of the circumstances in which they were placed, and when you have arrived at a judgment formed with due regard to all the facts, let your opinion be a calm one; let it be given with discretion, remembering the situation of those who have borne a part in great national events. Do not unfairly condemn those who have endeavoured with all their energy and ability to preserve the welfare of the people. (Cheers.) Sometimes it may be a young man sent forth to manage affairs and compelled to exercise the powers entrusted to him in the midst of warfare where everything is exceptional, sometimes disturbed by shrieking women and cries for help. Consider a man endeavouring to make laws for the general good, to found new nations, and to preserve the welfare and material prosperity of the people to whom he is sent. Rather pity such a man for the troubles he has to endure. Pity him even if he comes through it successfully; for he may have had to sustain an arduous struggle. I ask you again to judge calmly and rather with a favourable interpretation. It appears to me now almost incredible to think of the troubles that have fallen upon myself and others in such situations. I have often had to take measures unadvised, on which depended the welfare and happiness of countries then thinly inhabited, but the joint populations of which perhaps now amount to as many as three millions of people. Think of such a responsibility falling upon one man. The same thing has fallen upon others who are now judged in an erroneous spirit. Surely when great movements are taking place, in the midst of which no time is left for mature decision, when whole populations go forth from civilized centres and come amongst people not civilized, but still barbarous, the men who have been put at the head of a movement of that kind are entitled to fair judgment, and even to the compassion of their countrymen, even if everything is not done wisely. Deal with your statesmen as men who have done their best, if you are satisfied they have exerted themselves to the utmost; but if with such generosity you form a lenient judgment of the conduct of the European race, judge no less tenderly and fairly of the conduct of the leaders of the barbarian race, whose country was entered, nay in some instances invaded by a strange population, often overbearing, exacting,—sometimes insulting and cruel. Remember that under such circumstances the natives regarded themselves as patriots, fighting for lands and homes, and as endeavouring to expel unwelcome intruders. The many native letters that will come into your possession from great chiefs in various countries, will show that the great migrators of this century have often encountered native princes quite as generous, courageous, and merciful as ourselves. Let us honour and respect those who showed themselves great and good in the countries which we occupy and enjoy the fruits of, whilst the original inhabitants have too often faded away before us. We can form no fair judgment on these events; but you will have in your possession manifold proofs of the goodness of those who have been but too often badly rewarded for the kindness they showed to their first European visitants. Let commiseration, pity, and forgiveness be given to the leaders upon each side. Who could fail sometimes to err on some occasions in the midst of such novel, great and terrible events?

I thus conclude,—let us attempt to found here such a great institution as I have shadowed forth—an institution possessing such advantages as I have pointed out. Let us separate ourselves—in one important respect—from the instincts of an old country. There the rule is to try and found families, and aggrandise them by their surroundings. All those precious documents which are called family archives pass into the family chest and are locked up. They are shut out from public view; great libraries are collected, shut up for a century or two in cases defended by wire lattices, and are exhibited on a certain day in the week to crowds of excursionists, who pass through the family library ignorant of its contents and astounded at its extent. It is useless to its owner, and of no benefit to the nation. Too often it happens that the descendants of those families are landed in circumstances which in some way detracts from the glory of their ancestors. When that happens these treasures are dispersed, and thus having been shut up from the public, kept useless while they are held by the family, they are comparatively useless when broken up. Great reservoirs of knowledge, which, as a whole, would have fertilized the vast plains of literature, are changed into small and scattered pools—insignificant, and, in their isolated state, of use but to some few individuals, instead of supplying the wants of hundreds of anxious students. Let us not try to found families here on the old fashioned principles. Let us every one assist in founding one nation. Let us cultivate the instincts which we desire that nation should have by giving our entire heart to the work, and so foster and instruct the tendencies which we wish to direct. Let us think not of honouring merely individuals. It has been held, according to a statement which I heard made in the House of Representatives, that those who dispense Government funds are worthy of great honour, and niches were left in the halls of public buildings in which the statues of such benefactors were to be set up. Let us have no such niches. Let us think of no such things as these. Let us have great and magnificent halls if you please; let them be depositories of works of art; let them be full of the treasures of literature which shall cultivate the true instincts of a great nation. Let the people of that nation, who shall wander through these halls, if they are asked where are such statues, reply "*circumspice*—these works of art, these treasures of literature, are the statues

which our founders have set up for themselves." Let them mention in subdued voices, and in reverent tones, the names of such benefactors of the people of Auckland, as I have named to you this night, and let whole groups of families, and not only an eldest son say,— "An ancestor of ours was one of those to whom these treasures belonged, and who did such great things for his country, thinking of its welfare and not of the maintenance of a family name."

SIR GEORGE GREY resumed his seat amidst loud and prolonged applause, a large proportion of the audience waving hats and handkerchiefs.

His Lordship Dr. COWIE, Bishop of Auckland, moved the following resolution:—"That this meeting tenders its sincere and hearty thanks to Sir George Grey for the eloquent and instructive address just delivered, and for the interest he has taken in the Free Public Library since its establishment; also, it takes this opportunity of recording its high appreciation and deep gratitude for the munificent gift of his valuable library to the citizens of Auckland." He would merely express the hope that the munificent example of Sir George Grey would be followed by his fellow-citizens who possessed the means, both now and in the years to come.

MR. J. C. FIRTH said it would be impossible to add anything to the instructive and interesting address which had been given by Sir George Grey. He had listened to it with the greatest pleasure. It was unnecessary to ask the favour of that vast assemblage for the resolution which had been proposed by His Lordship the Bishop. He felt that those who listened to that address were not only attentive, but appreciative in the highest degree. Sir George Grey deserved the thanks of the people for presenting them with so noble a gift. He had laid the people of Auckland under lasting obligations to him. Sir George Grey had proved that sentiment was a great power and influence in producing results. Where directed by a high purpose and sustained by persevering effort, sentiment was a ruling power. He begged to second the resolution.

SIR GEORGE GREY proposed a vote of thanks to the Acting Mayor, who had so efficiently presided over the meeting.

The motion was carried amidst loud cheers.

Three cheers were given for Sir George Grey, after which the meeting separated.

WILSONS & HORTON, Printers, Auckland.

Educational Institute Of Otago. Inaugural Address

Delivered By The President, J. B. Park, Esq.,

At the Opening of the Fifth Annual Conference, JUNE 27TH, 1882

Published by the Institute for Distribution.

Dunedin: Coulls, Culling, & Co., Printers and Stationers, Rattray Street. 1882.

Inaugural Address,

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—The honour of occupying the position of President of the Educational Institute of Otago is one which I neither expected nor considered myself worthy to receive. The chair has already been filled in succession by three of our University Professors, and a gentleman who is considered to be no mean representative of the legal profession in Dunedin. It, therefore, behoves me, as the first of your own body, on whom you have conferred this honour, to tender you my grateful acknowledgements for your kindness and consideration, and at the same time, to express a hope that I may be able, with your indulgence, to discharge the duties of the office to your satisfaction and my own credit. But anything I have to say on the present occasion must come far short of the able addresses of my learned predecessors in office. Still my remarks, connected with the work in which we are all engaged, may contain a few truths, though trite or commonplace, not unworthy of our earnest consideration.

Before proceeding to the main subject of my address, permit me to say a word in reference to the advantages which may be derived from an association such as our Institute. These seem to me to be two-fold. First, the members are afforded opportunities for meeting together for the purpose of discussing questions in connection with their profession. Papers are read and freely commented on, in which the various experiences of teachers in the discharge of their duties are enunciated, and thereby fresh ideas are received, or old ones confirmed. In this way, effort for future work is strengthened, and the liability of falling into mistakes considerably lessened; besides, improved methods of teaching are almost certain to be the result of such procedure, if persistently and judiciously pursued. But perhaps I may be pardoned for remarking here that there are many teachers among us who seldom or never attend our meetings, to their own loss and disadvantage, which is greatly to be regretted. I am sure there is not a teacher in Otago, who has any regard for his profession, but would be the better for taking a part in these meetings. The second advantage of such associations, though it may not bulk in importance with the first, is still as necessary. For however exalted our aims may be to reach a high degree of excellence in the performance of our work, we cannot ignore the fact that what we have to do is

considered simply work, and, whatever a few enthusiastic writers on the noble calling of the schoolmaster may say to the contrary, is still by many considered not very dignified work, and paid for accordingly. We are, therefore, constrained to attend to the actualities of life as well as have a desire for the idealities of our profession. An important part of what I term the actualities of a schoolmaster's life is the responsibility laid upon him to secure for himself, and it may be for others dependent on him, an honest livelihood, without being worried by unnecessary restrictions hopeless of redress. "Well, the second advantage of our association consists in this: its members can meet if they choose and discuss any grievance, momentary or otherwise, and devise means for its redress. No doubt the grievances of the schoolmaster have afforded material for capital jokes to a certain class of social or political wiseacres, and it is therefore not very surprising that Teachers' Associations should sometimes be designated *Trades Unions*. Allow me to say a word here in reference to the unfairness of this charge, at least so far as our Institute is concerned. In what may be termed the commendable anxiety of popular educationists to bring primary instruction to the door as it were of even the humblest member of the community, the teacher, who ought to have some consideration, is apt to be over-looked, or at least considered of hardly equal importance with the school buildings and their appliances, and is consequently the first to suffer on the slightest financial emergency. In proof of this I may remind you that, when the state of the colonial revenue lately necessitated a reduction of ten per cent, in the salaries of all Government employes, schoolmasters acquiesced in the inevitable without a murmur. Such, however, was not the case with the other members of the civil service. Their condition was so loudly bewailed, that Government was constrained to restore to them their *ten per cent*. But, so far as I am aware, not one voice, either in the House of Representatives or out of it, has been once raised for the restoration of the *ten per cent*, to the poor defenceless dominie. Perhaps the reason is, that teachers are not recognised by Government as civil servants, and never were. Now, had our Association partaken of the nature of a *trades union*, we would have petitioned, memorialised, agitated, struck for our just rights. But we did nothing of the sort. "We are a law-abiding body—long-suffering class. Nay, more, I believe the subject was never specially dealt with by any branches of the Institute. A glance at the Report will show that the subjects of debate at the several branch meetings were those exclusively connected with the first series of advantages already spoken of, viz., the best means of reaching a high standard in our profession.

With these preliminary observations, allow me now to proceed to the main subject of my address. *The Teacher viewed in relation to his work and to society*. My remarks, though specially intended for our younger brethren, may not, I trust, be found inapplicable to any of us. I shall consider the teacher of youth in a three-fold aspect. First, as a man of culture, secondly, as an educator, and thirdly, as a member of the community.

1. Mathew Arnold's conception of a man of culture is, "That he strives to humanize knowledge, to divest it of whatever is harsh, crude, and technical, and to make it a source of happiness and brightness to all." Now, I think this should be the aim of every teacher of youth, and in striving for its accomplishment, his own moral, intellectual, and physical capacities should be cultivated as far as circumstances will permit. But I am afraid that culture, that is the culture of the whole man as an immortal being, responsible to a greater than himself, is scarcely the thing demanded by some, at least, of our advanced thinkers of the present day. Utility, in their estimation, is the be all and the end all of human life; and education that is not utilitarian in its aim has to them little to recommend it. If such be the prevailing belief of any considerable number of modern scientists, we have certainly some reason to be alarmed for the consequences. Man is above, or ought to be above, feeling satisfied with enjoyments that are merely sensuous. If the happiness and brightness of life spoken of by Mr. Arnold were secured by the gratification of the senses alone, then utilitarianism might claim our supreme regard. But the moral and religious instincts of humanity are nobler in their aims than to be bartered for, or set on one side by cold sensuous utilitarianism. When a teacher of youth is not guided by a keen sense of his moral responsibility, not to man only, but to One who claims and demands the homage and righteous obedience of all men, his work, in my opinion, may be performed in a manner so heartless and perfunctory as to be worthless, or vicious, or both. There must be no dubiety in his moral perceptions. Truth with him must not only be admired for its own sake, it must also be supremely loved and scrupulously obeyed, because it is the Divine basis of all true manhood.

The aphorism that "virtue is its own reward" is only true in a certain sense, for, as Dr. Newman well puts it, "Though it brings with it the truest and highest pleasure, they who cultivate it for pleasure sake are selfish, not religious, and will never gain the pleasure, because they can never have the virtue." The teacher, then, if impressed with this high conception of the unselfishness of the true moral character, cannot fail to be successful in the best sense of the term. He works not as the mere hireling. He feels in his inmost soul that he has to a certain extent the moulding for good or for evil the plastic minds of immortal creatures; and doubtless has found that the mere love of any moral virtue for its own sake has lamentably failed to support him in the irritating and arduous struggle. No, the source of his support springs from a nobler fountain head—the solemn conviction that he is responsible to a Power neither of man, nor in man, but above man. Whatever would tend to

blunt his moral perceptions of right and wrong he carefully avoids. His whole life, both on the floor of the schoolroom and when mixing in society, is consistent, transparent, and so far as in him lies, blameless. He is true to himself and fully alive to the responsibility of his office. Strengthened by the consciousness of moral rectitude, he cultivates the graces of life, and having before him the high ideal of a full, rounded, human character, exhibited in the lives of good men, rather than in the exploits of great men, he takes a delight in whatever is pure, lovely, and of good report. And conscientiously believing that no education can be complete that does not develop a pure morality, and further, that morality in its highest sense is spiritual, and can only reach its fullest development by faith in a Supreme Being. He, therefore holds that no man is competent to give *that* education who denies his moral responsibility to *this* Being.

A man may have a highly cultivated intellect, and be able in an eminent degree to impart his intellectual knowledge to others, but lacking *this* moral culture, he must fail as an educationist in the full meaning of that term. If such is the case, you will allow that the teacher who has a true sense of the importance of his work, must place supreme value on moral culture. The various virtues that combine to make a perfect moral character are not to him mere abstractions. Charitableness, forgiveness, gentleness, not a namby-pamby amiability, truthfulness, patience, and all the other moral virtues are to him as real as his own existence. He may come far short of a consistent exhibition of them in his own character, but, having the true ideal before him, and having been long accustomed to exercise another powerful moral virtue—self-control—he will never go far astray.

But to proceed. There is also intellectual culture. An ignorant teacher is an absurdity. For how can a man teach to others that of which he himself is ignorant? Every teacher must be a student. When he leaves the Normal School or the University, his education is not finished, it is, strictly speaking, only begun. He may have acquired a good deal of technical knowledge. But how is he to make this knowledge a source of happiness and brightness to the young? This is a question of such profound meaning and far-reaching consequences that a whole treatise would be required for its satisfactory solution. I can only throw out a few meagre hints, which I hope may not be considered wholly valueless in helping to a correct answer.

We are told that there are two sorts of people in this world, those who go through life with their eyes open, and those who perform the same journey, but have their eyes shut with regard to all that is worth seeing. The former are observant of the varied phenomena brought under their notice, and seemingly without any special effort, note whatever is worth retaining, make it their own, and lay it past to be brought forth as occasion requires to help them to sweeten and to brighten not only their own lives but also the lives of others. The latter see nothing, feel nothing, and therefore have nothing to communicate. The faculty of observation, when correctly and judiciously exercised, seems to me to form the basis of all true mental culture; and it can be indefinitely improved by exercise, as every one knows who has made the experiment. Indeed, I believe there is no intellectual faculty that so richly repays its possessor for its cultivation. And, besides, it has two worlds for its exercise, the world of mind and the world of matter. But I must confine my remarks to the latter world. Here we have all the physical sciences, among which I need only mention, physiology, botany, geology, and chemistry, whose remarkable and interesting phenomena meet us at every turn, so to speak, and call forth the observing faculty in a very special manner. How many points of practical interest does not even a slight knowledge of these sciences present to the observant student? No doubt it has been said that a little learning is a dangerous thing. But, perhaps, a more misleading aphorism was never coined. All human knowledge, comparatively speaking, is little. Is it not the great amount of knowledge that benefits a man, or the small amount that is dangerous to him? It is the right use he makes of his knowledge, that is really beneficial either to himself or to others. A little knowledge, however, of any subject should be complete and thorough so far as it goes. It is your pretentious smatterers in knowledge that make much of this little, and fools of themselves, who do mischief. But, even to know a little thoroughly demands continuous and systematic study. Not four or five hours' hard study for a few days, or a few weeks, or even for a few months, and then entire cessation from all mental effort. Such procedure can only be characterised as mental dissipation, and must end in failure and disgust.

It has been said that much study is a weariness to the flesh; but the culture of which I am speaking can be obtained at a less painful sacrifice. It is within the reach of any one to a greater or less extent who is willing to continuously and systematically employ the spare hours of his life. Spare hours did I say? Great things have been accomplished by the systematic employment of the spare minutes of even an active life. The pages of biography are full of examples confirmatory of the statement, and if we study them aright we shall strive to do likewise. I have just said that it is the pretentious smatterers in knowledge, or, as they might be termed, the skim milk philosophers of our day, who do mischief. The thorough student is not pretentious. He is no mere retailer of other men's literary wares. He knows that intellectual culture depends more on the quality of a man's mental attainments than on the amount of book learning with which his memory is charged. And herein, it seems to me, lies the difference between intellectual culture and mere knowledge of books. Some men have so saturated' their minds with the opinion of others, that they have none of their own. They are continually quoting

some authority or another in confirmation of their own literary or scientific attainments, and would fain pass for men of culture. But how can they be such, if their minds are only receptacles of other people's knowledge, which they have never assimilated or used as a means for sharpening their own perceptive faculties, or developing their own intellectual powers? Such men might make fair teachers, but poor educators of the young. Something more, therefore, is needed than a knowledge of books by any one who deserves the name of a man of culture. It should never be forgotten that books are but means to be used for the accomplishment of a purpose. It is not sufficient that we know of the existence of certain facts, we ought also to try and find out how they exist, and how they can be made subservient to human welfare. Our reading will be barren of results if it does not leave firm impressions on the memory for the exercise of our reason and judgment.

If all writers of books produced only what they gathered from other books there could be no intellectual progress. The teacher of youth, to be a man of fair culture, must, in the language of the prayer book, "read, learn, and inwardly digest;" and exercise a wise discrimination between the really useful books, and those, however entertaining, that are frivolous. He must also be a careful student of that book, one or two pages of which I have just named—the book of nature, the glorious panorama of vegetable and animal existence, created not only for man's special use and benefit, but also for his pleasure. The man of culture sees a beauty and adaptation in all nature's works, from the humblest to the most exalted; and in the contemplation of them, sensations of the purest enjoyment fill his soul; and he feels himself ennobled, lifted up, as it were, to a higher state of existence, and blesses the Creator of all, that He has endowed him with the capacity for such enjoyment. In short, wherever harmony exists, be it in colour, in symmetrical form, in musical sounds, or in the beautiful consistency of a noble life, each and all when brought under his observation, he can appreciate and admire.

Intellectual culture when rightly directed has thus both a refining and an ennobling tendency; and the greater interest a teacher takes in such culture, the better must he be fitted for his work. His mind expands, but it is not with the knowledge of facts only but with a sympathy for, and an appreciation of the beautiful and the good in whatever God has created.

But there are other books which the schoolmaster has, the living books that are before him in the schoolroom; and they afford him objects of study more wonderful, more diversified, and more entertaining, if he will only study them aright, than all the books that ever were written. In one word then, it appears to me, that the intellectual culture which the teacher requires can be best secured by an earnest use of the perceptive faculties, tempered with reason and judgment, and by the possession of an innate consciousness of the divine fitness of all things for the purpose of finding the best and the most beautiful in these things; and we, as teachers, having found this, will feel a real pleasure in the endeavour to enkindle and foster all noble desires in the minds of our pupils.

But there is physical culture. The health of the body must not be sacrificed for either moral or intellectual culture. Indeed, it is only when all the bodily functions are in a healthy and vigorous condition that moral and intellectual culture can be safely and satisfactorily prosecuted. The laws of health, therefore, are of primary importance to all, but more especially to those who are engaged in sedentary pursuits; not as laws in the abstract, but as laws that must be intelligently obeyed, or violated at our peril. Nature is patient and long-suffering; but if we persistently ignore its legitimate demands, we must sooner or later pay the penalty. A schoolmaster whose physical frame is feeble from over-study, or from an indolent regard for the ordinary laws of health, is very unfit for the tear and wear of the schoolroom. "The sound mind in the healthy body" is of all things to be devoutly wished for, and sedulously sought after by every teacher who would perform his duties with that manly vigour which robust health alone can command.

It is somewhat remarkable that so many students who ought to know, and who generally do know something of the marvellous structure of the human body, should so recklessly disregard its necessary claims. There are, I think, few things more deeply to be deplored than the conduct of the sickly and laborious student who year after year sacrifices his health at the shrine of learning. He may, after long toil, have just finished his collegiate course, and carried off the highest honours; but he has also carried with him the passport for another world. And what renders his case all the more regretful is, to use the language of the poet—

"He nursed the pinion that impelled the steel,"

and sinks into an early grave; while all his varied and brilliant acquirements are lost to the world for ever. There are few, if any, seats of learning but have their yearly victims. Able, bright, intellectual fellows, foolishly throwing away their lives, whereas, with a little prudential care they might live to a good old age, and materially promote the advancement of sound learning. Let every young ambitious student be advised in time. To such I would say—Your health is of the first importance; for what avails the highest intellectual culture if the body is a wreck?

The great cry of modern educationists is that elementary science should find an important place in our schools. Well, it seems to me, that before all the sciences that can be taught there, a knowledge of the law of

health should claim the first consideration. How can you expect a teacher, weighed down by lassitude from having to teach in a badly ventilated schoolroom, to throw into his work that liveliness of illustration which is so necessary to arrest and secure the attention of his pupils? I fear that children are often accused of indolence and inattention when the abnormal condition of their health, the result of having to breathe impure air, is the primary cause. But, besides pure air, physical culture demands pure water, plain but wholesome food, and bodily exercise; all which are necessary to give elasticity to the muscles, and energy to the brain. But the whole subject is one of such vital importance that it certainly demands more than a passing notice; and I just hope it will be taken up during the ensuing session by some of our promising young teachers whose studies may lie in that direction. Meantime, I would advise every teacher to be as careful of his physical frame as he is of his mental powers; for the satisfactory culture of the latter depends in no small degree on the health and vigour of the former.

2. I now proceed to offer a few remarks on the teacher as an educator. "We all know the difference between *teaching* and *educating*. But it should not be forgotten that though we may teach without educating, we cannot educate without teaching. Facts must first be imparted to the pupils; but the teacher must possess a thorough knowledge of the facts. And herein I think lies the advantage which the cultured schoolmaster possesses over any other. His perfect knowledge of his subject enables him to present it to the minds of his pupils in a way most suited to their respective capacities. He has long since learned that no man can with any degree of success teach all he knows to children; and he, therefore, has always a reserve fund far in advance of what his pupils require at their age to know, or even can learn. It is a great mistake to imagine that we can get on swimmingly at our work if we can manage just to keep ahead of our pupils. A teacher who is not master of his subject is hesitating and hazy in his explanations; and his pupils soon lose confidence in him as a teacher and respect for him as a man. But further, the teacher who educates does not rest satisfied with even a lucid explanation of facts. He makes his facts, so to speak, the foundation on which to build up and strengthen the gradually developing intelligence of his pupils. He makes them feel dissatisfied until they can perceive the why and the wherefore of things; in other words, he compels them to think, and whenever a teacher succeeds in making his pupils think, from that moment he is more than a teacher, he becomes an educator.

There is one point in which we teachers often err, and err grievously, and that is in not making sufficient allowance for the difference between our own minds and the immature minds of our pupils. We may have a clear understanding of a subject, and be remarkably lucid, as we think, in our explanation of it, and yet our pupils fail to comprehend us. Now the reason is simply this, we have failed to put ourselves in the position of young learners, and consequently have been leading them beyond their depth. The teacher, therefore, who would develop the thinking powers of his pupils, must feed them with food convenient for them; and to do this, he must first bring his own mind in complete sympathy with theirs. But this demands some knowledge at least of the functions and growth of the human mind. If such is the case, then, every teacher who desires to rise to the dignity of an educator, must possess some knowledge of mental science. I do not mean theoretical knowledge merely, which of course is of the first importance, but only as a means to an end, I mean experimental knowledge. A man may be fairly acquainted with logic and metaphysics as expounded in text books and taught in colleges, yet, "if he has not in a natural way acquired the general habit of thinking and reasoning" his acquaintance with the technicalities of these sciences "will fail to make him a great thinker" or a successful educator.

But the public school teacher's work now-a-days has become such a terrible race for results, and so deep is the rut in which he is compelled to run, that his mind has no elbow room. There is no time for thought. Such at least is the general complaint; and I am persuaded that any man of ordinary intelligence who examines the *syllabus* will say that the complaint is just. Even our school inspectors are raising their voice against the folly of attempting to teach such a multiplicity of subjects to young children. In last year's report Mr. Petrie speaks out with considerable emphasis regarding the barren results of the education in our public schools, blaming, perhaps unwittingly, the teachers more than the system under which they have to work. The minds of the pupils are not acted on; the teaching is too mechanical; the memory has to do all the work. In short, the education in our schools is degenerating "into a worthless process of cram." Now, I make bold to say that all this is only the natural outcome of the system. No better could be expected from it. No sane man will sow tares and expect to reap wheat. And if those who frame codes for elementary schools expect to obtain results completely at variance with what these codes indicate, they betray lamentable ignorance of the human mind.

The general experience both in the Home country and in the colonies, regarding codes and syllabuses as hitherto constructed, has been that they are detrimental to education. Sir John Lubbock, speaking of the Home system, says, "Our present methods rely too much on memory and too little on thought; make too much of books and too little of things; sacrifice education to instruction, and confuse book learning with real knowledge." It is well known that our educational syllabus is based on the Home system, or rather what was the Home system, for the old codes so dear to the heart of the first codemaker, Mr. Lowe, are being swept away by

Mr. Mundella. It is to be sincerely wished that when this new codemaker has brought his scheme into full operation, it will not sacrifice education to mere book knowledge. Codes have their advantages, and he who shall be successful in codifying elementary instruction on the basis of reason and common sense, may well be considered a public benefactor, and deserve the lasting gratitude of both teacher and taught.

It is to be regretted that such a liberal system of education as ours should be so ineffective from the unworkable nature of its details. But, defective as these details certainly are, still I do think that better results should be obtained from them. The temptation, however, to secure a high percentage of passes seems to have been too strong for all to resist; and, since the syllabus demands the *facts* and all but ignores thought and intelligence on the part of the pupils, teachers, to save themselves, have stuck to the syllabus; and last year's report proclaims to syllabus makers, and all concerned, the lamentable result.

The true educator would doubtless be satisfied with a lower per centage of passes than the public demands, provided he could secure greater intelligence in his pupils. But here is the difficulty. The public judges of the quality of a school only by the large number of children that can obtain a pass; and some committees have been foolish enough to publish in the local papers the high percentage of passes made in their schools, and commend their teachers accordingly. But neither the public nor committees have hitherto proved themselves to be infallible judges in these matters; and it is only such reports of the weak points in the system, as that given by our Inspectors, that will let them see the error of their ways, and lead them, we hope, to demand from those whom they have entrusted with the framing; of laws for the education of our children, a system based on reason and common sense. In the meantime, however, we have our syllabus, and till we get a better are bound to make the best of it. I would, therefore, strongly recommend that while we strive to secure as high a percentage of passes as possible, never to neglect our higher functions, that of educators.

It is generally allowed that the most difficult part of a teacher's duty is to get his pupils to give a reason for what they say or do, or in other words, to make them think. Some writers on education strongly object to teachers putting questions to pupils that can be answered by *Yes* or *No*, as not being educative. Of course, such answers are worthless if the examiner stops there. But if he, as the lawyers would say, cross question them, he may find that instead of being non-educative they will lead to very important results. For example, a teacher asks a pupil any simple question, such as, Does the sun rise in the east? Of course he will answer, "Yes, sir." But if the teacher immediately adds, How do you know? His pupil, though he may have answered without more thought than that the teacher expected "Yes," will be arrested, so to speak, and compelled to think or look very foolish; and rather than do the latter, he will strive to give a reason for his answer. Or again, when a teacher gets a wrong answer, I think he makes a mistake when he says, "No, that is wrong." The better way, in my opinion, would be to take the answer, and by cross questioning compel his pupil to contradict himself, who would then hardly fail to perceive his mistake. This, as you perhaps all know, is termed the Socratic method; and I am convinced it can be made very effective in the hands of a patient and careful teacher in getting his pupils to think. But I know that the great objection to this method is the want of time. Of course, the number of subjects we have to teach will not allow us sufficient time to do it justice. Still, I think we ought to lose no opportunity that presents itself in using it, for if we manage even in a slight degree to make our pupils think, it will smooth the way wonderfully for mere memory work. It is but reasonable to suppose that a child will commit to memory what he understands easier than what he does not understand. The mechanic spends a great deal of time in sharpening his tools, but when once sharp, he can with greater ease produce more and better work than if he had toiled away with them blunt and out of order. So it is with the teacher. If he can once manage to sharpen the intelligence of his pupils, he will get more satisfactory work from them than any amount of mere cramming could accomplish.

I have already referred to the influence that every teacher has or should have in forming the character of his pupils. It has been well said that "we teach not only by what we say and do, but very largely by what we are." This influence, therefore, will depend in a great measure on the uniformity and consistency of our demeanour in school. All know that moral education can be better promoted by example than by precept. No teacher of experience needs to be told that children are keenly observant. To excite youthful curiosity, then, in proper objects, and to direct and guide it in the right way, is the responsible but difficult duty of every schoolmaster. But if he has any peculiarity, either in manner or dress, he may rest assured that such peculiarity will only weaken his influence, by lessening the force of his wise precepts and faultless examples. Moreover, the teacher who would successfully inculcate sound moral principles in his pupils (and he cannot thoroughly educate without doing this) must not only be impressed with his own moral responsibility—he must also believe that there is a something in every human soul when rightly directed, that inclines to righteousness.

No doubt we have all heard often enough of the depravity of the human heart, but I fear you will never make either child or man good, wise, or lovable, by continually dinning into his ears that he is wicked and depraved. Be this as it may, however, it is a grand thing that the teacher has to do with the young before the artificialities of life have destroyed their ingenuousness. He must, therefore, have faith in their capacity to learn

the right, though the temptation to do the wrong may be often too powerful for them to resist, and sorely trying for him to successfully restrain. A faithful and persistent exhibition of moral rectitude on his part, however, will materially help to develop the better part of their natures. Whenever a teacher can implant the conviction in the minds of youth that he detests meanness, cowardice, and deceit; and that magnanimity, moral courage, and truth are the guiding principles of all his actions, from that moment he obtains a power over them for good which will only be limited by the time they are under his instruction, and perhaps not then.

I daresay we all know well enough that a teacher's influence over his pupils is considerably strengthened by the consistency of his own conduct towards them. Writers on education are strong on this point. But though it may not require many gifts and graces to put together finely-turned sentences embodying the noblest sentiments regarding teachers' duties in the abstract, no one knows so well as the teacher himself how terribly difficult it is to put them into practice. We are told to be kind but firm—a notable advice, and worthy of all consideration. But alas for the best intentions of frail human temperaments, the advice is often forgotten in the worry of our daily work. Still, if it is next to impossible for a teacher never to get angry without showing it, he should nevertheless strive against fickleness of temper—one of the weakest points in any teacher's character. To be severe against offences one day, and almost apologetically gentle with similar offences on another, betrays a mind wholly unfit to educate children. No, however difficult it is to maintain equanimity of temper on all occasions, he must seek after it, and the very efforts he makes are in themselves educative; and, moreover, while he is using his best efforts to discipline his own mind, he is acquiring additional fitness to bring into subjection the erring natures of his pupils.

Every teacher requires moral power. It is a mightier influence with children than the fear of punishment; and this moral power is always strongest in the man who has no obliquity in his own moral character. When a teacher stands before a class to teach a lesson which he himself has thoroughly studied, he has not only acquired the knowledge to teach it properly, he has also acquired the moral right to demand from his pupils careful and honest preparation of it. I fear that many teachers are not sufficiently alive to the influence which a thorough knowledge of their subject gives them over their pupils. Let any man try to teach a subject which, by previous thought and study, he has made his own, so to speak, and afterwards attempt to give one which he only thinks he knows, but is not sure of it, and he will be struck with the difference, not only in himself, but also in the general aspect of his class. While giving the former, he can hardly fail to arouse intelligent attention, while the result of the latter will be irritation and dissatisfaction on his part, and indifference and stupidity on the part of his pupils. Now, it seems to me that the natural inference from this is, that though a teacher has a legal right to be dissatisfied with imperfectly prepared lessons on the part of his pupils, he has no moral right, unless he knows them thoroughly himself. If the teacher, therefore, is well equipped, morally, intellectually, and physically, he will enter the schoolroom to do battle with the difficulties that confront him there in such a manner that ignorance, stupidity, and waywardness must speedily disappear.

3. Permit me now to offer a few remarks on the teacher as a member of the community. I approach this part of my subject with considerable hesitation. I feel less at home in speaking of the teacher out of the schoolroom than I do in speaking of him in it, so I hope that those who know better than I do what the responsibilities of the schoolmaster are to society and what society owes to him, will pardon me if I under-estimate the former or over-estimate the latter.

As a citizen the teacher is neither above nor below his fellow citizens. Whatever opinion he or his pupils may entertain of his own importance in the schoolroom, to the larger world outside of it he is just an ordinary man. When mixing in society he must conduct himself according to the ordinary usages of society, or take the consequences of any deviation from them. I need not remind you that it is not so much what any man thinks of himself that determines his true position in the community, as what his general behaviour induces others to feel what he is. The battle for position, I suppose, goes on wherever a number of civilized human beings have to live and act together; but, perhaps, in colonial society this battle is waged more openly, and with less consideration for the feelings of others, than is the case in older-settled communities. Still, here as elsewhere, "worth makes the man." The schoolmaster and the humblest handicraftsman may both elbow their way and command respect, not in consequence of, but in spite of their avocations.

All are recommended to magnify their office, whatever it may be; an advice, however, not unfrequently reversed: the office has to magnify the man. But whenever this is the case, you may be sure the man is beneath his office, and is sure to be considered a nincompoop if he feels above it. It is a common saying that the man is like his work. I daresay the most of us have observed the influence that certain kinds of work have over those who have been long engaged in it. A sort of congruity seems to grow up between them and it, so that when you see the work you are reminded of the worker, or you no sooner see the worker than you think of the work. This law of assimilation, if I may so term it, is remarkably powerful in the case of the schoolmaster. A very important part of his work is to rule. He is an autocrat in the schoolroom, and if not particularly on his guard, he is liable to exhibit a slight tendency in this direction out of it. But though his word may be law to his pupils, he

should remember that it is only the expression of an opinion among his friends. And as there is nothing so offensive in conversation as assertiveness on "the part of an equal, the person who indulges this habit is sure, however unwittingly, to make himself disagreeable, and be either secretly despised or openly disliked. If the teacher, then, who spends so large a portion of his time among his pupils, does not take precautionary measures to counteract this tendency to assertiveness, it will certainly gain the mastery over him. But of all the duties he has to perform in his intercourse with others, perhaps the most difficult is to keep in check this very tendency. He has two distinct natures, as it were, to maintain; the one demands and must secure implicit faith in, and unquestioning obedience to him as a superior person; the other requires of him suavity to equals and a just consideration for their opinions. Now, if the schoolmaster does not go out and mix in society for the interchange of ideas on other topics than those connected with the schoolroom, he will certainly deny himself the principal means for counteracting this disagreeable failing—a consequential assertiveness.

But the schoolmaster is not the only one who is liable to acquire this habit. It is the natural outcome of the manner of life of all mere specialists as a rule. Take them out of their rut, so to speak, and they are of little account; their conversation is either connected with their speciality, or what they can do or might do were it not for some hindrance or another that we, of course, can neither appreciate nor understand. In short, the pedagogue and the specialist who keep themselves to themselves are the greatest bores in creation, and are only matched by the female specialist, popularly called a *blue stocking*. The chance entrance of any of these three characters into a mixed company is like throwing a wet blanket over it. An eminent professor in one of the Scotch universities, writing on the same subject, says,—"The merely professional man is always a narrow man; worse than that, he is in a sense an artificial man, a creature of technicalities and specialities, removed equally from the broad truth of nature and from the healthy influence of human converse. In society the most accomplished man of mere professional skill is often a nullity; he has sunk his humanity in his dexterity; he is a leather-dealer, and can talk only about leather; a student, and smells fustily of books, as an inveterate smoker does of tobacco. So far from rushing hastily into mere professional studies, a young man should rather be anxious to avoid the engrossing influence of what is popularly called SHOP. He will soon learn enough to know the cramping influence of purely professional occupation." No doubt any man who has his work at heart has a strong predilection to talk about it to others. The conversation might possibly be interesting if those with whom he conversed were in any way concerned in it, but when they only listen from the dictates of ordinary politeness, it is not at all surprising if they consider him a bore, and take the first opportunity to get rid of him.

There is another failing that we schoolmasters are sometimes accused of, and that is being somewhat pretentious of our little Latin, or Greek, or mathematics. O, how it offends one's sense of propriety to hear your would-be learned dominie quoting Latin in general company, or using big unpronounceable words to explain simple subjects in the hope, I suppose, of being thought educated. Such conduct must lower him in the estimation of every sensible person, weaken his influence as a teacher, and make ordinary people think that though he may pretend to much learning, he has little common sense. Pedantry in any man, however highly he may think himself educated, betrays a weak point somewhere in his character; and in the newly-fledged dominie, particularly if he is a young man, it is simply contemptible. That manliness and uprightness of character which command respect everywhere are really little affected by mere technical knowledge. But if teachers generally have little social intercourse with any outside their profession, this and other peculiarities are sure to cling to them and lay them open to be made the butts of every small wit in the community. The schoolmaster of superior education will soon let the fact be felt by those with whom he associates, without unnecessary pedantic displays of it. He is a good listener rather than a big talker; but when he is called on for an opinion, he is not afraid to give it, but never ostentatiously. I think that the best proof a schoolmaster can give of the benefit he has derived from education is never, either by word or deed, to let even the humblest of his acquaintances feel that he is in presence of the dominie, and must therefore be on his guard.

Whether it has been the peculiar nature of his calling or the usages of society that have hitherto prevented the schoolmaster from taking an active part in social or political questions, I need not stay to determine. That he does not take any such part is well known. Now, one would naturally suppose that the opinion of any man on a subject with which he was well acquainted, whether he happened to be a schoolmaster or a ploughman, if he had a good education and possessed average ability, would be of more value than the opinion of another man who lacked the education, though he might possess the ability. But there is what is called official etiquette; and I suppose that no opinion, however valuable in itself, can be publicly offered by any teacher, even as a citizen, to his official superiors in the face of this mighty power. Well, I believe, that the repressive force of this officialism has hitherto been more powerful in restricting the social and political usefulness of the schoolmaster than either the usages of society or the narrowing influences of the schoolroom. Of course, the teacher must obey, and rightly so, the constituted authority of his official superiors in all matters relating to his duties as a teacher. But he has other duties to perform—the duties of a citizen; and these duties are supposed to confer privileges. It, therefore, seems to me that you push official etiquette too far when you deny the schoolmaster the

right to take a part in all that concerns his citizenship. The one species of duties and privileges are, or should be, distinct from the other. Is there any social or political reason consistent with the liberty of the subject why the schoolmaster should not have the same right as the grocer or the publican, or any other man, to take his part either actively or passively in all that concerns the wellbeing of the community of which he is a member? Of course, there must always be this proviso—his school duties must on no account suffer thereby. Would it not seem a strange thing in a democratic country if a man had to renounce his most valuable social privileges the moment he became a teacher in a public school?

Young men of ability are asked to enter the profession. Why? Because it is an honourable profession, and demands the highest talents in those who would successfully follow it. But what young man possessing the instincts of a *free man* would be willing, think you, to become a public school teacher if he had to surrender any of his rights as a member of the community? We hear a great deal of talk about the status of the schoolmaster; in certain important points he could have no status, if shut out by official or any other kind of etiquette from taking his rightful position among his fellow citizens.

In the old days of Provincial Governments when the Education Board was a political body, that is the Ministry for the time being, one of our schoolmasters advertised a lecture on a certain historical subject which he wished to deliver with the object of raising funds for school purposes. The then Provincial Secretary, whose name I need not rescue from oblivion, having seen the advertisement, thought, so far as I could learn, that the title of the lecture had a dubious ring about it, and sent a peremptory order to the offending dominie to withdraw the advertisement, and stop the lecture. I mention this circumstance to show how far a small-minded man can go when dressed in a little brief authority. I am not aware whether he consulted his colleagues or not, but this I do know, the teacher had to succumb, swallow the affront as he best could, and make no public complaint. Of course those days have gone by; and the schoolmaster, it is hoped, has a little more liberty of speech and action now. Still, I fear, the old influences yet cling to the skirt of what Carlyle calls officialdom; and until they are swept away, and the schoolmaster have elbow room, he will be looked upon by the public generally as a poor creature in all matters demanding energy, force of character, or business capacity.

Now I cannot see how any man should be expected to teach better by being restricted in the judicious exercise of his privileges. But perhaps public opinion is against me in this. I must, however, maintain that, in my opinion, this cramping of his energies has a deleterious effect on him both as a citizen and as a teacher of the young. I would say—give him free scope for the exercise of all his privileges, and if he is a fool and abuses his privileges, the profession and his official superiors will soon get rid of him; but if a wise man, this liberty of action will enlarge his views of things in general, draw out his social sympathies, and, in a word, make him more manly, and consequently better fitted not only to be an educator of youth, but also an able coadjutor with his fellow colonists in all that concerns the best interests of society.

In conclusion, as a man's actions determine his worth, let the schoolmaster show by his actions that he is able not only to teach children well, but also to lend a helping hand, when opportunity offers, in every good work that calls for help. There is in all communities work to be done apart from the ordinary avocations of its members. Is the schoolmaster to be shut out with his books and his pupils and leave others to do that which it is both his right and his privilege to do? People who look on the schoolmaster as fit only to teach children, and restrict him to this, commit a mistake, for they deprive society of what might be his valuable co-operation. He is supposed to be fairly educated and to have some knowledge of human nature; why then exclude him from taking his fair share in objects that demand these very qualifications for their attainment? In country districts, perhaps more so than in towns, the schoolmaster has opportunities for the exercise of such qualifications, that is if he possesses them. There he ought to be not only a kind of attractive centre to which every young enquiring mind might gravitate, but also the helper and adviser of all his less informed neighbours, and the able coadjutor with those who may even be considered his superiors in social standing. In one word, I would say to all teachers now hearing me, that the effectual way to magnify our office and secure an honourable position in society is to perform our school duties faithfully and well, and to exhibit in all our intercourse with others, whether social or official, suavity of manners, and respectfulness of demeanour, combined with true manliness of character, and leave the results to the decision of public opinion.

Before sitting down, I beg to remark that my address was written before the late unfortunate rupture between the Education Board and one of the teachers culminated; or before I had seen or read the letter or letters that caused it. But, if called upon to express my opinion on the subject, I would say,—If I write a letter to the newspapers as a teacher in one of the public schools, and sign it as such, calling in question the action of my official superiors I must decidedly offend against official etiquette, and perhaps, lay myself open to the charge of insubordination. But if I, being a teacher, write a similar letter as a citizen or a member of the community and sign it as such, officialism has nothing to do with me for writing it. If you say officialism has to do with me, then all that I say is, I am not a *free man*; I have bartered my liberty for my office, and as long as I hold it, I must be a cipher in the community, so far at least as the expression of my opinion on such matters is concerned.

And, if the public or the school committees which are the exponents of public opinion in the management of our educational system are satisfied that I should be gagged, I must submit, or leave the service; but if they are dissatisfied with such highhanded officialism, they have a remedy in their own hands—they elect the members of the Board.—(Loud applause.)

decorative feature

Coulls, Culling. & Co., Printers & Stationers, Dunedin.

Examination Of Barristers and Solicitors in New Zealand, Complete Set of Questions in Law,
Given Under "*The Law Practitioners' Act, 1882.*"

Wellington: Lyon & Blair, Printers, Lambton Quay.

Examination of Barristers and Solicitors in New Zealand.

September, 1882.

Law of Property and Conveyancing.

Time allowed: Three Hours,

(*Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 14 and 15.*)

- What is waste? What estates are subject to the law of waste, and what are the remedies therefor?
- Explain the doctrines of general occupancy and special occupancy, and state the present law on the subject.
- What do you understand by a condition precedent? Draw a short contract in which payment of money is made to depend upon a condition precedent.
- How do tenants in common convey and covenant?
- What is an estate by curtesy? Has this estate been affected in any way by recent legislation?
- What are the periods of limitation in actions on (a) simple contracts; (b) specialities; (c) actions for land?
- What is the time and nature of the enjoyment necessary to obtain a title by prescription to (a) a right-of-way; (b) light and air?
- Explain the doctrine of waiver as applied to a power of re-entry in a lease. Mention some acts which have been held evidence of waiver. Is there any difference as to the effect of waiver of such right in respect of a covenant not to assign, and one not to underlet?
- Can an infant make a marriage settlement; and, if so, how?
- In preparing a mortgage relying on the provisions of the Conveyancing Ordinance, would you consider it necessary to add to or to modify those provisions?
- What are the rules as to the periods of time for which an estate may be limited?
- State the provisions of the Wills Act as to the date from which the will is to speak, and as to lapsed and void devises, and the effect of such provisions respectively.
- How is the ownership of a ship evidenced, transferred, and mortgaged?
- Can a person effectively charge property to be acquired *in futuro*; and, if so, by what means?
- How would you effect a partition of land owned by joint tenants? How would this be done in England?

Contracts and Torts.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(*Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 15, 16, and 17.*)

- Illustrate "Do ut des," "Facio ut facias," "Facio ut des," "Do ut facias."
- Would you or would you not regard moral obligation, the abandonment of a doubtful claim, the mere statement of disputed accounts between plaintiff and defendant, an agreement by the former to give up part of his claim, as a sufficient consideration for an agreement to pay money? Illustrate your answer.
- When is an impossibility an excuse for non-performance of a contract. Illustrate your answer.
- To constitute a valid tender, is it possible to dispense with the production of the money? Supply reasons for your answer.
- What is a contract of guarantee, and what is the essence of the contract? State a case.
- What is the law in regard to the responsibility of a lessee when premises are destroyed by fire?
- Illustrate "Vigilantibus, et non dormientibus, succurrent jura" by three or four cases.

- Can you mention the facts of two or three contracts that were held to be void as being in general restraint of trade?
- Illustrate, by two or three cases, "Qui facit per alium facit per se," especially in relation to contractors and sub-contractors, the borrower of a carriage and his servant, and a job-master letting on hire and his servant.
- What is the law in regard to negligent excavations? Supply case.
- What are the rights and liabilities of a master and parent for an injury done to or by his servant or child?
- Define "continuing injuries," and state the class of cases in which fresh actions may be brought thereupon.
- What are the rights of a person having the constructive possession of personal chattels?
- Can a bank-note be the subject of conversion? If you return an affirmative reply, state the circumstances under which it may be so.
- What would and what would not constitute an abandonment of an easement to light and air?
- What is a contract *uberrimæ fidei*? Name the contracts belonging to the class, and illustrate the application of the principle.
- What is necessary to constitute a constructive total loss?

Equity.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 11, 15, and 16.)

- Is an actual transfer of property to a trustee necessary to the creation of an express trust?
- Will equity enforce the execution of a voluntary trust?
- "Joint tenancy is not favoured in equity." Explain this.
- A wife joins with her husband in mortgaging her estate, the equity of redemption being reserved to the husband: What is the rule of equity in such a case?
- What is the rule of equity as to the remuneration of trustees and the payment of their expenses in administering the trusts vested in them?
- In what order are the assets of a person deceased applied by a Court of Equity in payment of debts?
- Explain and illustrate the doctrine of apportionment and contribution.
- What is meant by a fraud on a power of appointment?
- Can an infant obtain a decree for specific performance of a contract? Give reasons for your answer.
- Will equity decree specific performance of a voluntary covenant?
- What are the remedies in equity for mistakes? Give examples of mistakes that will be remedied.
- A purchaser of land takes a conveyance—
 - In the name of another;
 - In the name of himself and another;
 - In the name of his wife;
 - In the name of a legitimate child;
 - In the name of an illegitimate child:
 What rule is applied by equity in each of these cases, and is such rule inflexible?
- A tenant for life of a freehold estate pays off encumbrances on the estate: What is the equitable presumption with reference thereto, and is it conclusive?
- State the general principles on which a Court of Equity will act in a suit for specific performance of a sale of land, the quantity being deficient.
- How far are the rules of equity as to covenants running with the land in conflict with those of the Common Law?
- Explain the equitable doctrine of making good representations.

Pleading and Practice.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 13, 14, and 15.)

- What are the claims which can be set-off by the defendant? State the circumstances under which such can be done, and the mode prescribed by the Supreme Court rules for doing so.
- When does the ordinary *indebitatus* count apply, and in what class of cases is it inapplicable?
- What course is open to a man whose goods have been wrongfully converted by another, and who has paid money upon a consideration that has failed?

- What action would you advise a client to take against an agent who had undertaken and then failed to sell and account for a quantity of flour; and what damages would you claim? Draw declaration.
- Is any relief provided against forfeiture for breach of covenant to insure; and, if so, in what circumstances will it be afforded?
- State shortly the provisions of the arbitrators and referees clauses in "The Supreme Court Practice and Procedure Act Amendment Act, 1860."
- What should a *cognovit* contain, and what steps must be taken to obtain judgment thereupon?
- In what cases will the Supreme Court or a Judge thereof order a stay of proceedings in a civil action?
- One of a firm contracts in his own name, but really for the partnership: Should or could the several partners join in one action upon the contract? State the reasons for your answer.
- Draw a plea of award and satisfaction, and state the proof that must be given in support of it.
- What is a plea of confession and avoidance? Draw one.
- To an action upon a sale of unascertained goods by description, for not accepting, what can be pleaded?
- Draw a distinction between ordinary and special damage, and state the method of pleading them in the Supreme Court. Explain the principle established by *Hadley v. Baxendale*.
- A bankrupt was libelled prior to filing, and subsequently thereto he desires redress. Who should carry on the action and claim the damages? State the reason for your reply.
- What are the rules of the Supreme Court in regard to the right to begin and to reply? Illustrate them.

Criminal Law.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 14,15, and 16.)

- Will ignorance of fact be allowed as an excuse for the inadvertent commission of crime? If so, in what cases?
- How would you proceed upon an indictment being found against a person who had never been committed for trial?
- What powers do Justices of the Peace possess in regard to bail, and when and how can they be exercised?
- What rules should be observed by counsel for the Crown when opening the prosecution to the jury?
- What class of evidence to character will the prisoner be allowed to call, and state whether the Crown would be permitted to call any, and, if so, what, evidence in reply?
- What are the several circumstances under which a witness would be declared to be incompetent?
- Under what several circumstances can the finder of lost goods be made liable for larceny thereof?
- State the mode or modes of proving the pretence upon an indictment for obtaining goods under false pretences.
- How is the insurance to be proved upon an indictment for burning a house with intent to defraud insurers?
- Define the three classes of homicide.
- Under what circumstances can a parent be made criminally liable for neglecting his child?
- What defence can be set up under the plea of Not Guilty to an indictment for libel?
- Under what circumstances will the postponement of a criminal trial be granted or refused?
- What must concur to constitute forgery? Can any persons other than the subscriber be made guilty of forgery? If so, under what circumstances will he become a principal?
- Can you elaborate the principles established in the "Queen's" case (conspiracy)?
- Draw an indictment against A.B., a clerk, for embezzling £6, the property of his employer.

Evidence.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 13,14,15. and 16.)

- How should the confession of an accomplice be dealt with when tendered as evidence against the prisoner, or against one of two indicted together?
- Can you advise the class of cases in which books of account can be admitted as evidence in favour of the party who kept and wrote them?
- Under what circumstances will an alteration avoid an instrument?
- Will you state the class of cases in which a witness can and cannot speak to belief?
- What liabilities does a witness incur who fails to appear upon his subpoena?
- When can a witness refuse and when is he bound to answer a question which might in his opinion degrade him?

- What are the best tests for detecting falsehood in a witness?
- What are judgments *in rem*, and how far are they binding upon strangers?
- When and when is not the admission of one joint contractor evidence against the others?
- What is the rule of law in respect to the construction of letters?
- Can you say where a question of negligence is for the jury, and where it is for the Judge?
- In what cases is more than one witness necessary?
- What is the rule in regard to the admission of evidence of collateral facts, and how should it be applied?
- What is the meaning of "leading question;" and what are the several circumstances under which it may be put?
- Upon whom does the *onus probandi* rest; and what are the reasons for and the tests of the rule you may lay down?
- What does "rebutting an equity" mean? Illustrate your reply.

Bankruptcy and Divorce.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Candidates for admission as Solicitors need not answer Questions 13 and 14.)

- Can a joint stock company be made bankrupt under the provisions of "The Debtors and Creditors Act, 1876"?
- What jurisdiction is given to District Courts by the same Act, and what are the provisions of the Act as to appeals from District Courts?
- Draw a declaration of insolvency. How must such declaration be signed, and where must it be filed?
- When notice of the filing of a declaration of insolvency has been gazetted, what is the effect of such notice on executions against the property of the debtor?
- What circumstances must concur in order to enable a creditor to petition for an adjudication on an execution against a debtor?
- Draw a petition for adjudication complying with the requirements of the Act, based on any Act of bankruptcy you may select.
- At the first meeting of creditors of an insolvent a trustee is appointed, but he refuses to signify his acceptance of the trusteeship within three days after the notice of his appointment. What is the consequence of such refusal, and the proper procedure thereupon?
- Give the existing provision as to the votes of creditors at general meetings?
- What are the provisions of the Act as to leases held by a bankrupt debtor?
- Under what circumstances may a decree of judicial separation obtained during the absence of the respondent be reversed?
- What is the effect of a judicial separation on the wife's power of contracting?
- What powers are given by "The Divorce and Matrimonial Causes Act, 1867," as to children of parties before the Court?
- Where a person who has become bankrupt is liable under a contract for a demand for unliquidated damages, are there any provisions in the Act for the adjustment of such claim?
- Can damages for a tort be claimed against the bankrupt estate?

New Zealand Law.

Also For Barristers and Solicitors admitted elsewhere.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

(Solicitors need not answer the last two questions.)

- What provision has been made in aid of the defective execution of powers of appointment, and how must an appointment to be made by deed be executed?
- "No conveyance shall create any estate by wrong, or work a forfeiture, or have any other effect than a conveyance by lease and release would have had before the passing of this Ordinance." Explain this enactment.
- What are the provisions of the Conveyancing Ordinance as to the appointment of new trustees?
- What amendment has been made by the same Ordinance as to the effect of releases of part of the land in respect of which rent is payable?
- What effect has been given to bills of lading as evidence of shipment, and by what Act?
- Under what statutory conditions, and to what extent, may a carrier free himself from his common-law liability?

- By whom may a marriage be solemnized, and whose consent is requisite to the marriage of a minor?
- Name some instruments which cannot be stamped after execution, and state the consequences.
- What provisions have been made to enable a person erecting a boundary-fence to secure contribution of part of the cost from the adjoining proprietor?
- Upon an information coming on before Justices of the Peace, what courses are open to them in dealing with same?
- State the jurisdiction conferred on Justices of the Peace by the Act of 1866 in cases of larceny?
- Name the principal Act relating to the disposal of waste lands of the Crown; and what is the machinery for, and principal method of, disposing of such lands?
- What is a miner's right, and what privileges does it confer?
- On an application to forfeit a claim under "The Mines Act, 1877," is there any other course open to the Court than forfeiture, assuming sufficient grounds of forfeiture proved?
- What effect is given to a certificate of title by "The Land Transfer Act, 1870," in a suit for specific performance of sale of land?
- What is the effect of the insertion of the words "no survivorship" in a transfer to joint proprietors?
- Give an abstract of the existing provisions as to the mode of trial of election petitions.
- For what causes of action may claims be made against the Crown under "The Crown Suits Act, 1881"?

International Law & Conflict of Laws.

(For Barristers only.)

Time allowed: Three Hours.

- What general principle has been established by the comity of nations as to the contract of marriage? State any exceptions.
- What are the general principles as to testing the validity of a contract made in one country and sued upon in another?
- Can a contract, valid where made, but involving a violation of English law, be sued on in an English Court?
- An action is brought in England on a contract made abroad, the remedy on which would be barred by lapse of time in the place where the contract was made: Can the plaintiff succeed?
- Define what is meant by the territory of a State.
- What are the rules of international law as to the use of the high seas, and the right of fishing therein?
- What are the rules of international law as to the trade of neutrals?
- What is an embargo, and what reprisals?
- Give some account of the methods and principles which regulate national intercourse in times of peace.
- Define war. How is it commenced, and what are the results as to the subjects of the respective States at war?

Roman Law.

For Barristers only.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

- What was the "jus gentium"?
- What were the offices of the Praetor and Judex respectively in the trial of actions?
- What was "dominium," and how might it be acquired?
- What was "in jure cessio"? Do you know of anything analogous in English law?
- What was "usucapio," and what was requisite to acquire title by this means?
- What were the provisions of the "Lex Falcidia"?
- Give some account of the "patria potestas."
- What was the difference in mode and effect of a disposition by way of legacy and one by way of "fides-commissum."
- What were the principal requisites to a valid testament?
- Distinguish "jus in rem" from "jus in personam."

General Law.

For Solicitors admitted elsewhere.

Time allowed: Three Hours.

- What is it necessary to prove to support an action for trover?

- Define libel and slander. State when each is actionable. What is a privileged communication, and the law as to same?
- What are the rights of a riparian proprietor in respect of the water flowing past his land?
- Explain accurately the terms "general average," "particular average," "constructive total loss."
- When must notice of dishonor of a bill of exchange be given, and when may it be dispensed with?
- Distinguish a void from a voidable contract, and give instances of each class.
- How may
 - ▲ a contract by deed,
 - ▲ a written contract,
 - ▲ a parol contract,
 be discharged? In case (b) is there any difference between contract required by law to be in writing and one which is not?
- What is necessary to constitute a fraudulent misrepresentation actionable at common law?
- State fully the incidents of life estates.
- What is the liability of a master to his servant for injuries sustained in the master's employment?
- Explain fully the scope and application of the maxim "Caveat emptor" on sales of goods.
- State accurately the statutory provisions as to the effect of the endorsement of bills of lading.

decorative feature

LYON AND BLAIR. PRINTERS, LAMBTON QUAY, WELLINGTON.

The Sixth Annual Report of the Educational Institute of Otago, 1882-83

PRESIDENT: DR. Macdonald.

VICE-PRESIDENTS: Jno. Nicholson, ESQ. (Balclutha) J. H. Rice, ESQ. (Oamaru) W. S. Mehaffey, ESQ. (Invercargill).

SECRETARY: MR. D. White.

TREASURER: MR. W. J. Mooiie.

LIBRARIAN: MR. R. S. Gardner.

REPRESENTATIVES OF BRANCH ASSOCIATIONS:

Dunedin MR. Walter Hislop.

Tokomairiro MR. Jas. Reid.

Balclutha MR. James Mcneur.

Lawrence MR. W. Macandrew.

Waitaki MR. Alex. Stewart.

Invercargill MR. William Duncan.

Representatives of the Institute:

MR. W. S. Fitzgerald

MR. W. Milne, M.A.

MR. J. B. Park

MR. Alex. Montgomery

MR. John Stenhouse.

Report of the Educational Institute of Otago.

1882-83.

THE Committee of Management have much pleasure in laying before Members the Annual Report of the Institute.

The subjects brought under the consideration of the Committee during the past year have reference to matters which concern teachers generally.

The resolutions from the Annual Meeting respecting the formation of a New Zealand Institute, were fully considered. The question of establishing a New Zealand Institute has been before the Committee on several occasions; indeed, it was part of the original intention in founding the Otago Institute, that, as soon as similar organisations were started in the other Provincial districts, it would then be desirable to have a

New Zealand Educational Institute.

A circular, containing the resolutions referred to, was sent to all the Teachers Associations in the Colony, inviting them to send representatives to Christchurch for the purpose of drawing up a constitution for the proposed Institute. Nineteen representatives met as appointed, and discussed the subject at length. Your

Committee nominated Dr. Macdonald, Messrs. Park, Fitzgerald, and White to represent Otago. The delegates report that the meeting was very successful; this was mainly due to the great interest manifested in the movement by the Canterbury and North Island representatives. The proposals adopted by the Conference are attached to this report.

New Zealand University teachers Regulations.

Our Committee have had under review the Regulations of the University permitting teachers to proceed to the B.A. examination. Members are doubtless aware that, according to existing statute the privilege would have been withdrawn this year, but the Senate having been memorialised on the subject, agreed to extend the time to 1884, not 1886 as reported in the local press. It will be for the Annual Meeting to say whether it is advisable to again petition the Senate for a further extension of time.

Inspectors Recommendations On Syllabus.

The Inspectors recently reported to the Otago Education Board on the requirements of the Syllabus, and suggested that amendment should be made in respect to (a) excluding History from the Third Standard; (b) fixing number of attendance necessary to qualify for examination; (c) treating History, Geography, and Grammar as class subjects. Your Committee cordially concurred in the course of instruction recommended, and expressed a hope that the suggestion would be given effect to.

Branch Reports.

The Southland Branch has seceded from the Institute.

A Branch has been established at Tapanui, which, although small, gives promise of increased membership.

Your Committee are of opinion that a Branch might be started at Palmerston as a centre, and will be glad to see the subject, taken up at the Conference of Teachers, resident in and around that district

Science Lectures At The University.

It is gratifying to the Committee of Management to find that the University has made provision for another course of Lectures, to be given by Professor Shand, on Mechanical Physics.

Finance.

The Treasurer reports a balance in hand of £24 13s. 2d., a satisfactory sum, seeing that one of the Branches has failed to pay up, and another has seceded from the Institute. It must be remembered, also, that the annual subscription is now only five shillings per member.

Balance Sheet.

Balance Sheet

The Conference.

The Education Board having sent out circulars to Committees advising the closing of the schools, it is confidently believed that all who wish to be present will be able to attend. The arrangements with the railway authorities are the same as those of last year. The Committee desire to record their appreciation of Mr. Prydes services in carrying out arrangements necessary for the success of the meeting.

D. White, *Secretary*.

W. T. Moore, *Treasurer*.

New Zealand Educational Institute.

The following is the Constitution adopted by the representatives at Christchurch:

- That the New Zealand Educational Institute shall consist of the Teachers Associations and Institutes in Auckland, Wellington, Nelson, Canterbury, and Otago, and such other Associations as may hereafter be admitted to the Institute.
- That the object of the Institute shall be to promote the interests of education within the Colony of New

Zealand.

- That the General Council of the Institute shall consist of members elected by the local Associations.
- That each Association shall be entitled to one representative for the first twenty members, and one for every additional fifty names beyond the first twenty names on the roll of membership.
- That the President, Secretary, and Treasurer of the New Zealand Institute shall be elected by and from the General Council.
- That the Council shall meet annually, during the Christmas vacation, at the chief centres of population, as shall be hereafter named by the Council.
- That the General Meeting of the members of the New Zealand Institute shall be held once every two years at such place as the Council shall determine.
- That each Association shall pay the Treasurer of the New Zealand Institute the sum of for each name on the roll of membership.
- That the General Council shall have power to make bye-laws for the conduct of all business, meetings, and proceedings of the Institute.

It will be part of the business of the forthcoming meeting to discuss the Constitution, and elect representatives on the General Council.

Scholarship Regulations.

The following are the resolutions adopted by the Committee appointed to report on this subject:

- That there should be two sets of scholarships a junior and a senior.
- That there should be an equal number of each.
- That the Dunedin High Schools be excluded from the junior competition.
- That all holders of junior scholarships should attend the Dunedin High Schools.
- That all schools be entitled to compete for senior scholar-ships.
- That there be an alteration of the text-book prescribed for the junior competition.

Annual Report of the Balclutha Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. John Nicholson.

SECRETARY: MR. Adam Miller, B.A.

LIBRARIAN: MR. A. Gregor.

We beg to submit the Sixth Annual Report of the Balclutha Branch of the Educational Institute.

During the past year the membership of this Branch has slightly increased. Three members have removed from the district, while seven names have been added to the roll. Up to date, 9 members have paid their subscriptions, the amount of which comes to £3 7s 6d; while our annual expenditure amounts to 9s 8d.

The Branch has met five times during the year, but we regret to state that the attendance has not been so large as in former years. Papers have been read on the following subjects: Knowledge is power by Mr. Renton; The average age at which a child should be presented for the 1st Standard by Mr. Nicholson; and The relation of Inspectors of Schools to the Education Department by Mr Waddell; and various subjects of educational interest have been discussed at our meetings. The following is an extract from the minutes :It was agreed unanimously, on the motion of Mr Waddell, that the following motion be proposed at the Annual Meeting of the Institute.

That the General Committee of Management be instructed to take all lawful means, by petitioning the House of Representatives or otherwise, to have Inspectors of Schools placed under the immediate control of the Education Department.

JONATHAN GOLDING, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Waitaki Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. W. G. Wallace.

SECRETARY: MR. R. Peattie.

LIBRARIAN: MR. W. Darley.

This Branch of the Educational Institute of Otago has held nine meetings during the year, viz. One annual meeting, seven monthly meetings, and one picnic. During the year there have been many changes among the

teachers of the district. Mr. Wallace, the President for the year, left the district towards the end of it. Very few have taken a keener interest in the Institute than Mr. Wallace, and the Branch recorded a vote of thanks to him. As a result of these changes, and from other circumstances, several papers were lost to the Branch. The only papers were *The Situation*, by Mr. Peattie; *Reading*, by Mr. Walker; and *The Liberal Culture of the Teacher*, by the Rev. Dr. Macgregor. At the other meetings, matters affecting the position and well-being of teachers were discussed.

Mr. Jas Lindsay and the Rev. Dr. Macgregor, both of this Branch, read papers at the General Conference.
R. PEATTIE, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Tuapeka Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. Robt. Neill.

SECRETARY: MR. W. Macandrew,

I have the honour to report for the year 1882-83 as follows:—

The lectures in Dunedin during the winter months interfered seriously with the meeting of this branch.

Seven meetings have been held during the year, which have been fairly attended. The following papers were read and discussed Mr Selby on *Reading*, and Mr Alnutt on *Leading and Driving*. The papers were usually read one day, and the discussion took place the following meeting.

Several interesting subjects were taken up for discussion, and, on the whole, the members have taken a lively interest in the meetings.

WILLIAM MACANDREW, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Tapanui Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-3.

PRESIDENT : MR. J. K. Menzies.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER : MR. P. Mco. Wilson.

I have the honour to submit our First Annual Report.

Four meetings have been held during the year, which have been fairly attended. We have as yet only six members, but anticipate an increase. Our schools being much separated interferes with the attendance at our monthly meetings.

P. MCO. WILSON, *Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Milton Branch.

Office-Bearers. 1882-3.

PRESIDENT: MR James Reid.

SECRETARY AND TREASURER: MR John Lyttle.

I have the honour to submit the Annual Report of the Milton Branch for the year ending 12th May, 1883.

During the year several members left the district, and their successors have not yet joined our Branch, consequently our roll number is lower than formerly.

On the 6th June; 1882, Mr Reid spoke on the necessity of some change in the syllabus, especially in the arrangement of History, Geography, and Grammar, and the motion "That Mr Petries suggestions for modification of the syllabus be sup-ported, was carried. The Branch did not hold its usual meetings during the months of Professor Scotts lectures on Physiology. After resuming, the following subjects were dealt with:(1) *The School Grounds*, a paper by Mr McDuff. (2) *The Pupil Teacher System*, a discussion introduced by Mr Mahoney.

(3) *The Preparation of Teachers*, a paper by Mr Reid. The Rev. Mr Chisholm agreed to read a paper at the Annual Conference.

The annual picnic was held in February at the Taieri Beach. We were joined by several members of the Dunedin and Lawrence districts, and spent a most pleasant day.

WILLIAM MELREA, *Interim Secretary*.

Annual Report of the Dunedin Branch.

Office-Bearers, 1882-83.

PRESIDENT: MR. D. Mcnicoll.

TREASURER: MR. W. Hislop.

SECRETARY: MR. W. J. Moore

MEETINGS In all, eight regular meetings were held during the year, the attendance of members at each being fairly satisfactory.

PAPERS, &c.—Fewer papers were read this year than in any other, a circumstance attributable mainly to the want of a fixed system of securing contributors. In September the President introduced for discussion a system of Mutual help in schools. November 4th: Mr. Jas. Jeffery read a paper on The English Language. March 3rd : The Secretary introduced for discussion the Otago Pupil Teachers Regulations. June 2nd: Mr. Jas. Rennie read a paper on The Insecurity of Teachers tenure of position in New Zealand.

MEMBERSHIP. The question of membership came on for consideration at the last meeting of the Branch, when it was unanimously resolved to issue circulars with a view of securing the countenance and active assistance of the many teachers in our midst. This step has resulted in a substantial addition to our membership roll.

W. J. MOORE, *Secretary*.

decorative feature

Dunedin:

Colls, Culling, and Co.,
Printers, Crawford Street.

Education as a University Subject.

Education as a University Subject

Its History, Present Position, and Prospects

BY David Ross, M.A., B.Sc.,

PRINCIPAL, CHURCH OF SCOTLAND TRAINING COLLEGE, GLASGOW; MEMBER OF CONVOCATION, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

Glasgow: James Maclehose & Sons, 61 St Vincent St.,

Publishers to the University

MDCCCLXXXIII

Greek text

THE total unacquaintance with the science of pedagogic, and with all that has been written about it, in which the intending schoolmaster is, in England, suffered to remain, has, I am convinced, injurious effects both on our schoolmasters and on our schools.—*Mr. Matthew Arnold*.

To those who maintain that schoolmastering wants no theory, and can have no science, the true reply is this: The old system of use and wont—the "blind hands" system, as we may call it—has broken down. A theory we must have, and if it turns out that we can have no science, this will be a very bad business for everybody. Those who now oppose themselves to scientific inquiry, are no more to be accounted of than so many Mrs. Partingtons trying to sweep back the Atlantic.—*Rev. Mr. Quick in opening lecture of Cambridge Course for Teachers*.

Education as a University Subject.

AT the late Educational Congress in Aberdeen

1 January 4th, 1883.

Aberdeen Congress.

the following Resolution was unanimously adopted:—

"That this meeting considers that there ought to be "instituted Chairs of Education in the Universities of "Aberdeen and Glasgow, and that a Faculty or Sub-Faculty of Education, with powers to give a Special "Teachers' Degree, should be constituted in all the "Scotch Universities." A full discussion elicited but very slight divergence of opinion as to the details; on the main point all the speakers were agreed. Among those who spoke were two clergymen of different denominations, a University Professor, two Principals of Training Colleges, the Rector of a Grammar or Higher Class Public School, and two old parochial schoolmasters. On any other educational question of importance it would, I think, be difficult to secure unanimity in a group so heterogeneous, its members having in some respects interests so diverse. It may, therefore, be accepted that the University recognition of Education carries with it many advantages, some of which influence one party and some another. For a detailed account of these advantages Professor Laurie's new volume on *The Training of Teachers* may be consulted, especially his inaugural address delivered on the occasion of the founding of the Chair of the Institutes and History of Education in the University of Edinburgh. The Aberdeen resolution commits the Educational Institute of Scotland to immediate and definite action. The time is opportune, for the Endowed Schools Commission is at work, and a University Executive Commission is promised. Of these

bodies the former may be expected to procure the funds, or part of them, and the latter to supply the authority needed to realise the project. At this juncture, therefore, it cannot but be useful to review the history of the question, particularly in Scotland, to examine how far and on what conditions education has been accorded University recognition, and to formulate our claims so as to meet the objections of some, and secure the co-operation of all who have the good of our profession at heart.

I.—History.

[unclear: f] Pillans [unclear: 8],

In 1834 Professor Pillans, speaking of "A Plan for Establishing a Lectureship on Didactics in one or two of our Universities," which he had first announced in 1828, says, "The tone of kindliness in which ministers and members of the House of Commons generally have spoken of popular education, and testified their desire to see it flourish in every part of the empire, encourages us to return to the subject, and even to extend the recommendation to all the four Universities of Scotland, being satisfied that there is no means within our reach that will be found at once so effectual, so little costly, and so practicable as the institution of four such lectureships."

Edinburgh Review. July, 1834.

The subject continued to interest Professor Pillans throughout his life; the longer he observed the educational condition of the country, the more he reflected upon the remedies to be applied, the more was he assured of the value of his scheme.

Meanwhile plans first adopted to meet the educational

Education Department

wants of England influenced our country also. The Training College system, necessary in England, was introduced into Scotland where it was less required, and where it modified most extensively, and that not in the line of our traditions, the Normal School system of Mr. Stow. Philanthropic minds had suddenly become alarmed at the rapid growth of our cities, and the great development of an urban population of a low type, whose educational destitution was extreme. Parliamentary aid was asked and obtained, and a new educational system was gradually developed side by side with an old, tried, and valued system, with which, however, it had little in common. The country was

1839-46.

too intent upon securing school accommodation and an adequate number of teachers, too confident in the value of those crude instruments the pupil teachers, too well satisfied with results of the most mechanical kind, to devote attention to the formative and the refining in education, or to care from what standpoint the teacher viewed his duties, or the pupils regarded their labours.

In 1847 the Educational Institute of Scotland was

Educational Institute of Scotland, 1847.

formed "for the purpose of promoting sound learning, and of advancing the interests of education in Scotland. From the first the Institute regarded education both as a science and an art. The third resolution adopted at the preliminary meeting is—" That in further prosecuting the object of the Association it seems expedient that a knowledge of the theory and practice of education be more widely disseminated among the profession by means of public lectures, the institution of libraries, and such other means as may afterwards seem advisable." A series of lectures was given in Edinburgh in the winter of 1847-48, of which Dr. Schmitz, formerly Rector of the Edinburgh High School, says, "The lectures were numerous attended by teachers in Edinburgh and its immediate vicinity, and the public took considerable interest in them." And Dr. Gloag tells us these lectures were not made for purposes of a local nature merely, but were chiefly intended for the benefit of the younger members of the profession, many of whom were at the time attending College in Edinburgh, and had been invited to avail, and did avail, themselves of the opportunity thus presented to them." This statement is confirmed by Mr. Middleton, afterwards well known as Dr. Middleton, H.M. Inspector of Schools. On the days preceding the annual meeting in September special lectures, usually three in number, were delivered, chiefly on the scientific aspects of Education. Among the lecturers were Mr. Gunn, High School, Edinburgh, Professor Pillans, and Dr. Cumming and Dr. Bryce of Glasgow. The last-named gentleman drew attention to the necessity of basing both the science and the art of education upon the laws of the college of [unclear: lege of] preceptors.

human mind. Meantime the College of Preceptors, which had been established rather earlier in England, with like objects, was pursuing a course similar to that of the Institute, and sent delegates to the Edinburgh meetings. Both bodies soon found that the systematic treatment of education as a science was a work too great to be satisfactorily dealt with by casual lecturers however eminent, and both agreed that it was too vitally important to be neglected. Accordingly in 1851 a Committee of the Institute drew up a scheme, which was

approved of, for "Lectures on the Theory and "Practice of Education." Want of funds prevented the scheme from being carried out, though from that time to the present the Institute has sought in various ways to realise its views, and to press them for acceptance upon the Scottish Universities.

[unclear: M]r. Brunton,

In his Presidential Address in 1858 Dr. Brunton says—" We must have our Professors of Paideutics; "and we shall lend a helping hand to maintain, extend, "and improve the education of Scotland, and preserve "the pre-eminence that this ancient kingdom has held "in education for by past centuries. We must have "Professors. . . . The times are favourable for the "institution of such chairs. We have a University "Commission, who have the power, if we could induce "to have the will, and impel them to action, towards "the accomplishment of our purpose. I have some "hopes that the petition to these noblemen and gentle "men will obtain a favourable answer. They will "found chairs; and can they found any which will "have a more beneficial effect on the education of the "country, or will tend more to elevate our profession, "which is the foundation of all the Faculties?"

In accordance with these views a memorial

See Appendix A.

was

Universities Commissioners, 1859.

presented to the Commissioners setting forth in detail the necessity and the advantages of the course advocated, but in vain. A quarter of a century has been lost, another Commission is now announced. Let us hope for a favourable issue. The memorial of 1859 is so applicable to the situation that no excuse is required for inserting it in the Appendix, and asking for it a careful perusal. Nothing better could even now be framed. An attempt had been made in 1857, but without success, to induce the Trustees of the Ferguson

Ferguson Bequest.

Bequest to aid in establishing Chairs of Education. Another effort was made in 1859 to induce these Trustees to consider the propriety of aiding the foundation of a chair in the University of Glasgow, which seemed to have a superior claim on the Trust. Aid was declined "on the ground that the Universities "being now popularized, and under the control of "public opinion to a much greater extent than formerly, "any change or enlargement which the times may "demand will be best left to the operation of this "opinion arising from a felt want on the part of the "public." Probably few will venture to affirm that any change in the character of the Universities, such as was expected by the Ferguson Trustees, has yet taken place. The General Council of a Scottish University is practically a powerless body. Corporate institutions do not readily respond to public opinion. Hence outsiders "do good in occasionally passing an "electric shock through the sluggish University Corporation."

Professor Bain in *Educational News* of 24th Feb., 1883.

In a recent pamphlet the Secretary to the Trustees says—"My views were embodied in a special report submitted to the Trustees on the 18th April, 1859. In "that report I stated that, had the available funds been "larger, I should have suggested the institution of a "new Chair or of a Lectureship, the latter an acknowledged want at the time."

See the interesting account of "The Ferguson Scholarships," just published by the Secretary, Mr. M. S. Tait, p. 4.

It would be gratifying to know that the proposed chair was one of Education.

Whitehall Certificates.

Meantime the character of our teachers was rapidly changing, owing to the development of the Whitehall system. A high class certificate, with a corresponding money value, limited the aims of the elementary teacher in his professional study, and such teachers speedily displaced University men in the common schools, which now confined themselves to mere elementary work. In our secondary schools University men were still found, but their sphere of employment being contracted, their numbers decreased, and their experience became narrowed, until they lacked that system in their work which the Code had forced upon their certificated brethren in primary schools. Hitherto in Scotland the profession had been one body, now it formed two quite distinct classes. Of these one wanted experience and method, while the other was imperfectly educated, and had the lowest aims and the narrowest views. Protests were unheeded. A system, faulty to begin with, was developed in a still more faulty way. Mr. Lowe had persuaded the English squires and manufacturers that the education of the masses should be limited in amount and mechanical in kind, and that it could be regulated in the same way as the workhouse, or the cotton market.

But there were not wanting among us, even in these dark years, true educationalists, who kept the lamp alive, and by whose light we have been guided so far out of the Whitehall dungeon. In July 1862 there appeared in the *Museum* a remarkable paper by "An Edinburgh Graduate," on "Training Schools in Scot-land," which attracted no little attention at the time. It set forth the anomalies of the system, its peculiar unsuitableness for

Scotland, especially in its ignoring the Universities, the relation between which and teachers had formerly been so intimate and so beneficial. From this paper, even after the lapse of twenty years, it is still pertinent to quote the following passage—"The special or professional training [of teachers] "might be provided by adding to the Faculties of Arts "a Chair of the Principles and Practice of Teaching, "and connecting it with a model or practising school "outside the University walls. During two full sessions the student would give his attention to classics, "mathematics, and the English language and literature (his familiarity with the ordinary subjects of "instruction in an elementary school being secured by "the bursary entrance-examination); devoting the "summer session of each year to attendance on the "Chair of Education, and a study of organization and "methods in the model school."

The scheme thus formulated attracted the attention
Prof. Pillans and Mr. Lowe.

of Professor Pillans, who, in his old age, was still seeking to realise the dream of his manhood. And so in the last year of his life, a patriarch in education, fired by professional zeal, offering £5000 for the cause which he had so much at heart, he went to London, and endeavoured to persuade the authorities to aid him in founding a Chair of Education in the University of Edinburgh. But what a change! Instead of the Ministers who had in 1834 received him with "kindliness," he was met by Mr. Robert Lowe, who contemptuously declared that there was "*no science of education*." Thus the project failed; and just as under Mr. Lowe's direction public education was reduced to dull and mechanical routine, so did his cold rebuff delay for a decade the smallest recognition of education as entitled to professional rank. Valuable years were lost in desperate struggles to show the hollowness of Mr. Lowe's scheme, and the necessity for higher aims in education, and the highest training in the educator. In the *Dick Bequest Report* of 1865 occurs the following statement so opposed to the views then current at Whitehall:—

Dick Bequest Report.

"It is only through a knowledge of psychology and "ethics that the schoolmaster can render to himself an "account of what he is doing, and can see to what "point his labours are tending. These are the two "pillars on which the whole fabric of education rests. "I do not mean to say that it is necessary that the "teacher should be a philosopher, but it is quite "indispensable that he should philosophize . . . "If he does not admit this, he degrades himself from "the position of an educated worker striving by means "of intellectual processes to reach certain well-defined "moral and intellectual results, to that of a mere "retailer of the alphabet, and of an inferior (because "male) nurse, and converts what is a profession, in "every sense in which that distinctive term is applicable, into a trade so unutterably petty and vexatious, "that only men of mean natures would willingly "adopt it."

Pp. 15-17.

In direct opposition, also, to Mr. Lowe's declaration that there was no science of education, we have the testimony of the highest educational authorities, as in the following passage from an address on *Teaching as a Profession*, delivered by Dr. (now Professor) Donaldson at Stirling in April 1867:—"There is a science of education, a science not

Professor Donaldson.

"merely in its rudiments, but worked out with considerable fulness; and those who have asserted the "contrary seem to me to betray their ignorance of "what has been done in this field, and their readiness "to pronounce an opinion before they have investigated a subject."

Museum, June 1867.

He points out that the Arts course at the Scottish and English Universities leaves graduates quite incapable as teachers. He says, "I "taught Greek in the Edinburgh University, and I "taught Latin in the Stirling High School, and during "the first three years of this my teaching career, I "was groping in the dark. I had plenty of impulse, "and gave that to my pupils in abundance. But look "ing back on these years, I now know that I needlessly put difficulties in the way of my pupils, that I "was ignorant of the nature of their minds, and made "mistakes in consequence. It was not until I had "made a thorough study of psychology, as it can and "ought to be applied to the minds of boys, that I saw "clearly the right methods to pursue. . . . The "teachers in the great schools of England are all highly "educated men, and yet the report of the Commissioners states that their teaching, taking it as a "whole, has been a miserable failure. Why? Because "most of them do not know how to teach. They "employ methods that violate every law of psychology. "They persist in practices which psychology pro "nounces injurious to the human mind. And you "will find, in the answers of some of them, opinions in "regard to teaching, which it is perfectly marvellous "that a sane man could entertain."

In 1866 Messrs. Greig and Harvey, the assistant
Assistant Commissioners.

Commissioners on Education, point out that the Normal Schools are all situated in University cities in Scotland, and go on to advocate complete University (including professional) training for some of our teachers,

and combined Normal and University training for the others. And in the Third Report of that Commission, 1868, there is shown in an appendix a plan for combining University with Normal School training.

Dr. Fitch.

In 1868 Mr. Fitch, H.M. Inspector of Schools, in reporting on middle-class education in Yorkshire, says:—"Nothing is more striking than the very general "disregard, on the part of schoolmasters, of the art and "science of teaching. Few have had any special preparation for it. Professional training for middle-class "schoolmasters does not exist in this country. It is "certain that many of them would gladly obtain it if it "were accessible. But at present it is not to be had. "... In every existing liberal profession, except "that of a teacher, it is assumed that special preparatio "is needed, and for it provision, more or less perfect, is "already made. The great medical schools attach "themselves to hospitals, and in this way vast endowments and sums contributed for benevolent purposes "have become available, in the most efficient manner, "in the professional education of surgeons and physicians. "Schools of law exist at the Universities; and in the "Inns of Court we possess ancient and wealthy corporations, with ample means for improving the character "of legal education. . . . But the scholastic "profession has no organisation, and is possessed of no "advantages analogous to any of these. . . . One "of the Universities should institute a Professorship of "Pedagogy, and should formally recognise in its teach "ing, and by special examinations, the importance of "the science of education One may hope "that a department will some day be created in which "an English University may offer honours in the principles and history of education."

Report to Schools' Inquiry Commission on Schools in the West Riding of Yorkshire.

Reference must also be made to an able paper entitled "A Plea on Behalf of Professors of Education," which appeared in the *Museum* for March, 1869, and which will amply repay perusal. It declares that there "is absolutely" no provision for any one obtaining systematic instruc "tion" in the science of education, and states "various "reasons why that would be best given in connection "with the Universities."

The vigorous discussions caused by the Education Bills, which were at this period annually introduced into Parliament, did not wholly absorb the attention of schoolmasters. In an address by Dr. Barrack, of Dollar, we find the following passage:—"Why should not the schoolmaster have a profession

Dr. Barrack.

"of his own? There is the medical profession, law, and "divinity, why should not the schoolmaster have a degree of his own, and elevate his work to the same "platform as that of divinity, law, or physic?"

In the presidential addresses to the Institute constant reference is made to education as a subject worthy of University recognition. Thus in 1870 Mr. M'Turk, F.R.G.S., after deploring the loss of the "golden "opportunity when the late Professor Pillans proposed "to endow a Professorship of Paideutics," goes on to advocate courses of lectures on education delivered in succession by eminent educationalists in each of our Universities. Acting teachers and students could, he thinks, attend them, and arrangements could be made "that University education and Normal teaching go "hand in hand, as the only real security for a race of "cultivated men, at once accomplished scholars and "skilful teachers—men of the traditional stamina and "acquirements of the world-famed Scottish teacher, "with all the superadded practical knowledge and skill "which the best modern training can impart."

At the conference of headmasters of English public

English Headmasters,

schools, held at Birmingham in December, 1872, attention was directed to the want of professional training.

Dr. Abbott, of the City of London Schools, said, "Personally, I feel that by some kind of professional training I should have been saved from many mistakes." Dr. Butler, of Harrow, expressed a similar opinion, and this conference and subsequent ones urged the Universities to remedy the defect.

Mr. Jolly, H.M.I.S.

A memorial, from the Northern Counties Association of Teachers, was considered at the meeting of the Educational Institute in September, 1873, and was supported in a stirring speech by Mr. Jolly, H.M. Inspector of Schools. The memorial drew attention to the fact that no professional training existed for teachers as a class, that Normal Schools were attended by a small part only of the whole body of teachers, and stated that the memorialists were "unanimously of opinion that professional training in the theory and practice of teaching should be provided in connection with our Universities." Four things were specified as important for this end:—

- Professors of the science and art of teaching.
- Lectures on method.
- Practising schools with classes of all grades.
- An educational library, museum, and reading room.

A Committee of the Institute was appointed to report on the best steps to be taken to secure" the establishment of a Chair of Education in the Scottish Universities, with its complementary training machinery."

Meantime Mr. Jolly, who was most enthusiastic in the cause, advocated it with great ability; and his

writings did much to remove misconceptions, and to give definite shape to the scheme. By articles in *The Fortnightly Review* and *The Schoolmaster*, by pamphlets, and by notices in his annual reports, he secured for it attention in the highest quarters. All interested in the question are advised to study two most able contributions by Mr. Jolly on "The Professional Training of Teachers," for which see *The Fortnightly Review* of September, 1874, and the *Transactions* of the Social Science Association, which met at Glasgow in the same year. Similar views were urged by Professor Hodgson at the Norwich meeting of the Social Science Congress, and by Mrs. Gray and others at the Belfast meeting of the British Association. The press declared in favour

The Press.

of the movement both in Edinburgh and Glasgow, particularly the *Scotsman*, *Courant*, *Daily Review*, and *Glasgow Herald*, the last-named then under the direction of Dr. (now Professor) Jack, a high authority in all educational affairs. Everywhere the educational atmosphere was rife with the cry of "Chair! Chair!" and a response was soon forthcoming.

The Bell Trustees intimated their intention to give
Bell Trustee.

£10,000 to aid in founding Chairs of Education in the Universities of Edinburgh and St. Andrews. The plan was received with favour. Principal Shairp declared that, "in the endeavour to connect the training of teachers more closely with the Universities we have the intelligence of the country on our side." In Aberdeen a committee on new chairs held that a Chair of Education was the one most urgently needed. The University of Glasgow made no sign. It is somewhat characteristic of this University to exhibit less eagerness than that of Edinburgh in securing chances of academic extension. The latter has now eighteen chairs in the Faculty of Arts, the former only nine. Without committing oneself to an approval of the Edinburgh system, the warning of Dr. Lyon Playfair may be addressed to Glasgow—"Unluckily the Universities allowed profession after "profession to slip away from them, because they could "not escape from their mediaeval traditions. Nothing "is more strange, for instance, than their abandonment "of the teaching profession, which was of their own "creation, while the older professions were rather the "creators of the Universities."

Address to Graduates' Association of St. Andrews in London, Dec., 1872.

The Bell Trustees, after formal promises of aid from the Government, found that certain Scotch members of Parliament, who ought to have known better, had come under the evil influences of the system propagated by Mr. Lowe, had unfortunately imbibed his spirit, and become afflicted with the craze for mechanical results. These were not confined to one political party, or to one religious sect, but combining to resist any grant they rendered futile the attempt to secure provision for Edinburgh and St. Andrews, and indirectly they caused the two other Universities to be left unprovided for. Though thus abandoned to their own resources, the Trustees persevered with their scheme, which resulted in the happy selection in 1876, as first occupants of the chairs, of two well-known educationalists, Professors Laurie and Meiklejohn.

Dr. Macdonald.

The Educational Institute continued to keep the subject in view. In 1874 Dr. Macdonald (now of the High School, Otago) gave in his Presidential Address lengthy advice as to the work of the chairs then contemplated. In the following year his successor, Professor Hodgson, laments the failure to secure a similar provision for the Universities of Aberdeen and Glasgow, and then goes on to say—

Professor Hodgson.

" Quite apart from the Training Colleges there is "ample room for professorships of the theory, practice, "and history of education. How many of our secondary teachers pass through no Training College, and "is acquaintance with the principles of education less "needful for them than for primary teachers? "The first step upward is practically to proclaim that" professional culture, as distinguished from knowledge "of the subjects to be taught, is needful for every "teacher of every kind, and of every grade." He quotes Sir J. Kay-Shuttleworth, who says, " A well "arranged system of training would at once stimulate "professional *esprit de corps*, supply a basis of organisation; and induce a large number of men to look "upon teaching as the work of their lives." Professor Hodgson thus concludes—"The professorship "is the essential nucleus of that which must ere "long be instituted a FACULTY OF EDUCATION, equal in "dignity and completeness to that either of medicine "or of law."

And at the Annual Congresses of the Educational Institute of Scotland (which include not teachers only, but all whose interest in education induces them to attend) the same opinions have been expressed and approved of again and again. At the very first of these Congresses, held in Glasgow in 1874, the whole question was admirably put before the meetings by Mr. Dalglish, M.A., of Edinburgh, and Mr. Glasgow, of Alloway. At the Aberdeen Congress of 1876 Professor Black, in advocating a degree or diploma in Education to be given after University training, said—"Nothing will tend more to rehabilitate our whole

Prof. Black.

"system of education, and restore it to its ancient "lines, in so far as such restoration is desirable or

"possible, than the admission of a large number of "teachers with such a qualification." In the discussion which followed it was remarked by another Professor that "there was no reason whatever except custom "and Conservatism, for there being no University "degree for teachers," and an ex-President of the Institute (Dr. Macdonald) maintained that the platform for the teachers was the University platform, because that was the platform on which all the other professions were trained; and because this was most in harmony with our national traditions in Education.

During 1876 and 1877 the late Universities' Commissioners
Universities Commission, 1876-8.

collected an immense mass of evidence,' examining, among other points, into the propriety of instituting new chairs. There was a remarkable agreement among most authorities on the question of Chairs of Education. It was maintained that for our higher schools the M.A. with honours should be demanded, for our better parish and village schools the M.A. pass might suffice, and that for inferior posts it was desirable to revive the old degree of B.A., or to institute a Literateship in Arts, to meet the case of many who could not take the full curriculum, and whose University qualification might nevertheless be recognized. But it was again and again urged upon the Commission that some attempt should be made to secure the power of communicating in school the knowledge which the teacher possessed, and to point out the application of those principles according to which the mind is developed, habit and character formed, and culture acquired. Instruction in Method, and in the History of education, as illustrative of both theory and practice, was also advocated. In their Report the Commissioners say—"As Chairs of Education are a "recent and somewhat experimental institution, we "refrain from making any special recommendation in "regard to them."

Report, Vol. I., p. 63.

As the evidence is of the greatest value, and not now very accessible, the opinions of some Professors and distinguished teachers are subjoined.

Professor Black of Aberdeen, in recommending the revival of the degree of B.A., or as the Commissioners prefer a certificate in Arts, says—

Prof. Black.

"It would serve along with suitable instruction in "methods of teaching, as a basis for a teacher's "diploma . . . The new degree would be granted upon "five subjects, on the same standard as the M.A. "degree, but covering a less area. I may mention "that this was the scheme practically agreed to by the "four Universities, two or three years ago, as the basis "of a teacher's diploma, and that it was, I venture to "think, within an ace—if I may use such an expression—of being accepted by the Education Department "in London, had not ecclesiastical jealousies somewhat "interfered. It is evidently a felt want all over the "country, and the feeling has found frequent and "varied expression." He thinks it "very desirable" that "we should have a Chair of Education [at Aberdeen]. In the meantime, if a teacher's curriculum "and diploma be instituted, as I trust it will, in the "form of a B.A. degree, or otherwise, we might make "other arrangements for giving teachers a knowledge "of method, but no plan of doing so would be so satisfactory as a Professorship of Education."

Report Univ. Com., Evidence, 6366 and 6388.

These, be it remembered, are the words of one who had for years, as an Inspector of Schools, unequalled opportunities of observing Aberdeen graduates at work, in elementary and superior primary schools, in the Dick Bequest counties, so peculiarly the home of graduate teachers.

Professor Geddes thinks "that it is with teachers as

Prof. Geddes.

"it is with poets, they are born, and can hardly be "made." Yet he allows that "knowledge of the "history and movements of Education . . . may develop an aptitude which is already inborn;" and he says—"There has been a movement towards what is "called a teacher's degree, with a certain flexible course "for a biennial curriculum. The scheme for a teacher's "degree or diploma, after a two years' curriculum, "seems to me to fit in well with this scheme of a "minor degree."

Ibid., 5301, 5337.

Professor Struthers declares that "a Chair for the
Professor Struthers.

"Theory and Practice of Education, which Edinburgh "and St. Andrews already have, seems essential if the "Scottish Universities are to attend to the education of "teachers."

Ibid., 7834.

The Rev. Professor (now Principal) Pirie is, however, of a different opinion. He objects to
Prof. Pirie.

and would abolish Chairs of Education, Rhetoric, English Literature, &c., because "there cannot be "much taught by them," and Moral Philosophy he specially attacks as "very useless, and indeed may be" mischievous. "He objects also to the office of Principal in a University, for the Principal" has nothing "in the world to do . . .

and must be apt to make a "fuss about trifles." The originality of the evidence of this witness afforded much amusement to the Commissioners, and gave one of them the impression that the Doctor held that "Plato and Cato had a sense of moral" obligation, but they ought not to have had it."

Report Univ. Com., Evidence, 2659-2673.

We may then assume that any pertinent evidence from Aberdeen is in favour of the recognition of Education in the University curriculum.

Professor Crombie.

From the University of St. Andrews we have the testimony of Professor Crombie. "The University, ten years ago, thought that a degree to be obtained by teachers was a desirable thing." He states that the Government favourably entertained the scheme, but on account of ecclesiastical jealousies it was abandoned. He adds that "to qualify teachers for secondary schools, it might be desirable that a teacher's degree were instituted. We have now a Professor of Education in the Universities of St. Andrews and Edinburgh, and these gentlemen would supply the theoretical knowledge which every teacher should have, while the University would give a diploma certifying his fitness for the office of teacher of a secondary school."

Ibid., 3588.

Sir Alex. Grant.

Sir Alexander Grant, Principal of the University of Edinburgh, gives a scheme of options in the higher studies for the degree of M.A., by which he manages to recognize for graduation every Chair in that University except the Chair of Education, regarding which he merely states that diplomas should be given to teachers.

Ibid., 150.

This exclusion of the Education Chair from the options led to a protest from the General Council, which, at a well-attended meeting in October 1879, carried a motion by a large majority to include education among the subjects qualifying for the degree of M.A. in the event of any changes being made.

Professor Calderwood thinks it of great importance

Professor Calderwood.

"to provide for an increased number of teachers coming to the University." He is inclined to have a special diploma for teachers after two years' attendance, or another degree for teachers of primary schools; and there might be included, to a certain extent, the assistants in secondary schools if the diploma included classics, which, I should think, it very commonly would do. I think that at present we want very greatly to encourage study at the University on the part of those who are preparing to be teachers in primary schools, our sole hope of success in general education being to raise the standard of culture and attainment on the part of the teachers."

Report Univ. Com., Evidence, 7092, 7096.

In the University of Glasgow, the evidence of Principal Caird, and of Professors Ramsay, Veitch, and Caird, is in favour of restoring for teachers the B. A. degree; while Professor Young complains that

Prof Young.

"the proposed Pædeutic chairs were solely for men, and nothing has been done for the large number of women who pass above 20 per cent, higher in all departments than men." Sixty-seven per cent, of teachers are women. He therefore thinks it is desirable there should be some provision for giving them a University stamp," and states that some of his colleagues would assent to a University degree or certificate of some kind."

Ibid., 1790, 1792.

Space will allow us to add only the testimonies of

Dr Bryce.

Dr. Bryce of Glasgow High School, and Dr. Macdonald, Rector of the Academy, Ayr. Dr. Bryce urges the establishment of Chairs of Education in Glasgow and Aberdeen, and shows how the University and Normal School can be correlated.

"No measure," he says, "would tend more to raise the status of the teachers than the certificate of the Professor of Education for knowledge of the science and skill in the art of education."

Report Univ. Com., Evidence, 9116.

Dr.

Dr. Macdonald, Ayr.

Macdonald wishes a diploma, degree, or certificate, for teachers. "There is such a degree for medicine, divinity, and law, and I think there ought to be something of that kind for the teaching profession."

Ibid., 5493.

Similar evidence was given on behalf of the teachers by Mr. William Sewell of Eastwood, and Mr. Somers of Collessie, parochial schoolmasters of high standing and long experience.

Alford Association.

In his Presidential Address, 1879, Mr. Duncan of Inchtute advocated the establishment of an Educational Faculty. In the same year the Alford Local Association forwarded an overture in favour of "professional degrees in education for teachers." It is remarkable that this overture should come from an association, the members of which are *alumni*, and three-fourths of them graduates in Arts of the University of Aberdeen. The possession of the coveted degree of M.A. did not reconcile these teachers to the relation of the Universities to their profession. The Secretary to the Board of Examiners was requested to "draw up a scheme for" accomplishing the object desired." But in consequence of discussions on the mode of electing the General Committee, and on tenure of office, the subject was not proceeded with.

Stirling Congress.

At the Stirling Congress of 1881, the present writer said, "A university should be many-sided, and if it has "room for medical men as such, for engineers as such, "for lawyers as such, would it be degraded, or would "it depart from the function of a university, if it were "to provide for teachers as such ? Until this end be "realised, the words of Dr. Playfair will still be true: "' It is strange that the very art, which has for its pro- "' fessed object to lay the foundations of every profession, has for itself no recognition as a profession in "' this country.' In former times, as I have shown, it "was not so. Dr. Playfair, however, regards the time "as near when ' the Universities will doubtless revert "'to their ancient practice of giving special degrees for" 'teaching.' Educational faculties cannot be difficult "to organize in Universities which contain educationalists of the stamp of Professors Geddes and Bain, "Meiklejohn and Crombie, Laurie and Calderwood, "Ramsay and Jack."

On the 11th May, 1882, a meeting was held in London of Heads of Colleges, Masters of Grammar Schools, Middle Class Schools, and others interested in the higher education. It was resolved to open a Training College for Teachers of Higher Class Schools. A suitable guarantee fund was raised, and on the 19th February, 1883, the Finsbury Training College was

Finsbury College.

opened under the auspices of the most distinguished teachers in England, whose honoured names appear among the Members of Council. The object is to prepare intending teachers for the certificate of the Cambridge Syndicate and the diploma of the London University. For details see *Appendix E*.

At the Aberdeen Congress in January last the Rector

Aberdeen' Congress, Mr. Moir.

of the Aberdeen Grammar School expressed a similar opinion—"One change, I am sure, you will all agree is "desirable, and that is that there should be in our Arts' "Faculties a sub-faculty of education and a teacher's "degree. With a system of options, and the institution "of Chairs of Paideutics in all our Universities, and "with our Normal Schools affiliated to the Universities, I can imagine a state of matters when our future "teachers, both elementary and secondary, both male "and female, could all get a University training. Then, "corresponding to clinical education in medicine, there "would require to be certain practising schools open to "students intending to be teachers. . . . Teachers "have a perfect right to assert their claims to be enrolled amongst the professions, and I am sure the "great mass of the Scotch people would hail with pleasure their recognition in that capacity. We are the "coming power in the country. The Church and the "Press must give us a place beside them as the educators of the people, as the producers of good citizens, "and the preventers of crime and immorality." At the same Congress an Aberdeen Professor declared that a "teacher's degree would be an admirable "thing." He had been in favour of a Professor of Education in each of our Universities. Such a position should, he thought, be highly esteemed, for the "highest of all functions was to be a teacher of teachers."

[unclear: fling] sociation.

A month ago the whole question was discussed by the Stirling Association, and opinions expressed by Mr. Jolly, H.M. Inspector of Schools, Mr. Hutchison, M.A., of the Stirling High School, Mr. Watson, Tillicoultry, and others well known in the educational world. The following resolution was unanimously adopted;—" That "it be represented to the General Committee of the "Institute that a special committee be appointed to "take immediate and practical steps in connection with "the reform of endowments, and the expected Universities Commission, to promote the institution of Chairs "of the Institutes and History of Education in the "Universities of Glasgow and Aberdeen; to secure "the foundation in all our Universities of a teacher's "diploma, with a sub-faculty of education; and to obtain the recognition of the diploma by the Education "Department."

[unclear: dee] cation.

The Dundee Association at their last monthly meeting (March) also approved of a motion, of which notice had been given, in the following terms:—" That this branch "of the Institute consider the propriety of establishing "Professorships of Education in the Universities of "Glasgow and Aberdeen, and that the Normal Colleges "be put in connection with the Universities."

The history of the movement for the recognition of education as a University subject has thus been traced to the present time. It is not a movement of recent date. In Scotland it has been advocated for more than fifty

years. The profession has ever sought to realise the ideas of Professors Pillans and Ferguson. They and most of the early leaders have now passed away, and have left for this generation the sacred duty of completing a work which the labours of half a century have done much to advance, and for the accomplishment of which the present seems a favourable opportunity.

II.—Present Position.

We now proceed to consider *How far has University recognition of Education been conceded, and to what extent has the Profession benefited thereby?*

It has been urged that in the Bell chairs at Edin

Bell Chair

burgh and St. Andrews education has been sufficiently recognised in these Universities; and it will now be asked what the result has been? It will not be difficult to show that these chairs, while left to starve by Government, notwithstanding solemn pledges, have not been awarded their due position in the University curriculum, and that any conclusion drawn from their past is therefore no index to their future, when their rightful claims shall have been allowed. Besides, it is well known that the University of St. Andrews is suffering

St. Andrei

from causes which affect all its chairs; and it would be marvellous if a new chair should not have been specially afflicted. During the present session it is gratifying to learn that a good attendance, all things considered, has been secured. But the energetic movement now being carried out in Dundee points to its new University College as the appropriate sphere to which to transfer the Education Chair at St. Andrews. In his evidence before the Commission Professor Meiklejohn states that while he had but 10 students at St. Andrews, a course of lectures given by him in Dundee was attended by 87.

[unclear: inburgh] university.

But what of Edinburgh? That University illustrates in a most remarkable manner the difficulty which corporations have in adjusting themselves to the times, the tendency to go on in the old way, even when that way is shown to be no longer the best, nay, even when it is positively injurious to the body as a whole. No Scottish University has so much profited by the rapid extension of the Arts and Sciences as Edinburgh. In recent years seven chairs have been added to what in the Calendar is called the *Faculty of Arts*, representing various branches of modern investigation, thought, or culture. There are now in Edinburgh no less than eighteen chairs in the Faculty of Arts, yet of these only seven qualify by attendance for graduation. Why are the eleven others thus ignored or despised? Because of mediaeval traditions regarding the *trivium* and *quadrivium* of the old curricula.

Lingua, Tropus, Ratio; Numerus, Tonus, Angulus, Astra.

Even these traditions are not strictly observed, else the Chair of Music should have been admitted into the magic seven, which number has ever been the perfect one in the Arts' course.

In his evidence before the *Universities Commission* in 1876, Professor Fraser, of Edinburgh, speaks of "the anomalous position of nine chairs in "the Faculty of Arts—or so-called Faculty of Arts These nine "chairs, with others in prospect, are not in any faculty at all, in the sense "of being connected with the curriculum."—Evidence, 2221. Glasgow University has two chairs in a similar position.

Surely the Executive Commission will teach all the Universities rightly to reflect the scientific and cultured aspect of the new professions, which have been so tardily recognised, or so persistently ignored, and will show Edinburgh how to group her chairs of

- History,
- Astronomy,
- Agriculture,
- Music,
- Philology,
- Engineering,
- Geology,
- Political Economy,
- Education,
- Fine Art,

and (last, but not least) Celtic, so that they shall no longer appear as mere excrescences on the Faculty of Arts, but have their due influence allowed, and their true positions conceded.

The Chair of Education has suffered greatly because attendance on it conferred no academic distinction. Now to teachers, the class for whom the chair is specially designed, academic distinction is of the first moment.

From its foundation, therefore, this chair has laboured under a disadvantage relatively greater than that of any of the other unrecognised chairs. Whatever excuse may be found for such treatment in the well-known conservatism of a University, there can be none for a disability to which the chair has been subjected by the Education Department. For some years the Education Department has recognised the

Education Department and Chairs Education.

attendance of Normal students at certain University classes in Arts and Science. The Department carries forward to the Training College examination in December, the Professor's mark for each student, and exempts the latter from examination in the same subject at Christmas. The Department also defrays a portion of the University fees. Will it be credited that the Department refuses to recognise in this way attendance on the Chair of Education? It was said that the principles of education were taught to these students in the Training Colleges. The reply was—So are Latin, Greek, and Mathematics, &C.

It was also pointed out that the Chair of Education, while adapted to secondary teachers, formed an advanced class in education for the Training College students.

The Department then took refuge in the excuse that the Chair of Education was not recognised by the University itself as qualifying for graduation. But the choice of classes is regulated by the Code, under powers conferred by the Education Act of 1872, and not by the University; and the Code is moulded by the Department. Thus the Department has homologated what is either a failing or a fault in the University, and stultifies itself, when so much power is committed to it, by pandering to a relic of mediæval scholasticism. And thus officialism has done its utmost to deprive of the advantages of this chair those for whom it is specially designed. But notwithstanding these disabilities the

Access of tinburgh air.

Edinburgh Chair of Education has been most successful under the direction of its able occupant. The class has steadily increased in numbers, and is now the largest optional class in the University. The writer has occasionally been privileged to listen to the Professor's lectures, and can testify that no more earnest class can anywhere be found than the 30 or 40 hearers there assembled. Among those who have attended the class are many distinguished teachers, and one of the medallists now occupies a Professor's chair in another University. We shall afterwards show how this success has influenced the English Universities, and caused them to take up a new position with respect to Education.

[unclear: lege] of receptors.

But first let us again direct attention to the proceedings of the College of Preceptors, a body which has done much for middle-class education in England. Under their auspices the late Mr. Joseph Payne delivered a series of lectures year by year beginning in 1873. Examinations were held and diplomas awarded. Besides examinations in general knowledge and in special selected subjects, candidates were examined in Logic, Mental and Moral Science, Physiology, and the History of Education. Since the death of Mr. Payne lectures have been regularly given by distinguished educationalists, among whom we may name Mr. Fitch, Mr. Quick, Mr. Sully, the Rev. Canon Daniel, Mr. Oscar Browning, Professor Meiklejohn, Mr. James Ward, &C.

See Calendar of the College of Preceptors. See also *Appendices D. and H.*

The diplomas are valued, the training is more valuable still; but the experience of the College of Preceptors, like the early experience of the Educational Institute of Scotland, showed that a University connection was necessary to enable the diploma to carry weight. The success of the Edinburgh Chair encouraged the College of Preceptors to apply to the University of London, and in January, 1879,

University London.

the Convocation of that University appointed a committee to inquire—

- Whether it was advisable to institute examinations in the theory and practice of education?
- What was the best form for such examinations to take?

The Committee got reports on these points from many authorities, Rev. Dr. Abbott, Prof. Laurie, Mr. Quick, Mr. Philip Magnus, M. Duruy, Minister of Education in France, Professor Meiklejohn, Mr. Isbister, Principal Faunthorpe, Mr. Matthew Arnold, Mr. Oscar Browning, &c., &c.

See *Report to Convocation*. May 13th, 1879.

As a member of Convocation of the University of London, the writer is in a position to state that the evidence of Professor Laurie had the largest share in influencing that body not only to undertake examinations in education, but also in determining the special form which the examinations should take. Convocation recommended the granting of a *degree* in Education, but the Senate resolved to begin by issuing a *certificate* only, to be called "The Teachers' Diploma." The first examination has been held this month—March, 1883. For details of the scheme see *Appendix G*.

Meanwhile the Universities of Oxford and Cambridge

University Cambridge.

had been observing the movement in Scotland and London. In Oxford the Council took some steps to

inaugurate a scheme, but both Oxford and London were soon distanced in the race by the speed of the Cambridge "*Teachers Training Syndicate*," which arranged for three courses of lectures followed by examinations for diplomas. The first lectures were delivered in 1879 and 1880 by Mr. Quick, Mr. Fitch, and Mr. Ward. The lectures of Mr. Fitch have been published, and form a most acceptable addition to our educational literature. Among the subsequent lecturers have been Mr. Oscar Browning and the Rev. Canon Daniel. For details, see *Appendix F*.

[unclear: luation] department.

A year ago the Education Department, watching the progress of events in London and Cambridge, suddenly informed the Training Colleges that Logic and Psychology would henceforth form the greater portion of the examination of senior students in the paper on *School Management*. Their programme is "the training of the senses and of the memory; the processes of reasoning; the order in which the faculties of children are developed; the formation of habits and of character;—all "considered in their application to the methods of teaching and of moral discipline." The lecturers in Training

[unclear: ing] colleges.

Colleges are advised by the Department to illustrate educational principles by reference to the works of Pestalozzi, Fröbel, Arnold, etc.; and two of the papers set at Cambridge on the Theory and Practice of Education are reprinted in the English *Blue Book* for last year, with the intimation that "most of these questions "should not be beyond the reach of the average student "if the subject has been steadily taught throughout his "training." As shown by the questions set in December last

See *Appendix K*.

the Department interpret their programme as including Logic Deductive and Inductive, Psychology and Ethics as applied in Education—in fact, the scientific principles on which our practice is based, or the philosophy from which we deduce our methods, and estimate their value. A hint is given that even junior students will be expected to prepare some portion of a course in which education is treated from the philosophical standpoint. Keen is the irony of fate! Twenty years ago the chief of the Education Department declared there was no science of education; ten years after, his successors announced themselves favourable to Chairs of Education, but unable to aid them; ten years later still, they compel students to be taught, and ask them to believe in, the science of education, because it is recognised in Cambridge. Who can tell what ten years more will accomplish? At present Scottish ideas are not entertained unless they come by way of Cambridge and London. Yet none the less have Scottish ideas triumphed, though fifty years have been lost, and due acknowledgment has not yet been conceded. The constant agitation of the past, the present partial recognition, the inconsistent position of the Education Department, the well-known candour of Mr. Mundella and the energy of Lord Rosebery, and also the unanimity of clergymen, professors, doctors, lawyers, and teachers in congress at Aberdeen, should encourage the Institute anew to formulate its views, and approach with confidence the Endowed Schools Commission, and the Universities' Executive Commission, as well as the Education Department itself, assured that, in the interests of the country, their righteous demands can no longer with safety be refused.

III.

In the preceding pages it has been shown that four University recognition of, Education.

of the British Universities, Edinburgh, St. Andrews, Cambridge, and London, have conceded the claim of education to University rank, and have made some provision in acknowledgement thereof. Oxford has approved of similar action, which will soon take definite form. Aberdeen is as anxious now as in 1859 and 1874 to secure a Professor of Education. Glasgow

University of Glasgow.

alone of the great British Universities has made no sign. It has already been stated (page 17) that this University has never exhibited the anxiety to adopt new chairs which has characterised her Edinburgh sister. In consideration, too, of the extraordinary effort she has lately made to raise the finest pile of University buildings in the kingdom, much may be forgiven her. She has of late rather directed her attention to the deficiencies of her entrants; and she has proclaimed these deficiencies so loudly that her prestige has suffered in the eyes of her sisters; whereas she sought only to point out the chaotic state of secondary education, and to rouse the country to action for its improvement. But now Glasgow is left alone on this question of *Education as a University subject*, and it would be folly were she to let slip the occasion of the present movement, and not assume her proper position regarding it.

Bell Fund in Glasgow.

The Town Council of Glasgow have charge of £10,000, left them for educational purposes by Dr. Bell, the

founder of the Madras System. An Act of the Court of Session compelled the Town Council to aid from this Fund the Sessional Schools of Glasgow, on condition of their teaching according to the Madras System, which has long since been superseded or abandoned. Moreover, these Sessional Schools have now all but ceased to exist, and the Bell Fund is unapplied. Can a better use be suggested than in founding a Chair of Education in Glasgow? The Chairs of Education in Edinburgh and St. Andrews derive their endowments from the Bell Trustees. We may be sure the Edinburgh University would not let slip so *golden* an opportunity as is now afforded to the University of Glasgow.

It has been stated that a Professorship of Education is not enough in any University. More is wanted: the recognition of education as a subject in which academic distinction can be attained. At present

Diploma in Education.

nothing better than a certificate or diploma is granted. Perhaps we could hardly have expected more, for these chairs have not yet been seven years in existence; and it is little more than two years since the first University diplomas were issued. It is not intended in this essay again to answer the objections which have been urged against such a recognition of education. Many of these have been answered by abler hands.

See Professor Laurie's *Inaugural Address*. See also the Inaugural Address before the Cambridge Syndicate, *The Schoolmaster Past and Future*, by Rev. R. H. Quick, M.A.

But a few new objections may be noticed.

Degrees in Education have been objected to because

Objections-Too many Degrees.

a multiplicity of degrees is undesirable, and might lead to applications for other degrees. Why not? Every new claim must be considered on its merits. Whoever raises this objection must hold that the increase of knowledge is to be regretted, because it may compel the Universities to cast off their mediaeval bonds, and keep up with the progress of an age little tolerant of such restrictions. Does the objector sigh for the return of that time, when each Professor, as *Regent*, conducted his class in successive years through the whole of the University curriculum? Division of labour, here as elsewhere, has led to advance, and further division is quite inevitable, and must be provided for. The English Universities, ignorantly supposed in Scotland to be so unprogressive, are alive to the necessities of the age. The University of Cambridge, for example, has just sanctioned a special examination in Modern Languages, and the Board of Studies is now engaged in arranging for a Modern Language Tripos. When shall we reach so liberal a scheme in Scotland? The objection to a multiplicity of degrees could come only from a Scotchman; for in Scotland alone has it been the practice for the majority of students to leave the University without graduation. Twenty years ago the Scotch degree of M.A. was so little valued that it was seldom taken even by excellent students.

In 1876 the Very Rev. Principal Caird estimated the proportion of graduates to students as 1 to 26.—*Univ. Com.*, Evidence, 304.

Of late years the popular feeling has on the whole been in favour of graduation, and in consequence the Universities have been able to raise the standard considerably. This feeling they cannot too carefully try to extend; for in so doing they will benefit themselves, the country, and the cause of progress and culture.

Practising schools.

We are also told that it is undesirable for the Universities to undertake the training of teachers because Practising Schools may be found indispensable, and that it is not proper for the Universities to establish these, and thus conduct work outside their proper sphere. The same argument might be applied as an objection to University training for the medical profession, because Hospitals and Dispensaries are necessary for clinical and other instruction. But, as in these cases, special arrangements can easily be made in University cities. Thus in Germany "the Normal Seminaries are connected with the different Universities, and designed, in general, to give the future schoolmaster a more firm and thorough grasp on the matters he studies there . . . and to introduce him to the practical requirements of the profession of schoolmaster."

Matthew Arnold—Higher Schools and Universities in Germany.

But such wants are easily met. Hardly have the Universities of Cambridge and London shown the need for such schools, when one is opened by private effort, under distinguished patronage, and a handsome sum subscribed to maintain it during the initial struggle necessary to secure a permanent self-supporting basis.

See account of Finsbury Training College—Appendix E.

[*unclear*: injure aining;] lleges.

Others object that Chairs of Education and the corresponding degrees will seriously injure the training colleges. This was the great point in the Parliamentary opposition to the chairs in 1874, but it has never been the opinion of those best able to judge. The first Rector of a Training College in Scotland, the Rev. Robert Cunningham, M.A.,

Of the Glasgow C. of S. Training College, Dundas Vale.

who had taught in America, and who was well acquainted with education on the Continent, writes to

George Combe in 1840, and recommends "the attaching of model schools, and a "Professorship of Education to the existing colleges" [*i.e.*, Universities] rather than the establishing of "distinct Normal seminaries."

G. Combe's *Notes on the United States*, Vol. III., p. 444. See also Mr Jolly's *Education*, G. Combe, pp. 649-650.

In 1867 the Rev. James Ridgway, M.A., F.S.A., Principal of Culham Training College, advocated "the establishment of an "educational faculty, co-ordinate with those of divinity, "law, and medicine, already existing; which is the "course adopted by other Universities in Europe." Mr. Fitch, H. M. Inspector of Schools, and once himself the Principal of a Training College says—" In France, Germany, and Italy, all the parts? "of the educational system are interwoven, and "strengthen one another. The Normal Schools are "available for teachers of *all* kinds, and are connected "with the Universities, and under the supervision of "their authorities." Similar views were expressed in 1869 by the Rev. George Rowe, Principal of the York Training College. The intimate connection for more than five years of the present writer with a training college enables him to add his testimony to the above.

The Education Committee of the Church of Scotland, in their Report to the General Assembly in May 1875, say, regarding the Chairs of Education then contemplated, "They will not in any way interfere "with the Normal Institutions, but they will be made "conducive to the efficiency of these, the most promising students in them being aided to complete their "studies at the Universities. The high standard of "qualification which has ever distinguished the parochial schoolmasters of Scotland will thus, it is hoped, "be fully maintained. The Chairs will be put on a "purely theoretical basis—their occupants giving lec "tures on the science, the history and literature of "education, the practical work of training for our "public schools being left, as at present, with the "Normal Institutions."

Report, 1875, p. 15.

On the other hand the present partial union of the Universities and the Normal Schools has been found to work well from the University point of view. Since the course for Normal students was satisfactorily arranged for, three years ago, Professors Ramsay, Jack, Jebb, and Veitch have been loud in praise of the methodical habits and careful preparation of these students. Similar testimony comes from Edinburgh.

Strange to say the greatest anxiety to prevent the Universities from trespassing upon and injuring, as is alleged, the Normal Schools, is displayed by those who have done little, if anything, to aid Normal Schools in the struggle which they have made for years to keep advancing and worthily to meet the progress of the age. It cannot be too soon explained to these pretentious friends that it is high time they were showing the value of their approval by the amount of their support. The University training of Normal students to be efficient entails a large outlay, an additional source of expnese, without any corresponding source of income beyond partial aid from the Education Department, which takes much credit for the good results, but is jealous of the expenditure. Perhaps it may just be as well to tell the whole truth—which is, that the combined Normal and University training of male students is now so very costly that no Normal School for males can be carried on except at a large yearly loss, which is met in

Training Colleges for Males costly.

Scotland by the fees charged female students. Training Colleges for females are self-supporting institutions. The staff is not costly, and each student is a source of income. But those for males are costly, as demanding a superior staff and expensive apparatus; while, as has been shown, each student is a source of loss. So true is this that of late years all the Training Colleges in Scotland have reduced the number of masters in training, and increased the number of mistresses. The consequence is that the supply of trained masters is not now equal to the demand. In the Glasgow Church of Scotland Training College, within two months after Christmas last, all the outgoing class of male students had received appointments. A greater number of male teachers must consequently be drawn from other sources, thus increasing the large contingent of graduates, undergraduates, &c., which has ever formed a very important element in our schools, and for which no professional training has been obtainable. Apart from the Normal school students, this source of supply would provide an excellent class for the Professor of Education, if attendance on his chair had attached to it academic or scholastic merit by the University itself.

Some have advocated the institution of a minor

Minor Degree for Teacher

degree, for which, say, five of the present classes in the Arts' course, and the class of education should qualify for graduation. The writer's experience as a teacher is against leaving the choice of classes wholly optional. He believes that a system of various groups will be found more useful to the students, and more intelligible to the community, than the random and grotesque selection by students as yet ignorant of the subjects upon the choice of which they are called to decide. If our Universities truly reflected the scientific investigation, culture, and thought of the age, suitable groups of classes could easily be formed. But in the absence of chairs of Philology, History, Modern Languages, &c., the grouping is beset with difficulties.

Some inquiry among Scotch graduates has satisfied the writer that the project of a minor degree in Arts will receive little support from them. In the dearth of graduates some time ago, it was proposed to revive the B.A. degree to prevent the General Councils from extinction. But graduates are now more numerous, and it is averred that improved and cheap text-books, cheaper secondary education, improved University teaching, more numerous and more valuable bursaries, and Training College subsidies, now render it easy for anyone of moderate industry and ability to take the degree of M. A. and the education class also.

[*unclear*: Pass] egree low.

Others again complain that the present M.A. pass degree is so low that a lower must not be thought of. It is somewhat astonishing to find this view supported by two of H.M. Inspectors of Schools, who do not speak without experience. We should be glad to learn that their experience is exceptional. Mr. Dey says, "Boys of the class attending public schools will] "seldom go to the University unless they are able to "win a bursary at the annual competition. But the "standard for a bursary has advanced so much in "recent years, and the attainments of teachers in University subjects have receded so much that neither a "Normal-school man nor an average M.A. is qualified "to teach a boy for the bursary competition. . . . "Certainly intercourse with men does not leave on "one the impression that all culture and knowledge is "wrapped up in an M.A."

Report on Education, 1881-82, p. 127.

In similar terms Mr. Marshall reports, "The majority of graduates wade" through the different branches much as infants learn "reading, and their scholarship is by no means above "the average."

Ibid., p. 130.

The general belief, however, is that the M.A. degree has never been higher in Scotland than in recent years. "Nothing in Education."

There are those, again, who take the opposite view that the M.A. course is of itself perfectly sufficient, embracing, as it does, a large part of the field of general knowledge, and including logic, psychology, and ethics, from which a "mere bundle of deductions" is derived and dignified with the name of principles of education. There is really *nothing in it*, say these critics; the history of education can be read and studied without aid, and method can only be learned in the schoolroom. In like manner it might be urged (indeed it has been urged), that there is nothing in engineering but mechanics and physics applied, and that practical skill can be acquired only in the field. But under Macquorn Rankine, Thomson, and Fleeming Jenkin, Chairs of Engineering have proved of the highest national utility. Closely examined, even ethics and psychology are similarly resolved. Just so, too, we might argue against the scientific treatment of agriculture, for the so-called science is but a "bundle of principles" drawn from botany, geology, chemistry, meteorology, &c. But is not the State at this very moment almost bribing every evening class to study agriculture as a science, and believing that it exercises a true and wise economy in the outlay?

The contrary opinion rather is the true one. It is

Much in Education.

not true that there is "*nothing in education*," it is true that there is much, very much, in it. In their memorial to the University of London, the College of Preceptors say:—" Their own experience, extending over "a quarter of a century, in the examination of teachers "for diplomas, has satisfied them that the range of" knowledge and independent reflection that might "fairly be included in an examination for an educational "degree is quite equal to that required for degrees in "medicine and law; while the amount of intellectual "effort required for a mastery of the subjects coming "within its scope is certainly not inferior. . . . The "logical and necessary corollary is the institution of a "degree in education, which will gather up and give "unity and consistency to various independent lines of "preparatory study, and at the same time, by giving "it an academical stamp, impart a new aspect to the "teacher's calling, and endow it with fresh claims to "public recognition and respect."

And hence we are not surprised to find an objection

Educational Faculty.

raised by some on this very ground that education is a subject too extensive to be dealt with from a single chair. We accept the objection, and urge it as an argument for a special faculty formed by grouping chairs, and granting a degree corresponding to B.D., L.L.B., M.B., &c. Philosophical training is essential in the teacher. Of the five divisions under which philosophy is now commonly arranged, viz., Logic, Psychology, Metaphysics, Ethics, and the History of Philosophy, the two first should be required of every teacher. If Chairs of Education were established in all the Universities, then the present L.A. certificate could easily be converted into a teacher's degree or certificate of the lower class qualifying for primary and higher primary schools. Education,

The Chair of Education in Edinburgh is recognized as qualifying for the L.A. Certificate.

Logic, and Psychology should be compulsory, and the student should be allowed an option as to three or four other classes in the Arts course. We should thus obviate the difficulty caused by the loss of the B.A. degree in the Scottish Universities, the restoration of which was advocated so strongly and from so many quarters before the late Universities Commissioners. It does not however seem possible to revive the title of B.A. in

Scotland. The tendency of the age is toward specialization, and hence B.E. (Bachelor in Education) seems the correlative of L.A., L.L.B., &c.

Higher Degree.

For the degree of M.E. (Master in Education), we might have the Education class, three of the five philosophical classes, and the M.A. pass standard in the other subjects of the Arts course. For specialists the degree of M.E. might be given on attaining the M.A. pass standard in Philosophy, and the M.A. Honours standard in Education and in one of the following groups:—

- Ancient Classics and History, Philology, &c.
- English and Anglo-Saxon Language and Literature, Philology, &c.
- Two Modern Languages (treated as classics).
- Mathematics and Molar Physics.
- Molecular Physics. 6. Experimental Physics.
- Biology. 8. Mental and Moral Science.

The present M.A. degree need not be interfered with.

In every country the teaching profession is that to which the country must look not only for the diffusion of existing knowledge, but for original investigation, and patient research. Without justification, a cry has been raised that scholarship in Scotland is on the decline. Probably at no time had we so many or so distinguished scholars, the product of our University teaching as now. But if the advance is to continue and to be encouraged as it ought, no means can better attain the end than specialization and academic distinction such as sketched above. It is well known that the great subdivision of the field of knowledge, and the minute research which succeeds the admirable general training of the gymnasiums, are potent causes of progress in the German Universities. During the present winter session no less than fifteen courses of lectures are being delivered in these Universities on various branches of Pädagogik, Didaktik, and Propädeutik.

See *Deutscher Universitäts-Kalender*, 1882-83, Winter Semester.

When shall our treatment of the subject be equally thorough?

Certificates of practical skill, or of experience in selected and approved schools, could be demanded from candidates for graduation in Education, just as now similar certificates are required of medical students. The actual graduation as M.E. might be deferred until after two or three years' practice, just as M.D. now follows M.B. And if a thesis were then demanded, its preparation would form the habit of that continuous study of education which is so desirable in the educator, and which is all but unknown in our country.

In *Appendices B to K* a detailed account is given of the manner in which education is treated as a subject of study examination and certification by those public bodies which have made provision for it. An inspection of these Appendices and of the evidence before the late Universities' Commission will lead the candid mind to acknowledge that any difficulties in the way of making a full provision for training and graduation in education must arise from other causes than the difficulty of the subject itself, and opposition must be attributed to other motives than sincere love of educational progress. But the times seem once more favourable. May we soon realise the dream of Brereton,

Graduate Teachers.

when we shall have "graduate teachers, themselves "imbued with the best educational influences of their "day, and not only able mechanically to teach, but "qualified, even unconsciously, to diffuse good sense, "good manners, and high principles among their "pupils. The degree appended to their names will "mean more than the reams of flashy testimonials "which now circulate between the scholastic agents "and the masters of middle schools. Nor will they, "as now, find it difficult to retain their raised literary "and social tastes when merged in the chaos of great "cities, or scattered in provincial towns and villages. "University men twenty years hence will not be a "mere clique in any county or neighbourhood. Those who "try to keep their heads above the waters of ignorance "and frivolity and coarseness will not be *rari nantes "in gurgite vasto*. For the teachers of the future will "meet everywhere their fellow graduates—men whom "no occupation can degrade, men who turn all trades "into professions."

Note.

In APPENDIX A there is reproduced an important document in which the teachers of Scotland, a quarter of a century ago, formulated their claims regarding the University recognition of education. Appendices B, C, D, E show how education is treated as a subject of study by the various bodies which provide for instruction therein. And, lastly, Appendices F, G, H, and K exhibit the various examination schemes now in operation in this country. The whole forms a brief guide to the present state of the question.

Appendices.

Appendices.

PROGRAMMES OF VARIOUS COURSES OF LECTURES ON EDUCATION.

EXAMINATIONS IN EDUCATION.

Appendix—A

PETITION OF THE EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTE OF SCOTLAND TO THE UNIVERSITIES' COMMISSIONERS, 1859, IN FAVOUR OF CHAIRS OF EDUCATION.

To the Right Honourable and Honourable the Commissioners under the Universities' (Scotland) Bill, the MEMORIAL of the Educational Institute of Scotland, humbly sheweth:

- —That your Memorialists, in the year 1847, formed an Association, embracing a large proportion of the teachers of Scotland of various Christian denominations, to which Her Majesty was graciously pleased (13th May, 1851) to grant a Royal Charter of Incorporation, under the name or style of the Educational Institute of Scotland, for the purpose of promoting sound learning, of advancing the interests of education in Scotland, and also of supplying a defect in the educational arrangements of that country, by providing for the periodical session of a Board of Examiners competent to ascertain and certify the qualifications of persons engaged, or desiring to be engaged, in the education of youth; and thereby furnishing to the public, and to the patrons and superintendents of schools, a guarantee of the acquirements and fitness of teachers for the duties required of them, and thus securing their efficiency, and raising the standard of education in general.
- —That they have steadily endeavoured, so far as was within their power, to carry into effect the objects for which they were incorporated; and have annually granted diplomas to such young men, desiring to enter the teaching profession, as presented themselves for examination, and have certified to their proficiency in those branches in which they were examined and found competent.
- —That they have long felt, with regret, the want of regular training in the theory and practice of education; and one of the objects specially contemplated by them in forming the Institute was the dissemination of a knowledge of this very important subject by public lectures, &c. The very limited means, however, placed at their command, have not enabled them to do more than furnish a few occasional lectures, which have been eagerly embraced by the members of the profession.
- —That it is now more than a century since Condillac first started the idea that the art of teaching and training the young might be, and ought to be, reduced to a science founded on the philosophy of the human mind. He was followed by Dugald Stewart, who fully and clearly demonstrates that no real and solid improvement in education can take place until this idea be realised. Dr. Thomas Brown advocates not less earnestly the same view as his illustrious predecessor. And the hope that it would give birth to such an Art of Education is urged by both philosophers as the strongest argument for the cultivation of that science to which they devoted themselves, and by which they have shed so much lustre on the University where they taught, and on their country. All those who, during the last sixty years, have thought most deeply on education, being, at the same time, most thoroughly conversant with its practice, have confirmed the opinion of these great men by many new arguments and illustrations. Some have gone farther, and have addressed themselves to the task of tracing the outline and laying the foundation of the much-wished-for science, to which the name *Pedeutics* has been given. Thus *Pedeutics* is the *Art and Science of education*, or in other words, education *reduced to fixed principles derived from the science of the human mind*.
- —That it is acknowledged by all enlightened educationists that regular scientific and practical instruction in *Pedeutics* is as necessary for a teacher as the like instruction in *Therapeutics*, or the scientific art of treating diseases, is to a physician or surgeon; and that a knowledge of mental philosophy is as essential to practical skill in the art of educating as a knowledge of anatomy and physiology is to practical skill in surgery and medicine.
- —That every sincere philanthropist will at once admit that a professional education is as necessary for the teachers of the poor as for those of the rich. No man in the present day would propound so absurd and heartless an opinion, as that systematic instruction in surgery, and a previous acquaintance with anatomy,

are necessary for the medical attendants of the nobility and gentry, but that a man without any such knowledge will do well enough for practising surgery upon the poor. Is it less heartless or less absurd to say, that he who trains the children of the rich needs an accurate scientific knowledge of the "intellectual and moral powers," on which he is to operate; but that such knowledge may be dispensed with in him who is to educate the children of the poor?

- —That the study of Pedeutics requires such previous training and attainments as can only be found among the students of a University. It presupposes an acquaintance with mental philosophy; that again presupposes a knowledge of logic; and that again, such a thorough appreciation of the nature and powers of language, as nothing but a sound classical education can give. Highly important, too, if not quite as essential, is an accurate knowledge of the fundamental principles of the different sciences by which the different sets of faculties are exercised.
- —That from these considerations it follows, that the only appropriate and effectual means of securing for our country those great benefits, for the sake of which the sagacious and practical mind of Dugald Stewart urged the construction and cultivation of such a science, is the foundation of a Professorship of Pedeutics in each of our Universities.
- —That a Scottish University is the place in which the first professorship of the kind ought to be founded, and that for the following reasons:—
 - Because students fully *prepared to profit* by a course of lectures on Pedeutics, are more numerous in the Scottish Universities than in any other, since mental philosophy is there studied by a larger number of persons, with greater attention, and in a more practical form.
 - Because persons, *whose interest it would be* to attend such lectures, are more numerous in the Scottish Universities than in any other, inasmuch as a very large proportion of their students resort to the occupation of teaching.
 - Because in a Scottish University such a course of lectures would *make its beneficial effects extensively felt and universally acknowledged* in a *much shorter time* than anywhere else. For, in Scotland, not only those who teach the children of the upper and middle classes, but also a large proportion of those who teach the children of the lowest, are men who have already received a University education.
- —That the intended Chairs of Pedeutics *will be to the Normal School what the Chair of Medicine and Surgery is to the Hospital*; the former will give a systematic and consecutive view of the *principles and rules* according to which education ought to be conducted; the latter will exhibit the *manner of applying* these rules and principles to the endless variety of individual cases that occur in practice. The proposed chairs, therefore, will not supersede or interfere with our Normal Schools, but will immensely increase their efficiency and usefulness.

May it therefore please the Universities' Commissioners to take the above premises into consideration; and in the exercise of the powers vested in them for extending and improving the Scottish Universities, to establish a Professorship of Pedeutics in each, or in such of them as to their wisdom may seem expedient.

Signed in name and by appointment of the Institute,

ROBERT BURTON, *President*.

GEO. FERGUSON, M.A., L.L.D., *Secretary*.

EDINBURGH,

May 14, 1859

Appendix—B.

UNIVERSITY OF EDINBURGH—BELL CHAIR OF EDUCATION. *Course of Lectures* by PROFESSOR LAURIE, M.A., F.R.S.E.

1.—The Theory or Science of Education.

THE END OF EDUCATION.

PHYSICAL CONDITIONS.

PSYCHOLOGY IN RELATION TO THE SCIENCE OF EDUCATION—

- The Intelligence.
 - Conclusions from the Intellectual Nature of Man with reference to his Education.
- Unfolding of Intelligence; or, Periods of Growth.
 - Conclusions from the Periods of Growth with reference to Education.

- The Ethical Nature of Man.
Conclusions from the Ethical Nature of Man, with reference to Education.
- Auxiliaries of the Processes and Growth of Mind.
Conclusions from Mental Growth with reference to Education.
The Science of Education as founded in the preceding Analysis.

2.—The Art of Education.

THE EDUCATIVE PROCESS IN GENERAL FROM THE ETHICAL POINT OF VIEW.

- The Real in the Educative Process—
With a View to Right Judgment.
The Real-Naturalistic with a view to the Elements of Right Judgment.
The Real-Humanistic with a view to the Elements of Right Judgment.
The Real in Education with a view to evoking the Ethical Sentiments.
- The Formal in the Educative Process.
Intellectual, Naturalistic, Humanistic.
Ethical; with a view to Habituation to Right and Good Action.

3.—Methodick.

- Methodick with a view to Instruction and Assimilation.
- Methodick with a view to Power of Judgment or Discrimination.
- Methodick with a view to Habituation to Right and Good Action.

4.—Methodology.

COLLECTION OF THE PRINCIPLES AND RULES OF METHOD IN INSTRUCTION.

- The Application of these Rules to Real Studies, viz.—
Intellectual, Naturalistic, Humanistic, and Ethical.
- The Application to Formal Studies—
Intellectual Habit.
Ethical Habit.
Motives and Punishments—
- Inner and Attractive.
- Outer and Coercive.
End of the Art of Education.

5.—Schools And The Teacher.

School Rooms, Furniture, Apparatus, Text Books, System of State Schools, Technical Schools, Girls' Schools. The Teacher and his Education.

6.—The History of Education.

Early Education, China, India, Persia; Greek and Roman Education; The Renaissance; Erasmus, Colet, Luther, Melancthon; Montaigne; Ascham, Sturm; Bacon and Realism; Ratke and Comenius; the Jesuits; Milton, Locke, Rousseau, Basedow, Campe; Pestalozzi, Jacotot; Bell, Lancaster; Froebel, Richter, Diesterweg; Arnold, Spencer, Bain. History of Education in Scotland; Primary Schools, Gymnasiums, and Real Schools in Germany.

Arrangements have been made whereby the following Schools may be visited with a view to the observation of school-organization and methods, viz.:—The Infant and Junior Departments of the

CHURCH OF SCOTLAND NORMAL SCHOOL, Johnstone Terrace.

FREE CHURCH OF SCOTLAND NORMAL SCHOOL, Moray House.

GEORGE WATSON'S COLLEGE SCHOOLS.

THE SCHOOL BOARD SCHOOLS, viz.:—West Fountainbridge, New Street, St. Leonard's, Leith Walk Dean, Causewayside, North Canongate.

Appendix—C.

UNIVERSITY OF ST. ANDREWS—BELL CHAIR OF EDUCATION.

Course of Lectures by PROFESSOR MEIKLEJOHN, M.A.

This Chair contemplates the instruction and training of teachers in the Science and Art of Teaching; and the

subject is divided into Three Parts:

- THE THEORY.—The *Psychology* of the growing mind—an attempt to estimate the mode, rate, and kind of growth by experiment; and an inquiry into the relation of various kinds of knowledge to the mind, and the influence of certain thoughts, emotions, and sets of circumstances upon the character. The growth of the senses, the memory, the understanding, the reason, the will, the imagination, the social emotions. The relation of the religious, moral, and intellectual sides of human nature to each other. The building up of a sound understanding, the formation of a just habit of action. The theories and writings of the best thinkers upon education.
- THE HISTORY.—History of the notions regarding education, the chief educational ideas of the East, of Greece and Rome, of the Jews, of Early, Medieval, and Reformed Christianity, of the Jesuits, and of the great men who have practised, or thought and written on, education. Bacon, Selden, Milton, Locke, Jean Paul, Goethe, Herbert Spencer; the educational ideas and processes of Comenius, Pestalozzi, Ratich, Jacotot, Diesterweg, Fröbel, &c.; the educational aims, beliefs, habits, and processes of the national systems which exist in Germany, France, England, and other countries.
- THE PRACTICE.—The processes employed in the schools of this country—the relation of these processes to the growth of the mind, and their value considered as means to ends—the teaching of languages—the difficulties, either inherent in the language or adherent to the circumstances under which it is taught. The difference of aim in teaching classical and modern languages, and the consequent difference in means. Science, especially the sciences of observation, and the necessary conditions under which these must be taught. The more usual school subjects—such as History, Geography, Grammar, English, Composition, &c. Text-books—the mental outfit of a Teacher, his aims, his practical ends, and the means to these; his difficulties, his rewards; the nature and limitations of his profession, its advantages.

Appendix—D.

COLLEGE OF PRECEPTORS—PROFESSORSHIP OF EDUCATION.

Course of Lectures and Lessons for Teachers on the Science,

Art, and History of Education. These lectures, founded in the year 1873, consist of three courses extending, with short intervals, over the year.

FIRST COURSE.

Course of ten lectures on Mental Science for Teachers, by James Sully, M.A., Examiner in Mental and Moral Science in the University of London.

- —Science of Mind and its bearing on Education—Three-fold division of Mind: Feeling, Knowing, and Willing—Laws of Mental Operation—Nervous conditions of Mental activity—Attention and Mental Life.
- —Development of Mind on the side of Feeling, of Knowing, and of Willing—Order of Development of Faculties—Native or original Capability—Principles of Heredity.
- —Sense-knowledge—Five Senses and muscular Sense—Discrimination of Sense-impressions—How the Child learns to refer Impressions to External Objects—Perception—Observation—On the training of the Observing Powers of Children—Kindergarten Exercises, &c.
- —Reproductive Imagination or Memory—Laws of Association—Attention and Repetition—Conditions of Memory—Varieties of Memory—Learning by Rote—Mnemonics.
- —Productive or Constructive Imagination—Imagination and Discovery—Inventiveness—Fancy—Play and its uses—Imaginative Literature.
- —Conception, or the formation of Concepts—Comparison—Abstraction and Generalization—Names—Resemblances—The Art of Questioning, and the Definition of Names.
- —Judgment and Reasoning—Analysis and Synthesis—Inductive and Deductive Reasoning—Cause—Applying rules to new cases—Exercise of Reasoning Power by Mathematics, Natural Science, &c.
- —Second Division of Mind, Feeling—Laws of Pleasure and Pain—Classification of the Emotions—Children's Feelings—On the cultivation of Emotion—Sympathy—Taste—The Moral and Religious Sentiment.
- —The active side of Mind, or Will—The beginnings of Action—Reflex and Instinctive Movement—Spontaneous Movement—Association, and the acquisition of new Actions—Imitation—Obedience—The Formation of Habits.
- —Higher stages of Will-growth—Development of Motives—Deliberation and Choice—Subordination of lower to higher Motive—Formation of Moral Habits—Character—Discipline and its uses.

SECOND COURSE—HISTORY OF EDUCATION.

Course of ten Lectures by Oscar Browning, M.A., Lecturer on the History of Education in the University of Cambridge.

The lecturer proposes to trace the growth of educational ideas and practices, and thus to contribute to the clear understanding of our present position of the principles already established. Attention will be directed chiefly to the great educational theorists and inventors of methods, who have lived since the revival of learning, and have had the greatest influence on practice.

- —Greek Education—Music and Gymnastics—Plato and Aristotle.
- —Roman Education—Oratory—Quintilian.
- —Education in the Middle Ages—Renaissance—Reformation—Humanistic Education—Sturm.
- —Realistic Education—Ratke—Comenius.
- —Naturalistic Education—Montaigne—Rabelais.
- —English Humanism, Ascham—English Realism, Milton.
- —English Naturalism—Locke.
- —The Jesuits and the Jansenists.
- —Rousseau.
- —Pestalozzi and Fröbel.

THIRD COURSE—PRACTICAL TEACHING.

By the Rev. Canon Daniel, M.A., Principal of the Training College, Battersea.

- —The Aims of Education.
- —The training of the Senses, Hand and Voice.
- The Art of Teaching.
- The Art of Teaching.
- —History.
- —Geography.
- —Arithmetic and Geometry.
- —Language.
- —Literature.
- —Discipline.

Appendix—E

FINSBURY TRAINING COLLEGE FOR SCHOOLMASTERS OF MIDDLE AND HIGHER SCHOOLS.

Opened 19th February, 1883.

This College has been established for the purpose of providing a sound, practical, and scientific training for those whose intention it is to become masters in middle and higher schools. The Council have obtained the City of London Middle Class School as a practising school. The course of study in the upper division of the College is of one year's duration, and is specially arranged to meet the requirements of the teachers' examination of the University of Cambridge and the London teachers' diploma. It includes practical work in school classes; the physiological basis of education, especially in relation to health and to the development of the mental faculties; the elements of mental and moral science in their application to the education of children; the history of education; and the examination and criticism of various methods of teaching school subjects. Technical lectures on school management, organization, apparatus, &c., are provided. The students spend some hours every day, during the course, in teaching or observing lessons given in the practising school, under the constant supervision of the Principal. A lower course is organised for students under eighteen.

The Council includes among others the following gentlemen:—Rev. Dr. Butler, head-master of Harrow School; Rev. G. C. Bell, M.A., head-master of Marlborough College; Rev. W. Haig Brown, L.L.D., head-master of Charterhouse; Oscar Browning, Esq., senior fellow of King's College, Cambridge; The Very Rev. the Dean of Westminster; H. W. Eve, Esq., M.A., head-master of University College School, London; J. G. Fitch, Esq., H.M.I.S.; Rev. F. B. Guy, D.D., head-master of Forest School, Walthamstow; Rev. T. W. Jex-Blake, D.D., head-master of Rugby; Rev. Brooke Lambert, vicar of Greenwich; Samuel Morley, Esq., M.P.; Frederick Pennington, Esq., M.P.; Rev. Canon Percival, D.C.L., president of Trinity College, Oxford; Rev. G. Ridding, D.D., head-master of Winchester College; Rev. T. W. Sharpe, H.M. Inspector of Training Colleges; Henry Sidgwick, Esq., Trinity College, Cambridge; F. Storr, Esq., chief-master of Modern Subjects, Merchant Taylors' School; Rev. E. Thring, M.A., head-master of Uppingham School; Rev. J. M. Wilson, M.A., head-master of Clifton College; R. Wormell, Esq., D.Sc., head-master of Middle Class Schools, Cowper Street,

E.C.

Further information may be obtained on application to the Principal—H. Courthope Bowen, Esq., M.A., The Schools, Cowper Street, City Road, London.

Appendix—F.

UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE.

REGULATION FOR EXAMINATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES IN THEORY, HISTORY, AND PRACTICE OF TEACHING.

Candidates must be (1) Graduates, or (2) have passed the Higher Local Examination, or (3) have matriculated at the University of London, or (4) have passed the L.A. Examination.

The subjects of examination are—

- —Theory of Education: (a) The scientific basis of the Art of Education, viz.:—Characteristics of childhood and youth; order of development and laws of growth and operation of mental faculties; natural order of the acquisition of knowledge; development of the will; formation of habits and of character; sympathy and its effects. (b) Elements of the Art of Education, viz.:—Training the senses, memory, imagination, and taste; the powers of judging and reasoning; training the desires and will; discipline and authority; emulation, its use and abuse, rewards and punishments.
- —History of Education: (a) General knowledge of systems, work of eminent teachers, and theories of writers on education. (b) Detailed knowledge of special subjects selected yearly—those for 1883 and 1884 being Milton's Tractate on Education, the Life and Work of Pestalozzi, and the Life and Work of Froebel.
- —Practice of Education: (a) Method—Order and correlation of studies, oral teaching, exposition, text-books, note-books, questioning, examining, special methods for various subjects, (b) School Management—Structure, furniture, and fitting of school-rooms; books and apparatus; visible and tangible illustrations; classification, time-tables, registration, warming, ventilation, and hygiene, &c., &c.

A special paper will also be set containing a small number of questions of an advanced character on each of the above three subjects.

- —The Syndicate will further award certificates of practical efficiency in teaching to candidates who have already obtained a certificate of theoretical efficiency, and have been engaged in school work for a year in some school or schools recognised for this purpose by the Syndicate. The bases of the certificate will be:
 - Examination of the class taught by the candidate.
 - An inspection of the class while being taught.
 - Questions put to the teacher in private after the inspection.
 - A report made by the Head Master or Mistress.

A fee of £2 10s. shall be paid by each candidate. Application should be made to Mr. Oscar Browning, M.A., Kings College, Cambridge.

Appendix—G.

UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,

EXAMINATION FOR DIPLOMAS IN THE ART, THEORY, AND HISTORY, OF TEACHING.

No candidate shall be admitted to this examination unless he shall have previously graduated in the University, nor unless he have paid a fee of £5.

Candidates shall be examined in the following subjects:—

I.—Mental and Mural Science in their relation to the Work of Teaching.

Observation, and the Training of the Senses—Association: Memory—Reasoning—Imagination—The Will, and how to Train it—Habit and Character—Authority and Discipline—Rewards and Punishments—The Conduct of the Understanding.

II.—Methods of Teaching and School Management.

The Structure Fitting, and Furniture of School Buildings—Sanitary conditions of Effective Teaching—Physical Exercises, Drill, and Recreation—Books and Apparatus—Registration of Attendance and Progress—Organization of Schools—Classification of Scholars—Distribution of Duty among Assistants—Apportionment of Time—The Co-ordination and Division of Studies—Examination, *Viva voce* and in Writing—The use of Oral Lessons and of Book Work—Methods of Teaching and of Illustrating each of the Subjects included in an ordinary School Course—Preparation of Teaching Notes—Tests and Records of Results.

III.—The History of Education; the Lives and Works of Eminent Teachers; and the Systems of

Instruction adopted in Foreign Countries.

In addition to a good general knowledge of the History of Education, special books and subjects will be announced from year to year. The special subjects for 1883 will be:—

Roger Ascham—The Schoolmaster.

Locke—On the Conduct of the Understanding.

Arnold—Higher Schools and Universities in German.

IV.—Practical Skill in Teaching.

The examination shall be both written and practical, and shall extend over three days. Candidates shall not be approved by the Examiners unless they have shown a competent knowledge in all the subjects of examination, and have given satisfactory evidence of practical skill in teaching. A certificate, to be called the "Teachers Diploma," under the Seal of the University, and signed by the Chancellor, shall be delivered at the public presentation for degrees to each candidate who has passed. Application should be made to the Registrar, University of London, Burlington Gardens, London.

Appendix—H.

COLLEGE OF PRECEPTORS.

REGULATIONS FOR EXAMINATIONS OF TEACHERS FOR DIPLOMAS.

The Diplomas are of three grades: ASSOCIATE, LICENTIATE, and FELLOW, for which candidates must have taught at least one, two, and five years respectively. The fee is one, three, or six guineas.

Candidates who are not graduates of a British University must be examined in certain general and some selected special subjects, and all must be examined in the following subjects:—

Theory and Practice of Education.

- Mental and Moral Science: Mind, Intellect, Association, Abstraction, Generalization, the Will and Voluntary Power, Control of Feelings and Thoughts, the Emotions, Habit.
- Physiology with reference to the Laws of Health and Physical and Mental Education.
- Logic and its application to Education.
- Government of a School, including Lesson-giving and Criticism of Methods; School Organization in all its departments.
- History of Education and Educational Methods; distinguished Educators, English and Foreign; Methods and Organization of Schools and Colleges of note at home and abroad.

Application should be made to the Secretary, C. R. Hodgson, B.A., 42 Queen Square, Bloomsbury, London.

Appendix—K.

EDUCATION DEPARTMENT, WHITEHALL.

EXAMINATIONS FOR CERTIFICATES AT TRAINING COLLEGES, 1882.

SCHOOL MANAGEMENT—SECOND YEAR.

Three Hours allowed for this Paper.

- —What do you understand exactly by the organisation of a school? Describe in full the organisation of the best school you have ever seen.
- —Describe the best arrangements you have seen in action for securing proper ventilation in a school. What expedients would you employ in a school in which these arrangements did not exist? Write full notes of a lesson on fresh air, and the best way of securing it.
- —Explain the processes of hearing and of seeing; and say by what sort of school exercise the eye and the ear may be trained. Distinguish between *sense*, *sensation*, *sensibility*, and *sensitiveness*.
- —What have you learned about the mental laws and processes concerned in the act of remembering? Distinguish between those school lessons which ought, and those which ought not, to be committed to memory; and give your reasons.
- —In the study of arithmetic, what kind of mental power is specially called into exercise? Give an example of the mode in which you would teach some arithmetical rule, with a view rather to the intellectual training of the learner than to the attainment of a correct answer to a sum.
- —What do you mean by the "converse" of a proposition? Give some examples. Say whether there are any cases in which the converse of a proposition is necessarily true.
- —In recent official instructions, examiners are counselled to ask children rather for the meaning of short sentences and phrases than for definitions or synonyms of single words. Why is this caution necessary? Give some examples of what is meant, and mention some exceptional cases (if any) in which it is useful

- and right to require formal definitions of separate words.
- —Analyse the faculty called attention; and show to what extent it is, or is not, dependent on the will. Specify the sort of lessons or other expedients by which the habit of fixed attention can best be formed and strengthened.
- —What is meant by "Induction?" Sketch out a lesson by which the inductive method is employed, taking *one* of these subjects:—
 - Passive Verbs.
 - The properties of water.
 - Climate.
- —What part of the moral character of a child is specially within the range of a teacher's influence? Mention any means, other than direct lessons, by which you hope to aid in the formation of right principles and habits among your scholars.
- —"One may be a poet without versing; and a versifier without poetry."—Sir Philip Sydney. Suppose, in giving an "English" lesson to your highest class, you wished to make the meaning of this sentence clear, what examples and explanations would you give?
- —Sketch out a list of suitable subjects for lessons in elementary science, in the lower Standards of a school in which it is intended to take up either Mechanics or Animal Physiology as a specific subject in Standard V.

Appendix L.

ADDITIONS BY REV. DR. BRYCE, BELFAST.

The historical portion of this pamphlet, having been read at Educational meetings, has attracted the attention of the Rev. Dr. R. J. Bryce of Belfast. In a letter which appeared in the *Educational News* of the 24th March, he gives some most interesting notes of his share in the early attempts to found Chairs of Education in the Scottish and Irish Universities. With his kind permission, the greater portion of the letter is here reproduced.

"In 1828," he says, "I published a pamphlet,

Sketch of a Plan for a System of National Education for Ireland; including Hints for the Improvement of Education in Scotland. By R. J. Bryce, A.M., Principal of the Belfast Academy. 128.

in one section of which I advocated at length the view, so eloquently set forth by Dugald Stewart and his successor, that education ought to be reduced to a science founded on the philosophy of the mind, and urged that Chairs should be established in the Universities to teach it. The work of my friend, Professor Pillans, to which Mr. Ross referred, and which advocates the same view more briefly, was published at the same time, neither of us being aware that the other was writing on the subject. This coincidence of view led to more frequent communication between us personally and by letter, which ripened our acquaintance into intimacy. My pamphlet was sent by a common friend to the late Lord Brougham (then Mr. Brougham), whose warm and generous praise of it induced me to call on him the next time I was in London (1830). I found that he had been thinking long and earnestly on the subject, and had gone into it far more profoundly than any man I had ever spoken to. In fact, he was the only statesman I ever conversed with, except one (to be mentioned immediately), who really understood what education is.

"About the same time another friend, Mr. James Emerson (afterwards Sir J. Emerson Tennant), to whom I had given a copy of my pamphlet when published, wrote me that he had shown it to Mr. Wyse, M.P. for Tipperary, who was preparing a bill to establish a system of national education for Ireland, and who earnestly desired my remarks, and would send me the bill when printed. He did so; I criticised it freely; and the correspondence soon led to an intimate friendship. Before Mr. Wyse could get his bill through the House of Commons, Mr. Stanley (afterwards Earl of Derby), then Chief Secretary for Ireland, established, by an Act of the Executive, without waiting or asking for the consent of Parliament, the so-called 'Irish National System of Education,' and Mr. Wyse dropped his bill.

"An essential part of my scheme was the establishment of two or three new Universities in Ireland, each of which should have a Chair of Education. (In that portion of the pamphlet which dealt with education in Scotland, I proposed the establishment of Education Chairs in all the Scotch Universities, and that a ticket for that class should be required for the degree of M.A.) Mr. Wyse cordially and enthusiastically adopted this idea, and persistently advocated it in Parliament for more than twelve years; and in every speech he made on the subject, honourably acknowledged the source from which he derived his ideas—a rare thing for statesmen to do. During all this time he and I were in constant communication, and working together for our common object. At length the late Sir Robert Peel, to escape out of a political difficulty in which he was placed by the pressure brought to bear on him by two hostile sects (each of which wanted money for a college to suit its own views), established, not the three Universities we wanted, but three provincial colleges, without the power of granting degrees, and without Professorships of Education. The fact is, Peel was not looking to the interests of education

at all. His one object was to satisfy, as cheaply as he could, the Presbyterian and Roman Catholic clergy. The whole scheme of education in the colleges was arranged with all the absurdity that might have been expected from the 'meddling and muddling' of people who undertook a business which they did not understand. Afterwards the three colleges were bound together by an examining board (absurdly called a University), and thus their students were enabled to obtain degrees.

"Had Mr. Wyse remained in Parliament, something might probably have been done for Education Chairs; but soon afterwards he was sent out to Greece as British Ambassador, and there was no one to take up his mantle."

Education as a University Subject.

Appendix L.

Programme, of Course in Training Colleges.

FOR the sake of comparison with the Course of Lectures detailed in Appendices B, C, and D, a statement is here given of the professional course of study in Training Colleges under the New Syllabus of the Education Department. The course annexed is that given in the Glasgow Church of Scotland Training College during the sessions 1882 and 1883; but similar courses are given in all the Training Colleges in England and Scotland. The course extends over two sessions of nine months each.

- —PRACTICE OF EDUCATION.—The Students spend two hours per week in the Normal Practising Schools, teaching classes under the direction of the Master of Method, listening to and reporting on Model Lessons by the same Master, and criticising under his guidance, or that of the Principal, prepared lessons given by their fellows.
- —INSTRUCTION IN SCHOOL MANAGEMENT.—One hour per week is devoted to oral instruction in this subject, given partly by aid of a text-book (Fitch's *Lectures on Education*). Care is taken to connect this instruction with the practical work noted above.
- —PRINCIPLES OF EDUCATION AS A SCIENCE.—A course of Forty Lectures, on Logic, Psychology, and Ethics as applied in Education. The subjects are treated nearly in the manner and order shown in Appendices F and G, which see. In addition to the lectures the treatise of some authority in education is studied, explained, and criticised. In this way the following works have been read, Locke's *Thoughts on Education* (1881), Herbert Spencer's *Education, Moral, Physical, and Intellectual* (1882), and Professor Bain's *Education as a Science* (1883).
- —HISTORY OF EDUCATION.—A course of Twenty Lectures on Modern Education; Ascham, the Jesuits, Comenius, Milton, Locke (3 lectures), Rousseau, Pestalozzi (3 lectures), Jacotot, Bell, Lancaster, Fröbel (3 lectures), Arnold, Stow (2 lectures).

All the lectures are reproduced by the students, and carefully examined and corrected. Test examinations are held quarterly, and oral examination is frequent. The lectures are fully illustrated in a way which is as yet possible only in Training Colleges.

A specimen of the Examination Paper set by the Education Department will be found in Appendix K.

First Annual Report Of the Otago Society

For the PREVENTION OF CRUELTY To Animals.

"Fleber blend our pleasure or our pride with sorrow of the meanest thing that feels"

Office - 60 Fringes Steet, Dunedin.

The Committee earnestly request that this Report may not be destroyed, but circulated as much as possible, so that the work of the Society may become better known.

Dunedin Printed at the "Otago Daily Times" Office, High Street MDCCCLXXXIII

Officers of the Otago Society,

For The Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

1883-84.

President's HIS HONOUR MR. Justice Williams.

Vice-Presidents: THE HON. Thomas Dick. MR. E. B. Cargill.

Committee: MR. S. Barker MR. James Barr MR. H. Benjamin MR. G. P. Clifford MR. R. Ewing MR. G. Fenwick MR. R. Glendining MR. T. S. Graham MR. J. W. Jago REV. B. Lichtenstein REV. J. Niven MR. E. Quick MR. Keith Ramsay MR. W. H. Taggart MR. J. A. Torrance MR. R. Wilson.

Honorary Solicitors: MR. A. Bathgate MR. F. R. Chapman

MR. R. Stout MR. D. Stuart

HONORARY VETERINARY SURGEONS: MR. J. G. Douglas. MR. S. Durham, M.R.C.V.S.L

Hon. Treasurer: MR. Robert Wilson
Hon. Secretary: E. Quick, 60 PRINCES STREET.
Inspector and Collector: MR. R. T. Aitken.

Extracts From the Rules.

2.—The objects of the Society shall be to prevent cruelty to animals by enforcing, where practicable, the existing laws, by procuring such further legislation as may be found expedient, by exciting and sustaining an intelligent public opinion regarding man's duty to animals, and by all such further and other ways and means as the General Committee may deem expedient.

3.—The Society shall consist of all persons who shall contribute to its funds an annual sum of not less than five shillings; of life members who shall pay a sum of not less than five pounds; and of honorary members elected by the General Committee from amongst persons who have evinced marked sympathy for the cause at home or abroad.

4.—Children under the age of sixteen shall be admitted as associates of the Society, on the payment of one shilling annually.

11.—The Secretary shall call a general meeting of members at the request of the Committee, or on the written request of twenty members.

Otago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals.

First Annual Report of the General Committee

On the 26th June, 1882, at a public meeting convened by Messrs. G. Fenwick and H. Houghton, a resolution was passed affirming the desirability of forming a Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals, and a Provisional Committee was formed to carry out that object.

This Provisional Committee reported to an adjourned meeting on the 13th July, when the Society was organised, and rules were adopted, and a General Committee was appointed.

The Committee advertised for a suitable person to act as inspector and collector, and out of a number of applicants, several of whom appeared to be well fitted for the office, selected Mr. Robert Thomson Aitken, who had been in the employ of a similar Society in Glasgow. Mr. Aitken entered on his duties on the 1st October, and was subsequently, at the request of the Committee, sworn in as a constable, thus having the same status and power to deal with offenders as a policeman. Mr. Aitken has shown himself zealous and intelligent in the discharge of his duties, and has given perfect satisfaction to the Committee. His time has been wholly devoted to the work of the Society, principally in Dunedin and suburbs; but he has also visited Waikouaiti, Milton, Mosgiel, Toiro (near Clinton), &c.

Knowing that cruelty is often the result of ignorance and stupidity, the Committee instructed the inspector not to prosecute at first except in flagrant cases or where his remonstrance was disregarded, and consequently he only prosecuted in seven cases, and in each case obtained a conviction. Ninety-six cautions were administered to various persons for illtreatment of horses and other animals, with, it is believed, very good effect. Four horses unfit for work were destroyed at the request of the inspector. During the same time four cases of cruelty have been prosecuted by the police, who have acted most harmoniously with your Society.

At the suggestion of Mr. Slesinger, V.S., notice has been given to farriers to discontinue the cruel practice of burning horses' mouths for lampas.

In one case where a horse died, as it was suspected, from overdriving, the driver absconded, apparently from fear of prosecution, but the fact that the matter was taken up by the Society will probably cause others to be more careful.

The thanks of the Society are due to Messrs. A. Bathgate, F. R. Chapman, and R. Stout, your honorary solicitors, for their ready and gratuitous services in advising the inspector and conducting prosecutions; to Messrs. Douglas, Durham, Farquharson, and Slesinger, your honorary veterinary surgeons, who have given much valuable information, and also to Mr. Weldon and the Police Department generally for their most ready assistance and advice.

The income of the Society for the past year has been £159 6s., and the expenditure £116 16s. 6d., leaving a balance of £42 9s. 6d., but from this the cost of printing and circulating this report will have to be deducted.

The present number of members is 317, and the Committee earnestly hope that very many more will be

induced to join as the Society becomes better known. From a desire to interest children in the work, special provision was made for their admission as associates on payment of one shilling, but up to the present time none have availed themselves of the opportunity. This is much to be regretted, and also that so few ladies have joined the Society. In England it is not so; there the majority of the subscribers appear to be women. The Committee, however, admit that they have not brought the subject very prominently forward, and recommend it to the careful consideration of their successors, feeling sure that such a work of kindness—so essentially woman's work—only requires to be placed before ladies to ensure their sympathy and support. In reply to a letter written to the Education Board of Otago, asking for its countenance in bringing the objects of the Society before the children attending the State schools, an answer was received expressing the sympathy of the Board with the objects of the Society, and its hope that the teachers will forward those objects by all means in their power. This also will require the attention of the incoming Committee.

Overtures have been made to several municipalities with a view to the establishment of branch societies, but the only satisfactory reply yet received has been from Gore.

Since this Report was adopted a favourable reply has also been received from Palmerston.

As the Committee's year of office had nearly expired, this also was allowed to stand over for the decision of their successors.

During the present year a much larger expense must be incurred for printing if the Society is to take its proper position as a factor in the education of the people. To do this adequately a much larger income will be necessary, and the Committee most earnestly seek the sympathy and assistance of all lovers of animals—of all, indeed, who have any feeling for their poor dumb fellow creatures.

Summary of Cases Dealt With to 30th June, 1883.

7 persons were prosecuted, convicted, and fined for cruelty to horses.

4 Horses unfit for work were killed at the request of the Inspector.

96 persons were cautioned for various offences as under:

By the request of the Inspector, tar or paint is now used at the Burnside Sale Yards for identification.

Otago Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals,

Year ending 30th June, 1883.

Receipts. £ s. d. To Subscriptions as per list 159 6 0 £159 6 0 Expenditure. £ s. d. By Salary, Inspector and Collector, from 1st October, 1882 97 10 0 " Printing and Advertising ... 10 9 0 " Stationery and Petties 6 17 6 " Fidelity Guarantee 2 0 0 " Balance in Bank ... 38 7 6 , Cash 4 2 0 42 9 6 £159 6 0
Robert Wilson, Hon. Treasurer. Audited and found correct, July 7, 1883. William Brown.

Report of First Annual Meeting.

The first Annual Meeting of the Otago Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Animals was held in the City Council Chamber on Friday, the 27th July, 1883, and the attendance was both large and influential. About 50 gentlemen and some half-dozen ladies were present, and His Honor Mr. Justice Williams (President of the Society) occupied the chair.

Annual Report.

The President called upon the Hon. Secretary (Mr. E. Quick) to read the Report and Balance-sheet as printed in preceding pages.

The PRESIDENT: I think, ladies and gentlemen, that you will agree with me that the Report shows the Society to have done some good in a quiet way at a very moderate expenditure. What the Society asks from the public is a comparatively small amount of money; but what it really wants is more precious than money—viz., sympathy and active assistance in securing its objects. I will now call upon Bishop Nevill to move the adoption

of the Report.

Bishop NEVILL said: Your Honor, ladies and gentlemen, although I have consented to move the adoption of the Report just read, I must say that I wish this Society could, within the shortest possible time, "execute the happy despatch," or in some way get rid of its own existence. I do not say this in any disparagement of its work, which, alas! is too evidently needed; but because it does seem to me to be a blot upon our civilisation that there should be in this nineteenth century any necessity for the existence of a society for the prevention of cruelty to animals.—(Applause). I therefore only hope that the time will shortly arrive when such a Society will not exist. But unhappily it is proved by the work of last year that this time has not yet arrived, and we have therefore to support an instrument such as this, which states as its object the putting it out of any man's power to be guilty of any offence so disgraceful to humanity as cruelty to animals. This can be done in two ways. There is such a thing as prevention by coercion, and there is also prevention by the spread of educational influences. As shown in the admirable Report we have heard, prevention by coercion has on some few occasions been resorted to, but I am also very glad to perceive that the other point has not been lost sight of by this Committee, who have shown a desire to operate rather in the direction of educational influences than to exercise those powers conferred upon them for the punishment of wrongdoers. It is more to the former part of the subject that I wish to address myself just now. It is too evident by the very circumstances that caused this Society to exist that man does possess a power over the inferior animals—as it is the habit to call them, although physically they may be superior to himself. This, so far at least, is a verification of the Divine revelation told us as the charter of our existence—that man should have authority over the beasts of the field and all other creatures proceeding, like himself, from the Creator of all things. It needs no words to illustrate that for good or evil man does possess this power. But it is desirable to observe that though this charter of dominion gives us some right and authority to use these creatures, there is the clearest distinction between dominion and tyranny. But although it is a wonderful thing this triumph of mind over matter—how intellect will in the long run rise superior to bone, muscle, and tissue—yet some of us are not sufficiently educated to perceive the distinction between the right to use and the right to tyrannise over. One of the offices that might well be performed by this valuable Society is the dissemination of this knowledge, among the young especially, and I have heard with pleasure that it is their intention to move in this direction. But to advance further, not only is there the clearest possible distinction between these things, but the Creator, in placing these powerful animals under our authority, had a higher purpose than a merely utilitarian one in view. He placed them under our authority, not merely to be used to serve our often merely selfish needs, but for the education and discipline of man himself. This is the point, it seems to me, which should influence the Society, and if they will follow out such a meaning as this their influence will be strongly felt by the population by which we are surrounded. Opportunities may be made use of to disseminate such thoughts as these—that the object of the Creator in placing these creatures under us as the noblest work of His hands upon this earth, was at least not merely utilitarian; but that we, by using his power aright, may learn to be like Himself who made us, and who is far more widely removed from us than we from them, and learn to behave towards them as He in His wonderful kindness deals with us. If such thoughts found place in our minds, how impossible it would be for us to abuse the authority our all-wise Creator has given us. It is with the greatest pleasure I see that the Committee have already set on foot a method for introducing this knowledge to the children in the National schools throughout this country. While I hope the teachers will take the opportunity of speaking to their children in such terms as this, it is even still more the function of the teachers of religion to disseminate such principles. I rejoice in the fact that an opportunity has lately been given them of gaining access to the children for the purpose of giving religious instruction, and such subjects as this will naturally come in their way. Surely that Volume from which all ministers must draw their inspiration makes this matter clear. Have we not evidence of authority yet to be bestowed upon men in addition to this? We read "What! know ye not ye shall judge angels?" Here is an advance in power and authority, and can we conceive any human being having such power given him who has misused that authority here bestowed upon him over the lower animals—who had ill-treated the mute and patient horse, always ready to labour and do that which it has been trained to with an endurance that is wonderful? Can we conceive such as this in one of those upon whom such superb dignity and authority shall be conferred? Are there not glimpses of the paradise we may attain to when we see that all is beautiful around us? But then we see, also, the one being who has rendered himself imperfect, abusing his powers to the injury of all those other creatures placed under his dominion. Such thoughts bring us a feeling of weariness and disgust, and lead us to long for that state illustrated by the bear, the ox, and the lion—all harmlessly existing together and a little child leading them—not merely living with them, but exercising that authority which God intended. And its exercise by a little child shows us that it is to be the authority not of tyranny or physical power, but the authority of love. In all this there are glimpses of God's intentions. The relations between all the creatures of His hand are indicated, and it is shown that whilst we may use them here below they are not insignificant, but may, for all we know, find their place in the paradise of God. If this finds a place in our minds it will be impossible for us to ill-treat God's creatures

whilst here passing through what is a period of probation to ourselves.—(Applause.)

The MAYOR (Mr. J. B. Thomson) had much pleasure in seconding the adoption of the report. He felt considerable satisfaction in the establishment of such a society in our midst. Its existence, and the knowledge that it had an officer going about for the prevention of anything in the shape of cruelty, was to a very great extent a preventive in itself. There were things in the report and balance-sheet worthy of notice. There had seldom been a society established for a philanthropic purpose such as this, undertaking its work voluntarily, which could at the end of its first year not only say that it had existed and done its work, but also that it possessed a credit balance.

The report was unanimously adopted.

Complimentary.

Mr. G. FENWICK said: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, it has been, no doubt, observed in the report that special mention is made of the thanks due to those gentlemen of the legal profession who by their advice have aided us both at committee meetings and when actions for cruelty have been brought before the Court; also to the veterinary surgeons of the city, who have each and all come forward and given us their very valuable advice at our meetings, and have shown anxiety that the work of the Society should be carried on successfully. So far as both these branches of special knowledge are concerned, we have received great benefit from the gentlemen engaged in them, and our thanks are certainly due. I do not know that it is necessary for me to say anything more upon this head, as the report will sufficiently commend itself to your notice. I may, however, digress for a moment to express the gratification I feel as one of the promoters of the Society that it is able at the end of its first year to appear in such a creditable position. Our difficulties have not been small, nevertheless. The Mayor remarks that we come forward with a credit balance. True; but this satisfactory position has not been attained without much hard work and anxiety. A very great deal of work was necessary in getting together sufficient funds to pay our collector and inspector—who, I may remark, is a most worthy and suitable officer—(hear),—probably the very best that could have been selected for the post, although we had a great many to choose from. He has gone to work entirely to the satisfaction of the Committee—in the wisest manner—exercising no arbitrary interference, but administering cautions where good might be so done, and only in the most flagrant cases has it been found necessary to proceed to extremities. When that has been done, I am happy to say, convictions have been obtained in every instance. I would now strongly appeal to all present to continue their subscriptions to the Society, and if possible to double them, because during the coming year we shall of necessity have to bear many expenses that have been avoided in the past if the affairs of the Society are to be carried on vigorously and successfully. It is true the times are dull, but still the little each one is able to give will amount in all to a large sum, and will enable us to carry on much very necessary work which otherwise we might not feel justified in doing. I will not trespass further on the time of the meeting, and will now move that a hearty vote of thanks be accorded the honorary officers of the Society for their advice and assistance during the past year.

Mr. H. BENJAMIN seconded the resolution, which was carried unanimously.

Election of Officers.

DR. COUGHTREY moved:—" That the Hon. Officers and Committee be re-elected as follows:—President, His Honor Mr. Justice Williams; Vice-Presidents, Hon. T. Dick and Mr. E. B. Cargill; Committee, Messrs. R. Wilson, R. Glendining, George Fenwick, T. S. Graham, R. Ewing, E. E. C. Quick, S. Barker, H. Benjamin, G. P. Clifford, J. W. Jago, J. A. Torrance, Keith Ramsay, W. H. Taggart, James Barr, Rev. J. Niven, and Rev. B. Lichtenstein; Hon. Solicitors, Messrs. R. Stout, A. Bathgate, and F. R. Chapman (Mr. Donald M. Stuart's name was added, on the motion of the Secretary); Hon. Veterinary Surgeons, Messrs. S. Slesinger, J. G. Douglas, R. C. Farquharson, and S. Durham; Hon. Treasurer, Mr. Robert Wilson; Hon. Secretary, Mr. E. Quick. These gentlemen had voluntarily given their services, and had exercised such a wise moderation in the past year that they might well be elected for the ensuing one. That point of wise moderation was one which should not be lost sight of, and the speaker enumerated the numerous instances during the last year in which persons had been cautioned, &c., by the Officer of the Society.

Mr. GOURLEY seconded the motion, which was unanimously carried.

The SECRETARY (Mr. E. Quick) took the opportunity of remarking that although the Society had a credit balance to show at this their first Annual Meeting, their expenses only commenced nine months ago, and that more money would be needed to meet next year's demands. He acknowledged with thanks the receipt of letters indicating supposed cases of cruelty, but deprecated the fact of many of them being anonymous. The Committee would treat the names of their correspondents as in confidence, and had no wish to thrust unpleasant

duties upon them when it was not desired.

The PRESIDENT intimated that the business was now concluded. He hoped that next year the Committee would be able to give as favourable an account of their stewardship as those present would agree they had done that evening. The proper exercise of the functions of the Society required considerable care and discretion at the hands of its officers. As Dr. Coughtrey had said, what was most needed was a wise moderation, in not interfering save where absolutely necessary. If they wished to gain the confidence of the public, they would respect the feelings and prejudices of an Englishman which led him to object to unnecessary interference with his private affairs.

The Meeting then closed with a vote of thanks to the President.

Annual Subscription,

For Year ending 30th June, 1883.

Vaccination Small-Pox

Being A Popular Account of Jenner's Great Discovery And A Plea For Its More Efficient Performance.

by WM. M. Stenhouse, M.D.

(UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW).

Salus Populi Suprema Lex.

"If Vaccine were the only discovery of the epoch, it would serve to render it illustrious for ever; yet it knocked twenty times in vain at the doors of the Academies."—CUVIER.

Dunedin Alexander Sligo, Bookseller, George Street. MDCCCLXXXIII

Certificate

I, the undersigned, being authorised by the Privy Council to give to persons whom I have instructed in the practice and principles of Vaccination, such certificates of proficiency as shall qualify them, if otherwise eligible, to be contracted with by Guardians and Overseers for the performance of Public Vaccination, do hereby certify that Mr. W. M. Stenhouse has under my direction, at my appointed Vaccinating Station, duly studied the practice and principles of Vaccination; and that I having from time to time enquired as to his progress therein, do now believe him to be skilful and well-informed in all that belongs to the duties of a Public Vaccinator

(Signed) Hugh Thomson.

Dated at Glasgow this 21st day of September, 1874.

Vaccination Small-Pox

Being A Popular Account of Jenner's Great Discovery and a Plea for its More Efficient Performance.

by WM. M. STENHOUSE, M.D.

(UNIVERSITY OF GLASGOW).

Salus Populi Suprema Lex.

"If Vaccine were the only discovery of the epoch, it would serve to render it illustrious for ever; yet it knocked twenty times in vain at the doors of the Academies."—CUVIER.

Dunedin: Alexander Sligo, Bookseller, George Street. MDCCCLXXXIII

Preface.

Three or four years ago, when vaccination was being vigorously discussed in the Home Country by both lay and medical journals, and a great cry was raised for the introduction of animal lymph, as preferable to the humanised lymph till then exclusively used in Great Britain, it seemed to us that the subject was not unworthy of the attention of practitioners in New Zealand. Accordingly a supply of pure calf lymph was furnished us from home; and, after a careful study of the whole question, our views were embodied in a paper read before the August meeting, 1879, of the New Zealand Medical Association, which paper was almost identical with the present work. Since then the outbreak of small-pox in Sydney has attracted universal attention throughout New Zealand, and given to the subject a gravity and importance which it would be impolitic to ignore.

This has, therefore, appeared to us a favourable moment for educating public opinion in favour of vaccination, which after all is a mother's question, rather than a medical or state one; for, however unanimous medical opinion may be in its favour, or however strict legislation may be in its enforcement, the nation will never reap the full benefits thereof until mothers give an intelligent assent to the operation. To awaken the interest and excite the confidence of parents in cow-pox inoculation is therefore the object of this little work, which, if it succeeds in its mission will, we take it, be of some slight service to the cause of humanity.

We flatter ourselves also that some of its pages may be found useful to our fellow practitioners, who may not have given the subject the same thoughtful consideration as ourselves; and that some of its suggestions may be thought worthy of adoption when next the Government of New Zealand legislates in this direction.

Wm. M. Stenhouse, M.D.

MORAY PLACE, DUNEDIN,

Sept. 1, 1881.

Vaccination and Small-Pox

There is nothing new under the sun, we are told on the highest authority, and the modern discovery of vaccination gives countenance to the proverb; for though popularly supposed to have originated with Dr. Jenner, in the end of the 18th century, it is now known to have been understood and practised in the earliest ages by the natives of India and Persia, and other countries of the East. Not only so, but Humboldt found during his researches in South America, that there prevailed among the inhabitants the belief that the eruption on the udder of the cow preserved them from small-pox. This in no way, however, detracts from the merit of Dr. Jenner's discovery, which was arrived at without any knowledge on his part of its early history, and was the fruit of acute and accurate observation, patient investigation, careful experiment, and brilliant deduction. By this discovery Dr. Jenner immediately became the foremost benefactor of his age, and indeed we question if any single discovery ever conferred such a blessing on suffering humanity. His own generation, which had too often witnessed the ravages of small-pox, gave him his full meed of praise, and if we are less sensible at the present day of the benefits of vaccination, this is the strongest proof that could be adduced in its favour, as our indifference arises chiefly from the circumstance that few of us have ever seen, much less suffered from this dreadful disease. As, however, a knot of ignorant and presumptuous busybodies has of late attempted to destroy public faith in vaccination, and so far succeeded in evasion of the vaccination laws as to have made small pox endemic in London, we think we shall be doing the State some service by narrating in popular form the story of vaccination, proving its successes, and refuting alleged objections to the practice. We do this all the more readily from our knowledge that vaccination is constantly evaded in New Zealand, and very often imperfectly performed, so that should small-pox ever get footing amongst us, its effects would undoubtedly be most severe.

In order to convey to our readers some adequate notion of the ravages committed by small-pox before the era of vaccination, we may be permitted a quotation from the late Lord Macaulay's history. This historian describes it as "the most terrible of all the ministers of death. The havoc of the plague had been far more rapid; but the plague had visited our shores only once or twice within living memory, but the small-pox was always present, filling the churchyards with corpses, leaving on those whose lives it spared the hideous traces of its power, turning the babe into a changeling at which the mother shuddered, and making the eyes and cheeks of the betrothed maiden objects of horror to the lover."

The asylums, workhouses, and hospitals of Great Britain were crowded with the victims of this loathsome disease, for its effects on the living were indeed fearful to witness, and we are told that two-thirds of the applicants for relief at the Hospital for the Indigent Blind owed their loss of sight to small-pox.

And although small-pox had thus raged for centuries among civilised nations, as yet no means had been found to cripple its power or mitigate its effects. True, Lady Mary Wortley Montague had introduced the practice of inoculation from Egypt, by which the disease was artificially produced in a modified form. But this, however advantageous to the individual, was undoubtedly inimical to the common weal, for it so multiplied the foci of contagion, the artificial being as contagious as the natural disease, that it rendered small-pox more prevalent than ever, and hence its effects became most disastrous, as it was seen that the general mortality from small-pox had greatly increased since the adoption of this practice.

The time was therefore ripe for the discovery when Dr. Edward Jenner hurried from his native Berkeley to

London, and published in June, 1798, "An Enquiry into the Causes and Effects of the Variola Vaccina, known by the Name of the Cow-Pox." This pamphlet was the fruit of twenty-three years' study and experiment, which he pursued in spite of obstacles and opposition sufficient to discourage anyone possessed of less genius than himself. For it was in 1775 that Dr. Jenner's attention was first directed to the subject, by observing that a number of persons in Gloucestershire could not be inoculated with small pox; and, having ascertained in the course of his inquiries that there was a popular belief that persons who had caught the cow-pox from milking the cows were not subject to small-pox, he began to investigate the grounds for this belief. The inquiry was by no means an easy one, for at the very threshold he was confronted with a serious difficulty. He found that the cow's teat was subject to a variety of eruptions, all of which were indiscriminately named cow-pox. These he learned to distinguish, and ultimately ascertained that only one of them was possessed of a specific protective power over the human body. This he called the *true* cow-pox, the other the *spurious*. He then gave himself up to an exhaustive investigation of the qualities of true cow-pox, during which he ascertained that it underwent progressive changes, and was endowed with prophylactic or anti-variolous properties only at one period of its progress, or in the acme of eruption. In 1796 he was first, enabled to carry his brilliant idea into practice by taking the decisive step of inoculating for the cow-pox, upon the success of which the truth or falsity of his deductions from his long labours would be demonstrated. Entirely successful as these first vaccinations were, with the patience characteristic of the man, he waited two years, testing his discovery in every possible way, before he published the results to the world. Every page of his work bore the impress of genius, and is still as deserving of study as it was when first issued from the press. In it Dr. Jenner contends that cow-pox does not originate in the cow, but is communicated from the horse, where it appears on the heels, and is known by the name of the grease, which is conveyed to the cow by the hands of farm-servants and milkers. He next suggests that small-pox may have been originally morbid matter of the same kind, which circumstances had changed and aggravated into a contagious and malignant disease. He finally states his conviction that cow-pox inoculation secures the constitution forever afterwards from the infection of small-pox.

If Dr. Jenner expected that his discovery would be immediately welcomed, and he himself hailed as one of England's foremost sons, he must have been grievously disappointed, for his work was received with marked hostility. The moth-minded and hollow-hearted men of his own profession—for many such, alas! then as now, disgrace this noble calling—were foremost in the attempt to run him down, lending the weight of their influence and reputations to crush *this obscure country practitioner*. Not a single medical man could be induced to make a trial of vaccination. It appeared for a time as if the discovery were to be lost to the nation. The comic periodicals of the day, taking their cue from the leaders of the profession in London, published the grossest caricatures of this great and good man. He was represented as attempting to bestialise his species by the introduction into their systems of diseased matter from the cow's udder. It was gravely asserted, and received a ready credence, that vaccinated children became ox-faced, that abscesses broke out to indicate sprouting horns, and that the countenance was gradually transmuted into the visage of a cow, the voice into the bellowing of bulls. Not only did his enemies attack his professional reputation, but they assailed his moral character, and the pulpit fulminated its anathemas against him, and denounced his discovery as diabolical. Indeed, so violent was the opposition at this time to the operation, that several persons who had sufficient courage to undergo vaccination were set upon by a mob, pelted with stones, and driven into their houses.

At length, having spent three fruitless months in London, Dr. Jenner returned to his native village, dejected and discouraged. But we hold that true merit and goodness can never be finally crushed by calumny, misrepresentation, and abuse, and will ultimately come to the front not only in spite of, but even because of such hateful opposition. And for Jenner the hour of triumph was at hand. Two ladies of quality, Lady Ducie and the Countess of Berkeley, whose names must for ever be placed in honourable juxtaposition to that of Jenner, had the courage to have their children vaccinated, a step which effectually broke through the prejudices of the day. In 1801 upwards of 6000 persons had been vaccinated, the greater part of whom were tested and proved to be protected from small-pox. Before the end of 1802 vaccination was introduced into Prance, Germany, Italy, Spain, and the East Indies. Everywhere Jenner was recognised as the greatest benefactor of his age, and received many tokens of grateful recognition of his services. In 1802 the British Parliament voted him £10,000; in 1807 it gave him other £20,000; decorations and public thanks were sent him by foreign governments;—but what he valued more highly than these tangible and ostentatious rewards were the blessings of those that were ready to perish.

When the success of his discovery had made Jenner famous, his conduct was marked by a degree of modesty and self-denial which invariably accompanies true goodness, an example which it would be well for physicians in our day to imitate—many of whom, apparently pursuing their high vocation with the sole object of gain, reduce their profession to the low level of shoddy manufacturers, huckstering merchants, and pettifogging lawyers. On being urged to quit his native village, where he practised as a physician, to settle in London where fame and fortune were within his reach, he thus wrote to a friend:—" Shall I who, even in the

morning of my life, sought the lowly and sequestered path of life—the valley, and not the mountain—shall I, now my evening is fast approaching, hold myself up as an object for fortune and for fame?"

THE RESULTS OF VACCINATION.

If the experience of nearly eighty years has not justified Dr. Jenner's expectation that smallpox would be extinguished by his discovery, the results have been sufficiently striking, as can be conclusively proved by statistics. The apparent failures are due, in our opinion, to no inherent defect in the principle of vaccination, but to the simple operation being too often carelessly and inefficiently performed, and to the constant evasions of the Vaccination Acts which take place in spite of the most stringent regulations. A careful study of the whole subject has convinced us, and will we expect convince our readers as well, that under careful, complete, and efficient vaccination, the disease of smallpox would become a pathological curiosity amongst us. At the same time it is to be borne in mind that there is in every community a certain proportion of individuals who are liable to take small-pox twice or oftener, just as we find others taking scarlatina or measles more than once. As an example of what is here stated, it is well known that Louis the Fifteenth died of a second attack of small-pox. Yet cases like his are so rare that it may be said of them that the exception proves the rule. But vaccination does not act solely in the way of absolutely protecting from small-pox. It also has a controlling power over that disease, which is taken in a milder form after vaccination, and runs a more favourable course, the primary fever being less severe, the eruption more scattered, the pustules neither so deep nor so much inflamed, the scab maturing sooner and very rarely pitting, and there being no secondary fever.

Look we now to the statistics of the disease. In 1780 the deaths throughout England and Wales amounted to about 1 in 40 of the population; in 1811 they had declined to 1 in 52; and in 1821 they had sunk to only 1 in 58; and are at present 1 in 62. It is in accordance with observed facts to credit the operation of vaccination with this great reduction of nearly 50 per cent, in the death rate. But this is brought out most conclusively in the following table:—

TABLE showing the average of deaths from small-pox out of every 1000 deaths from all causes during the half century preceding vaccination.

TABLE showing the same during the half century succeeding the introduction of vaccination.

In regard to other countries it is shown in Mr. Simon's blue-book that the fatality of small-pox in Copenhagen is but an eleventh part of what it was before the introduction of vaccination; in Sweden little over a thirteenth; in Berlin and in large parts of Austria but a twentieth; in Westphalia but a twenty-fifth.

The decline in the death rate from small-pox is even more conspicuously seen by the following table:—

Facts equally conclusive are derivable from the health statistics of Her Majesty's troops. From 1817 to 1836 the following facts are recorded:—In Dragoon regiments and Guards, with an aggregate strength of 44,611 men, and a total mortality of 627, there were only three deaths from small-pox. Among the troops at Gibraltar one death occurred, the aggregate strength being 60,269, and the whole mortality 1291.

In the West Indies, although several epidemics of small-pox had ravaged the islands within these years, not one person died of the disease among the British or white troops, out of an aggregate strength of 86,661 and a total mortality of 6,803; while among the black troops (who had all been thoroughly vaccinated on enrolment) numbering 40,934, with a mortality of 1,645, there was not even one case of small-pox.

At Bermuda, Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Cape of Good Hope, and the Mauritius, not a single death from small-pox occurred during those 20 years, and even the white troops of Western Africa wholly escaped this disease which was carrying off hundreds of the black unprotected population. But the strongest evidence of the protective power of vaccination is derivable from the experience of our troops in Malta from 1818 to 1836, when only two deaths occurred from small-pox amongst 40,826 British troops; whereas amongst the civil population of the island, all unprotected, there was a mortality of 1,169 persons in the years 1830 and 1831 alone, when small-pox raged as an epidemic.

It cannot be a matter of surprise, with such statistics before us, that vaccination gradually entered into the life of the nation, became highly popular, and formed a part of the daily routine of family life. If there were any objectors to the practice, their complaints had not as yet penetrated the public ear, but were either confined to their own bosoms or limited to the circle of their private acquaintances. We must now turn our attention, however, to the rise and progress of the recent crusade against vaccination, answer the objections urged by anti-vaccinationists, and point out what measures should, in our opinion, be adopted to improve the practice of vaccination as now adopted, in order to thoroughly stamp out the much-dreaded small-pox.

The attention of the legislature and of the public was first forcibly attracted to the subject of vaccination by a severe outbreak of smallpox, assuming an epidemic type, which took place in London in 1871. The government showed itself alive to the urgency of the position by appointing a special commission to inquire into the causes of these outbreaks, and to discover any defects in the existing Acts. Several eminent members of

the medical profession took up the subject of their own accord, and pursued it with such painstaking research and fulness of inquiry as to materially supplement the labours of the commissioners. Nor were the opponents of vaccination less active. Hitherto there were to be found here and there a few individuals who objected on various grounds to the operation, and refused to have their children vaccinated. But these crotchety persons carried no weight, and their example was lost upon the public. Now, however, taking advantage of the scare of the public, they organised themselves into associations, having for their object the repeal of the Compulsory Vaccination Act. They produced statistics—manufactured, of course, by themselves to suit their preconceived opinions—to prove their objections. They circulated pamphlets in which they denied the beneficial effects of vaccination, and urged that it introduced into the system unheard-of diseases. Their mischievous efforts bore fruit among the ignorant section of English society, and there are now hundreds of parents who prefer fine and imprisonment to vaccinating their children; indeed, for a time their labours were crowned with so much success that it seemed as if England, the birth-place of vaccination, were to be robbed of the benefits of Jenner's discovery. By and by the report of the special commission was issued, and several able pamphlets appeared from the pens of well-known medical men. The friends of vaccination were pleased to find therein overwhelming proofs of the success and efficiency of the operation, and a triumphant refutation of the slanderous and misleading assertions of its opponents. But so difficult is it to eradicate error and scandal, however baseless, that such idle tales will no doubt be repeated and accepted as truthful for generations. The commission clearly traced the extent of the recent epidemic to the total neglect of vaccination in numerous cases, and to the careless and inefficient manner in which the operation was carried out in others. The Acts were accordingly amended so as to remedy the defects which had come to light; and there can be no doubt that vaccination is at present carried out far more faithfully and efficiently in Great Britain than at any former period of its history.

THE OBJECTIONS TO VACCINATION ANSWERED.

1. *Vaccination alleged to be a failure.*—A favourite cry of anti-vaccinationists is that vaccination has been a failure, that after an experience of more than half a century, small-pox still does its deadly work in our midst. In answer to this objection we have only to point to the statistics already adduced. We freely admit that vaccination has not quite realised the reasonable expectations of its discoverer; but that it has been to some extent a failure is an excellent argument for its more efficient performance—none at all against the operation. In a word, small-pox still exists because vaccination is sometimes wholly neglected, sometimes imperfectly performed, and in most cases too long delayed. But of this more anon.

2. The second objection we have to notice has more weight with parents than every other consideration; and if it can be shown that it is a groundless one, we shall have gone a great way in repopularising vaccination. *Diseases, it is said, foreign to the infant's constitution are introduced along with the vaccine virus.* If this were true to any appreciable extent, it would be necessarily fatal to the operation, for no parent would be justified in exposing his child to an immediate urgent danger for the sake of preserving it from a remote and casual one. Happily this question has been searchingly investigated by the most eminent medical men everywhere, and they are quite unanimous in deciding that the objection cannot be sustained. Moreover, every alleged case in which disease or death has been attributed to vaccination has, on strict investigation, completely broken down. Our own experience confirms these views. During three months that we attended the Faculty Vaccination Station at Glasgow, where we performed or saw performed many hundred cases of vaccination, in not a single instance did we see evil result. Our experience in Dunedin, where we have vaccinated hundreds of children, has been equally favourable. But let us see what men of the largest experience believe regarding this objection. Dr. Seaton says that although he has investigated many of such alleged cases, he has never yet in a single instance found that the child from whom the lymph was taken was suffering from the disease it was said to have imparted. Mr Marson states that in the performance of 40,000 vaccinations, he had never seen any other diseases communicated with the vaccine virus, nor did he believe in the popular reports that they are so communicated. Sir W. Jenner, at University College Hospital, London, in six years, in 13,000 cases, and Dr West in seventeen years, in 26,000 cases, both say that in no single case had they reason to believe that any constitutional taint had been conveyed from one person to another by vaccination. According to Sir James Paget, the worst that can be charged against vaccination is, that sometimes it evolves a constitutional affection till then latent in the system. Even this, he adds, can very seldom be charged with truth.

Finally, actual experiments have been made with a view of testing if disease is really communicable through vaccine virus. Persons suffering from constitutional diseases in an active state have been vaccinated, and with the lymph taken from them healthy individuals have been vaccinated, and in no single instance has it been found that the disease was so communicated from one to the other. It must therefore be considered proved, both by experiment and authority, that the danger of communicating infection through vaccine virus is so

infinitesimally small as to be practically non-existent.

3. As a third objection, it is urged that erysipelas frequently results from the practice of vaccination. We have to reply, that although some cases of erysipelas, and even fatal cases, have followed vaccination, they have been so few in proportion to the millions of vaccinations that have been performed as hardly to deserve notice. Besides, the erysipelas is not due to the vaccine virus, but to the slight scratches or wounds that are made with the lancet. It is well known that this disease, in a fatal form, sometimes follows the most trifling surgical operation. We have seen erysipelas and death result from the amputation of a finger, in the practice of one of the best surgeons in Scotland, and we have seen tetanus follow the removal of a toe nail. But would any reasonable man argue that, because surgical operations sometimes eventuate untowardly, all surgical operations should be condemned? We have shown that thousands of lives are saved annually by vaccination, and millions protected from unseemly pitting. Is it reasonable to expect that this great result can be gained without here and there a child getting erysipelas from its vaccination? Even this, in our opinion, can be prevented by adopting a method of vaccination which we shall recommend below.

4. A fourth objection we have to notice is, that a skin eruption frequently breaks out subsequent to vaccination, which is therefore considered by the parents the *fons et origo mali*. In most cases, our experience has taught us that the vaccination and eruption are not even remotely connected with one another, the latter being due to dentition or disorder of the stomach, liver, or kidneys, or inherent defect in the constitution. Even when no other cause can be assigned for the eruption than the vaccination, parents must not hastily assume that the vaccine lymph employed has been bad. No such thing. But inasmuch as vaccination causes a certain amount of irritation, from this irritation a skin affection may result in sensitive subjects. We have had two, or at most three, cases in which an eruption on the head has followed vaccination; but having kept a record of the vaccine lymph employed, we were able to prove that the vaccine virus was not at fault, as it had been used in other cases without evil effects. Moreover, the children so affected were not vaccinated till the fifth and six months; and this fact will give us a clue to a remedy which will be noticed below, when we come to speak of reform in the practice of vaccination.

5. Anti-vaccinationists have strongly urged in late years that although the mortality produced by small-pox has been reduced, yet the infantine mortality of other diseases has increased, so that no real gain of human life has followed from vaccination. We notice this objection only for the sake of exposing the disingenuousness of the opponents of Jennerism. For if these gentry had only consulted statistics before committing themselves to such a statement, they would have found, as has been conclusively shown by Mr Simon, that the mortality of measles, scarlatina, scrofula, and other infantile diseases has really diminished since the introduction of vaccination. And this is what scientific deduction would have led us to expect, because thousands of children who happened to survive smallpox had their constitutions so weakened that they fell ready victims to the next disease which attacked them.

Other objections still more absurd have been put forward by zealous anti-vaccinationists. For instance, vaccination has been said to have produced mental and physical degeneration of the human species, to have evolved diseases before unknown, to have diminished men's stature, to have rendered them incapable of supporting the same fatigue and exposure as their ancestors; and, let teetotallers mark this, to have driven men for consolation to dram-drinking and tobacco-smoking. All such objections have been gravely put forward from Jenner's time downwards. They prove the weakness of the case they are designed to support, and are so palpably false and inconsequent that we shall not stop to refute them, but merely leave them to the intelligence of our readers.

VACCINATION REFORM.

The prevalence of small-pox in London for some years, and its present attack on the good people of Sydney, point to some defects in the existing machinery which it is of the last importance to the health of the community should be discovered and remedied. It is vain to expect that we in New Zealand can always enjoy immunity from this unwelcome disease. Whether its visit will be short-lived or permanent will depend on the fidelity with which vaccination is here performed. For our own part, we know that in New Zealand we have a soil rich for the propagation of the pest, viz., a large proportion of the community wholly unprotected by vaccination. We know scores of children who have not been vaccinated at all; and there are many in whose cases the vaccination has been most imperfect. We shall therefore proceed to briefly indicate the measures which ought to be adopted, in our opinion, in order to guarantee to the community the full benefits and security of vaccination.

1st. It is essential that the penal clauses of the Compulsory Vaccination Act be strictly enforced. Every child on the register of births should, within the period prescribed by the Act, be registered as vaccinated, as dead, or as insusceptible of vaccination. Should every birth registered not be so accounted for, the Registrar

should take steps to trace the child, and compel compliance with the Act.

2nd. The Vaccination Act in the Colony should be amended so as to restrict the period within which primary vaccination must be performed to three months. There are serious objections against prolonging the period to six months. Parents, as a rule, delay getting their children vaccinated till near the expiry of the period. It then often happens that it has to be delayed owing to illness from dentition, diarrhoea, or mal-nutrition, all which ailments are more prevalent during the later age. It will thus be seen that by delaying the operation until the sixth month, there remains in the community a large number of unprotected infants who, were smallpox once in our midst, would become a standing menace, since through their agency small-pox would probably become epidemic. In every populous country there are many thousands of children under six months old. In Dunedin and suburbs there must be about 500, while at three months there would be but half that number. Statistics lend weight to our argument, as it has been proved in recent epidemics in London that 11 per cent, of the victims of small-pox die before their fourth month. Moreover, by reducing the period to three months, we are sure that a serious objection to vaccination—noticed by us above—would be almost entirely removed, inasmuch as it has been found that eruptions on the skin rarely follow vaccination when performed in the early weeks of infancy, and thus vaccination would be freed from the unjust imputation of having caused such eruptions. Three months of age is recommended by the principal vaccinators in Great Britain, and many practitioners perform the operation much earlier than this. Having performed hundreds of vaccinations between six weeks and three months, we have come to the conclusion that the younger the child the greater the safety and effectiveness of the operation, and we have every confidence in recommending the adoption of the third in place of the sixth month.

3. *Uniformity of Operation.*—Steps should be taken by Government to insure as far as possible a fixed standard of successful vaccination, anything short of which would not be recognised as vaccination in the sense of the Act. At present, the manner of performing the operation is left to the fancy or discretion of the operator. Under this system, or rather want of system, it happens that the vaccination of one man is something quite different from that of another operator. One surgeon scratches the arm; another punctures, but at his option puts two, three, four, or more punctures. The same rule prevailed at home before the Commissioners' report, after which Government adopted a uniform system for all public vaccination. That this is not a matter of indifference has been proved by recent observations in several epidemics of smallpox. According to these vaccination is efficient as a protection from smallpox in proportion to the number of sores produced on the arm. Of the patients admitted into the London Small-pox Hospital in the two last epidemics the great majority had never been vaccinated, and the rate of mortality was high. Next to the unvaccinated came those who had been vaccinated in infancy, and whose arm bore only one scar. In this class the mortality was still high, but very much less than in Class 1. The third class bore two scars, and amongst these the disease was greatly modified, and the mortality small. The fourth class bore three or four scars; the disease ran a mild course, there was no pitting, and a death was very exceptional. Lastly, none were admitted whose arm bore six good scars, thus showing that such persons enjoyed an absolute immunity from smallpox.

It has been our frequent practice to employ six punctures, in this respect following the practice of the Faculty Hall Vaccination Station at Glasgow, where during a three months' apprenticeship, we witnessed or performed many hundred operations, all by six punctures, not one of which was followed by a bad symptom.

Mothers often object to this number, but when it is explained to them that there are less risk and suffering from six small punctures than from two or three large blotches, and that the former method gives absolute immunity, their scruples usually give way. No. 2 of the Instructions for Vaccinators, issued by Her Majesty's Most Honourable Privy Council, recommends:—In all ordinary cases of primary vaccination, if you vaccinate by separate punctures, make such punctures as will produce *at least four* separate good-sized vesicles; or, if you vaccinate otherwise than by separate punctures, take care to produce local effects equal to those just mentioned. This rule we beg to recommend in the strongest terms for adoption in New Zealand. If Government would insist on all public vaccinators operating by four—or, better still, six—separate punctures, the practice of this method would soon extend to private practitioners, and there would be thus secured a uniform standard, which could not fail to produce good results in the course of time.

4th. A supply of pure vaccine lymph should be provided by Government for all regular medical practitioners. A consideration of this recommendation opens up a vexed, but highly important, question, on which the highest authorities differ. The question is this: Does vaccine lymph, after being repeatedly transmitted from one human being to another, lose any of its prophylactic power? As early as 1809, Mr Brown, of Musselburgh, published the opinion that the prophylactic virtue of cowpox diminished as the time from vaccination increased. Dr Jenner dissented from this view, and ever since medical opinion has been divided on this point. In our judgment, Mr Brown was right, although he missed the explanation, which we shall here give. Humanised lymph deteriorates because in the course of time a large quantity of imperfect lymph passes into circulation. And to this want of care or skill in the selection and storing of lymph do we attribute any

impairment of its protective power, and not to the mere fact of its having passed through many subjects. But let us see what is the opinion of the best authorities, dead or living. In the opinion of the permanent members of the National Vaccine Board, it maintains its quality undiminished; and in this opinion Sir Thomas Watson coincides (1871), declaring that he had opportunities of satisfying himself that lymph which had been transmitted without interruption from person to person ever since the time of Jenner, continued to generate what seemed a very perfect cow-pox vesicle.

On the other hand, Mr. Simon, who will be recognised as the highest authority on the subject, came to the conclusion "that the occasional impermanence of protection may depend upon impairment in the specific power of vaccine contagion, an impairment arising in the transmission of that contagion through many generations of men." M. Brisset, in France, as early as 1818, alleged that the past ten years had made a marked difference in the visible characters of the vaccine vesicle. Dr. Meyer, of Kreutzburg, states that he has found the older scars much better marked than the more recent ones. Frequent opportunities of our own of testing this observation of Meyer, have convinced us of its truth.

According to the testimony of many vaccinators, the proportion of unsuccessful to successful vaccinations is every year increasing. Dr. Gregory and Mr. Estlin, in England, have adduced similar facts in evidence that the vaccine lymph, by passing through the bodies of many persons, loses in process of time some essential part of its activity.

The experience furnished by the Prussian Army shows very clearly that vaccine lymph undergoes a gradual deterioration. It appears that where vaccine supply has seldom or never been renewed from the cow, the proportionate resusceptibility of vaccine disease at a given age has undergone a progressive increase. "And (in the words of Mr. Simon) it is difficult to conceive how the infantine generations of a country could, crop by crop, successively derive less permanent constitutional impressions from vaccination, unless the efficient causes of those impressions—the vaccine contagion itself—had year by year undergone enfeeblement of its powers." Moreover, the statistics of the Prussian Army in regard to revaccination of its recruits tells the same story. When the system of re-vaccination was adopted in 1833, the proportion of successful results was thirty-three in every hundred. Now the annual percentage is seventy. This proves conclusively either that vaccine lymph has deteriorated very materially, or that primary vaccination is not so efficiently performed now as in the early days of the operation, a hypothesis we have no ground to sustain.

Mr. Marson's (the highest authority in England) testimony agrees with this. According to him, vaccine lymph becomes humanised, and consequently weakened as a prophylactic, by passing many times through the human body; the scars are not so good as they were formerly; and the mortality after vaccination, estimated on a large scale, shows a considerable increase.

All which consensus of opinions points to the desirability of renewing the supplies of vaccine lymph directly from the cow.

Having more than three years ago recognised the desirability of introducing an entirely new supply of vaccine matter into our practice, we made application for a supply of pure calf-lymph, such as is used in Germany under Government supervision. This we obtained through Messrs. Hilliard and Sons, Surgical Instrument Makers, Glasgow and Edinburgh. Since receiving which we have operated with it in several cases with the result:—1st. That the percentage of failures is higher than with ordinary lymph. 2nd. That the vesicle produced in successful cases differs materially from the common vesicles in being smaller and less active, and leaving a deeper scar. 3rd. That after this calf-lymph has passed once or twice through the human system, its great superiority to old humanised lymph becomes apparent, as it shows such activity as to make it necessary to use the lymph more sparingly, comes to maturity more rapidly, and leaves a much deeper cicatrix, the separate pits of which are well marked. We have therefore formed a highly favourable opinion of animal as opposed to humanised lymph; and as the use of such calf-lymph would remove the strongest objection of parents to the operation, viz., the fear of introducing disease, it is in our opinion the clear and urgent duty of the government to afford a supply of such lymph to all registered practitioners. For the question of introducing calf-lymph is ripe for consideration; and, if left to individual action, mischief will undoubtedly arise, the propagation and storing of calf-lymph being beset with difficulties and dangers only to be adequately realised by those who have made or may make the attempt.

The advantages of having a lymph supply free from all suspicion of taint or impairment of energy will be admitted by all, and are simply incalculable at a time when the growing distrust of human lymph threatens to oppose a serious difficulty in the proper enforcement of the Compulsory Vaccination Act. Meanwhile we are content to claim for ourselves the merit of having, as far as we can ascertain, successfully introduced into this Colony a new supply of lymph derived directly from the original source.

5th. Re-vaccination.—The question of re-vaccination crops up ever and anon, as often as the public mind takes alarm at a threatened invasion of small-pox. Of its utility there cannot be a question, as the statistics of the British Army and Navy adduced by us in a previous page abundantly testify. In some Continental States

re-vaccination has been made compulsory, and the results have been highly satisfactory. Indeed we have no hesitation in affirming, that were re-vaccination thoroughly carried out, in two generations small-pox would only be known from historical records. Apart from the question of the deterioration of the lymph now in use, it has been satisfactorily established that while one primary vaccination in infancy protects the great majority of individuals throughout life, there still remains a numerous class who become resusceptible to small-pox. As these individuals cannot in any way be distinguished from protected persons, it is necessary to re-vaccinate the entire population. This secondary vaccination ought to be performed about the age of puberty, with pure calf-lymph or with humanised infantine lymph, never with lymph drawn off are-vaccinated person.

As in all probability the country is not ripe for compulsory re-vaccination, the way might be paved for its becoming general by its being made compulsory in the case of every candidate for the public service, including teachers and railway officials.

6th. We have, lastly, to recommend that Inspectors of Vaccination be appointed, whose duty should consist in visiting the different public vaccination stations throughout the country, watching the Public Vaccinator's mode of operation, inspecting the results attained as seen on the arm on the eighth day, examining the cicatrices, testing the quality of the vaccine lymph, and taking measures to correct whatever might appear to him faulty. This has been carried out in Great Britain for several years, and has resulted in a vast improvement in the quality of the vaccination. In connection with this inspection a system of extra payments by results was introduced, which has had the desired effect in reconciling public vaccinators to the inspection, and has stimulated them to obtain the best results possible. These extra payments take the form of grants, and do not interfere with the regular remuneration per head, which is paid to all public vaccinators alike.

THE THERAPEUTICS OF VACCINATION.

Medical men have been long familiar with the fact that one disease often expels another from the system, temporarily in most cases, the old disease returning after the cure of the new one, but in many cases effecting a permanent cure. But although in vaccination a ready means of introducing a new disease, viz., cow-pox, has been long available to the profession, this aspect of vaccination has attracted very little attention.

Having had the advantage of attending the lectures and clinique of Professor McCall Anderson, the celebrated Dermatologist, at the Glasgow Dispensary for Diseases of the Skin, we had our attention directed to this means of curing chronic diseases which refused to yield to the ordinary remedies. Ever since this has been a favourite subject of investigation to us, and has yielded us remarkable results. We were therefore much gratified lately when we came to know that this use of vaccination had not escaped the acute penetration of Dr. Jenner, who writes in his original essay, "Cow-pox inoculation holds out the prospect of great benefit to those who are labouring under chronic forms of disease, in which counter irritation is desirable."

Remarkable cases of the cure of old disease by means of vaccination have been published by Dr. McCall Anderson, Mr. Lawson Tait, and others; but there is nothing more striking than has occurred in our own practice, as a single example will show. In July, 1877, C.M., aged 18 months, was brought to us by her mother. We found her suffering from a severe form of *eczema impetiginodes*. From the history of the case as given us by her mother, we learned that she was a perfectly healthy child up till her fourth month, when the *eczema* attacked her face and head in the usual manner. She was immediately put under treatment, but no good resulted, as the child grew the longer the worse. When brought to us we found her a pitiful spectacle, being covered from head to foot with a mass of crusts and scabs, and she looked like a wizened prematurely-aged old woman. We treated her for a year with a varying result; on the whole the disease was modified, but a cure seemed as far off as ever, and her sufferings were so great, and her appearance so loathsome, her growth all this time being entirely arrested, that her mother often expressed a desire that death might end her sufferings. At length we suggested vaccination, and the mother consented. The vaccination ran the usual course, and was hardly at its height when the skin disease underwent a notable change for the better. In a few weeks it had entirely disappeared from the head and body, but lingered longer on the vaccinated arm. This, too, soon got well, the child began to grow, and she is now as healthy and fine looking a girl as a mother's heart could desire.

For upwards of six years we have had recourse to vaccination as a regular part of treatment in many morbid states of the constitution, particularly in mal-nutrition of infancy, in which it is undoubtedly of great value. In epilepsy, scrofula, syphilis, and in the gouty and rheumatic diathesis, we have tried it with considerable success. But this is not the place to enter at length into this aspect of vaccination, and at present we take our leave of the subject. We must express the hope, however, that the therapeutics of vaccination, if it be permitted us to coin a phrase, will now receive a candid and unbiassed investigation from all medical men. We venture to predict as the result of such trial, that vaccination will establish itself as a valuable addition to a physician's armamentarium, and thus acquire a new claim to the gratitude and confidence of mankind.

The End.

Printed by John Mackay, Moray Place, Dunedin.
Proceedings of the District Grand Lodge of Ancient Free and Accepted Masons of Otago and Southland, Under the Grand Lodge of England.
Annual Communication Held at the Freemasons' Hall, Dunedin,
On Monday March 31, 1884.

Present:

The Right Worshipful Brother Thos. Sherlock Graham, District Grand Master.

Worshipful Brother E. Nathan, Deputy District Grand Master.

Worshipful Brother Robt. Stout, District Grand Senior Warden.

Worshipful Brother C. De L. Graham, District Grand Junior Warden.

Worshipful Brother W. Ronaldson, District Grand Chaplain.

Worshipful Brother Jno. A. D. Adams, District Grand Registrar.

Worshipful Brother Sydney James, District Grand Secretary.

Worshipful Brother D. Cameron, District Grand Senior Deacon.

Worshipful Brother T. Proctor, as District Grand Junior Deacon.

Brother R. Mckenzie as District Grand Pursuivant.

Brother A. J. Barth, District Grand Steward.

Brother J. M. Hunt, District Grand Steward.

Brother A. Westwood, District Grand Steward.

Brother H. W. Meyer, District Grand Tyler.

Minutes of last Quarterly Communication read and confirmed.

Roll of Lodges called :—

The following Lodges under the sister constitution were represented :—St. Andrew's, Thistle, Otago Kilwinning Scottish Constitution, St. Patrick's Irish Constitution.

The Roll of Officers was called, and responded to by those present Apologies were received and accepted from Brothers Hyman, District Grand Treasurer; De Leon, Director of Ceremonies; and Horsburgh, Steward.

- The District Grand Secretary reported the following Dispensations granted by the Right Worshipful District Grand Master :—
- October 18, 1883.—Southern Cross Lodge 997.—Authorising wearing Masonic clothing at funeral of late Brother R. Powell.
- December 14, 1883.—Otago 844.—Authorising wearing Masonic clothing at the re-union of the Otago Kilwinning Lodge, S.C.
- January 16, 1884.—General.—Authorising wearing Masonic clothing at Divine Service at St. Peter's Church, Cavershatn, on Sunday, January 20.
- March 3, 1884.—Mount Ida 1262.—Authorising wearing Masonic clothing at funeral of the late Brother E. T. George.
- March 4, 1884.—To Brother H. F. Dench, P.D.G. Swordbearer, and Brother W. G. M. Mackenzie, P.D.G. Pursuivant.—Authorising them to represent this D.G. Lodge at the Installation of Sir W. J. Clarke, Bart., as District Grand Master of the three Constitutions in Victoria.
- March 29, 1884.—Southern Cross Lodge 997.—Authorising wearing Masonic clothing at funeral of the late Brother McChesney.

The audited balance-sheets of the General Purpose and Masonic Benevolent Funds, as below, were read and adopted.

General Purpose Fund, 1883-84.

Receipts.

Dues during the Year from Lodges as under—

Expenditure

Masonic Benevolent Fund, 1883-84.

Receipts.

Expenditure.

JULIUS HYMAN D.G. *Treasurer.*

SYDNEY JAMES D.G. *Secretary.*

We have examined the books of the District Grand Lodge, compared the vouchers, and find the receipts and expenditure correct.

SEPTIMUS DE LION

H. ELDRIDGE,

J. A. D. ADAMS, *Auditors.*

TREASURER.—Letter read from Brother Hyman, thanking the D.G. Lodge for having elected him for the last two years, stating that he did not wish to take office again.

Resolved—"That Brother H. Eldridge, P M., Lodge 844, be elected Treasurer for current year.

The District Grand Secretary reported :—

Number on the roll of Lodges as per last returns under :—

The Right Worshipful District Grand Master then addressed the D.G. Lodge upon the state of Masonry in his District, and upon the Masonic circumstances which had occurred during the past year, especially alluding to the opening of the Hiram Lodge, No. 2003, Green Island, and thanked the officers for their regular attendance, and for the support which had been accorded to him in the chair.

The District Grand Secretary read the names of the officers that the Right Worshipful District Grand Master had been pleased to appoint for the current year as follows :—

- Deputy District Grand Master, Brother Robert Stout.
- District Grand Senior Warden, Brother C. De L. Graham.
- District Grand Junior Warden, Brother J. A. D. Adams.
- District Grand Chaplain, Brother Rev. D. J. Murray.
- District Grand Registrar, Brother W. M. Hodgkins.
- District Grand Secretary, Brother Sydney James.
- District Grand Senior Deacon, Brother B. Lichenstein.
- District Grand Superintendent of Works, Brother D. Cameron.
- District Grand Director of Ceremonies, Brother J. Jordan.
- District Grand Swordbearer, Brother J. Horsburgh.
- District Grand Organist, Brother J. A. X. Reidle.
- District Grand Stewards, Brothers R. Mackenzie, A. J. Barth, E. W. Cochran, A. Silverston, G. F. Rowlatt.

The officers appointed for the year were then conducted to the throne, addressed by the Right Worshipful District Grand Master, invested with their collars and jewels of office, and their patents of appointments handed to them with the exceptions of Brothers Hodgkins, Registrar; Horsburgh, Swordbearer; and Rowlatt, Steward; who were unavoidably absent.

BOARD OF GENERAL PURPOSES.—Upon the motion of the Worshipful Deputy District Grand Master, Brother R. Stout, seconded by District Grand Secretary, Brother James, the following brethren were elected members of the Board of General Purposes for the year :—

- Brother C. De L. Graham,
- Brother A. H. Burton,
- Brother J. A. D. Adams,
- Brother D. Cameron.

The District Grand Master, Deputy District Grand Master, and District Grand Secretary being *ex officio* members of the Board.

The Right Worshipful District Grand Master, in accordance with the bye-law 21, has granted to Lodges Southern Cross, St. George, Ophir, and Hiram, the privilege of selecting a Brother as their representative on the Board, and has appointed Brother A. H. Burton President.

BOARD OF BENEVOLENCE.—The undersigned were appointed members for the year :—

- Brother A. H. Burton,
- Brother B. Lichenstein,
- Brother R. Ritchie,
- Brother E. W. Cochrane.

The District Grand Master, Deputy District Grand Master, District Grand Treasurer, and District Grand Secretary being *ex officio* members.

Correspondence read as under :—

- From Caledonian Lodge, S.C., Timaru, asking for the names of the Lodge Secretaries in order to apply for relief for a Brother.
- The D.G. Secretary stated that he had replied that the R.W.D.G. M. did not approve of this, and that in any case communications should come from the D.G. Secretary.
- From V.W. Brother Clerke, Grand Secretary, enclosing warrant for, the Hiram Lodge No. 2008.
- From W. Brother T. H. Lempriere, D.G. Secretary of the D.G. Lodge of Victoria, E.C., requesting the pleasure of the attendance of the R.W.D.G.M. and officers of the D.G. Lodge, on behalf of Brother Sir W. J. Clarke, Bart., at his installation as District Grand Master for the three Constitutions in Victoria, on the 26th March.

The D.G. Secretary read letters which he had sent, by command of the Right Worshipful District Grand Master, to Brother Sir W. J. Clarke and Brother Lempriere, expressing the regret of the D.G.M. that he would be unable to accept the kind invitation congratulating Brother Sir W. J. Clarke on being appointed to so high and important a position and the Brethren of Victoria in having so worthy a head, and that he had deputed Brothers H. F. Dench and W.G.M. Mackenzie, two past officers of the D.G. Lodge at present in Victoria, to represent this District Grand Lodge at the installation ceremony.

Prospectus of an intended publication (to be issued at Wellington) called the "New Zealand Craftsman and Masonic Review."

The D.G. Secretary reported that, by command of the R.W. District Grand Master, he had applied to Brother C. J. Toxward, R.W.D.G.M. for the North Island, at Wellington, to know if the intended publication was issued with his cognizance and support, and had received a reply to the effect that it was not so issued, consequently the D.G.M. had refused his sanction to the issue of the same in the Lodges of his district.

On the motion of Brother Stout, D.D.G.M., seconded by Brother James, D.G. Secretary, a hearty vote of thanks was accorded, and ordered to be recorded on the minutes, to Brother Nathan, Past Deputy District Grand Master, for his services during his term of office and to Masonry in general for a lengthened period.

Brother Nathan feelingly returned thanks.

Nothing further offering, the D.G. Lodge was closed in peace and harmony and with solemn prayer at 10 p.m.

Sydney James, *District Grand Secretary*.

EXTRACTS FROM BYE-LAWS.

17. Every private Lodge shall four times in each year transmit direct to the District Grand Secretary a list of its members and of the brethren initiated or admitted therein since the last return, with the dates of initiation or joining, and when passed or raised, the dates of those degrees respectively, together with the ages, titles, professions or trades of such brethren, and the name and number of the Lodge to which a joining member belonged, and at same time remit all monies due to the District Grand Lodge; the return shall be signed by the Master and Secretary.

21. The Board of General Purposes shall consist of eight members and the District Grand Secretary. Four of the members to be elected by the District Grand Lodge, and four to be elected by the country lodges as their representatives, in such manner as the District Master shall deem fit.

35. Each private Lodge subscribing five guineas per annum to the Fund shall have power to nominate a member to the Board of Benevolence.

decorative feature

Hebrew text Order of Service,
For the Consecration of the New Synagogue,
Moray Place,
On Sunday, the
3rd Ellul, 5641. 28th August 1881
To Commence at 3 O'Clock, P.M.

Dunedin, New Zealand Coulls & Culling, Printers & Stationers Rattray-St. 1881

Hebrew text New Synagogue,

Consecrated by Rev Bernard Lichtenstein

Honorary Officers: MR. Maurice Joel, *President*. MR. Abraham Solomon, *Treasurer*.

Committee: Past President Mr. Godfrey Jacobs, *Ex-Officio*. MR. Ezekiel Nathan MR. Barnard Isaac MR.

Simeon Isaacs MR. Josephf. Anderson MR. Michael Cohen MR. Samuel Goldston MR. Sigsmund Kohn MR.

Hyman Naphtali

Trustees: MR. MESSRS Maurice Joel, Ezekiel Nathan, Robert M. Marks.

Building Committee: MR. Maurice Joel MR. A. Solomon MR. Godfrey Jacobs MR. J. F. Anderson MR. B. Isaac

MR. Solomon De Beer

Architect: L. Boldini, Esq.

Contractors: MESSRS Johns AND Evans.

Choir Master: MR. Joseph Moss.

Hebrew text Order of Service,

For the Consecration of The New Synagogue,

Moray Place,

On Sunday, the

3rd Ellul, 5641. 28th August 1881

To Commence at 3 O'Clock, P.M.

Dunedin, New Zealand Coulls & Culling, Printers & Stationers Rattray-St 1881

Psalm CL.

Hebrew text

(Psalm cl.)

Sing Hallelujah! praise to God;
Upon His holy seat,
In His great power. His mightiness
With praise His presence greet;
And with His mighty excellence
Let your high praise accord;
Exulting Hallelujahs sing,
And shout, "Praise ye the Lord!"
With trumpet's sound, psalt'ry, and harp,
With timbrel and with dance,
With organs and string'd instruments,
Proclaim His excellence.
With cymbals' tone, with cymbals' clang,
Your praise to Him accord;
Let every breathing thing proclaim,
"Praise Him! Praise ye the Lord!"

Evening Service.

CONCLUDING PRAYER.

It is incumbent upon us to praise the Lord of all; to magnify the Creator of the beginning; for he hath not made us like unto nations of other countries, nor disposed of us in the manner of other families of the earth; neither hath he appointed our portion like unto theirs, nor our lot like all their multitude. For we bend the knee, worship, and make our acknowledgments to the presence of the supreme King of kings! the holy and blessed Being; he who stretched out the heavens, and laid the foundations of the earth, the throne of whose glory is in the heavens above, and the residence of whose might is in the celestial heights. He is our God, and there is no

other. Our King is truth, and there is none besides him; as it is written in his law, "Know, therefore, this day, and reflect in thine heart, that the Lord he is God, in heaven above, and on the earth beneath: there is none else."

We will, therefore, place our hope in thee, O Lord, our God! speedily to behold thy glorious power; removing the abominations out of the earth, and causing all the idols to be utterly destroyed, that the universe may be established under the Almighty government; all flesh invoke thy name, and all the wicked of the earth turn unto thee: then shall all the inhabitants of the world know and acknowledge, that unto Thee every knee must bow, and every tongue swear: before thee, O Lord, our God! shall they kneel and fall prostrate: they shall ascribe honour to thy glorious name, and all shall take upon themselves the duties due to thy dominion : and thou wilt speedily reign over them for ever and ever. For the kingdom is thine, and in eternal glory wilt thou reign; as it is written in thy law, "The Lord shall reign for ever and ever." And it is also expressed, "And the Lord shall be King over all the earth," on that day will it be acknowledged that the Lord is One, "and his name One,"

May he who blessed our forefathers, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, bless the Wardens and Members of this Congregation, and all who have brought their offerings for the building of this synagogue. May he bless them, their wives, their sons, their daughters, and all belonging unto them. May he preserve them from distress and sorrow, may he prosper the work of their hands, and vouchsafe unto them length of days in joy and happiness. Amen.

Hebrew text

Prayer for the Queen and Royal Family.

May he who dispenseth salvation unto kings, and dominion unto princes: whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom; who delivered David his servant from the destructive sword; who maketh a way in the sea, and a path through the mighty waters: May he bless, preserve, guard, assist, exalt, and highly aggrandize our Sovereign Lady QUEEN VICTORIA, ALBERT EDWARD, PRINCE OF WALES, THE PRINCESS OF WALES, and all the ROYAL FAMILY. May the Supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, grant her life, preserve her, deliver her from all manner of trouble and danger; subdue people under her feet, make her enemies fall before her, and cause her to prosper in all her undertakings. May the Supreme King of kings, through his infinite mercy, incline her heart, and the hearts of her counsellors and nobles, with benevolence to act kindly towards us and all Israel. In her days, and in our days, may Judah be saved, and Israel dwell in safety; and may the Redeemer come unto Zion; O that this may be his gracious will! and let us say, Amen.

Hebrew text

And when the Ark rested, he said, Return, O Eternal! to the myriads of thousands of Israel! Arise, O Eternal! unto Thy resting place, Thou, and the Ark of Thy strength. Let Thy priests be clothed with righteousness, and Thy pious ones shout for joy. For the sake of Thy servant David turn not away the face of Thine Anointed, "for I have given you good doctrine, forsake ye not my law; it is a tree of life to those who take fast hold of it, and the supporters thereof are happy; its ways are pleasantness, and all its paths are peace."

Hebrew text

CHOIR.

Do Thou turn us unto Thee, O Eternal! and then we shall return. Renew our days as of old.

The Scrolls of the Law are then, placed in the Ark.

THE MINISTER THEN PREACHES A SERMON, AND OFFERS UP A CONSECRATION PRAYER.

During the Sixth Circuit.

(Psalm CXXX.)

O Lord! I raised to Thee a plaintive cry,
Prom the abyss of sin and misery.
O Lord! I pray that Thou wilt turn Thine ear,
And hearken to my supplicating prayer.
Alas! "What man before Thy face could stay,

If thou did'st always mark his evil way?
But grace and pardon ever with Thee dwell,
And man to reverential awe impel.
My soul all hopeful waiteth for the Lord,
And steadfastly relieth on His word;
More eagerly than watchmen through the night,
Await the coming of dawn's glimm'ring light,
My soul relieth on the Lord, as they
A wait, full certain of returning day;
And thus may Israel hopefully rely
Upon the Lord, who reigns eternally.
Mercy, and full redemption are with Him,
And He, from sin, all Israel will redeem.

During the Seventh Circuit.

(Psalm xxiv.)

The earth, O Lord! belongs to Thee, And all that in it dwell,
For Thou hast built it on the sea, Above the ocean's swell.
O Lord! Who shall ascend Thy hill—Dwell in Thy holy place?
Whose heart and hands are free from ill, Imbued with heavenly grace;
Whose soul from vanity is free, Who hath not sworn deceitfully;
Such men a blessing shall receive From Thee, Almighty Lord,
Who in Thy saving power believe, And trust Thy holy word;
These are the men of Israel's race, who hope to gaze upon Thy face.

The Ark is opened, and the Reader and Choristers chant:

Ye gates, uprear your lofty heights, Above all earthly domes,
Doors of Eternity, fly back, The King of Glory comes.
The King of Glory! Who is he? The strong and mighty Lord,
Whose presence bringeth victory, The sole Almighty God.
Ye gates, uprear your lofty heights, Above all earthly domes,
Doors of Eternity, fly back, the King of Glory comes.
The King of Glory! Who is he Whose coming ye proclaim?
The Lord of all Eternity! Praised be His hallow'd name.

During The Sixth Circuit.

Psalm CXXX.

Hebrew text - Psalm CXXX

During The Seventh Circuit.

Psalm XXIV.

Hebrew text - Psalm XXIV

During the Third Circuit.

(Psalm c.)

Shout joyfully unto the Lord, All earth your voice upraise;
Exulting serve Almighty God; Come, singing psalms of praise.

Know the Lord God created us; To Him do we belong;
His people, sheep beneath His care—Then come to Him with song.

Come to his gates with thankful praise. His courts fill joyfully.
Bless His great name, His holy ways, "With grateful minstrelsy.

For everlasting is His grace, His goodness, truth, and worth.
Enduring when all human race Shall cease to be on earth

During the Fourth Circuit.

(Psalm cxxvii.)

If the Lord lendeth not His aid, All useless is man's toil
To build the house, or safely guard The city free from spoil.

'Tis useless that at early dawn, From slumber ye arise,
And until midnight labour on For your necessities.

But if God's grace your work attend, If it by Him be bless'd,
He brings it to successful end, And gives the toilers rest.

Behold! the children whom ye love, Are blessings from the Lord,
A heritage sent from above To mankind for reward.

He who is bless'd in early life With children's loving smiles,
Is like a warrior arm'd for fight, "Whose darts his quiver fills.

Such man shall never turn aside, But at the gate appear;
Speak to his enemies with pride, Nor shrink away in fear.

During the Fifth Circuit.

(Psalm cxvii.)

Praise ye the Lord, all nations sing,
All people your laudations bring;
For great and lasting is the grace
Which He bestows on Israel's race.
True and enduring is His word,
Then sing aloud, Praise ye the Lord.

During the third Circuit.

Psalm C.

Hebrew text - Psalm C

During the Fourth Circuit.

Psalm CXVII.

Hebrew text - Psalm CXVII

During the Fifth Circuit.

Psalm CXVII.

Hebrew text - Psalm CXVII

Ye saints, exulting voices raise, In song your thanks proclaim,
All mindful of God's holy ways, And His exalted name.

For momentary is His rage, But lifelong is His grace;
Though tears the night's dark hours engage, With dawn come joy and peace.

And thence in my security, Triumphantly I said,
"I shall remain immutably, There's nought for me to dread."

O Lord! it pleased Thee to endow With strength my mountain fair,
Thou did'st conceal Thy face, and, lo, Calamity and care.

I raised a supplicating cry, O Lord! Eternal God!
What Good is it, that now I die? What profit is my blood?

"When I descend into the grave, Can I extol Thy name?
Shall the mere clay in utterance have The Lord's truth to proclaim?"

"O Lord! give heed into my prayer, With favour on me shine;
O Lord! on me bestow Thy care, And grant Thy help divine."

Now Thou hast turn'd my wailing grief Into a dance of glee;
My garb of sackcloth taken off, And deck'd me festively.

Therefore my voice to Thee I'll raise, In thankful minstrelsy—
O Lord! Almighty God! Thy praise I'll sing eternally.

During the Second Circuit.

(Psalm xliii.)

Judge me, O God! and aid my cause Against an impious race;
From unjust and deceitful men Release me through Thy grace.

In Thee, O God! my strength abides, Why dost withdraw Thine aid?
Why doth my foes' oppression sore, With grief o'erwhelm my head?

Send forth, I pray, Thy light and truth, To guide me on the road,
Which leadeth to Thy holy hill, Unto Thy bless'd abode.

Then to God's altar will I go; I'll tune my harp, and sing=
My thanks to God, my joy of joys, My Lord—Almighty King!

My soul, why art thou sorrowing, O'erwhelming me with tears?
Put trust in God, praise His great name, And cast aside all fears.

For I will ever offer praise And thanks unto the Lord,
Who hath upheld my countenance, And is Almighty God.

Hebrew text

During the Second Circuit..

Psalm XLIII.

Hebrew text - Psalm XLIII

Previous to the Consecration, Afternoon Service will be read in the Temporary Synagogue at 3 o'Clock.

The Minister, the Wardens, and other Honorary Officers of the Congregation, bring the Scrolls of the Law to the door of the New Synagogue, when the Minister exclaims in Hebrew:—

Open unto me the gates of righteousness; I will enter them, and praise the Lord.

The doors being opened, the Minister and others enter in procession, with the Scrolls in'their arms, when the Minister and Choir Chant:—

How goodly are thy tents, O Jacob! thy tabernacles, O Israel!

O Lord! I have ever loved the habitation of thy house, and the dwelling-place of thy glory.

We will come into thy tabernacles, and worship at thy footstool.

The procession then passes up the Synagogue, under the Canopy, until it arrives at the Ark; during its progress the Minister and Choristers sing :

From the Lord's house, we praise proclaim
On him who cometh in his name.
On us th' Eternal God doth shine,
And bless us with His light divine;
The sacrifice for Him design'd,
Upon the altar haste to bind.
A thankful prayer to Thee I'll raise :
Thou art my God, Thy name I'll praise.
The Lord is good, unto His name
Let us with praise our thanks proclaim,
For everlasting, good and pure,
His gracious mercy will endure.

Hear, O Israel, the Eternal is our God; the Eternal is One.

Our God is a Unity : great is our Lord, Whose name is the Most Holy.

The procession then passes round the Synagogue seven times; during each circuit one of the following Psalms is chanted by the Minister and Choristers.

During the First Circuit.

(Psalm xxx.)

Lord! Thou hast protected me, And lifted me on high,
Hast saved me from mine enemy, Still'd his exulting cry.
I will extol Thy mighty name; I cried, O Lord; to Thee,
From Thee, my God! assistance came, Thou hast deliver'd me.
Thou hast redeem'd my soul from death, My life Thou hast restored,
Hast saved me from the grave beneath, Eternal, mighty Lord!

Hebrew text

During the First Circuit.

(Psalm XXX.)

Hebrew text - Psalm XXX

Dunedin Review.

THE ISLES OF THE PACIFIC.

THIS is a delightful book of 224 pages, profusely illustrated, by B. Francis. The Pacific Ocean is said to cover nearly half the globe, and sketches of its emerald isles set in azure are always attractive. New Zealand engrosses 100 pages of the work. This is the most remote corner of the British Empire, and still the most nearly resembling England, in respect to its climate, atmosphere, and productions. We "have completely filled it with our own people, plants, and animals, and built towns and villages almost like those in our own land. The climate, too, is in some respects like our own, but warmer and finer, and the atmosphere is clear and bright, and the sky very blue. There is a slight dampness in the air, owing, it is thought, to the vast tracts of water by which it is surrounded, but which keeps the foliage and the grass as green as it is in England. Of all the islands in the world, New Zealand is surrounded by the largest extent of water." The natives of these isles of New Zealand are "a fine, intelligent tribe of men." Captain Cook "found them living in villages, in huts made of wood and reeds. They wore clothing woven from the native flax, and dyed with bark, and they made stone weapons, and instruments of various kinds, and cooked their food. They also cultivated their land, and made laws about property, and stored provisions against bad times. Being much given to fighting among themselves, they made forts and defences of the most ingenious kind. Though they had no written language, they had all sorts of songs and proverbs, handed down from generation to generation; and they knew and had named every bird, plant, and insect in their island. They had also names for the stars, and called the constellations from fancied resemblances to different familiar objects, such as canoes or weapons. They had various amusements and games, many of them like our own—such as flying kites, walking on stilts, wrestling, and hide-and-seek. They treated their wives well. They were cannibals, and after a battle it was their custom to kill and eat the prisoners they had taken. They had no religion, only a sort of strange mythology of their own, but they believed in a future existence."

We are told that "the fruits and flowers of New Zealand are endless in variety and beauty." Roots and seeds imported from England flourish here in great perfection. In the Northern Island, "the myrtle and scarlet geranium bloom unsheltered all the year round; and grapes, figs, and melons ripen perfectly in the open air, and oranges, bananas, and pine-apples."

Currants, gooseberries, strawberries, potatoes, grow in great profusion in the South Islands. Our flowers—roses, honeysuckle, lavender, mignonnette, snow-drops, crocuses, and daffodils blossom luxuriantly; also, the oak, elm, and other English trees. A New Zealand forest in its native wildness is a most beautiful sight, with its infinite variety of pine trees, evergreens, creepers, and shrubs. Many of the large trees bear lovely flowers, and the ground is carpeted with them. Among the most beautiful plants are the tree-fern and the cabbage-palm; the commonest is the manuka scrub, which grows all over the island. It is something like a myrtle, and has white, and sometimes pink, blossoms. All the native trees, with one or two exceptions, are evergreen."

The Maoris ornament their heads with feathers, combs, and pearl shells. "In their ears they wear pieces of jasper or green-jade, and sharks' teeth. The women adorn their necks with strings of sharks' teeth and a particular kind of berry." New Zealand is rich in "a great variety of birds; green parrots and pigeons of various kinds; the bell-bird, with its sweet, dreamy note; the iris, or parson-bird, who wears a glossy black suit; and the New Zealand robin, who is no robin at all, but has a yellowish-white breast." We have wood-hens also, and several species of the kiwi. They have neither wings nor tails, and are covered with hair. The moa is extinct. The Maoris—a tall, well-built race—with coarse black hair, large noses and mouths, "tattoo their faces most elegantly and elaborately." They, also, "smear their faces with oil and red ochre." With respect to their superstitious rites, the *tapu* and *murū* are very singular. The *tapu* means that a thing is sacred and not to be touched. With regard to the *murū*, "if any one has an accident or affliction, it is thought a compliment and a token of sympathy to visit him, eat up all his provisions, and sometimes rob him of everything he possesses! "

Like the Homeric heroes, "when a chief died, it was considered right and proper to kill a slave

immediately, in order that the great man might have a spirit to attend him into another world. One or more of his wives would always make an end of herself, that she might accompany her husband."

Of course these rites are now discontinued. However, "the wives content themselves with covering their heads, howling and lamenting for days together." These lamentations and certain ceremonies and a great deal of feasting always accompany the death of a chief, and constitute a *Tangi*."

Samuel Marsden was the first missionary to the Maoris. "In 1808 he visited England, and laid the foundation of the Church of England Mission in New Zealand." On his way back, he made the acquaintance of Ruatara—a young Maori chief, who like other young chiefs had gone to England, and had been cruelly treated by unprincipled captains. George, one of the ill-treated Maoris, had his revenge on the captain and crew, who were murdered on their return. But Ruatara proved a real friend and helper to the benevolent Mr Marsden. On the 19th November, 1814, Marsden embarked from Sydney for New Zealand with the pioneer missionaries. They landed at the Bay of Islands, "at the spot where the massacre had taken place." The missionary dissuaded the natives from further acts of mutual hostilities, for they were fighting on his arrival.

On Christmas Day, 1814, Marsden preached the first sermon in New Zealand. The natives for the first time heard "the glad tidings of great joy!" Praise first rose up to heaven in the words of the Old Hundredth Psalm. There was a large congregation. Hangi, another chief who had visited England, and had been kindly treated, and received guns from King George, caused great trouble to the missionaries, and much carnage among the Maoris; for in his raids on other tribes "villages were burned, and hundreds of prisoners killed and eaten." The labours of Mr Williams for forty years require special praise. In 1836, the New Testament was translated into Maori, and in 1842, Mr Williams welcomed Bishop Selwyn to New Zealand. The Gospel and the Church came to subdue "the power of sin over the heart of unregenerate man."

The New Zealand Company was formed, "and sent out settlers, under the guidance of Colonel Wakefield, to buy land from the natives—to be paid for in all sorts of things which the Maoris valued more: tools, seeds, looking-glasses, clothing, muskets, gunpowder, &c." Land enough was bought in a year, and the natives began to repent of their foolish bargains; hence the subsequent wars. At last Captain Hobson hoisted the British flag, and the Treaty of Waitangi was "signed by 46 chiefs in 1840." This year also Taranaki was founded by the N.Z. Company, the settlers being mainly from Devon and Cornwall. New Plymouth is "one of the most beautifully situated towns in the world." It is built at the foot of Mount Egmont, cone-shaped, covered with snow, with sugar-loaf rocks around it. In 1844 Heke cut down the flagstaff at the Bay of Islands, and set the Government at defiance.

Troops were sent from Sydney to put down the rebels. But from this time we must really date "the beginning of the New Zealand war." True, there were a few years of peace, but "the seeds of the terrible wars of more modern times were sown" then and there. A Land League was created, "to prevent the settlers getting more land into their hands, and in 1858 a King was set up at Rangiawhia. Governor Browne was likened to the *kapu* or hawk, "which hovered over head, and though a bird of prey still could always be seen." Whereas, Sir George Grey was compared to the *Mori* or rat, "which worked underground, so that it could not be told where it went in or where it would come out." Striking comparison and true to the core; as subsequent events proved. "In 1883 the terrible campaign of the Waikato began." The bravery of the Maoris shone out conspicuously at the Gate Pah, which was defended by 300 natives against 1,700 English, with Armstrong guns. Twenty-seven were killed, of whom 11 were officers, and 70 wounded. Tamihana, the Maori chief and friend of England, established a newspaper, was a pacificator throughout, and told his countrymen on his death-bed "to stand by the Government and the law." The watchwords of this King-maker were *Christianity, Love, Law*. Like Cassandra, his counsels were not heeded—else there had been no wars at all.

New Zealand is famed for its beautiful scenery, fertile soil, and genial climate. Lady Baker's "Station Life" gives us "delightful pictures of the free, open-air life of the farmers and their families settled there." The forests, ferns, and mountains are splendid, so also are the lakes, hot-springs, baths, rivers, streams, plains, glens, and gullies.

"Fully a quarter of the Canterbury Province is one enormous plain of 3,000,000 acres, all divided into sheep runs, and covered with flocks and herds. The principal city, Christchurch, is built on the banks of the beautiful river Avon."

Otago was founded by the New Zealand Company, and colonised by the Scotch, on the 23rd March, 1848. In 1861 gold was discovered in Otago, and "the effect of the discovery was almost like the touch of the wand of Cinderella's fairy god-mother on this part of New Zealand. Fine buildings sprang up in the towns, gas illumined the streets, railways and telegraph wires crossed the country."

Dunedin is now the first city in the Colony, and "one of the finest of colonial cities."

The Maoris are dying off in obedience to a strange law of nature, which decrees that in whatever land the white man settles the dark native race diminishes, and as it were melts away before him."

NEW CALEDONIA,

THE most southerly of Melanesia, is 240 miles long, very mountainous and barren. The bread-fruit grows here. Plan tains, sugar-canes, and cocoa-nuts are to be found. The natives use spears, darts, slings, and clubs, and Tomahawks. They are good fishers, and catch sardines, eels, cray-fish, mullet, shell-fish and molluscs. The chiefs hold absolute rule, and have the power of life and death. Their ancestors are their gods, whose relics are carefully kept, and to which they pray before fighting, fishing, planting, feasting. The spirits of the dead go to the bush, where, periodically, feasts are spread before them. As in New Zealand, the first Christian worship was held on Christmas Day. "In a temple of waving cocoa-nut trees, with the blue sky for its roof, and the singing of birds in the branches, and the gentle murmur of the waves on the beach supplying the place of the solemn strains of the organ," the first act of public devotion was performed, We read of "the beauty of the scenery, the glorious mountains grand and bare, and the green valleys, and broad rivers often forming cascades." They are now comparatively civilized. Such is the marvellous influence "of the Gospel in taming the ferocity of savages and paving the way for the advance of civilization. It not only teaches them what is right and just, but wins their hearts to approve it; and thus prepares them to yield a willing obedience to fair and equitable laws."

THE LOYALTY AND FIJI ISLANDS.

Sandal-wood forms their staple article of barter. "They are the most civilized of the Melanesian race, and nearly all Christianized. There is a certain resemblance in all the languages of the Pacific Islanders, though there are an immense variety of them, all totally distinct." The Fiji group numbers 150 islands of all shapes and sizes. The largest is Viti Levu. Levuka, the capital, is on Ovalau. They were a very savage and degraded race of cannibals, but are now Christianized. They used to bury each other alive—generally with the consent of the party to be interred. They had a great variety of gods, with qualities like themselves. The natives are fond of dancing. The women are graceful, and light and agile in movement. Before conversion they were fearfully superstitious. They are also lazy. The climate is pleasant. The sea breeze sweeping continually over the islands keeps them comparatively cool and fresh during the summer; but the midges, flies and, mosquitoes, that love the damp, are almost intolerable. Insect life flourishes in Fiji. There are also rats, frogs, lizards and snakes.

Twenty years ago—1863—I wrote a series of letters and articles, urging upon the people of Australia and New Zealand to insist upon the English Government assuming the sovereignty of this group. Now the Fiji Isles form England's youngest Colony. England should annex the whole of the Pacific Isles, and thus prevent other powers stepping in upon this large archipelago. But Gladstone's parish policy prevents this desirable consummation.

THE ISLAND OF TAHITI

Produces cocoanuts, oranges, guavas, bread-fruit, banana, &c. It is "crossed on all sides by splendid mountains, of which the highest is 7000ft. All these mountains are surrounded by a belt of land, which is inhabited, and skirted by splendid forests." Tahiti has been called the Queen of the Pacific. In 1797, "missionaries first entered the Matavai Bay, and were enchanted with the beauty of the Island." The natives are tall, graceful, the skin not dark, and their hair is sometimes red or flaxen. They have big mouths, flat noses, and white teeth. The women annoint their skin with cocoanut oil. They have short hair. The chiefs keep very long nails, and are tatoed. "The native dress is formed of a kind of cloth, resembling paper, made from the bark of certain trees, particularly of the paper-mulberry. They are vegetarians. The island abounds in birds, ducks, green turtle-doves, pigeons, parrots, king-fishers, cuckoos, herons. Snakes there are none. The climate is decidedly warm and healthy." They retire to rest shortly after dark—a good custom. They "use a kind of oily nut, stuck upon a piece of wood for a candle. The mats in their houses are woven in a wonderfully clever and dexterous manner, of rushes, grass, and the bark of trees. They also make very nice baskets, ropes, and lines, from the bark of a tree, and thread from the fibre of the cocoanut," &c.

Fishing lines are made of nettle, nets of grass, and hooks of mother-of-pearl. They have also stone hatchets, chisels of human bone, and rasps of coral. Now they get plenty of European tools. The general complaint is "that the missionaries give them plenty of word, talk, and prayer, but very few knives, axes, scissors or cloth."

The Tahitian tongue was "the first Polynesian language reduced to writing." At first they were "in a deplorable condition of ignorance and superstition. They worshipped idols, killed their own children, and offered human sacrifice to their gods, especially to their principal deity, Oro, who was nothing but a straight log of hard wood, six feet long, and decorated with feathers." The king, Pomare, was first converted, then a powerful priest, Potu, and at last, in the year 1814, "five or six hundred had renounced idol-worship, and the following year it was totally overthrown." In the space of less than 20 years Tahiti became Christianized.

An aged chief confessed at a meeting of missionaries that he had murdered his 19 children on the very spot where they were gathered together. "What a contrast between his present moral state and the black ignorance of crime that formerly reigned in his heart!"

THE SANDWICH ISLANDS

Are 2350 miles from San Francisco, and the same distance from Japan, the Marquesas, the Samoa Islands, and the Alentian Islands. "They are only connected with the other Pacific Islands by bare coral reefs, the nearest of which is 700 miles off." They are civilised and Christianized, with an educated king. They are seven in number; besides four rocky and uninhabited islets. Hawaii, the largest, is 70 miles across. It has vast volcanic mountains, some 14,000 feet high. "Hilo, the principal town in Hawaii, is one of the most delightful places in the world. The crescent-shaped bay is fringed with cocoanut and palm trees, and the town beyond looks from the sea like one mass of greenery, for white houses are half burried in the rich, luxuriant vegetation." The people are indolent and voluptuous. They are passionately fond of flowers. "The girls and women are constantly employed in making wreaths and necklaces of every description, with which they adorn themselves." The *taro* or *kalo*, a sort of arum, forms the principal article of diet. They are famous bathers and swimmers. Molokai Island is reserved for lepers. "Father Danneus, a man of education and refinement, has chosen to give up all the comforts and enjoyments of life" in order to minister to the wants of his afflicted fellow islanders. He is a noble example of heroic self-sacrifice. The volcano of Kilanea is the largest in the world—a gulph of liquid fire, nine miles in circumference and 1000 feet deep down the centre. It issues out of Mauna Loa, which with Mauna Kea, are the two great volcanic mountains towering over Hilo. Fancy a river of fire issuing from four huge fountains, throwing crimson lava, and rocks weighing many tons, to a height of 1000 feet. Fancy, I say, "a river of fire from 200 to 800 feet wide, and 20 feet deep, with a speed varying from 10 to 25 miles an hour."

PITCAIRN ISLAND.

Dimensions 6x3 miles. Shores rocky. Water around it deep. "But within the rocky precipices round the coast are lovely valleys with palm-forests and groves of cocoa-nut, bread and fruit-trees. The climate is delicious and the soil rich. It is the scene of the story of the Mutineers of the Bounty. Life here in the open air among flowers and cocoa-nut trees is Elysian. "The little village of Pitcairn stands on a rock, in the midst of bananas and banyan trees, and surrounded by glorious scenery. The women wear a loose bodice and skirt down to the ankles, and their long black hair twisted into a graceful knot, without any pin or fastening. Their food was pork or fowls, baked between stones, bread-pudding, made of the Taro root, fruit, and vegetables."

In 1829, John Adams, the good patriarch, died; and in 1856, the people migrated to Tahiti; "but a small portion became so home-sick that they made their way back to Pitcairn Island."

The Marquesas—a group of islands discovered in 1595 by a Spanish Marquis. They are numerous, and "vary in size from 10 to 20 miles." The climate is both warm and salubrious. "They are not encircled by coral reefs. The coast is rocky and abrupt, but there are very good harbours, such as Resolution Bay, in Tahuata." The natives have "wonderfully beautiful figures." The women are both "simply and gracefully dressed in tunics of snow-white tapa, and mantles of the same, with necklaces and flowers strung together on fibres of tapa, bracelets and anklets made in the same way, and garlands of flowers on their heads—the perfection of grace and beauty.

Their idols are rough, clumsy, possessed of great power, but often treated disrespectfully. They are splendid swimmers.

EASTER ISLAND

Is thirty or forty miles in circumference. Its natives "live on yams, potatoes, and sugar-cane, the soil being so fertile that three days' work is sufficient to provide sustenance for a native for a whole year. Easter Island is celebrated for the wonderful remains of some prehistoric people, who must have lived there ages before the race who now inhabit it, and about whom the people there now cannot tell us anything at all. The remains consist of stone houses, sculptured stones, and gigantic stone images." Sculptured monuments extend over the island—"the most extraordinary are found in nearly every headland round the coast, where there is almost always an enormous platform of stone."

"Towards the sea there are high walls built of immense stones most ingeniously fitting into one another without cement, and stone platforms and terraces have been levelled with large slabs which had been pedestals for the images. Most of those slabs were 15 or 18 feet high, and some 37 feet. The figures are human bodies without legs, the heads being flat to allow of crowns being put on; these crowns were made of a red material found only at a crater three miles from the stone houses. The houses are built on regular lines, with doors facing

the sea, the walls are 5 feet thick and 6 feet high, built of layers of irregularly-shaped flat stone, and lined inside with upright flat slabs. These are painted with figures of birds and animals, and geometrical figures. Quantities of a particular shell were found inside the houses, and in one of them a statue 8 feet high. Near these houses the rocks on the brink of the sea-cliffs are carved into all sorts of strange shapes, sometimes like odd human faces, and sometimes like turtle."

Was there once a civilisation over the Pacific Isles? Was this isle the Delos of the great Archipelago? Who can tell? The whole is enveloped in a mysterious shroud. So much for the Isles of the Pacific by B. Francis. It is a charming book, and will well repay the cost of purchase and the labour of perusal. It is full of illustrations, and fraught with wisdom.

A Scamper Through America.

T. S. HUDSON, in this book of 289 pages, records daily the incidents and impressions of a voyage over 15,000 miles of sea and land, accomplished in 60 days. He left Liverpool on Good Friday, 1882, and after two months he was back again. Quick, consecutive, and *unprecedented* travelling. Prefixed to the book is a table of daily contents, of 22 pages. There are several typographical, and some orthographical errors. The work is distributed into 60 divisions, *e.g.*, Day one, &c. At Day ten, Mr Hudson records his impressions of New York. He is sadly annoyed at the American "vexatious operation of protectionist imposts." The street cars, and the crude telegraph poles, and the dingy lamp posts "would have disgraced the smallest English towns." The hotels presented "a mixture of splendour and coarseness." He considers that "the officials and waiters are repulsive, rude," as their "filthy national habit" of smoking. *Politeness* is not in the Yankee market at any quotation. Courtesy there is none, and the "meals are bolted" down like pigs. At Day eleven we read that "if you are so confiding as to run the risk of theft by putting your shoes outside of your bed-room door to be cleaned, and you should be so fortunate as to get them back again, a charge of ten cents appears in your bill." The charge for carriages is almost prohibitory. "The vestibules of these palatial buildings are crowded by sitting and moving groups of male persons in an everlasting buzz of conversation, or *chewing* or smoking for ever." The "*sallow complexions of the people*" and their insane "advertising enterprise" are held up to merited condemnation. The landscapes are "blurred by huge letters painted upon rocks and trees." Boston is characterised as the Edinburgh of America. The scenery on the Hudson, after leaving Hudson town, "was quite equal to the Rhine, and in one part almost as grand as the Iron Gate of the Danube." The trams and roadways of Philadelphia were "more rugged and uneven than those of New York, there being holes in the middle of the best streets, and the crossings were very bad." Philadelphia is "the largest city in area" in America, with a million citizens. Brook Street is 23 miles long. But "the other streets are poor, and have all the objectional points of American cities—open drains, filthy and rotten wooden shades over the footpaths, rough telegraph posts, &c."

Fairmount Park is "the largest city park in the world, being 14 miles on both sides of the river Schuylkill, which is crossed by elegant bridges."

The American railway stations are the *veriest hovels*. In that land of pseudo-freedom the *coloured* people are not allowed to worship with the whites in churches and chapels. In "Washington" the lamp-posts which adorn the steps and balconies" of the Capitol "would be put to shame by an ordinary gin-palace lamp; and in front of the building is a dirty pool of water containing a few hungry gold-fish, and surrounded by a rusty iron paling." What could we expect from the capital of Mobocracy? Certainly not Attic taste. The vulgar representatives and senators smoke in their legislative halls. "We heard on every hand regret expressed at the decadence of the House, owing to universal suffrage having placed the seats in the hands of men who pandered to the mob, the result being that the best men kept aloof from politics."

The ascent of the Alleghany Mountains is a matter of some engineering ingenuity. "For 17 miles the train, drawn by two powerful locomotives, pursued its serpentine and upward way, the most of the time on the brink of deep gullies, where, hundreds of feet beneath us, the swollen mountain torrents rushed along their rocky beds, fed every few yards by foaming cascades which dashed under or over our very cars, as we sped along. At the extreme summit of the range, 2,800 feet above the sea, we noticed the waters hesitate which way to flow, and then exhibit a tendency to run in one direction, until very quickly the little rills united into the impetuous stream which formed the upper waters of the Youghiogeny river. Descending by heavy cuttings, embankments, and tunnels, for 20 miles, we reached the end of this mountain section at Grafton."

The Southern Hotel at St. Louis "is not behind any in Europe for any one thing excepting situation; and for grandeur, size, and comfort combined, is not eclipsed in either continent. The Palace at San Francisco beats it for size, and the Windsor at Montreal for luxurious elegance; but the other three monster hotels of the world—the Baldwin at San Francisco, the Palmer House and Grand Pacific at Chicago, do not excel it in any material particular."

Fancy a bridge of 3,000 yards spanning the Missouri river! Advancing Westward Ho, one can see trains of emigrant waggons, drawn by mules—"the straggling succession of bullock-drawn waggons that wended in long trains up the course of the Platte in pre-railroad days, sometimes for miles actually in the shallow water or dry part of the bed of the stream." The town of Cheyenne is 6,041ft high, with a population of 6,000. It has two daily newspapers. "Endless and poor-looking prairies surround it." Coming in sight of the snow-clad Rocky Mountains, "for 30 miles the train climbed up jagged granite rocks, winding in and out of the wooden sheds built to keep the snow off the track." The snow sheds are numerous, and one of them is 28 miles long.

During the afternoon of Day 25, they reached Sherman, 8,242 feet above the sea—"the highest railway station in the world." On the whole route there were 250 stations, traversed in six days and nights from ocean to ocean. But for the long stoppages, the journey could be done in four days. America is greatly over-rated. "Even in the most favoured parts very little greenness ever refreshes the eye." Much of it is a region of desolation—"where the lack of moisture and the prevalence of alkali which covered the face of the earth like dirty snow—debarred the possibility of any vegetation whatever, excepting the pertinacious and useless sage-brush—a poor-looking, scentless shrub not unlike the fragrant plant from which it derives its name."

The western States and territories—parts of California and Texas excepted—"already supported as many people' as could find subsistence." No rivers and no moisture to grow cereals. In Nevada, there is only a rainfall of three inches annually. Utah is in the same parched state. The land is fitted for pasturage only, as in Australia. "The Mormon capital is well laid out There are 260 blocks, each one-eighth of a mile square, sub-divided into eight lots, each containing one and a-half acres. Trees and running water line each street, and almost every lot has an orchard of pear, plum, peach, and apple-trees. The houses are mostly of one storey, with separate entrances where the proprietor has more than one wife. To the north the mountains are close up to the city, while to the south are 100 miles of plains, beyond which rise, clear-cut and grand, the grey range whose peaks are covered with perpetual snow." The Tabernacle is seated for 12,000 persons. Its interior elevation is 60 feet. It has 20 large doors—through which in a minute and a-half it can be emptied. "Polygamy should be stamped out as the plague."

At Wells Station, there are 20 springs—5 or 6 feet in diameter, nearly round, apparently bottomless. "After passing Be-o-wa-we Station, we observe jets and columns of steam rising in a line from a barren hill-side. From this line boiling, muddy, sulphuric water descended, desolating everything in its course, and escaping through the bogs of the plains."

A whole day was spent traversing Humboldt Yalley, through which the Humboldt river flows, until it empties itself into Humboldt Lake. This, and smaller lakes, appear to have no outlets and yet large rivers flow into them! No underground exitbut the evaporation in summer is equal to 6 inches per day.

The Nevada Plains, for hundreds of miles of lava and clay, are, indeed, dreary deserts. "No green thing meets the eye as it roams over thousands of acres covered with dirty white alkali. The sun's rays fall glaringly upon the barren scene; burning and withering and crushing out any attempt of Nature to introduce life."

Day 29—"Having left Reno in the early evening, our train had proceeded along the bank of the Truchee River, and ascending 1,060 in 26 miles, passed out of Nevada into California." After emerging out of a 28 mile snow-shed, "we were tearing along high up on one side of a deep valley. No more snow; but the hills covered with tall pines, and far, far down at the foot of the precipice spread luxuriant verdure. A short stoppage was made at Summit, 7,000 feet above the sea, and 240 miles from San Francisco. We wended round the brow of the mountain where the track is cut in a sharp descent out of the very-front of the precipice. An enchanting occupation it was to gaze perpendicularly down upon the tree-tops and streaks of river below." And now "from the desert of Nevada we descended into the fruitful plains of California"—which is 1,800 long and 200 broad on an average. The Palace Hotel covers three acres. It is seven stories high—the lowest being 27 feet—and the highest 16. "Five elegant elevators, constantly ascending and descending, convey 1,200 guests to and from the rooms."

Chinatown—the Chinese quarter of San Francisco—"is the dirtiest and most densely populated mass of buildings under the sun." Here are 20,000 pagans. Congress has passed an Act "prohibiting further immigration from the Flowery land for ten years."

What a travesty on freedom! But "the American statesman is the slave of the lowest of the population." Such a law is at variance with "the very foundations of universal liberty upon which its constitution is framed." San Francisco is made of wood. Whole blocks can be removed at will by house-removers. The telephone is greatly utilised. The traveller gives us a minute description of the Safe Deposit Block. Its name indicates its use. The tramway system is good. "On California Street there are four lines of rails." In the hilly parts "dummy cars are employed, drawn by an endless rope enclosed in a casing level with the roadway, a slit in which admits a lever worked by the conductor of the dummy, by which the starting and stopping is accomplished with great ease. The motive power is a stationary engine of 500 horse-power."

The Americans, it is said, evinced "an unmistakeable feeling of satisfaction at the dastardly murders in

Phoenix Park, Dublin." The expression of a gentlemanly-looking American to the expressed horror of the writer, on hearing the sad news, was—"Wal, you Britishers have used Ireland tarnation badly." Travelling in California is no child's play—but the drivers are said to be very expert Jehus. Sometimes, they attained a height of 6,300 feet above sea level. Down beneath was the wondrous Yosemite Valley. The Yosemite Fall "takes a vertical leap of 1,500 feet, and then an unbroken fall of 600 feet to the bottom of the chasm. The bed of the valley, through which the river Merced flows, receiving the waters from all the falls, is 4,000 feet above sea level." The Bridal Veil—30 yards across—"drops clean over a ledge 900 feet high. The Virgin's Tears Creek makes a fine fall of 3,300 feet enclosed in a deep recess of the rock. There are six other falls of similar dimensions, and innumerable *ribbon falls*, whose fantastic motions, as wafted by the wind over the face of the smooth granite, form an interesting feature in a Spring inspection of this enchanting gorge." Sunrise and sunset in California are said to be very good, "the orb of day rising and setting clean against the horizon of sea or land, without any traces of haze or cloud." California is a farmer's paradise. "The regularity of the seasons being such that his operations can be carried on with the minimum of uncertainty as to results."

On Day 39, they passed through the Loop Tunnel, where, "to suit the exigencies of the construction of the line, the road is made to describe a circle and go under and over itself." We have a picture presented to us of the orange groves and rose gardens of Los Angeles—The city of the Angels—which lies at the southern base of the Sierra Santa Monica Mountains—" is completely embosomed in foliage; being irrigated from the Los Angeles river by windmills, vineyards, orange and lemon orchards, and lovely gardens and groves meet the eye at every turn, while magnificent plantations stretch away as far as sight can ken." South California excels Greece and Italy in point of climate. "Yuma has 300 cloudless days in a year, Los Angeles 260, New York 120, London 60!"

Tucson—the capital of Arizona—is said to be the second oldest town in America.

Day 38 was, also, "through wilderness, the chief production being cacti of every shape and size," there being 150 varieties. The Indians are called by the Yankees *vermin*, which is ruthlessly killed by the soldiers. Santa Fé is reached in Day 39 — the city of the Holy faith, 700 feet high. At Las Vegas are hot springs. The Ratan Tunnel, deep in the bowels of the Rocky Mountains, is passed through on Day 40. Next day by a downward grade, they reached the State of Colorado. Then passed into Kansas, "following the flat banks of the Arkansas river, in some places 40 miles wide." Next to Massachusetts it is the most progressive and intellectual State of the Union. McPherson Lakeisrich in wild fowls, grouse, quail, and prairie duck being plentiful. Speaking of the Government of the Union, Hudson says that "there are 55 lawyers amongst the 76 senators, and of the 293 members of Congress, 177 are of the same fraternity! "

Day 42, the train swept through waving cornfields and rich pastures fenced in, as had not been the case previously for thousands of miles. In a few years the city of Kansas has sprung up rapidly, having 60,000 citizens. American liberty is only a *name*—considering the treatment of the Indians and Chinese. Theories as to equality of races and nations are all very fine; but let our friends practise first and boast afterwards." The writer speaks of the enormous *strikes* of the Americans! Those Trade Unions threaten to be dangerous, "if free-trade in labour is to be prevented by Acts of Congress." Chicago "is a veritable Phoenix begotten of the ashes. Paving here is on an enormous scale—" huge blocks of stone, 12 x 10 feet and a foot thick, securely set and needing no curbstone. Book-shops, on a great scale, abound in the city. Lake Michigan is 400 miles long and 100 miles wide. It waters the city. The City Hall is the third grandest in America—"the Capitol at Washington and the State House at Albany ranking before it. Thirteen swivel-bridges, revolving on piers in the middle of the river, connect the principal streets, and are opened and closed with great ease and rapidity by hydraulic machinery." The American women are, in a word, blue-stockings, "one could admire, revere, worship; but *love* them, *never*."

The influences of Puritanism and Boston are everywhere felt. Except Scotland, "the Sabbath is better observed than in any other country." In April, 1882, "one hundred and eight thousand immigrants from Europe arrived at New York alone! "America has quite enough to do to supply their wants. The Niagara Falls are described in the usual way. Toronto is a well built city of nearly 100,000 citizens. "The lake-side situation of Toronto is effective, and the country around is highly cultivated and picturesque. An utter absence of paving and Macadam causes all the streets to be perfect bogs in wet weather, and all the wooden side-walks, although cleanly and good to walk upon where not worn into holes, are not consistent with the pretensions of the architecture. For 40 miles of the St Lawrence, "we threaded 1,692 islands—that reach of the noble river called the Lake of the Thousand Islands." The art of *shooting the rapids*, before reaching Montreal, is somewhat perilous. " The Windsor Castle at Montreal is one of the chief glories of Canadians. The city lies in a plain, immediately to the rear of which rises a hill 700 feet high. Along the river for four miles stretch the streets and buildings, reaching inland about two miles." From Mount Royal the panorama is splendid. The numerous islands and rapids of the river and the monster railway bridge nearly two miles long, are visible. "The mountains of St. Clair, Belleisle, and Busheville, rise against the eastern horizon, and to the northward is a

fertile country melting away to bleak-looking hills in the direction of Labrador. The whole of the ground for many miles, particularly along the banks of the river, is covered with habitations, which, being whitewashed and standing amid plots of well-cultivated land and trees, give an idea of prosperity and happiness that is everywhere evident in Canada. The solid grey limestone presents a display of continuous substantial masonry unequalled on the North American Continent; and fountains and statues are not wanting to testify to the successful efforts of the citizens to maintain the reputation of Montreal as a model city for construction and embellishment. Notre Dame is an old and spacious cathedral, and strange, "the whole space was covered with pews." The Cathedral of St. Peter—after the model of the Roman—"was in course of construction. Its design included five domes and twenty chapels. The Episcopal Cathedral is a unique specimen of English Gothic, and is surmounted by a spire 224 feet in height."

The voyage through the Atlantic Ocean, with 190 icebergs in sight, on Day 55, may have been picturesque, but it was perilous with the temperature as low as 39 degrees Fahrenheit. After leaving the Banks of Newfoundland, the sailing was delightful. As the steamer passed into Lough Foyle at dawn of Day 60, they were delighted with "the ever-vaunted verdancy of the Irish vegetation." Such greenness is not to be seen in American landscapes, "even in the choicest spots of the American Continent." In that respect the British Isles beat America, and New Zealand beats them. They "crossed the Mersey bar within an hour of 60 days from the commencement of our scamper of close upon fifteen thousand miles."

The story of their wanderings by sea and land is well told, and is pregnant with thought, and suggestive of reflections of the great strides of progress and civilisation achieved in 1882. So much for the "Scamper Through America."

New Novels and New Supplies.

Lyon & Blair's Monthly Review.

John Inglesant. By J. H. Shorthouse. 7s. 6d.

A Ball-Room Repentance. By Mrs. Edwardes. 7s. 6d.

An Australian Heroine. By Mrs. Campbell Praed. 7s. 6d.

Stephen Archer. By George Macdonald. 7s. 6d.

The Root of all Evil. By Florence Marryat. 4s. 6d.

"The Lady Maud." By Clark Russell. 7s. 6d.

The Village Comedy. By Mortimer and Frances Collins. 4s. 6d.

Nadine: The Study of a Woman. By Mrs. C. Praed. 6s. 6d.

Only a Word. By George Ebers. 6s.

Stray Pearls: Memoirs of Margaret de Ribbaumont, Viscountess of Bellaise. By Charlotte M. Yonge. 2 vols. 12s.

Paul Faber. By George Macdonald. 2s.

Thomas Wingfold, Curate. By George Macdonald. 2s.

Kit. By James Payne. 2s. 6d.

Proud Maisie. By Bertha Thomas. 2s.

The Leaden Casket. By Alfred W. Hunt. 2s.

The Fun Burst. Edited by H. L. Williams. 2s.

Merry and Wise. Edited by H. L. Williams. 2s.

The Mirthful Medley. Edited by H. L. Williams. 2s.

An Uninhabited House. By Mrs. Riddel. 2s.

Miss Daisy Dimity. By Author of "Queenie." 2s.

Quaker Cousins. By Agnes Macdonell. 2s.

Texas Sitings. By Sweet and Knox. 9d.

An old Fogey. By Max Adeler. 9d.

Spring Number of All the Year Round. 9d.

Mount Royal. By Miss Braddon. 2s.

The Colonel's Daughter. By W. S. Hayward. 2s.

Random Shots. By Max Adeler. 9d.

Tag, Rag & Co. By James Greenwood. 1s. 3d.

Jack Chaloner. By James Grant. 2s.

Two Pretty Girls. By Mary Lewis. 2s.

Odd or Even? By Mrs. Whitney. 2s.

Glimpses through the Cannon Smoke. By A. Forbes. 2s.

Dora's Diamonds. By E. Noble. 2s.
 The Mysteries of Heron Dyke. By T. W. Speight. 2s.
 Some Private Views. By James Payn. 2s.
 James Duke. By William Gilbert. 2s.
 The Fool's Revenge. By Miss Braddon. 1s. 3d.
 Sweetheart and Wife. By Lady Constance Howard. 5s.
 The Christmas Hamper. By Alexander Watt. 1s. 3d.
 No Longer a Child. By Maud Jeanne Franc. 6s.
 Dinglefield. By Mrs. O'Reilly. 4s. 6d.
 Christy Carew; a Novel, by author of Hogan, M. P., 6s. 6d.
 Prince of Wales's Garden Party; by Mrs Riddell, 7s. 6d.
 Through the Ranks to a Commission, 3s. 6d.
 My Mother and I; by Miss Mulock, 7s.
 For the Term of His Natural Life; by Marcus Clarke, 7s. 6d.
 Maude Bolingbroke. By E. J. Worboise. 4s. 6d.
 Pendower: A Story of Cornwall. By M. Filleul. 5s.
 Court Netherleigh. By Mrs. Henry Wood. 7s. 6d.
 The Beautiful Wretch; the Four Macnicols; the Pupil of Aurelius; Three stories in 1 vol. By William Black.
 6s. 6d.
 Uncle Remus. By Joel Chandler Harris. 1s. 3d.
 The Fixed Period: A Novel. By Anthony Trollope. In two vols. 12s. 6d.
 Erema; or, My Father's Sin. By R. D. Blackmore. 6s. 6d.
 The Caged Lion. By Charlotte Yonge. 6s. 6d.
 Lady Hester. By Charlotte Yonge. 6s. 6d.
 The Pupils of St. John the Divine. By Charlotte Yonge. 6s. 6d.
 Impressions of Theophrastus Such. By George Eliot. 7s. 6d.
 Daniel Deronda. By George Eliot. 3 Vols. 18s.
 Hereward the Wake. By Charles Kingsley. 7s.
 Alton Locke. By Charles Kingsley. 7s.
 Water Babies. By Charles Kingsley. 7s.
 Lady Silverdale's Sweetheart. By William Black. 6s. 6d.
 A Sailor's Sweetheart. By Clark Russell.
 Cradock Nowell. By R. D. Blackmore. 6s. 6d.
 Cripps the Carrier. By R. D. Blackmore. 6s. 6d.
 In Silk Attire. By William Black. 6s. 6d.
 Kilmeny. By William Black. 6s. 6d.
 A Daughter of Heth. By William Black. 6s. 6d.
 Three Feathers. By William Black. 6s. 6d.
 Alice Lorraine. By R. D. Blackmore. 6s. 6d.
 Mary Marston. By George Macdonald. 6s. 6d.
 Dynevor Terrace; or the Clue of Life. By Charlotte Yonge. 6s. 6d.
 Footprints. By Sarah Tytler. Illustrated. 7s.
 House by the Works. By Edward Garrett. 6s.
 Prince and the Pauper. By Mark Twain. 2s. 6d.
 Story of A Sin. By Helen Mathers. 5s.
 Red Rag. By Mounteney Jephson. 4s. 6d.
 Dean's Wife. By Mrs. Eiloart. 4s. 6d.
 Endymion. Earl of Beaconsfield. 7s. 6d. and 2s.

New Books & New Editions.

The Colonial List for 1883: Comprising Historical and Statistical Information respecting the Colonial Dependencies of Great Britain, with Maps, &c. By Edward Fairfield.

Dissertations on Early Law and Custom; chiefly selected from Lectures delivered at Oxford. By Sir Henry Sumner Maine. 15s.

Moses and Geology; or, the Harmony of the Bible with Science. By Samuel Kinns, Ph.D. With 110 illustrations. 12s. 6d.

Surnames as a Science. By Robert Ferguson, M.P. 7s. 6d.

- The War in Egypt: Illustrations and Maps from "The Times." By Richard Simpkin. 4s. 6d.
- Jocoseria. By Robert Browning. 6s. 6d.
- A Journey round my Room. By Xavier de Maistre. From the French by Henry Attwell. 3s. 6d.
- Foreign Office Sketches : Reprinted from "Vanity Fair." 7s. 6d.
- Spurzheim's Lectures on Phrenology. By Alfred T. Story, 5s. 6d.
- New Zealand as It Is. By John Bradshaw, J.P. 14s.
- Livy. Books XXII.—XXV. The Second Punic War. Translated into English, with notes, by Alfred John Church, M.A. and William Jackson Brodribb, M.A. With Maps. 10s.
- Seamanship. By William Culley Bergen. Sixth edition. 3s. 6d.
- Elementary Meteorology. By Robert H. Scott, M.A., F.R.S. (New vol., J.S.S.) 6/6.
- Critical and Historical Essays. By Lord Macaulay. Cheap edition, cloth extra, 3s. 6d.; cloth, gilt edges, 4s. 6d.
- Seven Years at Eton, 1857-1864. Edited by James Brinsley-Richards. 7s. 6d.
- Life of General Lord Wolseley. By Charles Rathbone Low, F.R.G.S. 7s. 6d.
- Ranolf and Amohia: A Dream of two Lives. By Alfred Domett. New edition, revised in 2 vols. 15s.
- Health in Schools. Primer. 1s. 3d.
- India: What can it Teach us? A course of Lectures delivered before the University of Cambridge. By F. Max Müller, K.M. 15s. 6d.
- Alirabi, or the Banks and Bankers of the Nile. By a Hadji of Hyde Park. 9s.
- Specimen Days and Collect. By Walt Whitman, 11s. 6d.
- Life of Michael Davitt, Founder of the National Land League; with Collections from his Speeches. By D. B. Cashman. To which is added the Secret History of the Land League by Michael Davitt. 1s. 3d.
- William I., German Emperor and King of Prussia: A Biographical Sketch. By Wm. Beatty-Kingston. 1s. 6d.
- The Western Farmer of America. By Augustus Mongredien. 4d.
- The Official Year Book of the Church of England. 5s. 6d.
- The Works of William Shakspeare. Edited by Charles Knight. A new edition, with Sir John Gilbert's illustrations. 4s. 6d.
- The Works of Alfred Tennyson, Poet Laureate. Cloth, gilt. 9s.
- Rifle Exercises and Musketry Instruction, 1879. 1s. 6d.
- Field Exercises, 1877. Pocket edition. 1s. 6d.
- Longman's Magazine, No. IV., 9d. Parts I., II., and III. still to be had. 9d. each.
- Standing Orders for Local Governing Bodies. By Coleman Phillips. 1s.
- The Science of Ethics. By Leslie Stephen.
- The Principle of Science: A Treatise on Logic and Scientific Method. By W. Stanley Jevons. 15s.
- Selected Essays. By A. Hayward, Esq., Q.C. In two vols.. 12s.
- "Money," "Business," "Progress." By James Piatt. 1s. 3d. each.
- The Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, By Edward Gibbon. Verbatim Reprint. In 3 vols. 18s.
- History of English Poetry from the Eleventh to the Seventeenth Century. By Thomas Warton, B.D. A full reprint, Text and Notes, of editions 1778 and 1781. 7s. 6d.
- Memoirs of the Court of Elizabeth, Queen of England. By Lucy Aiken. 4s. 6d.
- The Rule and Exercises of Holy Living and Dying. By Jeremy Taylor, D.D. 4s. Cd.
- Memoirs of John Evelyn, Esq., F.R.S., comprising his Diary from 1641 to 1705-6, and a Selection of his Familiar Letters. Edited by William Bray, Esq. 4s. 6d.
- A School Greek Grammar. By William W. Goodwin, LL.D. 4s. 6d.
- Political Economy. By Nassau William Senior, M.A. 5s.
- Political Economy for Schools and Colleges. By James E. Thorold Rogers. 5s.
- Chapters on Practical Political Economy, being the substance of Lectures delivered in the University of Oxford. By Professor Bonamy Price. 15s.
- Political Economy. By W. Stanley Jevons, LL.D., &c. 1s. 3d.
- Manual of Political Economy. By Henry Fawcett, M.P. 15s.
- Principles of Political Economy, with some of their Applications to Social Philosophy. By John Stuart Mill. 7s.
- James Mill: A Biography. By Alexander Bain, with portrait. 6s. 6d.
- John Stuart Mill: A Criticism, with Personal Recollections. By Alexander Bain, LL.D. 3s. 6d.
- The State in Relation to Labour. By W. Stanley Jevons. 4s. 6d.
- Free Trade and Protection. By the Right Hon. Henry Fawcett. 4s. 6d.
- Land Nationalisation. By Alfred Russel Wallace. 6s. 6d.

- The Science of Politics. By Sheldon Amos. 6s. 6d.
- Progress and Poverty. By Henry George. 9d.
- Over Legislation. By Herbert Spencer. 1s. 3d.
- The Theory of Political Economy. By W. Stanley Jevons, LL.D. 12s. 6d.
- Rugby Tennessee. By Thomas Hughes. 6s.
- The Principles of a Time Policy: Being an Exposition of a Method of Settling Disputes between Employers and Labourers. By R. S. Moffat. 5s.
- Lombard Street: A Description of the Money Market. By Walter Bagehot. 9s. 6d.
- Mental Science, comprising Method, by Samuel Taylor Coleridge; and Logic and Rhetoric, by Richard Whately, D.D. 6s.
- The Coming Democracy. By G. Harwood. 7s.
- Elements of Logic. By Richard Whately. 5s. 6d.
- Constitutional History of England, by Henry Hallam; and, The Constitution of England, by L. de Lohne. In one vol. 3s.
- The Constitutional History of England, from the accession of Henry VII. to the death of George II. By Henry Hallam. With Addendum and Macaulay's Essay. 7s.
- An Inquiry into the Causes of the Wealth of Nations. By Adam Smith, LL.D., F.R.S. 4s. 6d.
- The Beginnings of History according to the Bible and the Traditions of Oriental Peoples. From the Creation of Man to the Deluge. By Francois Lenormant. 14s. 6d.
- Orts (True Greatness.) By George MacDonald. 7s. 6d.
- Four Years of Irish History, 1845-1849; a Sequel to Young Ireland. By Sir Charles Gavan Duffy. 12s.
- Recollections of Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. By Granville Bradley, D.D. 4s. 6d.
- The Sun; Ruler, Fire, Light, and Life of the Planetary System. By Richard A. Proctor. 17s. 6d.
- The Orbs Around Us. By Richard A. Proctor. 10s.
- The Moon; Her Motions, Aspect, &c., &c. By Richard A. Proctor. 12s. 6d.
- The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold, D.D. By Arthur Penrhyn Stanley. In 2 Vols. 13s. 6d.
- A Grammar of the English Language in a Series of Letters. By W. Cobbett. 2s.
- Pleas for Protection Examined. By Augustus Mongredien. 9d.
- University of New Zealand. Examination Papers, 1882. 2s. 6d.
- Entrance Examination Papers, 1882. 1s. 6d.
- Examinations of Barristers and Solicitors in New Zealand. Complete set of questions in law. Given under "The Law Practitioners' Act, 1882." 2s.
- Illustrated History of the world for the English people, from the earliest period to the present time. Full of illustrations. Vol. I., 10s.
- Life of Jonathan Swift, Dean of St. Patrick's, Dublin. By Henry Craik, M.A. With Portrait. 20s.
- The Poetical Works of Sir Walter Scott. With introduction and notes. 4s. 6d.
- A History of English Prose Fiction, from Sir Thomas Malory to George Eliot. By Bayard Tuckerman. 10s. 6d.
- Our Queen: A sketch of the life and times of Victoria. By the author of "Grace Darling." 4s. 6d.
- Soil of the Farm. By John Scott, and J. C. Morton. 3s. 6d.
- A Scamper through America, or, fifteen thousand miles of Ocean and Continent in sixty days. By T. S. Hudson. 7s. 6d.
- Reminiscences of an adventurous and chequered career at Home and the Antipodes. By Alexander Tolmer. In two vols, with portrait. 25s.
- Isles of the Pacific: or, Sketches from the South Seas. By B. Francis. 4s.
- A Commentary on the Revised Version of the New Testament. By W. G. Humphry, B.D. 10s.
- Central Africa, Japan, and Fiji: a Story of Missionary Enterprise, Trials, and Triumphs. By Emma Raymond Pilman. 6s. 6d.
- Pearls of the Faith; or, Islam's Rosary: being the Ninety-nine Beautiful Names of Allah. By Edwin Arnold, M.A. 9s. 6d.
- An Engineer's Holiday; or, Notes of a Round Trip from Long. 0° to 0°. By Daniel Pidgeon, F.G.S. 10s.
- Short Studies on Great Subjects. By James Anthony Froude, M.A. 14s. 6d.
- Dick's Recitations and Readings; a carefully compiled selection of humorous, pathetic, eloquent, patriotic, and sentimental pieces, in Poetry and Prose, exclusively designed for recitation or reading. Edited by Wm. B. Dick. 2s.
- Life, Adventures, and Political Opinions of Colonel Frederick Burnaby. With Portrait. By R. K. Mann. 1s. 3d.
- Handy-Volume Shakespeare. Cabinet Edition; in 10 vols.; full white morocco, extra gilt. 65s. 6d.

Master Humphrey's Clock, and the Old Curiosity Shop. A reprint from the original edition. By Charles Dickens. 1s. 6d.

Tales from Charles Dickens' Works. 1s. 3d.

Essays from Thomas Carlyle, including Burns, Boswell's Life of Johnstone, Sir Walter Scott, and The Diamond Necklace. 9d.

Oliver Cromwell: The Man and His Mission. By J. Allanson Picton. With steel Portrait. 9s.

Brighter Britain; or, Settler and Maori in Northern New Zealand. By William Delisle Hay. In 2 vols. 24s. 6d.

Longfellow's Poetical Works. The Memorial Edition. Illustrated. 4s. 6d.

Hamilton. Philosophical Classics Series. By John Veitch, LL.D. 4s. 6d.

Life of a Scotch Naturalist, Thomas Edward. By Samuel Smiles. Portrait and Illustrations. 7s. 6d.

Parallel New Testament: Old and New Version side by side. 2s., 3s. 6d., 7s. 6d., and 10s. 6d. each, according to binding.

Personal Life of David Livingstone. With Portrait and Map. By W. G. Blaikie, D.D. 7s. 6d.

Monthly Review of New Books & Contemporary Subjects masthead The Monthly Review of *New Books & Contemporary Subjects*. Vol. No. IV, No. 5. Wellington, N.Z. Friday, June 1, 1883..

The Prime Ministers Of England.

BY COLEMAN PHILLIPS.

Earl Godwin.—(CONTINUED.)

IN 1040 A.D., on March 17th, Harold I. died and was buried at Westminster. "After his funeral the nobles of almost the whole of England sent envoys to Hardicanute

The name is written Hardicanute, Hardecanute, Harthacnut, Hardeknut. At the present time the spelling of Saxon names in works of English literature is in a transition state. It may be advisable to give the different modes so as to prepare the general reader for a future fixed and definite one. I am personally inclined to favour the current method, and to write Ædward, Edward; Ælfred, Alfred; Ædwithra, Edith; although coins and ancient charters give the first forms. The early writers appear to have delighted in using a perfectly unnecessary diphthory—ex. gra. Æthelred for Ethelred. Again, the word Swegen was most certainly pronounced Sweyn, as the Latin, *Suanus*, will testify. Some writers spell it Sveyn. The "g" appears to have been silent. I think, therefore, that the safest rule for modern writers is to adopt the simple form, and not to follow the method pursued at a time when reasonable spelling was misunderstood. This matter is of importance, if we desire to impart a general knowledge of our Saxon History.

at Bruges, where he was staying with his mother, and thinking it was for the best, invited him to come to England and ascend the throne. Thereupon he fitted out fifty ships, and embarking Danish troops, before midsummer sailed over to England, where he arrived about June 18th. He was received with universal joy and shortly afterwards crowned.

Florence of West., p. 142.

But let us return. Harthacnut's first act was to cause the body of his predecessor and brother (Harold) to be disinterred and after the head had been cut off to be thrown into the Thames. Some Danish fishermen finding it, buried the body in their own cemetery (St. Clement-Danes, in London). By this we see that even in death the Danes kept apart from the English. And furthermore what little reliance can be placed upon brotherly-love. The members of a family will often hate each other with intense and surpassing hatred. How necessary, therefore, is it for parents to guard against such hatred, by always acting consistently before a young family and promoting concord and goodwill. For the seeds of after strife are often times sown in childhood and if the plants bloom and flourish the parents are principally responsible. The weeding-out such seeds is a great trust, sadly neglected. King Canute's children appear to have been most bitter enemies.

When Harold was elected in 1035, the Witanagemote reserved a portion of the kingdom for Harthacnut, who, however, declined to leave the Continent. It is important to observe that this division of the kingdom by the Witan, was the last division of the Crown of England. Egbert was our first king (A.D. 800-839), but it took two centuries to completely consolidate the crown upon one single head, and 1035 A.D. saw the last division. Our ancestors jealously guarded their right of election to the throne, and it was found necessary to divide the crown so late as that year. Since that time England has remained one kingdom, this moreover, absorbed the independent sovereignties of Scotland, Ireland, and Wales, which shows that civilization tends to bring about

consolidation, and not disintegration. The English crown has often been competed for by different parties, but it has always remained a single crown.

Before 1035 A.D. for a period of nearly six centuries, there was constant strife among the different Saxon kingdoms, and it is interesting to note this, and to compare it with the wonderfully peaceful progress *inter se* of the present British colonies, notably of Canada and Australasia. The Saxons, Angles, Jutes and Danes of England, were people speaking almost one language, whose habits, manners, and customs were alike. Quite similar are the circumstances of, say, the Australasian Colonies. The march of civilization does not impress the tendency above referred to, so much upon young as upon old communities, for the common language, habits, manners, or customs of neighbouring communities do not save them from war. Witness these old English troubles, or the present troubles in Chili, Peru, and Bolivia. Was it that our ancestors possessed sovereign powers in their local dominions? and does it follow that the *want* of sovereign office in young communities is almost a blessing? The tie which binds the different colonies to England may be a far more important one, (if their own peace and welfare for many years to come are considered,) than colonists are inclined to believe. Sacrifice that tie! Erect independent Legislatures possessing sovereign power, and war most assuredly will follow. It is almost a historical maxim, that the more legislatures the more war. Thus in Saxon England, under the Octarchy or Heptarchy, strife was constant and incessant. Less so under the three great Earldoms of Wessex, Mercia, and Northumbria; and still less so under the single crown. In further proof, it may be said that war has entirely ceased between England and Scotland since the union. Whether English statesmen acted beneficially in granting so many almost independent legislatures to the colonies, is uncertain. But having them, it becomes Colonial statesmen to act as Earls Godum and Leofire acted, in that wonderful spirit of conciliation with one another which brought about so many years of domestic peace. Even Siward—Warlike Siward—felt himself controlled by the conciliatory and merciful spirit shown by the two southern Earls. In this, Godwin was eminently the chief. Both he and his son Harold, as will shortly be seen, were conciliatory men. Leofrie fell into Godwin's way of thinking, and Siward followed Leofrie. Thus, England became united into one single crown. The very accident, the very grammar of the word Federation is conciliation, and this conciliation must be displayed by leading public men. Quarrelsome, rash, or compulsory statesmen generally bring danger and trouble upon a community.

"Having given this example of vengeance and barbarity against one dead brother, the new King, with a great show of fraternal affection, commenced an extensive judicial enquiry into the murder of Alfred. He himself, being a Dane, no man of Danish race was cited by him to appear before the justice seat, and Saxons were alone charged with a crime, which could only have been useful to their masters. Godwin, whose power and doubtful designs inspired great fears, was the first accused; he presented himself, according to the English law, accompanied by a great number of relations, friends, and witnesses, who with him, swore that he had taken no part, directly or indirectly, in the death of the son of Ethelred." (The oath of numerous friends and witnesses "that a prisoner was innocent" was the highest form-of Saxon defence. It was apparently the basis of the jury system; for in those times, as indeed in the present day, in sparsely populated countries, a man's neighbours, and dependants, can best judge of his guilt or innocence of a particular crime. The Anglo-Saxon Race is not an impulsive race. If numerous friends and witnesses state that a man is innocent of a crime, we may accept, the statement as correct, as the statement would not be made at all, if doubts existed.)" This then perfectly legal proof was not sufficient to satisfy a King of foreign race; and in order to give it value, it was necessary for the Saxon chief to back it with rich presents, the details of which, if not wholly fabulous, would lead one to believe that many of the English assisted their countryman to buy off this prosecution, instituted in bad faith. Godwin gave King Harde Knut a vessel adorned with gilt metal (gold), and manned with eighty soldiers, each with a gilt helmet, a gilt axe upon his left shoulder, a javelin in his right hand, and on each arm bracelets of gold, weighing six ounces. A Saxon bishop, named Leofwin ("Lyfing"), accused of having assisted the son of Ulfnoth in his alleged treason, like Godwin, cleared himself by presents.

Thieny, Vol. I., p. 119. This vessel must have been a very large one, as the ordinary vessel of the time, only carried twenty men. Thus the Royal dues fix in the town of Dover were twenty vessels of twenty men each, for fifteen days' service in the year.

Florence of Westminster states : "Moreover, he (Godwin) made oath to the King, with almost all the chief men and greater Thanes in England, that it was not by his counsel, or at his instance, that his brother's eyes were put out, but that he had only obeyed the commands of his lord, King Harold."

p. 143,

King Harthacnut's actions are scarce worthy of notice. He heavily taxed the people, and two of his collectors (Feader and Thurstan) were killed by the citizens of Worcester. Whereupon Leofric, Earl of Mercia; Siward, Earl of Northumbria; and Godwin were sent against the city to waste it with tire and sword. They duly carried out the king's commands, although Godwin appears to have privately sent the inhabitants notice to leave the city and save their lives. Worcester was not in his earldom, but doubtless it was with a heavy heart that

Godwin saw an English city given up to tire and sword to please almost a foreign prince. But this was the manner of the times, just as afterwards Edward wished Godwine to punish Dover. These two earls, Leofric and Siward, are important men in our history; stout men and true each of them, and contemporaneous with Godwin. The three ruled England for Edward,—but Godwin as chief,—and they ruled their respective divisions well. Leofric was the husband of Godgifu, the Lady Godiva of legend, a remarkable historical event concerning which the chroniclers say exactly nothing. Earl Leofric appears always to have been a peaceable, easy-going, conciliatory man, (slightly, but only slightly jealous of Godwin,) and his wife was a sensible Englishwoman. There is about as much truth in the story of "Peeping Tom of Coventry" as there is in all the nonsense Shakespeare wrote about Macbeth's wife Gruach, or in the legend of King Knut and the sea waves. Earl Siward is the Siward of Shakespeare,—"Warlike Siward,"—Old Siward,—the protector of Malcolm (the son of the murdered Duncan),—the father of young Siward who perished in the battle wherein Macbeth afterwards fell. This famous King Macbeth appears to have been a good ruler in Scotland just as Edward happened to be in England. Duncan's death was decreed by his own subjects, if indeed they did not murder him. The removal of an obnoxious ruler in those days was commonly by assassination. Of course the blame fell upon Macbeth, and Shakespeare has very graphically entombed the legend in his verse, but both Shakespeare and our school histories give us a very faint idea of the mode of life and ways of our Saxon forefathers. It is important, however, to notice how strongly the men living in this particular time have impressed themselves upon our history.

In 1041 A.D. Edward came over from Normandy, and was well received by Harthacnut, and remained at his Court. On the 8th June, 1012, Hardicanute fell down dead at a carouse, and he was buried near his father, Canute, at Winchester. "His brother, Edward, laconically adds the historian,

Florence of Worcester.

was proclaimed king at London, chiefly by the exertions of Earl Godwin and Living (Lyfing), Bishop of Winchester. "These two men, be it remembered, were the persons principally charged with the crime of "putting out Alfred's eyes," which, *perhaps*, may have caused the prince's death. They were arraigned only for " putting out his eyes." The chroniclers are silent as to the exact cause or manner of Alfred's death.

Thus, at the accession of Edward, Godwin held command of the greatest earldom of the South,—Wessex, including Sussex and Kent, Dover being esteemed his town, as will soon be seen when we come to the matter of Count Eustace of Boulogne. What is now termed the Goodwin (properly Godwin) sands, doubtless formed portion of the earl's estate, Pevensey (his residence) was looked upon by Saxon England as the seat of Saxon justice. His two sons,—Harold (who afterwards contested with William the Norman for the English Crown), and Sweyn, the eldest,—commanded large tracts of country in central and western England. Harold, indeed, almost reduced Wales to the state of an English province. His daughters were also well married. We may say that Godwin and his family had the command of the richest half of England. The other sons were Tosty (or Tostig), Gyrth (or Gurth), Leofwin and Wulfnoth. The daughters, according to Freeman, were Eadgyth (Edward's Queen), Gunhild (properly Gunnilla), and A'Efgifu

Norman Conquest, App. F., Vol. 2,

(properly Elfira). Godwin's relations in Denmark by his marriage with Gytha the daughter of Ulf, were powerful persons, and closely connected by blood with the reigning family. Eadgyth (or Edith), the daughter of Godwin, who became Queen, exhibits in the great charm of her character, a proof that in the family of the ambitious Earl she had received a gentle nurture.

Ingulphus, the Monk of Croyland says of her in a Latin hexameter "As the thorn is the parent of the rose, so is Godwin of Editha" (*Sicut spina rosam. genuit Godwinus Editham*), and he adds, " I have seen her many times in my childhood, when I went to visit my father, who was dwelling in the King's palace. Oftentimes, when I was returning from school, would she question me in my grammar, or my verses, or my logic, in which she was skilful; and when, after much subtle argument, she had concluded, she would by her hand-maiden give me some pieces of money, and send me for refreshment to the buttery." This rose never saw another rose bloom from her tree. Her husband, with the superstition of the cloister, first neglected her. Then came a time when he persecuted her. She was forced upon the King, a mature man of forty, say some of the chroniclers, and they put these words into Godwin's mouth, "Swear to me that you will take my daughter for your wife, and I will give you the Kingdom of England. According to others, Edward was as unwilling to receive the Kingdom as to be encumbered with a wife.

Knight Hist, Vol. I, p. 162. Mr. Knight evidently thought poorly of the character of the Earl. Dr. Lingard says: "The character of this powerful Earl has been painted by most of our historians in colours of blood. They describe him as a monster of inhumanity, duplicity, and ambition." Hist., Vol. I, p. 288.

We will not search too closely into Edith's character, but content ourselves with the opinion of Ingulphus concerning her.

Edith is charged with many things by late historians, but no object can be served by repeating them. As

Freeman says: "That she looked carefully after her rents in money, kine, and honey, and after the man who stole her horse, is no blame to her." We should like to see stronger evidence before condemning Edith, and any lady is to be fully excused for looking carefully after the loss of a favourite horse. I am sorry Tennyson has accepted the modern dictum touching Queen Edith.

It has before been said that William of Malmsbury, like the other Monkish historians of the Norman time, were prejudiced against Godwin, but this is Malmsbury's account of the succession of Edward the Confessor, to the throne :

"Edward receiving the mournful intelligence of the death of Hardecanute, was lost in uncertainty what to do, or whither to betake himself. While he was revolving many things in his mind, it occurred as the better plan, to submit his situation to the opinion of Godwin. To Godwin therefore he sent messengers, requesting that he might in security have a conference with him, Godwin, though for a long time hesitating and reflecting, at length assented, and when Edward came to him, and endeavored to fall at his feet, he raised him up; and when relating the death of Hardecanute, and begging his assistance to effect his return to Normandy, Godwin made him the greatest promises. He said : "It was better for him to live with credit in power, than to die ingloriously in exile; that he was the son of Ethelred, the grandson of Edgar : that the Kingdom was his due : that he was come to mature age, disciplined by difficulties, conversant in the art of well-governing from his years, and knowing from his former poverty, how to feel for the miseries of the people : if he thought fit to rely on him. there could be no obstacle; for his authority so preponderated in England, that whenever he inclined, there fortune was sure to favour. If he assisted him, none would dare to murmur, and just so was the contrary side of the question; let him then only covenant a firm friendship with himself, undiminished honors for his sons, and a marriage with his daughter; and he who was now shipwrecked almost of life and hope, and imploring the assistance of another should shortly see himself a king."

"There was nothing which Edward would not promise, from the exigency of the moment; so pledging fidelity on both sides, he confirmed by oath everything that was demanded. Soon after, convening an Assembly at Gillingham, Godwin, unfolding his reasons, caused him to be received as king, and homage was paid to him by all. He (Godwin) was a man of ready wit, and spoke fluently in the vernacular tongue; powerful in speech, powerful in bringing over the people to whatever he desired. Some yielded to his authority; some were influenced by presents; others admitted the right of Edward; and the few who resisted in defiance of justice and equity were carefully marked, and afterwards driven out of England."

[CONTINUED ON PAGE 13.]

The Mystery of Marie Roget.—CONTINUED.

"HAVING prescribed thus a limit to suit its own preconceived notions : having assumed that, if this were the body of Marie, it could have been in the water but a very brief time; the journal goes on to say:

"All experience has shown that drowned bodies, or bodies thrown into the water immediately after death by violence, require from six to ten days for sufficient decomposition to take place to bring them to the top of the water. Even when a cannon is fired over a corpse, and it rises before at least five or six days' immersion, it sinks again if let alone.'

"These assertions have been tacitly received by every paper in Paris, with the exception of *Le Moniteur*.

The " N.Y. Commercial Advertiser," edited by Col. Stone.

This latter print endeavours to combat that portion of the paragraph which has reference to 'drowned bodies' only, by citing some five or six instances, in which the bodies of individuals known to be drowned were found floating after the lapse of less time than is insisted upon by *L'Etoile*. But there is something excessively unphilosophical in the attempt on the part of *Le Moniteur*, to rebut the general assertion of *L'Etoile*, by a citation of particular instances militating against that assertion. Had it been possible to adduce fifty instead of five examples of bodies found floating at the end of two or three days, these fifty examples could still have been property regarded only as exceptions to *L'Etoile's* rule, until such time as the rule itself should be confuted. Admitting the rule (and this *Le Moniteur* does not deny, insisting merely upon its exceptions), the argument of *L'Etoile* is suffered to remain in full force; for this argument does not pretend to involve more than a question of the *probability* of the body having risen to the surface in less than three days; and this probability will be in favor of *L'Etoile's* position until the instances so childish adduced shall be sufficient in number to establish an antagonistical rule.

"You will see at once that all argument upon this head should be urged, if at all, against the rule itself, and for this end we must examine the *rationale* of the rule. Now the human body, in general, is neither much lighter nor much heavier than the water of the Seine; that is to say, the specific gravity of the human body, in its natural condition, is about equal to the bulk of fresh water which it dis-places. The bodies of fat and fleshy

persons, with small bones, and of women generally, are lighter than those of the lean and large-boned, and of men; and the specific gravity of the water of a river is somewhat influenced by the presence of the tide from sea. But, leaving this tide out of question, it may be said that *very* few human bodies will sink at all, even in fresh water, *of their own accord*. Almost any one, foiling into a river, will be enabled to float, if he suffer the specific gravity of the water fairly to be adduced in comparison with his own—that is to say, if he suffer his whole person to be immersed with as little exception as possible. The proper position for one who cannot swim, is the upright position of the walker on land, with the head thrown fully back, and immersed; the mouth and nostrils alone remaining above the surface. Thus circumstanced, we shall find that we float without difficulty and without exertion. It is evident, however, that the gravities of the body, and of the bulk of water displaced, are very nicely balanced, and that a trifle will cause either to preponderate. An arm, for instance, uplifted from the water, and thus deprived of its support, is an additional weight sufficient to immerse the whole head, while the accidental aid of the smallest piece of timber will enable us to elevate the head so as to look about. Now, in the struggles of one unused to swimming, the arms are invariably thrown upwards, while an attempt is made to keep the head in its usual perpendicular position. The result is the immersion of the mouth and nostrils, and the inception, during efforts to breathe while beneath the surface, of water into the lungs. Much is also received into the stomach, and the whole body becomes heavier by the difference between the weight of the air originally distending these cavities, and that of the fluid which now fills them. The difference is sufficient to cause the body to sink, as a general rule; but is insufficient in the cases of individuals with small bones and an abnormal quantity of flaccid or fatty matter. Such individuals float even after drowning.

The corpse, being supposed at the bottom of the river, will there remain until, by some means, its specific gravity again becomes less than that of the bulk of water which it displaces. This effect is brought about by decomposition, or otherwise. The result of decomposition is the generation of gas, distending the cellular tissues and all the cavities, and giving the *puffed* appearance which is so horrible. When this distension has so far progressed that the bulk of the corpse is materially increased without a corresponding increase of *mass* or weight, its specific gravity becomes less than that of the water displaced, and it forthwith makes its appearance at the surface. But decomposition is modified by innumerable circumstances—is hastened or retarded by innumerable agencies; for example, by the heat or cold of the season, by the mineral impregnation or purity of the water, by its depth or shallowness, by its currency or stagnation, by the temperament of the body, by its infection or freedom from disease before death. Thus it is evident that we can assign no period, with anything like accuracy, at which the corpse shall rise through decomposition. Under certain conditions this result would be brought about within an hour; under others, it might not take place at all. There are chemical infusions by which the animal frame can be preserved *for ever* from corruption; the bi-chloride of mercury is one. But, apart from decomposition, there may be, and very usually is, generation of gas within the stomach, from the acetous fermentation of vegetable matter (or within other cavities from other causes) sufficient to induce a distension which will bring the body to the surface. The effect produced by the firing of a cannon is that of simple vibration. This may either loosen the corpse from the soft mud or ooze in which it is embedded, thus permitting it to rise when other agencies have already prepared it for so doing; or it may overcome the tenacity of some putrescent portions of the cellular tissue, allowing the cavities to distend under the influence of gas.

"Having thus before us the whole philosophy of this subject, we can easily test it by the assertions of *L'Etoile*. 'All experience shows,' says this paper, 'that drowned bodies, or bodies thrown into the water immediately after death by violence, require from six to ten days for sufficient decomposition to take place to bring them to the top of the water. Even when a cannon is fired over a corpse, and it rises before at least five or six days' immersion, it sinks again if let alone.'

"The whole of this paragraph must now appear a tissue of inconsequence and incoherence. All experience does *not* show that 'drowned bodies' *require* from six to ten days for sufficient decomposition to take place to bring them to the surface. Both science and experience show that the period of their rising is, and necessarily must be, indeterminate. If, moreover, a body has risen to the surface through firing of cannon, it will *not* 'sink again if let alone,' until decomposition has so far progressed as to permit the escape of the generated gas. But I wish to call your attention to the distinction which is made between 'drowned bodies,' and 'bodies thrown into the water immediately after death by violence.' Although the writer admits the distinction, he yet includes them all in the same category. I have shown how it is that the body of a drowning man becomes specifically heavier than its bulk of water, and that he would not sink at all, except for the struggles by which he elevates his arms above the surface, and his gasps for breath while beneath the surface—gasps which only by water supply the place of the original air in the lungs. But these struggles and these gasps would not occur in the body 'thrown into the water immediately after death by violence.' Thus, in the latter instance, *the body, as a general rule, would not sink at all*—a fact of which *L'Etoile* is evidently ignorant. When decomposition had proceeded to a very great extent—when the flesh had in a great measure left the bones—then, indeed, but not *till* then, should we lose sight of the corpse.

"And now what are we to make of the argument, that the body found could not be that of Marie Roget, because three days only having elapsed, the body was found floating? If drowned, being a woman, she might never have sunk; or having sunk, might have re-appeared in twenty-four hours, or less. But no one supposes her to have been drowned; and, dying before being thrown into the river, she might have been found floating at any period afterwards whatever.

"'But,' says *L'Etoile*, 'if the body had been kept in its mangled state on shore until Tuesday night, some trace would be found on shore of the murderers.' Here it is at first difficult to perceive the intention of the reasoner. He means to anticipate what he imagines would be an objection to his theory—viz., that the body was kept on shore two days, suffering rapid decomposition—*more* rapid than if immersed in water. He supposes that, had this been the case, it *might* have appeared at the surface on the Wednesday, and thinks that *only* under such circumstances it could so have appeared. He is accordingly in haste to show that it *was not* kept on shore; for if so, 'some trace would be found on shore of the murderers.' I presume you smile at the *sequitur*. You cannot be made to see how the mere *duration* of the corpse on the shore could operate to *multiply traces* of the assassins. Nor can I.

"'And furthermore, it is exceedingly improbable,' continues our journal, 'that any villains who had committed such a murder as is here supposed, would have thrown the body in without weight to sink it, when such a precaution could have so easily been taken.' Observe, here, the laughable confusion of thought! No one—not even *L'Etoile*—disputes the murder committed *on the body found*. The marks of violence are too obvious. It is our reasoner's object merely to show that this body is not Marie's. He wishes to prove that Marie is not assassinated—not that the corpse was not. Yet his observation proves only the latter point. Here is a corpse without weight attached. Murderers, casting it in, would not have failed to attach a weight. Therefore it was not thrown in by murderers. This is all which is proved, if anything is. The question of identity is not even approached, and *L'Etoile* has been at great pains merely to gainsay now what it has admitted only a moment before. 'We are perfectly convinced,' it says, 'that the body found was that of the murdered female.'

"Nor is this the sole instance, even in this division of his subject, where our reasoner unwittingly reasons against himself. His evident object, I have already said, is to reduce, as much as possible, the interval between Marie's disappearance and the finding of the corpse. Yet we find him *urging* the point that no person saw the girl from the moment of her leaving her mother's house. 'We have no evidence,' he says, 'that Marie Roget was in the land of the living after nine o'clock on Sunday, June the twenty-second.' As his argument is obviously an *ex parte* one, he should, at least, have left this matter out of sight; for had anyone been known to see Marie, say on Monday, or on Tuesday, the interval in question would have been much reduced, and, by his own ratiocination, the probability much diminished of the corpse being that of the *grisette*. It is, nevertheless, amusing to observe that *L'Etoile* insists upon its point in the full belief of its furthering its general argument.

"Reperuse now that portion of this argument which has reference to the identification of the corpse by Beauvais. In regard to the *hair* upon the arm, *L'Etoile* has been obviously disingenuous. M. Beauvais, not being an idiot, could never have urged, in identification of the corpse, simply *hair upon its arm*. No arm is *without* hair. The *generality* of the expression of *L'Etoile* is a mere perversion of the witness's phraseology. He must have spoken of some *peculiarity* in this hair. It must have been a peculiarity of colour, of quantity, of length, or of situation.

"'Her foot,' says the journal, 'was small'—so are thousands of feet. Her garter is no proof whatever—nor is her shoe—for shoes and garters are sold in packages. The same may be said of the flowers in her hat. One thing upon which M. Beauvais strongly insists is, that the clasp on the garter found had been set back to take it in. This amounts to nothing; for most women find it proper to take a pair of garters home and fit them to the size of the limbs they are to encircle, rather than to try them in the store where they purchase.' Here it is difficult to suppose the reasoner in earnest. Had M. Beauvais in his search for the body of Marie, discovered a corpse corresponding in general size and appearance to the missing girl, he would have been warranted (without reference to the question of habiliment at all) in forming an opinion that his search had been successful. If, in addition to the point of general size and contour, he had found upon the arm a peculiar hairy appearance which he had observed upon the living Marie, his opinion might have been justly strengthened; and the increase of positiveness might well have been in the ratio of the peculiarity, or unusualness, of the hairy mark. If the feet of Marie being small, those of the corpse were also small, the increase of probability that the body was that of Marie would not be an increase in a ratio merely arithmetical, but in one highly geometrical, or accumulative. Add to all this shoes such as she had been known to wear upon the day of her disappearance, and, although these shoes may be 'sold in packages,' you so far augment the probability as to verge upon the certain. What, of itself, would be no evidence of identity, becomes through its corroborative position, proof most sure. Give us, then, flowers in the hat corresponding to those worn by the missing girl, and we seek for nothing farther. If only *one* flower, we seek for nothing farther—what then if two or three, or more? Each successive one is multiple evidence—proof not *added* to proof, but *multiplied* by hundreds or thousands. Let us now discover, upon the

deceased, garters such as the living used, and it is almost folly to proceed. But these garters are found to be tightened, by the setting back of a clasp, in just such a manner as her own had been tightened by Marie shortly previous to her leaving home. It is now madness or hypocrisy to doubt. What *L'Etoile* says in respect to this abbreviation of the garters being an unusual occurrence, shows nothing beyond its own pertinacity in error. The elastic nature of the clasp-garter is self-demonstration of the, *unusualness* of the abbreviation. What is made to adjust itself, must of necessity require foreign adjustment but rarely. It must have been by an accident, in its strictest sense, that these garters of Marie needed the tightening described. They alone would have amply established her identity. But it is not that the corpse was found to have the garters of the missing girl, or found to have her shoes, or her bonnet, or the flowers of her bonnet, or her feet, or a peculiar mark upon the arm, or her general size and appearance—it is that the corpse had each and *all collectively*. Could it be proved that the editor of *L'Etoile* really entertained a doubt, under the circumstances, there would be no need, in his case, of a commission *de lunatico inquirendo*. He has thought it sagacious to echo the small-talk of the lawyers, who, for the most part, content themselves with echoing the rectangular precepts of the courts. I would here observe that very much of what is rejected as evidence by a court, is the best of evidence to the intellect. For the Court, guiding itself by the general principles of evidence—the recognised and *booked* principles—is averse from swerving at particular instances. And this steadfast adherence to principle, with rigorous disregard of the conflicting exception, is a sure mode of attaining the *maximum* of attainable truth, in any long sequence of time. The practice *en mass*, is therefore philosophical; but it is not the less certain that it engenders vast individual error.

"A theory based on the qualities of an object, will prevent its being unfolded according to its objects; and he who arranges topics in reference to their causes, will cease to value them according to their results. Thus the jurisprudence of every nation will show that, when law becomes a science and a system, it ceases to be justice. The errors into which a blind devotion to *principles* of classification has led the common law, will be seen by observing how often the legislature has been obliged to come forward to restore the equity its scheme had lost."—*Landor*.

"In respect to the insinuations levelled at Beauvais, you will be willing to dismiss them in a breath. You have already fathomed the true character of this good gentleman. He is a *busybody*, with much of romance and little of wit. Anyone so constituted will readily so conduct himself, upon occasion of *real* excitement, as to render himself liable to suspicion on the part of the over-acute, or the ill-disposed. M. Beauvais (as it appears from your notes) had some personal interviews with the editor of *L'Etoile*, and offended him by venturing an opinion that the corpse, notwithstanding the theory of the editor, was, in sober fact, that of Marie. 'He persists,' says the paper 'in asserting the corpse to be that of Marie, but cannot give a circumstance, in addition to those which we have commented upon to make others believe.' Now, without re-adverting to the fact that stronger evidence 'to make others believe,' could *never* have been adduced, it may be remarked that a man may very well be understood to believe, in a case of this kind, without the ability to advance a single reason for the belief of a second party. Nothing is more vague than impressions of individual identity. Each man recognizes his neighbour, yet there are few instances in which anyone is prepared to *give a reason* for his recognition. The editor of *L'Etoile* had no right to be offended at M. Beauvais' unreasoning belief.

"The suspicious circumstances which invest him will be found to tally much better with my hypothesis of *romantic busybodyism*, than with the reasoner's suggestion of guilt. Once adopting the more charitable interpretation, we shall find no difficulty in comprehending the rose in the key-hole; the 'Marie' upon the slate; the 'elbowing the male relatives out of the way;' the 'aversion to permitting them to see the body;' the caution given to Madame B—, that she must hold no conversation with the *gendarme* until his return (Beauvais'); and, lastly, his apparent determination 'that nobody should have anything to do with the proceedings except himself.' It seems to me unquestionable that Beauvais was a suitor of Marie's; that, she coquetted with him; and that he was ambitious of being thought to enjoy her fullest intimacy and confidence. I shall say nothing more upon this point: and, as the evidence fully rebuts the assertion of *L'Etoile*, touching the matter of *apathy* on the part of the mother and other relatives—an apathy inconsistent with the supposition of their believing the corpse to be that of the perfumery-girl—we shall now proceed as if the question of *identity* were settled to our perfect satisfaction."

"And what," I here demanded, "do you think of the opinions of *Le Commercial* ?"

"That, in spirit, they are far more worthy of attention than any which have been promulgated upon the subject. The deductions from the premises are philosophical and acute; but the premises, in two instances, at least, are founded on imperfect observation. *Le Commercial* wishes to intimate that Marie was seized by some gang of low ruffians not far from her mother's door. 'It is impossible,' it urges, 'that a person so well known to thousands as this young woman was, should have passed three blocks without someone having seen her.' This is the idea of a man long resident in Paris—a public man—and one whose walks to and fro in the city have been mostly limited to the vicinity of the public offices. He is aware that *he* seldom passes so far as a dozen blocks

from his own *bureau*, without being recognized and accosted. And, knowing the extent of his personal acquaintance with others, and others with him, he compares his notoriety with that of the perfumery-girl, finds no great difference between them, and reaches at once the conclusion that she, in her walks, would be equally liable to recognition with himself in his. This could only be the case were her walks of the same unvarying, methodical character, and within the same *species* of limited region as are his own. He passes to and fro, at regular intervals, within a confined periphery, abounding in individuals who are led to observation of his person through interest in the kindred nature of his occupation with their own. But the walks of Marie may, in general be supposed discursive. In this particular instance, it will be understood as most probable, that she proceeded upon a route of more than average diversity from her accustomed ones. The parallel which we imagine to have existed in the mind of *Le Commercial* would only be sustained in the event of the two individuals traversing the whole city. In this case, granting the personal acquaintances to be equal, the chances would be also equal that an equal number of personal recounters would be made. For my own part, I should hold it not only as possible, but as very far more than probable, that Marie might have proceeded, at any given period, by any one of the many routes between her own residence and that of her aunt, without meeting a single individual whom she knew, or by whom she was known. In viewing this question in its full and proper light, we must hold steadily in mind the great disproportion between the personal acquaintances of even the most noted individual in Paris, and the entire population of Paris itself.

"But whatever force there may still appear to be in the suggestion of *Le Commercial*, will be much diminished when we take into consideration *the hour* at which the girl went abroad. 'It was when the streets were full of people,' says *Le Commercial*, 'that she went out,' But not so. It was at nine o'clock in the morning. Now at nine o'clock of every morning in the week, *with the exception of Sunday*, the streets of the city are, it is true, thronged with people. At nine on Sunday, the populace are chiefly within doors *preparing for church*. No observing person can have failed to notice the peculiarly deserted air of the town, from about eight until ten on the morning of every Sabbath. Between ten and eleven the streets are thronged, but not at so early a period as that designated.

"There is another point at which there seems a deficiency of *observation* on the part of *Le Commercial*. 'A piece,' it says, 'of one of the unfortunate girl's petticoats, two feet long, and one foot wide, was torn out and tied under her chin, and around the back of her head, probably to prevent screams. This was done by fellows who had no pocket-handkerchiefs.' Whether this idea is, or is not well founded, we will endeavour to see hereafter; but by 'fellows who have no pocket-handkerchiefs,' the editor intends the lowest class of ruffians. These, however, are the very description of people who will always be found to have handkerchiefs even when destitute of shirts. You must have had occasion to observe how absolutely indispensable, of late years to the thorough blackguard, has become the pocket-handkerchief."

"And what are we to think," I asked, "of the article in *Le Soliel*?"

"That it is a vast pity its inditer was not born a parrot—in which case he would have been the most illustrious parrot of his race. He has merely repeated the individual items of the already published opinion; collecting them, with a laudable industry, from this paper and from that. 'The things had all *evidently* been there,' he says, 'at least three or four weeks, and there can be no *doubt* that the spot of this appalling outrage has been discovered.' The facts here re-stated by *Le Soliel* are very far indeed from removing my own doubts upon this subject, and we will examine them more particularly hereafter in connexion with another division of the theme.

"At present, we must occupy ourselves with other investigations. You cannot fail to have remarked the extreme laxity of the examination of the corpse. To be sure the question of identity was readily determined, or should have been; but there were other points to be ascertained. Had the body been in any respect *despoiled*? Had the deceased any articles of jewellery about her person upon leaving home? if, so, had she any when found? These are important questions utterly untouched by the evidence; and there are others of equal moment which have met with no attention. We must endeavour to satisfy ourselves by personal inquiry. The case of St. Eustache must be re-examined. I have no suspicion of this person; but let us proceed methodically. We will ascertain beyond a doubt the validity of the *affidavits* in regard to his whereabouts on the Sunday. Affidavits of this character are readily made matter of mystification. Should there be nothing wrong here, however, we will dismiss St. Eustache from our investigations. His suicide, however corroborative of suspicion, were there found to be deceit in the affidavits, is, without such deceit, in no respect an unaccountable circumstance, or one which need cause us to deflect from the line of ordinary analysis.

"In that which I now propose, we will discard the interior points of this tragedy, and concentrate our attention upon its outskirts. Not the least usual error, in investigations such as this, is the limiting of inquiry to the immediate, with total disregard of the collateral or circumstantial events. It is the mal-practice of the courts to confine evidence and discussion to the bounds of apparent relevancy. Yet experience has shown, and a true philosophy will always show, that a vast, perhaps the larger portion of truth, arises from the seemingly

irrelevant. It is through the spirit of this principle, if not precisely through its letter, that modern science resolved to *calculate upon the unforeseen*. But perhaps you do not comprehend me. The history of human knowledge has so uninterruptedly shown that to collateral, or incidental, or accidental events we are indebted for the most numerous and most valuable discoveries, that it has at length become necessary, in any prospective view of improvement, to make not only large, but the largest allowances for inventions that shall arise by chance, and quite out of the range of ordinary expectation. It is no longer philosophical to base, upon what has been, a vision of what is to be. *Accident* is admitted as a portion of the substructure. We make chance a matter of absolute calculation. We subject the unlooked for and unimagined to the mathematical *formulae* of the schools.

"I repeat that it is no more than fact, that the *larger* portion of all truth has sprung from the collateral; and it is but in accordance with the spirit of the principal involved in this fact that I would divert inquiry, in the present case, from the trodden and hitherto untruthful ground of the event itself, to the contemporary circumstances which surround it. While you ascertain the validity of the affidavits, I will examine the newspapers more generally than you have as yet done. So far, we have only reconnoitred the field of investigation; but it will be strange indeed if a comprehensive survey, such as I propose, of the public prints, will not afford us some minute points which shall establish a *direction* for inquiry.'

In pursuance of Dupin's suggestions, I made scrupulous examination of the affair of the affidavits. The result was a firm conviction of their validity, and of the consequent innocence of St. Eustache. In the meantime my friend occupied himself, with what seemed to me a minuteness altogether objectless, in a scrutiny of the various newspaper files. At the end of a week he placed before me the following extracts:—

"About three years and a half ago, a disturbance very similar to the present was caused by the disappearance of this same Marie Rogêt, from the *parfumerie* of Monsieur Le Blanc in the Palais Royal. At the end of a week, however, she re-appeared at her customary *comptoir*, as well as ever, with the exception of a slight paleness not altogether usual. It was given out by Monsieur Le Blanc and her mother, that she had merely been on a visit to some friend in the country; and the affair was speedily hushed up. We presume that the present absence is a freak of the same nature, and that, at the expiration of a week, or perhaps of a month, we shall have her among us again"—*Evening Paper—Monday, June 23.*

"N. Y. Express.

"An evening journal of yesterday, refers to a former mysterious disappearance of Mademoiselle; Rogêt. It is well known that, during the week of her absence from Le Blanc's *parfumerie*, she was in the company of a young naval officer—much noted for his debaucheries. A quarrel, it is supposed, providentially led her to return home. We have the name of the Lothario in question, who is, at present, stationed in Paris, but, for obvious reasons, forbear to make it public,"—*Le Mercurie—Tuesday Morning, June 24.*

"N. Y. Herald."

"An outrage of the most atrocious character was perpetrated near this city the day before yesterday. A gentleman, with his wife and daughter, engaged about dusk, the services of six young men, who were idly rowing a boat to and fro near the banks of the Seine, to convoy him across the river. Upon reaching the opposite shore, the three passengers stepped out, and had proceeded so far, as to be beyond the view of the boat when the daughter discovered that she had left in it, her parasol. She returned for it, was seized by the gang, carried out into the stream, gagged, brutally treated, and finally taken to the shore at a point not far from that at which she had originally entered the boat with her parents. The villains have escaped for the time, but the police are upon their trail, and some of them will soon be taken."—*Morning Paper—June 25*

"N. Y. Courier and Inquirer."

"We have received one or two communications, the object of which is to fasten the crime of the late atrocity upon Mennais

"Mennais was one of the parties originally suspected and arrested, but discharged through total lack of evidence.

but as this gentleman has been fully exonerated by a legal inquiry, and as the arguments of our several correspondents appear to be more zealous than profound, we do not think it advisable to make them public."—*Morning Paper—June 28.*

"N. Y. Courier and Inquirer."

"We have received several forcibly written communications, apparently from various sources, and which go far to render it a matter of certainty that the unfortunate Marie Rogêt has become a victim of one of the numerous bands of blackguards which infest the vicinity of the city upon Sunday. Our own opinion is decidedly in favour of this supposition. We shall endeavour to make room for some of these arguments hereafter."—*Evening Paper—Tuesday, June 31.*

"N. Y. Evening Post."

"On Monday, one of the bargemen connected with the revenue service, saw an empty boat floating down the Seine. Sails were lying in the bottom of the boat. The bargemen towed it under the barge office. The next

morning it was taken from thence, without the knowledge of any of the officers. The rudder is now at the barge office." *Le Diligence-Thursday, June 26.*

"N. Y. Standard."

Upon reading these various extracts, they not only seemed to me irrelevant, but I could perceive no mode in which any one of them could be brought to bear upon the matter in hand. I waited for some explanation from Dupin.

"It is not my present design" he said "to *dwell* upon the first and second of these extracts. I have copied them chiefly to show you the extreme remissness of the police, who, as far as I can understand from the Prefect, have not troubled themselves, in any respect, with any examination of the naval officer alluded to. Yet it is mere folly to say that between the first and second disappearance of Marie there is no *supposable* connection. Let us admit the first elopement to have resulted in a quarrel between the lovers, and the return home of the betrayed. We are now prepared to view a second *elopement* (if we *know* that an elopement has again taken place) as indicating a renewal of the betrayer's advances, rather than as the result of new proposals by a second individual—we are prepared to regard it as a 'making up' of the old *amour*, rather than as the commencement of a new one. The chances are ten to one, that he who had once eloped with Marie, would again propose an elopement, rather than that she to whom proposals of elopement had been made by one individual, should have them made to her by another. And here let me call your attention to the fact, that the time elapsing between the first ascertained, and the second supposed elopement, is a few months more than the general period of the cruises of our men-of-war. Had the lover been interrupted in his first villany by the necessity of departure to sea, and he seized the first moment of his return to renew the base designs not yet altogether accomplished—or not yet altogether accomplished *by him*? Of all these things we know nothing.

"You will say, however, that, in the second instance, there was *no* elopement as imagined. Certainly not—but are we prepared to say that there was not the frustrated design? Beyond St. Eustache, and perhaps Beauvais, we find no recognized, no open, no honourable suitors of Marie. Of none other is there anything said. Who, then, is the secret lover, of whom the relatives (*at least most of them*) know nothing, but whom Marie meets upon the morning of Sunday, and who is so deeply in her confidence, that she hesitates not to remain with him until the shades of the evening descend, amid the solitary groves of the Barrière de Roule? Who is the secret lover, I ask, of whom at least *most* of the relatives know nothing And what means the singular prophecy of Madame Rogêt on the morning of Marie's departure?—'I fear that I shall never see Marie again.'

"But, if we cannot imagine Madame Rogêt privy to the design of elopement, may we not at least suppose this design entertained by the girl? Upon quitting home, she gave it to be understood that she was about to visit her aunt in the Rue des Drômes, and St. Eustache was requested to call for her at dark. Now, at first glance, this fact strongly militates against my suggestion;—but let us reflect. That she *did* meet some companion, and proceed with him across the river, reaching the Barrière du Roule at so late an hour as three o'clock in the afternoon, is known. But in consenting so to accompany this individual, (*for whatever purpose—to her mother known or unknown,*) she must have thought of her expressed intention when leaving home, and of the surprise and suspicion aroused in the bosom of her affianced suitor, St. Eustache, when, calling for her, at the hour appointed, in the Rue des Drômes, he should find that she had not been there, and when, moreover, upon returning to the *pension* with this alarming intelligence, he should become aware of her continued absence from home. She must have thought of these things, I say. She must have foreseen the chagrin of St. Eustache, the suspicion of all. She could not have thought of returning to brave this suspicion; but the suspicion becomes a point of trivial importance to her, if we suppose her *not* intending to return.

"We may imagine her thinking thus—' I am to meet a certain person for the purpose of elopement, or for certain other purposes known only to myself. It is necessary that there be no chance of interruption—there must be sufficient time given us to elude pursuit—I will give it to be understood that I shall visit and spend the day with my aunt at the Rue des Drômes—I will tell St. Eustache not to call for me until dark—in this way, my absence from home for the longest possible period, without causing suspicion or anxiety, will be accounted for, and I shall gain more time than in any other manner. If I bid St. Eustache call for me at dark, he will be sure not to call before; but, if I wholly neglect to bid him call, my time for escape will be diminished, since it will be expected that I return the earlier, and my absence will the sooner excite anxiety. Now, if it were my design to return *at all*—if I had in contemplation merely a stroll with the individual in question—it would not be my policy to bid St. Eustache call; for, calling he will be *sure* to ascertain that I have played him false—a fact of which I might keep him for ever in ignorance, by leaving home without notifying him of my intention, by returning before dark, and by then stating that I had been to visit my aunt in the Rue des Drômes. But, as it is my design *never* to return—or not for some weeks—or not until certain concealments are effected—the gaining of time is the only point about which I need give myself any concern.' "

(*To be continued.*)

FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF CUSTOMERS AND OTHERS, MESSRS. LYON & BLAIR HAVE

IMPORTED A WELL-SELECTED SUPPLY OF FRENCH LITERATURE, COMPRISING WORKS BY BALZAC, PAUL DE KOCK, GEORGE SAND, ALPHONSE KARR, DUMAS, COMTESSE DASH, CONSCIENCE, PAUL FEVAL, BERTHET, SOULIE, ENAULT, HOUSSAYE, MALOT, LAMARTINE, LITRE, FEYDEAU, CHAMFLEURY, &c., &c. These Books are having a large sale at prices ranging from 1/6 to 3/-each.

Earl Godwin.—[CONTINUED FROM PAGE 4.]

With great pomp Edward was crowned at Winchester on Easter Day, and held the sovereignty for nearly twenty-four years,—viz., from 1042 to 1066 A.D.

P. 215.

Godwin presented Edward with a great ship manned by 200 rowers. A golden lion adorned the stern, and the West Saxon dragon,—the national ensign shone at the prow. That a noble so powerful should thus have acted, not seeking the Crown for himself, which he might have done, as the English people did not care for Ethelred's Norman children, nor indeed had they much venerated Ethelred himself is a matter worthy of our respect, and redounding to Godwin's honor.

Looking at the light of events then and since, there could have been no possible objection to his having assumed the Crown for himself, and, had he done so, England might never have been subjected to a Norman Conquest. Freeman, in his History of the Norman Conquest, considers this a "wild suggestion," but we cannot overlook the evidence of the chroniclers. The English nation did not care for Ethelred's Norman children, and it was Godwin's loyalty to the House of Cerdic that was the cause of Edward being chosen king by "all folk." The chroniclers distinctly-enough state that Godwin would not entertain the thought of the Crown for himself. Mr. Freeman depends a little too much upon his imagination, although generally correct in his deductions,

There must have been high talk at Perensey amongst Godwin's sons and his dependents as to whether Edward or their father should take the Crown, and we can imagine Godwin importuned to ascend the Throne. But we can further imagine him firmly resolving to do the right, as he had tried to do all his life, and quietly and sternly going to meet Edward and pledging himself loyally to him as his subject. It must have been a great mental battle in which the right conquered, and as long as he lived and as long as he was permitted, Godwin was a faithful subject to the weak, but apparently good-intentioned king. His sons may have wondered at these actions, and thought their father a foolish man. But Godwin took his own path, which we can now see was the right one.

In the great hall at Pevensey we can imagine these powerful young nobles,—Sweyn, Harold, Tosty, Gyrth, Leofwine, and Wulfnoth,—discussing the matter, and proffering the assistance of the districts over which they ruled to their father Godwin. For as we have before said, Harold and Sueyn ruled in Central England, and Tosty had friends in the North. Cousins and relatives from Denmark (and, doubtless, the Earl of the East Angles married to Elfgifu (or Elfiva), Godwin's youngest daughter,) joined in the discussion,—powerful young earls in their own land,—the commanders of many ships and many Norsemen. Anxiously all awaited the decision of the head of the family,—Godwin,—who, walking to and fro on the green sward beneath the walls of the castle,—now looking out to sea where now lie those treacherous sands, now over the pleasant landscape, revolved the question over in his mind, and came to the determination already stated. No murmur of discontent appears to have arisen. His sons and relatives greatly respected him. What he said to them was law. Edward was to be king, not their father. Their duty was to obey, and when Godwin announced his determination, each returned to his district, regretting perhaps the decision, but cheerfully obeying it. This filial obedience, from so powerful a family, forms a pleasant picture in our history, and a bright example to children of the present day. Godwin, and his wife Gytha, were wise parents. Their sons and daughters England may well be proud of. As to Sweyn's folly in carrying off the abbess and his subsequent misdeeds, who can say now the extent of his crime? It may have been but a lover's quarrel, in which the maiden took the vows. Hence the sacrilege. Consequently all the powers of the Church were exerted against Sweyn. With regard to Harold's bringing over the Danes from Ireland to assist in his father's restoration, or Tosty's afterrebellion, we must remember that these young men lived in somewhat barbarous times, and that their violence was mild in comparison with the violence of our subsequent kings and great barons. What a different tale does history tell of Queen Emma's children by her two husbands, Ethelred and Knut.

Godwin appears to have been the principal sufferer by the course he adopted, for no sooner was Edward firmly seated upon the Throne, than his Norman favourites began to flock over in numbers and naturally commenced to undermine the influence of Godwin's family. One historian fairly sums up the statements of the old chroniclers, although we have already warned the reader to be careful in accepting those statements,

Knight, Vol. I., p. 164.

(To be continued.)

Economic Value of the Drink Trade.—(Concluded.)

HERE is an interesting statement by the Rev. Dawson Burns, M.A., who is admittedly a high authority upon a question of this nature, he estimates this loss as follows:—

First—Loss of wealth annually incurred in the production and retailing of intoxicating liquors.

Second—Expenses and burdens annually arising from the use of intoxicating liquors:—

This, of course is simply an estimate, but nearly all competent authorities deem it an under, rather than an overestimate. Mr. Hoyle's opinion, possibly our highest authority, is that the last two items could safely be made £10,000,000 more, and that if a proper allowance were made for the lost labour of our paupers, criminals, vagrants, thieves, lunatics, &c., it would amount to at least £20,000,000 more.

Take another particular. It is admitted that the value of every industry to a community is determined by the amount of labour it employs, or its wage fund.

The accumulations of the products of industry depend upon the right application of labour. If directed to produce useful articles, and these in their turn are rightly employed, it is rapid. If wrongly employed, the accumulation—if there be any—is slow and unsatisfactory.

When we buy any article, we simply pay for the labour expended upon it. So just as a community accumulates wealth—is its power to employ labour. This question has been almost entirely overlooked by our economists. Yet there is none of greater moment.

If the influence that a proper or improper expenditure of money exercises upon the demand of labour was realized, we would readily see the value of the drink trade to the country. Let us ask, how does the liquor trade stand when brought to this test? Mr. Hoyle in "Our National Resources" illustrates this matter by the example of the Poor Law Union of Bury. Its population in 1861 was 101,132 of whom 50,000 are engaged in labor, averaging 14s. per week wage?, which gives for the year £1,750,000.

In the Bury Union there are 205 public-houses, and 295 beershops, or a total of 500 places where intoxicating liquors are sold. While since 1860 a number of grocers sell wines and spirits. The average expenditure of these houses throughout the United Kingdom is upwards of £750 per annum. Taking this average for Bury, it gives £375,000 as spent in intoxicating liquors, or upwards of one-fifth of its total income. The manufacture of £375,000 worth of intoxicating liquors would not employ more than from 200 to 250 people; and if to these be added 500 publicans, and say as many servants, gives 1000 more, or a total of 1250 persons who derive a living from the £375,000 expended upon drink. Now, if £1,750,000 will give employment to 50,000, it follows that, if properly expended, £375,000 would find employment and subsistence for 10,714 persons, or 9,464 more than when spent on drink : so that by spending so much of the money on drink, there are, out of the 50,000 workers, 9,464 who are thrown out of employment, and have to be supported by the labour of the other 40,536 workers.

But the spending of £375,000 upon intoxicating drinks involves also the destruction of at least 250,000 bushels of grain, which, if converted into bread, would make 3½ millions 4lb. loaves, and would provide sustenance for the whole year for at least one-fourth of the population of the Union.

To show that substantially the same results always attend the presence of this trade, we append two or three tables from Dr. Hargreaves, United States, " Our Wasted Resources." Table IX., page 85, *shows the number of persons employed, the wages paid, value of materials used, the capital invested, etc., by expending but little more than half of what is paid for intoxicating drinks in Pennsylvania*

By this table it will be seen that by expending for useful and necessary articles of our manufactures, only 41,660,666 $\frac{2}{3}$ dollars, or little more than half of what is spent for liquors in Pennsylvania, it would give employment to 28,650 hands, pay 9,710,000 dollars in wages, use 21,500,000 dollars worth of raw materials, and find an investment for 18,750,000 dollars of capital in the manufacture of the articles named. What the result of that on the happiness, comfort and general prosperity of the State would be is incalculable.

Among the manufactures of Pennsylvania, as given in the Census Returns of 1870, are the following :—

Let us now compare the totals of Tables IX. and X. and see how the question stands:—

By the difference of totals we find that the money, if spent for useful articles, would employ 26,540 more hands; pay 8,716,616 dollars more for wages; pay 15,087,977 dollars more for materials; and invest 9,178,777 more capital to produce 41,666,663 $\frac{2}{3}$ dollars' worth of useful articles than it would to produce 11,692,528 dollars' worth of liquors at the places of manufacture.

We think statements such as these show beyond question that the existence of the liquor traffic is

destructive of the best material interests of a community, and is the real cause of bad trade, and the commercial disasters, which recur periodically while they are the *fons origo* of pauperism and vagrancy, to say nothing of the social and moral ruin wrought by their use.

Our space is exhausted, and our tale but half told. We had hoped to have referred to the address of Mr. George, Chairman of the Chamber of Commerce, some time since, when he availed himself of his position to commend the interests of the liquor traffic of the district to the tender consideration of the community. But that must be deferred for some other occasion. In the meantime, we ask our readers to apply the conclusions to be drawn from the foregoing statement to the state of this City of Wellington. We gather from Mr. George that there is about half a million of capital invested in Wellington in this trade, that taking the consumption of the city to average the rest of the colony, there is £100,000 spent here in intoxicating liquors annually. What we wish to be considered is this: supposing this capital was diverted from the trade, and employed in some other, which would use more raw material, and expend a vastly larger wage fund. What would be its effect on the trade, and the social life of the city? If this £100,000 *swallowed* annually by the inhabitants was diverted to the channels of productive and legitimate trade, the cry of depression and hard times would pass away, never to return.

And herein lies the remedy for the pauperism, which Major Atkinson is so laudably desirous of preventing. If he would apply his mind to this question and grapple with it, as he is doing with his National Insurance scheme, which even if he could carry it, would be at best, but a palliative, leaving a *cause* which in spite of any, and all such nostrums, would unfailingly produce a poverty so dense, as would practically enable the people to contribute the premiums necessary to insure the benefits sought. We venture to commend this matter to the honorable Ministers serious attention, as that which will be a radical cure, not only of the poverty, but largely of the vice and crime of the New Zealand which he loves, and of which he is so distinguished a son.

W. P.

FOR THE CONVENIENCE OF CUSTOMERS AND OTHERS, MESSRS. LYON & BLAIR HAVE IMPORTED A WELL-SELECTED SUPPLY OF FRENCH LITERATURE, COMPRISING WORKS BY BALZAC, PAUL DE KOCK, GEORGE SAND, ALPHONSE KARR, DUMAS, COMTESSE DASH, CONSCIENCE, PAUL FEVAL, BERTHET, SOULIE, ENAULT, HOUSSAYE, MALOT, LAMARTINE, LITTRE, FEYDEAU, CHAMFLEURY, &c., &c. These Books are having a large sale at prices ranging from 1/6 to 3/- each.

New Books & New Editions.—Continued.

- Nature and Thought: An Introduction to a Natural Philosophy. By St. George Mivart. 12s. 6d.
- Literary History of England in the end of the Eighteenth and beginning of the Nineteenth Century. By Mrs. Oliphant. In 3 vols. 25s.
- Introduction to the Literature of Europe in the Fifteenth, Sixteenth, and Seventeenth Centuries. By Henry Hallam, F.R.A.S. With Illustrations complete in 1 vol. 9s. 6d.
- Picturesque Scotland; its Romantic Ruins and Historical Associations, described by Lay and Legend, Song and Story. By Francis Watt, M.A., and the Rev. Andrew Carter. Coloured Illustrations, &c. 1 vol. 7s. 6d.
- Brief History of the Indian People. By W. W. Hunter, C.I.E., LL.D. 4s. 6d.
- Ralph Waldo Emerson: His Life, Genius, and Writings. A Biographical Sketch. By Alexander Ireland. 12s.
- Dictionary of Aneityumese Language. By Rev. John Inglis. 7s. 6d.
- Little Pilgrim in the Unseen. Macmillan. 3s. 6d.
- Introduction to the Science of Religion: Four Lectures delivered at the Royal Institution in February and May, 1870. By F. Max Müller, M.A. 9s. 6d.
- Macaulay (E.M.L. Series). By J. C. Morison. 3s. 6d.
- Tunis: The Land and People. By Chevalier De Hesse-Wartegg. New edition, with illustrations. 4s. 6d.
- Fiji and the Friendly Isles: Sketches of their Scenery and People. By S. E. Scholes. 1s. 6d.
- Manual of Vegetable Materia Medica. By George S. V. Wills. With 105 coloured illustrations and maps. 15s. 6d.
- Cities of Egypt. By Reginald Stuart Poole. 6s. 6d.
- Chapters on Evolution. By Andrew Wilson, F.R.S.E., F.L.S., &c. 9s. 6d.
- Winners in Life's Race; or, The Great Backboned Family. By Arabella B. Buckley. With numerous illustrations, 11s.
- Parallel New Testament. Greek and English side by side. Edited by F. H. A. Scrivener, M.A. 15s.
- Sacred Books of China : The Texts of Confucianism. Translated by James Legge. 14s. 6d.
- Satapatha-Brâhmana according to the Text of the Mâdhyandina school. Translated by Julius Eggeling. 14s.

- 6d.
 Bhagavadgîtâ. With the Sanatsugativa and the Anugîtâ. Translated by Kâshinath Trimbak Telang, M.A. 14s. 6d.
- Asiatic Studies: Religious and Social. By Sir Alfred C. Lyall. 14s. 6d.
- Vinaya Texts. Translated from The Pâli. By T. W. Rhys, Davids, and Hermann Oldenberg. 14s. 6d.
- Grape Vine : A Practically Scientific Treatise on its Management, explained from his own experiences and researches, in a thorough and intelligible manner for vineyardists and amateurs in garden and vine culture. By Frederick Mohr, Doctor of Philosophy and Medicine, &c. 7s. 6d.
- Land, Sea, and Sky; or, Wonders of Life and Nature: A description of the Physical Geography and Organic Life of the Earth. Translated from the German of Dr. Herman, &c. By J. Minshull. With 300 original illustrations. 10s.
- Land Nationalisation; Its Necessity and its Aims: Being a comparison of the system of landlord and tenant with that of occupying ownership in their influence on the well-being of the people. By Alfred Russel Wallace. Cheap Edition, 6s. 6d.
- On Mr. Spencer's Unification of Knowledge. By Malcolm Guthrie. 15s.
- The Early Days of Christianity. By Frederic W. Farrar, D.D. 2 vols. 27s. 6d.
- Charles Darwin Memorial Notices. Reprinted from "Nature." 3s.
- The Farm in the Karoo; or what Charley Vyvyan saw in South Africa. By Mrs. Carey-Hobson. Illustrated. 6s. 6d.
- Mate of the Jessica : A Story of the South Pacific. By F. Frankfort Moore. 5s. With illustrations.
- Correct Card, and How to Play it. By Major Campbell Walker. 3s. 6d.
- Laws of Short Whist. By James Clay. 4s. 6d.
- The Gardeners' Dictionary. By George W. Johnson. New edition. 7s. 6d.
- Through the Looking-Glass. By Lewis Carroll. With 50 illustrations. 7s. 6d.
- Alice's Adventures in Wonderland. By Lewis Carroll. Illustrated. 7s. 6d.
- A Thousand and One Gems of Song. By Charles Mackay, LL.D. 4s. 6d.
- Advice to a Mother. By Henry Chavasse, F.R.C.S. 3s. 6d.
- Counsel to a Mother. By Henry Chavasse, F.R.C.S. 3s. 6d.
- Advice to a Wife. By Henry Chavasse, F.R.C.S. 3s. 6d.
- Maternal Management of Children. By Thomas Bull. 2s.
- Illustrated Book of the Dog. By Vero Shaw, B.A. With an appendix on Canine Medicine and Surgery, by W. Gordon Staples, C.M., M.D., &c. 42s.
- Life of Richard Cobden. By John Morley. 3s.
- Book of the Horse, Saddle and Harness, British and Foreign. By S. Sidney. With full-page coloured illustrations and numerous wood engravings. 35s.
- The Thrift Book: A Cyclopoedia of Cottage Management and Practical Economy for the People. With many Illustrations. 9s.
- Cassell's Illustrated Universal History. By Edmund Oilier. 12s. 6d.
- Bracebridge Hall. By Washington Irving : With 120 Illustrations. 9d.
- Old Christmas. By Washington Irving. With 100 illustrations by Caldecott. 9d.
- The Russian Empire: Historical and Descriptive. By John Geddie, F.R.G .S. 7s. 6d.
- New Ireland: Political Sketches and Personal Reminiscences of Thirty Years of Irish Public Life. By A. M. Sullivan. Cloth gilt, 3s.
- The Mind of Mencius, or Political Economy. Founded upon Moral Philosophy. By the Chinese Philosopher Mencius, B.C. 325. 13s. 6d.
- My Sketch Book. By George Cruickshank. 6s.
- A Book of Boyhoods. By Ascott R. Hope. 5s.
- The Religious Signs of the Times : A Lecture. By Rev. Joseph Cook, delivered in Auckland. 6d.
- Newman's Essays: Critical and Historical. 2 vols. 15s.
- The Dominion of Australia : An Account of its Foundation. By W. H. L. Ranken. 15s.
- Maoria: A Sketch of the Manners and Customs of the Aboriginal Inhabitants of New Zealand. By Captain J. C. Johnstone. 7s.
- From Lock to Lock: A Playful Guide to the River Thames. Illustrated, from "Judy." 1s. 3d.
- Three Wonderful Travellers; or, The Adventures of an Out and Outer. Illustrated. 1s. 3d.
- A Short Account of a Canonisation at St. Peter's, at Rome, from an unsectarian point of view. By J. Henniker Heaton. 3s. 6d.
- The Confederate Chieftains: A Tale of the Irish Rebellion of 1641. By Mrs. J. Sadlier. 3s. 6d.
- Sartor Resartus: Heroes and Hero Worship, and Essays. By T. Carlyle. 3s. 6d.

- Arabian Nights' Entertainments. Illustrated by Millais and others. 1s. 6d.
- Longfellow's Poems. Illustrated. 1s. 6d.
- Hood's Own; or, Laughter from Year to Year. With the original illustrations. 3s.
- The Persian Chief. By William Dalton. 9d.
- Father Matthew. By J. F. Maguire, M.P. 9d.
- A Bird's-Eye View of Irish History (enlarged and carefully revised.) By Charles Gavan Duffy, K.C.M.G. 3s.
- Egypt Under Its Khedives; or, The Old House of Bondage under New Masters. By Edwin De Leon. With illustrations; 5s.
- The Burman: His Life and Notions. By Shway Yoe. In two volumes. 12s. 6d.
- The Laws of Contrast of Colour. By M. E. Chevreul. 4s. 6d.
- Ferdinand's Adventure; and other Stories. By Lord Brabourne. With illustrations by Ernest Griset. 7s. 6d.
- Talks about Science. By the late Thomas Dunman. With a biographical sketch by Charles Welsh. 4s. 6d.
- Winters Abroad: Some Information respecting Places Visited by the Author on Account of his Health. Intended for the use of Invalids. By R. H. Otter, M.A. 10s. 6d.
- Our Lord's Life on Earth. By the Rev. William Hanna, D.D., LL.D. 10s. 6d.
- Through America; or, Nine Months in the United States. By W. G. Marshall. Illustrated from Photographs. 20s.
- English Literature in the Reign of Queen Victoria. By John Morley. With fac similes of the signatures of Authors of this Reign, 3s.
- Science and Culture and other Essays. By Thomas H. Huxley, LL.D. 12s. 6d.
- Scepticisms in Geology, and the reasons for it. An assemblage of facts from nature opposed to the theory of "Causes now in action." By Verifie. 9s.
- Peak in Darien, with some other Inquiries touching concerns of the Soul and the Body. By Francis Power Cobbe. 10s.
- Familiar Lessons on Food and Nutrition. By Thomas Twining. 6s. 6d.
- Lord Palmerston. By Anthony Trollope. 3s.
- The Jews of Barnow. By Karl Emi Franzos. Translated by M. W. Macdonald. 7s. 6d.
- Jorrocks's Jaunts and Jollities. By Mr. John Jorrocks. 2s. 6d.
- My Old Playground Revisited: A Tour in Italy in the Spring of 1881. By Benjamin E. Kennedy. 7s. 6d.
- A smaller English Dictionary,—Etymological, Pronouncing, and Explanatory,—abridged from the Students' English Dictionary. By John Ogilvie, LL.D. 3s.
- Heroes of Britain in Peace and War. By Edwin Hodder. (Complete Edition in one Volume, Illustrated.) 17s. 6d.
- Head Hunters of Borneo: A Narrative of Travel up the Matakam and down the Barito. Also, Journeyings in Sumatra. By Carl Bock, with 30 colored Plates, Map, and Illustrations. (New Edition.) 40s.
- Pearls of the Pacific. By J. W. Boddam-Whetham. Illustrated. 9s. 6d.
- James T. Field's Biographical Notes and Personal Sketches, with Unpublished Fragments and Tributes from Men and Women of Letters, 15s.
- A Lady's Life in the Rocky Mountains. By Isabella L. Bird, with illustrations. 9s.
- Great Movements and those who achieved them. By Henry J. Nicoll, with eight Portraits. 7s.
- Rise of the Dutch Republic: A History by John Lothrop Morley. (A new Edition.) 4s. 6d.
- Amateur Theatricals. By Lady Pollock. 3s. 6d.
- Old Christmas: From the Sketch-book of Washington Irving. Illustrated by Caldecott. 7s. 6d.
- Bracebridge Hall. By Washington Irving. Illustrated by Caldecott. 7s. 6d.
- Wild Wales: Its People, Language, and Scenery. By George Borrow. 7s. 6d.
- Asia, with Ethnological Appendix. By Augustus H. Keane. Maps and Illustrations. 27s. 6d.
- The Little Cyclopædia of Common Things. Edited by the Rev. Sir George W. Cox, with numerous illustrations. 10s. 6d.
- A Popular Account of Missionary Travels and Researches in South Africa. By David Livingstone, with Map and Illustrations. 10s. 6d.
- Our Holiday in the East. By Mrs. George Sumner. 7s. 6d.
- Cast-Up by the Sea. By Sir Samuel W. Baker. (A new Edition with Illustrations by Huard.) 7s. 6d.
- A New English-German Dictionary. By C. Hossfeld. 2s.
- A New French-English Dictionary. By Hossfeld and Daniel. 2s.
- Warne's Model Cookery, with complete Instructions in Household Management, with colored Illustrations. 7s. 6d.
- Ward and Lock's Own Book: A Domestic Encyclopædia, forming a companion volume to Mrs. Beeton's

book of Household Management, with colored illustrations. 10s.

Ward and Lock's Book of Farm Management and Country Life: A complete Cyclopædia of Rural Occupation, with numerous illustrations. 10s.

Conflict between Religion and Science. By John W. Draper. 6s. 6d.

A History of France from the Earliest Times to the Year 1789: Related for the Rising Generation. By M. Guizot. Author of "The History of Civilization in Europe," Ac., Ac., with numerous illustrations. Translated by Robert Black, M.A. 7 vols. 12s. 6d. per vol.

Laurie's Interest Tables. Low rates; half calf, 32s. Ditto high rates, 9s.

Cottage Gardening. By E. Hobday. 2s.

Garden Receipts. By Charles W. Quin. 2s.

Notes on Cage Birds. By various hands. 6s.

Hall Marking of Jewellery Practically Considered. By George E. Gee. 7s. 6d.

The Canal Boy who became President. By F. T. Gammon. 2s.

System of Logic. By John Stuart Mill. 2 vols. 32s.

Principles of Political Economy. By John Stuart Mill. 7s.

The Russian Empire: Its Origin and Development. By S. B. Boulton. 2s. 6d.

Sir John Gilbert's Shakspeare. Edited by Howard Staunton. 800 Illustrations by Gilbert. ¼-bound, 8s; cloth gilt, 10s. 6d.

The Queen and the Royal Family; anecdotes and narratives. 7s. 6d.

History of the Formation of the Constitution of the United States of America. By George Bancroft. 2 vols. 30s.

Transcendental Physics: An Account of Experimental Investigation. From the Scientific Treatises of Johann C. F. Zölliner. By Charles Carelton Massey. 5s.

First Twenty Years of Australia : A History founded on Official Documents. By James Bonwick, F.R.G.S. 7s.

Romney and Lawrence. By Lord Gower. 3s. 6d.

Reminiscences. By Thomas Carlyle. Edited by J. A. Froude. In 2 vols. 20s.

Thomas Carlyle : A History of the First Forty Years of His Life, 1795-1835. By James Anthony Froude. In 2 vols. With Portrait and Etchings. 24s.

The Life of George Cruikshank. In two epochs. By Blanchard Jerrold, with numerous illustrations, in two volumes. 27s. 6d.

Catharine and Craufurd Tait, wife and son of Archibald Campbell, Archbishop of Canterbury. A Memoir by the Rev. William Benham, B.D. 3s. 6d.

The Newspaper Reader. The Journals of the Nineteenth Century, on events of the day. By H. F. Bussey and T. Reid. 3s. 6d.

Business by James Platt. 1s. 3d.

Money. By James Platt. 1s. 3d.

Monckton's National Stair Builder. A complete work on Stair-building and Hand-railing, with designs, &c. &c. Large quarto volume. 27s. 6d.

Twenty-four Volumes of Vanity Fair, bound half morroco, £22 0s. 0d. This set was published in London at £50.

Shaftsbury and Hutcheson. By Thos. Fowler. 4s. 6d.

Under the Sunset. By Bram Stoker. Illustrated. 12s. 6d.

The Crops of the Farm. By several writers. 3s. 6d.

The Revisers on the Greek Text of the New Testament. By two Members of the New Testament Company. 3s. 6d.

Health Primer Series: The Nerves. 1s. 3d.

Ollendorff's Key to the German Exercises. 8s. 6d.

Rifle Exercises and Musketry Instruction. 1s. 6d.

A Paper Currency Proposal; and other Subjects. By J. R. McBeth. 6d.

The Psalter and Canticles pointed and set to accompanying Chants: Ancient and Modern. By Sir H. Baker, and W. H. Monk. 4s.

Organ Copy of Hymns Ancient and Modern. By William Henry Monk. 27s. 6d.

German Culture and Christianity: Their Controversy in the Time 1770-1880. By Joseph Gostwick. 18s. 6d.

Outlines of Primitive Belief Among the Indo-European Races, by Keary. 20s.

Religion and Philosophy in Germany: A Fragment. By Heinrich Heine. 7s. 6d.

Mixed Essays, by Mathew Arnold. 10s.

New Annual Volumes.

Christmas Number Vanity Fair. With Portrait of H.R.H. the Princess of Wales.
Pictorial Wrapper. 1s. 6d. Sunday at Home. Cloth gilt, 7s. 6d.; half calf, 10s. 6d.
Leisure Hour. Cloth gilt, 7s. 6d.; half calf, 10s. 6d.
Cassell's Family Magazine. Cloth gilt, 10s. 6d.
The Quiver: For Sunday and General Reading. 8s. 6d.
Good Words. Edited by Donald Macleod. 8s. 6d.
The Sunday Magazine. Edited by Benjamin Waugh. 8s. 6d.
Little Folks; bound in fancy picture boards, 4s; cloth gilt, 6s.
Little Wide Awake; bound in fancy picture boards, 130 colored illustrations, 5s; cloth gilt, 6s. 6d.
Chatterbox, bound in fancy picture boards, 3s. 6d.; cloth gilt, 5s. 6d.
Vanity Fair, Winter Number, colored plates, 1s. 3d.